



Towards a Common Future for Education

A report commissioned by the Commonwealth Consortium for
Education

John Kirkland
February 2018



Foreword

This study of future possible directions for Commonwealth educational co-operation has been commissioned by the Commonwealth Consortium for Education (CCfE), a grouping of Commonwealth voluntary and professional organisations in the fields of education, youth and culture.

On the eve of the 20th Conference of Commonwealth Education Ministers in Fiji in February 2018, and the ensuing Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in London in April, this report is intended as a conversation starter to stimulate constructive dialogue on how educational collaboration can be enhanced through partnerships among (and beyond) members of the Commonwealth family. The combined resources of Commonwealth organisations and programmes in the education sector represent some of the Commonwealth's greatest assets. Consortium members believe there is great potential for mobilising these in the pursuit of Commonwealth objectives in the framework of global efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals.

The need for a stocktaking of Commonwealth education potential is given fresh urgency by significant reductions in the Commonwealth Secretariat's allocations for education work and its consequent calls for greater partnership working. Now is therefore a key moment for the Secretariat and its civil society partners to work together to identify new modes of engagement and cooperative mechanisms that strengthen both the Secretariat's contribution to education and that of its civil society partners who rely on the Secretariat for leadership, guidance, information, and for its brokerage services in facilitating access to governments and international organisations. We believe that Commonwealth effectiveness in education is most readily realised through productive partnerships between Commonwealth member governments, its intergovernmental organisations and Commonwealth associations.

In an effort to provide thought leadership on potential ways forward, the Consortium decided to commission a brief study of ways to advance Commonwealth educational co-operation in today's challenging circumstances. We were fortunate to secure as author Dr John Kirkland, former Deputy Secretary-General of the Association of Commonwealth Universities and Secretary of the Commonwealth Scholarship Commission in the UK for nearly 20 years. He thus brought to the task extensive personal knowledge of major Commonwealth institutions and programmes, and experience of the way Commonwealth business is conducted in ministerial conferences and committees. He was asked to work to the terms of reference shown at Appendix 1.

Dr Kirkland worked with speed and diligence to complete this report in the limited time available. Both he and the Consortium were very conscious that whilst he consulted as widely as he could (see list of informants at Appendix 4), much broader input is required and this report was always intended as a catalyst for debate, rather than the more substantial review of the sector that we believe is necessary and hope will ensue from the discussions this study stimulates. We would like to record our deep appreciation to Dr Kirkland for his dedication to the task and the skill with which he has executed it and we also put on record our gratitude to all those who contributed material and insights to assist him.

The analysis, conclusions and recommendations to the Consortium are entirely Dr Kirkland's own as an independent consultant. We are sharing them more widely as a first contribution to a debate that we believe should take place in the next few weeks and months about the way forward for the Commonwealth in educational co-operation.

We do not expect complete agreement with Dr Kirkland's analysis and conclusions, but we would anticipate that many of the central points he makes will command wide assent. For example he draws attention to the wide range and variety of educational institutions and programmes bearing the Commonwealth name, and sees them as representing significant potential. He reports that calls for more partnership working were universally welcomed and that a leadership role from the Secretariat and the requisite professional capacity to sustain it were seen as crucial to establishing an effective new partnership mechanism. He notes that there is a symbiotic relationship between the functions and capacities of the inter-governmental, governmental and non-governmental actors and believes that if all pull together, and given leadership, the education part of the Commonwealth family is capable of a great deal more than it has been able to achieve through somewhat fragmented past efforts.

Dr Kirkland also proposes a number of new ways for the education community to work together, including: joint programmes of work on priority issues; the idea of creating a forum through which the main Commonwealth education players could co-ordinate their efforts more closely; and wider resort to mobilisation of distinguished thought-leaders and experienced practitioners as Commonwealth chair-holders and Commonwealth champions; and the greater engagement with the young people who represent the Commonwealth's future.

Let this then be seen as an initial contribution to a broader debate and deeper thinking. The Consortium's earnest hope is that such a debate will culminate in agreement by Governments to commission an in-depth review of Commonwealth capacities for collaboration in education and how best to realise the potential that undoubtedly exists. This would provide a platform for launching an exciting new Commonwealth Education Agenda as we celebrate the 60th Anniversary of Commonwealth educational co-operation in 2019.

Professor Colin Power, AM

Chair, Commonwealth Consortium for Education

c/o Association of Commonwealth Universities,
Woburn House, 20-24 Tavistock Square,
London WC1H 9HF

secretary@commonwealtheducation.org
www.commonwealtheducation.org

Contents

Foreword.....	i
Preface	v
Executive Summary.....	1
Introduction	5
Purpose of the Study.....	5
Key Stakeholders and the Structure of Commonwealth Collaboration	5
Education and the Commonwealth	7
Context and Recent Developments	7
Contraction versus Expansion.....	7
The Case for Commonwealth Education	9
The Role of Commonwealth Education Organisations	12
Scope and Functions	12
Achievements and Potential	14
Barriers and Constraints	16
Possible Responses	18
The Role of Governments	19
The Role of the Commonwealth Secretariat	20
Supporting the Secretariat.....	21
Alternative Approaches	22
The Potential for Collaboration	23
Conferences of Commonwealth Education Ministers	25
The Potential for Reform	27
A Programme for Renewal.....	28
Increasing the Policy Impact	28
Increasing Participation	29
Increasing Awareness	31
Implementation and Resources.....	31
Conclusion.....	34
Appendices.....	35
Appendix 1: Terms of Reference.....	35
Appendix 2: Membership of the Commonwealth Consortium for Education (CCfE)	37
Appendix 3: List of Accredited Commonwealth Organisations	38
Appendix 4: List of Informants.....	41

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACU	Association of Commonwealth Universities
AO	Accredited Organisations
CAPA	Commonwealth Association of Technical Universities and Polytechnics in Africa
CCfE	Commonwealth Consortium for Education
CCEAM	Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and Management
CCEM	Conference of Commonwealth Education Ministers
CFTC	Commonwealth Fund for Technical Cooperation
CHEC	Commonwealth Human Ecology Council
CHOGM	Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting
COL	Commonwealth of Learning
CSFP	Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan
EMAG	Education Ministers Action Group
EPG	Eminent Persons Group
IFCO	Informal Forum of Commonwealth Organisations
IGO	Inter-Governmental Organisation
LGBT	Lesbian Gay Bisexual and Transgender
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
RCS	Royal Commonwealth Society
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
Secretariat	Commonwealth Secretariat
UNESCO	United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization

Preface

Production of this study in the time available would not have been possible without the active support of many individuals. Grateful thanks are extended to those listed in Appendix 4, who gave their time to talk with me, send written comments or attend consultation meetings, also to the staff of the Commonwealth Secretariat library. Their collective knowledge of the Commonwealth and its mechanisms was inspirational.

Huge appreciation is also extended to the Commonwealth Consortium for Education, whose grant made the report possible, and to its Secretary and Acting Secretary, Beth Kreling and Peter Williams, for their guidance throughout. Additional gratitude is due to Peter Williams for his thorough reading through of successive drafts, which prevented many errors appearing in the final version. Any that remain are entirely my own.

John Kirkland

January 2018

Executive Summary

Education has declined as a priority area for Commonwealth collective action. This study identifies the reasons for this, and re-visits the case for the Commonwealth Secretariat to maintain a significant presence. Consideration is given to the role of other Commonwealth organisations working in education, of individual Commonwealth governments, and how more effective cooperation could develop between all stakeholders. The report examines the role of triennial Conferences of Commonwealth Education Ministers (CCEM), and concludes by proposing a three-year programme of action to refresh the Commonwealth's role in education leading up to the next CCEM in 2021.

The main findings are as follows:

Education in the Commonwealth (Paragraphs 13-41)

- Education plays a substantial role in the Commonwealth. There are probably more civil society organisations working in this area of Commonwealth co-operation than any other, and a Commonwealth inter-governmental organisation (COL) devoted specifically to it.
- Resources for education within the Commonwealth Secretariat have declined rapidly. This reflects declining Secretariat resources generally, increased funding pressure from other policy areas and a consequent desire to focus on areas where the Commonwealth is thought to add most value. There is an urgent need for education to refresh its case.
- Member governments disagree about what priority the Commonwealth should give to education. Some argue that other international bodies are better placed to work in the area. Others, primarily from developing countries, respond that education is a priority area for most countries, and that the Commonwealth agenda should reflect their needs.
- Recent years have seen compromises between these two positions. The Commonwealth Secretariat has retained its education presence, but with a significantly reduced resource base. This outcome is unlikely to satisfy either side in the argument above.
- The 2017-21 Strategic Plan envisages that the remaining education functions of the Secretariat will be merged in to a Social Policy Development team. For education, this could present either an opportunity (for cooperation across sector boundaries) or a threat (further reducing viability and visibility).
- Distinctive features of Commonwealth collaboration include the unique balance of developed and developing countries, attention to the role of small states, openness of debate and common values. Some are particularly relevant to education – including the use of English language in teaching and the number of Commonwealth education organisations, with the potential to reach down into their respective memberships.
- Specific examples of recent successful Commonwealth collaboration include the development of the *Commonwealth Teacher Recruitment Protocol* and the development of a common position on the role of education in the Sustainable Development Goals. The role of the market in education is an example of a policy area where the Commonwealth could make a distinctive contribution in future.
- The 2017-21 Commonwealth Secretariat Strategic Plan identifies Peace, People, Prosperity and Planet as being strategic priorities. Education has a critical role to play in achieving all four of these.
- Taken together, the intrinsic importance of education in many Commonwealth countries, the ability to apply distinctive features of Commonwealth collaboration to education, and the synergy between education and the Commonwealth Strategic Plan strengthen the case

for a visible and distinct education presence in Commonwealth priorities. This needs to be supplemented by evidence of specific impact and continuing demand from member states.

The Role of Commonwealth Organisations (Paragraphs 41-72)

- The overwhelming majority of Commonwealth education collaboration takes place outside the Secretariat. Collectively, Commonwealth groups working in education touch tens of thousands of Commonwealth citizens each year. The Strategic Plan proposes more collaboration between the Secretariat and such external organisations.
- This effort is disproportionately centred on four organisations and programmes – the Commonwealth of Learning, Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan, Association of Commonwealth Universities and Commonwealth Education Trust. These four have the presence and expertise to lead any programme of renewal.
- The exercise of this leadership requires the four organisations to engage closely with the Secretariat and each other, possibly through establishment of a joint forum. Such a forum could take the lead in identifying new areas for Commonwealth intervention, and significantly raise the attractiveness of the Commonwealth as an international partner.
- Other civil society organisations also have a significant contribution to make to maintenance of the Commonwealth presence across the sector. Although not on the scale of the ‘big four’, taken together they have substantial reach.
- Many such organisations are keen to increase their presence, but are struggling. Membership revenues are not sufficient to maintain activity, they have no core funding and many find project funding difficult to access. Selective support is needed to create an environment in which such organisations can develop.
- Four potential areas of support are identified. First, measures to increase available manpower, by converting a higher proportion of those who have ‘one-off’ contact with the Commonwealth into long-term supporters. Second, measures to attract additional expertise and younger members, who could have a disproportionate impact in stimulating activity. Third, the development of a stronger ‘Commonwealth education brand’ to increase recognition and visibility of current activities. Finally, incentivisation of such groups through clearer opportunities to contribute to policy, including a route to suggest topics for Ministerial discussion.

The Role of Governments (Paragraphs 73-77)

- Individual governments tend to be regarded as consumers of Commonwealth policy, or as part of the accountability process. There is potential for them to use the Commonwealth more proactively as a channel through which to pursue their own policy objectives and development.
- The Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan provides an example of governments working bilaterally, under a multilateral framework. Some governments have provided earmarked funding for specific programmes in addition to their core contributions, or used the Commonwealth as a channel to find recipients for existing scholarships or other development programmes. Additional channels for government collaboration might be through collaborative benchmarking of programmes; secondment of staff to Commonwealth organisations to work on specific issues; participation in working parties to address specific issues of Commonwealth concern; and more active contribution to Conferences of Commonwealth Education Ministers.

Role of the Commonwealth Secretariat (Paragraphs 78 – 91)

- The substantial role of other Commonwealth organisations in education might be said to obviate the need for active Secretariat engagement with the education sector. This view is rejected. Some functions can only be delivered through a strong central presence, including acting as the main point of contact with individual governments and implementing the policies that they agree. The capacity and reach of these partner bodies depends very much on an active and engaged Secretariat.
- Staff resources for education within the Secretariat have declined rapidly. The Secretariat is no longer able to fund important historical functions. Its main roles over the next three years are likely to be those of an enabler, providing facilitation, brokering and coordination, and acting as a catalyst for activity between member governments. With its current resource base, the Secretariat may be stretched in performing those functions, and unlikely to provide ‘thought leadership’ on education issues affecting Commonwealth countries.
- The Secretariat has attracted external funding for its education work in the past year. Such funding is welcome, however project work should not be its main source of funding.
- Commonwealth organisations can support the Secretariat in several ways – providing information, information manipulation, platforms, evidence, advocacy and expertise.
- The Secretariat is the natural focal point for coordinating Commonwealth education activity, especially with regards to relations with and between member governments. Should this no longer be possible, consideration should be given to alternative mechanisms which could assume this role.

The Potential for Collaboration (Paragraphs 92-101)

- Realising the full potential of Commonwealth education activity depends on an ability to work together – amongst Commonwealth organisations and between such organisations and the Secretariat.
- Several successful collaborations are identified, together with existing structures to encourage these, yet there remains a tendency for organisations to work in silos.
- Constraints to stronger collaboration include lack of communication, over concentration on London based activity, and sometimes a lack of trust between civil society organisations and the Secretariat. The biggest constraints are time and resources.
- Incentives for common working are critical, given that organisations have their own ambitions and often operate on a voluntary basis with limited resources.
- Past collaboration instigated by the Secretariat is often seen as ‘top-down’ and ‘one-way’. A clear definition of partnerships is needed, defining key principles and operational models, and providing more opportunities for proposals to be made to the Secretariat.
- The forum proposed to ‘brainstorm’ on current policy issues, and identify new areas of collaboration, could provide an important stimulus to collaboration.

Conferences of Commonwealth Education Ministers (Paragraphs 102-121)

- Recent conferences have sought to fulfil four functions – sharing expertise amongst governments, providing accountability to Ministers, framing a ‘Commonwealth view’ and engagement with civil society
- Conferences continue to enjoy reasonable support, although perhaps more so from developing than developed countries.

- Examples of impact from CCEMs include the Ministerial group to put forward a Commonwealth approach to education targets and establishment of the CSFP Endowment Fund.
- CCEMs do not fulfil their potential. Governments need to be more engaged in agenda setting, and encouraged to consider their conference aims in advance. CCEMs must be regarded as a 'place to do business' in a culture of open, informal discussion.
- Further reforms are needed to ensure civil society involvement. These should include greater access to official delegations, recognising that this could be difficult to ensure in advance. Accredited organisations should be invited to propose items for discussion and report to the main CCEM, to be selected on a competitive basis.
- The proposed 2021 CCEM in Kenya would be an ideal opportunity for a substantial re-launch of the Commonwealth presence in education. If this is confirmed, planning should start immediately.

A Programme for Renewal (Paragraphs 122-140)

- A three-year programme of activity is proposed – leading to the 2021 CCEM and matching the period of the Secretariat Strategic Plan. The programme comprises three elements.
- *Increased policy impact* is proposed through creation of six working groups tasked with providing high profile insights into key issues. Membership of such groups should encourage cross-working across Commonwealth organisations, with members from civil society groups and member governments. Each group could be serviced by the Secretariat or one of the larger Commonwealth education organisations.
- *Increased participation* would be encouraged by programmes to attract a new cohort of experts to work under the Commonwealth banner, and a new cohort of younger participants, initially utilising Commonwealth Scholars and alumni. These activities should also seek to improve the geographical balance of participants.
- Creation of a stronger '*Commonwealth education*' brand, and developing publicity outlets which bring together existing achievements would *increase awareness* of Commonwealth education activity. This should be used to consolidate involvement from those who are currently touched by Commonwealth education initiatives on a one-off basis.
- The proposals recognise resource limitations, but require some additional resources. A level of between £100-220k per year is suggested, including an additional resource of 1-2 full time equivalent staff within the Secretariat. Funding should be sought from a combination of Secretariat sources, in-kind support and external funding.
- Implementation of the proposals should involve the whole sector, with the Secretariat working in partnership with the Commonwealth of Learning and civil society representatives.

Conclusion (Paragraphs 141-143)

- Much will be lost if the decline in Secretariat capacity and engagement in education continues. The international visibility of the Commonwealth will be reduced, and some member governments may conclude that the Commonwealth does not reflect their interests. By failing to engage in education, the Commonwealth is neglecting some of its most visible activities and its members' deepest needs and aspirations.

The report has proposed a series of modest practical measures as a first step to arresting the decline in Secretariat resources for education, whilst recognising the likely resource constraints of the immediate future.

Introduction

Purpose of the Study

1. The Commonwealth Consortium for Education seeks to ‘promote the development of education throughout the Commonwealth by mobilising the contribution of education-based civil society organisations’. Its member organisations believe that education should play a critical role in the process of Commonwealth renewal, which it hopes will be an outcome of the 2018 Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting.
2. This study seeks to assist in that process. It essentially covers three areas - it reviews the case for education as a Commonwealth priority; considers the extent of current collaboration and the role of key players within it; and makes recommendations on how this might be increased. The terms of reference can be found in Appendix 1. The report is primarily aimed at an audience with some prior awareness of Commonwealth activities, although the definitions in this introduction are intended to provide some insights for the lay reader.
3. The analysis took place between October and December 2017, and involved interaction with over fifty representatives of Commonwealth governments, organisations and other stakeholders, listed in Appendix 4. Given the limited time to assimilate information, it is possible that this report may contain some inaccuracies and omissions. Responsibility for these rests with the author.
4. The report defines ‘education’ broadly. This embraces all age levels, and informal as well as formal and traditional methods. Analysis embraces some organisations whose activities are not primarily in education, but none the less interact with the sector. Examples are not drawn proportionally across areas of education, but reflect the current scale of activity. The analysis and recommendations for further action are, however, intended to be applicable throughout the sector.
5. The report presents a snapshot of Commonwealth activity, at a time of significant change. The Commonwealth Secretariat is undertaking a review of high-level governance which may make further recommendations which affect the education function. Commonwealth Education Ministers will meet in February 2018 at their 20th Conference in Fiji. The Commonwealth itself has identified four key areas of priority – fairness, prosperity, security and sustainability – for review by Heads of Government in April. The Commonwealth Secretary-General has written to Commonwealth Accredited Organisations (AOs) asking for suggestions on ways in which they can help deliver the Secretariat’s Strategic Plan for 2017/21.
6. Any of these developments might produce new directions, which could render some of the recommendations below outdated. However, the analysis is also intended to address longer term trends in the strength and nature of Commonwealth organisations, the extent and purpose of Commonwealth involvement in education and the relationship between the official Commonwealth, professional expertise and civil society.

Key Stakeholders and the Structure of Commonwealth Collaboration

7. Key Commonwealth organisations are listed in Appendix 3. An overview of the relationship between these may be helpful as a preliminary to the analysis, and to assist the lay reader.
8. The *Commonwealth Secretariat* is the main inter-governmental agency and central institution of the Commonwealth, responsible for facilitating co-operation, for organising key meetings (including

those of Heads of Government) and for implementing their conclusions. Although the Secretariat has the prime responsibility for managing Commonwealth affairs, there are two other 'inter-governmental organisations' which receive funding directly from member states. The *Commonwealth Foundation* was established to foster relations between non-government bodies and civil society involvement in Commonwealth affairs. The *Commonwealth of Learning* has a specific mandate to promote open and distance learning throughout Commonwealth member states, a function which has extended to such areas as teacher training and quality assurance.

9. A key feature of Commonwealth collaboration is the range of '*accredited*' organisations, listed in Appendix 3. These often represent specific professionals and interests. They are not part of the 'formal' Commonwealth, but their affiliation to the Commonwealth is accredited by a sub-committee of the Secretariat Board of Governors.

10. Organisations seeking accreditation must meet criteria arranged under five headings – a commitment to the fundamental values and principles set out in the Commonwealth Charter, representing the true diversity of Commonwealth countries (including presence, membership and activities in at least three of the four Commonwealth regions), accountability and transparency, openness to eligible individuals, organisations and associations from other Commonwealth member countries and activity track record. The number of such organisations is increasing. The 76 accredited bodies on the current list compare with 65 in 2011.

11. Accredited Organisations divide into two main groups. These are, first, networks of individuals organised on a Commonwealth-wide basis, often around a single profession or discipline, and second, wider-interest or pressure groups that subscribe to Commonwealth values but whose interests are not confined to the Commonwealth. One respondent differentiated these as '*organisations of the Commonwealth, and organisations in the Commonwealth*'. The main benefits of accreditation are access to Secretariat staff, facilities and resources, and participation in events and consultation. The latter area offers involvement in meetings and consultation mechanisms, including privileged access to Ministerial and Heads of Government Meetings.

12. A recent analysis by the Royal Commonwealth Society and Informal Forum of Commonwealth Organisations estimates that eighteen Accredited Organisations have education as a major function. Several organisations whose main function is not education embrace some educational activities: CCfE membership includes bodies such as the Commonwealth Human Ecology Council, the English Speaking Union and the Royal Overseas League. Conversely some CCfE members that focus on education are not formally accredited. One key Commonwealth educational activity – the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan - has survived for almost sixty years with virtually no formal structure, and in consequence does not appear on any of the institutional lists.

Education and the Commonwealth

Context and Recent Developments

13. Education has played a major role in the history of the Commonwealth. It provides the longest standing, and largest, of the sectoral Ministerial meetings. The Education team at Marlborough House was established in 1960, five years before the Secretariat itself. Commonwealth collaboration in education has produced enduring and well recognised structures such as Commonwealth Scholarships and the Commonwealth of Learning. It has provided technical support to individual governments, and developed common positions. There are probably more Commonwealth civil society organisations working in education than any other field.

14. Past achievements alone will not be sufficient to guarantee the place of education in future Commonwealth priorities. In an age when the Commonwealth has been subject to increasing scrutiny by its major donors, and which has seen the emergence of new priority concerns, education needs to refresh its case to be at the heart of Commonwealth activity.

15. The need for such refreshment is acute. The Eminent Persons Group, established in 2011 to identify priorities for Commonwealth renewal, did not highlight education in detail. Reporting on the relationship between the official Commonwealth and civil society the following year, Stuart Mole interpreted reaction to the EPG report as indicating that ‘the Secretariat will no longer attempt to act as a provider across a whole range of mandates’.

16. The following year saw the Education Section of the Secretariat reduce from eight professional and support staff to five, continuing a decline from fifteen staff two decades earlier. This process has continued in more recent restructuring, to a current position where core funding supports only one senior staff member devoted entirely to education. This process has inevitably left the Secretariat unable to undertake many of its historic functions.

17. The 2017-21 *Strategic Plan* signals no intention to reverse this trend, again emphasising the need to streamline Commonwealth activities. The main reference to education indicates that:

Recognising that health and education are key development sectors with significant national and international budgets, the Secretariat is keen to focus its expertise and comparative advantage where it is most effective. Hence, the Secretariat’s efforts will focus towards policy advocacy and technical support for the development and implementation of strengthened health and education policies that better undergird the SDGs

18. It is intended that education activity will be combined with health, youth and gender functions, as part of a Social Policy Development team in the Economic, Youth and Sustainable Development Directorate. This may represent a threat or an opportunity for education. It might lead to further decline in its visibility or it could allow a re-shaping of boundaries, particularly with the youth programme, which has been better able to maintain funding in recent years. The Commonwealth’s youth agenda embraces several areas that interface with education, including the development of a new diploma in youth work and the establishment of a Commonwealth Students Association.

Contraction versus Expansion

19. Strong views are held on the role of education as a Commonwealth function. These are sometimes portrayed as a difference of opinion between developed and developing countries. This division was broadly accurate within the small sample of country representatives consulted.

20. Developed countries stress their commitment to international development, education, and the Commonwealth. They do not, however, believe that Commonwealth organisations represent an effective channel for education funding, when compared with larger, more professional or specialised organisations that have access to greater resources, expertise and local infrastructure. In an age of greater transparency and accountability, they are under pressure to apply development expenditure in ways which have the most demonstrable impact.

21. Increased interest in emerging new policy areas, such as peace and security, has further increased pressure on education budgets. Recent years have seen increasing emphasis on governance, democracy and human rights, said to reflect priorities in the Commonwealth Charter. A review of the *2013-17 Strategic Plan* by the University of Wolverhampton noted concerns that the range of Secretariat activities was ‘too broad for an organisation with a £50 million portfolio’. It was argued that the Commonwealth must focus on areas in where it has most comparative advantage.

22. The counter view is that Commonwealth priorities should reflect the needs of all member states. For developing countries, education remains a major priority; inevitably so, given the age profile of their populations. In their eyes Commonwealth education programmes remain some of the most visible expressions of Commonwealth membership.

23. One respondent found it difficult to see how an organisation could promote democracy without taking a corresponding interest in education, arguing that ‘you can have education without democracy, but not democracy without education’. Another questioned the argument that the Commonwealth was focusing on those areas highlighted in the Charter – ‘I do not see trade mentioned in the Charter, but that seems to have no difficulty finding a place on the Commonwealth agenda.’ A wider concern was expressed at the trend for larger donor countries to earmark their contributions to specific projects, rather than Commonwealth funds more generally. This was thought to undermine the nature of the Commonwealth as a multi-lateral institution which takes decisions collectively, and move it towards a series of bi-lateral programmes – ‘a pay to play’ approach where priorities are determined by the largest donors. Some informants expressed concerns that the Commonwealth agenda was too UK-centred.

24. There are strong arguments to suggest that Commonwealth educational co-operation should not be judged by international development criteria alone. It also benefits public diplomacy, international relations and cultural understanding. One informant observed that many donors ‘wrongly perceive the role of the Commonwealth in education to be principally as aid giver and receiver, rather than as a creative force in seeking for a more equitable world order in international educational relations’. Most large donor countries, however, now classify support for the Commonwealth as development aid, requiring measurable outcomes demonstrating impact. Not all Commonwealth organisations are good at speaking the language used by contemporary evaluators.

25. Discussions on the future of education in the Commonwealth tend to polarise around one or other of the views summarised above. Both have some merit. It is in the interests of developing, even more than of developed, countries that expenditure is deployed in ways that have most impact. Conversely a multilateral organisation – particularly one that espouses democratic values – needs to reflect the wishes and needs of its entire membership, substantial numbers of whom want to see education play a significant role in Commonwealth relationships.

26. This divergence of view has had a damaging impact. It has produced a compromise – the retention of an education function within the Secretariat, but with a sharply reduced presence – unlikely to satisfy those on either side of the debate. An under resourced education staff which

none the less carries considerable weight of expectation is liable to produce neither the evidence of impact sought by major donors, nor the level of active engagement desired by developing countries.

The Case for Commonwealth Education

27. One proposition put to the author was that past Commonwealth education collaboration had often been supply-led, responding to the needs and interests of the implementing agency (whether the Secretariat or other Commonwealth organisations) rather than those of funders and recipient governments. Any future role will depend on identifying the *demand* for Commonwealth activity.

28. To address this point, there is a need to identify the distinctive features of the Commonwealth as a delivery mechanism, refresh these in the light of current trends and needs, and identify how they can be applied specifically to education collaboration. It is important to be realistic and honest, but not to become overburdened with expectations that are not met elsewhere. The role of the Commonwealth needs to be looked at in the context of what international organisations generally can and do deliver, and of available resources. Those justifying an education role for the Commonwealth should not need to meet more exacting standards or different criteria from those applying to others.

29. Much of the case for a 'distinctive' Commonwealth role applies across all policy areas, but should be briefly recited here for completeness. This includes:

- The balance of *developing and developed countries*, special opportunities to shape international agendas and reach consensus on topics which often divide the two groups, such as migration and brain drain
- The significant membership amongst *small states*, giving a presence that these are unlikely to achieve through other fora, and distinctive insight into issues that disproportionately impact on them, such as climate change
- The ability, as an *inter-governmental organisation*, to gain the attention of member governments and other international bodies in a way that would not be possible for individual member states alone
- The use of a *common language* and presence of *shared values and structures*, still reflected in many domestic systems and practices
- The *voluntary nature* of membership, intended to be part of a wider and enduring relationship extending beyond specific issues
- Existence of a strong network of *civil society organisations*, and opportunities for these to engage with government.

30. A further significant claim is that Commonwealth discussions can be more open, informal, honest and transparent than those of other international organisations. Sometimes this is said to reflect the voluntary nature of membership and the acceptance of common values. A more sceptical view is that the lack of resources at stake and absence of formal resolution encourages openness, because what the Commonwealth decides matters less than outcomes of other international organisations.

31. One representative of a developed country recognised that the ability to offer genuinely open and honest exchanges between member governments could provide the Commonwealth with a distinctive selling point. Planning international development initiatives, he argued, was hindered by a lack of clear articulation of southern needs and priorities, sometimes leading to a degree of 'second guessing' between donors and recipients.

32. How far can these advantages be demonstrated to apply in the specific area of education? In the climate of public accountability and impact evaluation highlighted above, specific examples of application are needed in order to extend the general benefits of the Commonwealth into a case for maintaining or expanding its education work. Three such examples – two of past activities, and one for future potential collaboration - are cited below.

33. The first concerns agreement of the *Commonwealth Teacher Recruitment Protocol*, aimed at providing defining agreed practices and frameworks for use on teacher migration, a topic where developing and developed country interests divide sharply. Following discussion at the 2003 Conference of Commonwealth Education Ministers, the Protocol was finally agreed at a meeting in 2004, acceptance being formally proposed by the Jamaican Minister, and seconded by a UK counterpart.

34. The Protocol gained significant credibility amongst other international agencies, leading to joint activity with UNESCO and acting as a model for a Continental Teacher Recruitment Protocol in Africa. An article by Kimberly Ochs, presented at the sixth Commonwealth Symposium on Teacher Mobility, Recruitment and Migration in 2011, highlighted the distinctive consultation methods of the Commonwealth as being critical to its progress:

The process of delivering the CTRP is exemplary in the extent to which it has been able to draw on different levels and experiences from member states. Through the establishment of interim committees to oversee the Protocol, to the ongoing involvement of senior government officials, including regular reporting to Ministers at CCEMs, there has been a continuing emphasis on collaboration.

35. The second example concerns the development, following the 2012 Conference of Commonwealth Education Ministers, of joint proposals for the development of international Sustainable Development Goals. The importance of this intervention was articulated by a senior NGO representative:

I would defend the role of the CCEM as a space which really helped to tip the balance in the build up to agreeing the SDGs. There were some powerful global forces questioning whether there should be a standalone education goal or arguing for a very narrowly farmed goal based on basic literacy and numeracy amongst young children. The CCEM marked a turning point in making the case for a more ambitious and inclusive goal. I think that the relative informality and the confidence of developing country members to speak up in such a forum (where in other donor-funded/ resource-related forums they might be cautious) helped to make a big difference. I wonder whether, ironically, the Commonwealth acts as a space where developing countries sometimes feel more entitled and emboldened to challenge former colonial powers

36. Another participant reported that:

After the CCEM I chaired the feedback session of the Global Consultation in Education in Dakar in 2013 where six different sets of proposals were considered. The one we developed for the Ministerial Working Group stood out for its coherence and continuity and had a more credible legitimacy because of the way it was developed.

37. My third example is an area where Commonwealth collaboration has the *potential* to play a distinctive role. The increasing role of the 'market' has been a major feature in education over the past three decades. In some Commonwealth countries the state is now the minority supplier of tertiary education. This trend may increase further as student demand outstrips the ability of governments to provide education of the required quality. The issue extends beyond higher education; provision at secondary level contains many examples of the growth of private English language teaching and pupils registering for international examinations.

38. Combined with de-regulation in public provision, these developments mean that decisions taken by individuals (whether, what, where and how to study and work) and individual institutions (what to offer, at what price and what quality) are increasingly important to the success of national systems.

39. The Commonwealth is potentially well placed to make a distinctive contribution in the area. Policy development in a 'market' requires an understanding of the motivation of individual actors. The Commonwealth has a tradition of convening that goes beyond governments – to teachers, students, universities and other institutions. Understanding their experience and motivations is critical in planning future provision, for marketing services and devising future development programmes, yet there are gaps in our knowledge. Through their members - universities, polytechnics, teachers and students - Commonwealth organisations have the capacity to articulate need or opinion that could play a very important role in this regard.

40. Finally, in making the case for Education as part of Commonwealth priorities, mention should be made of its relevance to the priorities stated for the forthcoming CHOGM, those identified in the Secretariat *Strategic Plan* (see paragraph 17 above), and in the United National Sustainable Development Goals, on which the Plan is partly based. Some illustrative examples, set against specific priorities from the Plan, are given in Table 1.

41. This section has identified three main arguments for the retention of education as a Commonwealth priority. These are its intrinsic policy importance, particularly to developing country members, evidence that the distinctive benefits of Commonwealth collaboration can be and are applied in the context of education; and the strong synergy between education and other Commonwealth priority areas. These arguments strengthen the case for the education presence to be distinct and visible, rather than being regarded as a support mechanism to be deployed in pursuit of other objectives.

The Role of Commonwealth Education Organisations

Scope and Functions

42. The next three sections consider the ability of key stakeholders to contribute to educational co-operation, looking in turn at organisations external to the Secretariat, member governments and the Secretariat itself. Currently the vast majority of pan-Commonwealth educational activity emanates from the first of these categories.

43. The Commonwealth makes strong claims for its engagement with civil society. An official publication notes that ‘Commonwealth citizens are linked by an active network of more than eighty intergovernmental, civil society, cultural and professional organisations’. This level of contact is often claimed as a distinctive feature. Addressing the United Nations Human Rights Council, the previous Secretary-General argued that ‘one of the Commonwealth’s unique strengths is that we are an association of peoples and not just governments. We encourage and support greater cooperation ... as partners in deepening and strengthening our work’ Stuart Mole’s 2012 report compared the Commonwealth with a range of other international organisations. Mole concluded that the Commonwealth was ‘unique in having a range of professional and other organisations which define their identity and – in most cases – the scope of their work by reference to it.’

44. The types of organisation working on education in the Commonwealth, and the process by which they are accredited, are outlined in paragraphs 7-12. These have been set up at different times, for different purposes and with different membership and accountability regimes. This diversity can militate against collaboration, reflecting different foci among subject and professional topics rather than their common commitment to the Commonwealth. Some overlaps exist in function; the organisations can be rivals as well as collaborators. They can compete for members, resources and attention, and in the policy interests that they advance. The scope of Commonwealth groups has not been designed to proportionately reflect the needs of the sector. Higher education, for example, is over represented when compared with primary education. Perhaps this is inevitable given the greater extent of international mobility at that level.

Table 1: Synergies between the Secretariat's Strategic Plan and Commonwealth Education Activities

COMMONWEALTH STRATEGIC PRIORITY	EXAMPLE OUTCOMES (numbers relate to Strategic Plan outcomes)	EXAMPLES OF RELEVANT EDUCATION ACTIVITIES
Peace	1.4 – Strengthened mechanisms of civil paths to peace in member countries to counter violent extremism	Project to develop ‘Faith in the Commonwealth’ materials within the Secretariat Education section ACU Project on Tolerance and Objectivity in Universities
People	3.1 – Young people engaged and empowered to meaningfully participate in political and development processes 3.3 – Strengthened sustainable policies reduce disparities and	Commonwealth Youth Gender and Equality Network and Model Youth Summits of the RCS INSPIRE project of the Commonwealth of Learning –

	<p>improve health and education outcomes</p> <p>3.4 – Women, girls and other vulnerable groups empowered against violence and harmful practices</p>	<p>which has trained over 25,000 women</p> <p>Bursaries for secondary education awarded by the Commonwealth Girls Education Fund</p>
Prosperity	4.1 – Effective mechanisms for increased access to trade, employment and business growth	<p>Leading role of the CAPA in developing entrepreneurship education in Africa</p> <p>2017 ACU Seminar on Graduate Employability, informing a session at 20CCEM</p> <p>Technical and Vocational Skills Development at COL – 39,000 enrolled in 2015-17</p>
Planet	5 – Strengthened resilience of small and other vulnerable states, including adaptation to and mitigation of climate change	<p>Commonwealth Curriculum Framework for the Sustainable Development Goals published by the Secretariat (2017) with widespread input</p> <p>Collaboration between CHEC and Friends of the Earth in education about the importance of bees</p>

45. From Interviews and materials submitted as part of the study, it is possible to identify six main areas of activity for such organisations, as follows:

- *Professional Development* – supporting the development of professional infrastructures in member countries, including adoption of common standards and encouragement of better professional performance in specific occupations. Some AOs may accredit professional qualifications directly.
- *Networking and Information Flows* – providing mechanisms, such as conferences, publications or benchmarking, to create a stronger ‘community of practice’.
- *Service Delivery* - the provision of specific projects (often externally funded) in their area of expertise.
- *Advocacy* – advancing practices, views or policies to the Commonwealth network, including governments.
- *Grant Provision* - dispersing grants to members and others, for example for research projects, training, scholarships or prizes.
- *Articulation* – identifying, and reporting current practice and trends in their areas of specialisation.

46. These are not mutually exclusive, and their distribution between groups is very uneven. Most organisations perform more than one, but few undertake them all. Most commonly claimed were

advocacy, networking and information flows, perhaps because these tend to require least financial resources. Service delivery and grant giving, by contrast, require external and/or internal funding. Few were able to give grants from their own resources, with notable exceptions including the Commonwealth Education Trust, the ACU and the Commonwealth Girls Education Fund. The former two organisations draw on significant endowments, whilst the CGEF relies on year to year fund raising, with some support from reserves and investment income.

47. The function of articulation is less often discussed, and merits special mention. Articulation is taken to mean the bringing together of needs or current circumstances (usually of the professional or organisational group being represented) in a way that has not been previously done. An example of such work was the *Survey on the Impact of the Use of Technology on Teaching and Learning*, produced by the Commonwealth Teachers Group in 2012. Although not complex in design, and relying on information produced by national individual teacher organisations, such activities struck the author as potentially fertile ground for Commonwealth activity, at a time when policy discussion often appears to lack adequate information about resources and attitudes at grass roots level.

Achievements and Potential

48. Do Commonwealth education organisations have the potential to provide the support and collaboration envisaged in the Secretariat *Strategic Plan*? Crude numbers of those obtaining accreditation have increased, but give little indication of the depth of commitment, or the availability of resources to pursue it.

49. Organisations and programmes display a huge variety in their ability to contribute, with four standing out. These are the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan (CSFP - annual expenditure of £25-30 million), the Association of Commonwealth Universities (annual expenditure £8 million), the Commonwealth of Learning (annual expenditure of C\$ 12 million, or £7 million) and the Commonwealth Education Trust, with an income, in 2006, of over £700,000 from its endowment and operational activities, which is supplemented by drawing on its capital to invest in new initiatives.

50. These four organisations dominate Commonwealth education provision. The CSFP has produced over 35,000 alumni in the name of the Commonwealth, spread across every Commonwealth country. Recent evaluations by the Commonwealth Scholarship Commission in the United Kingdom confirm that the vast majority have returned to their home regions, most of them working in occupations relevant to international development objectives, and that many rise to positions of seniority. A historic criticism is that tenure of awards has been concentrated in those countries that finance the scheme. This concentration has increased in recent years with the withdrawal of Canada as a major donor, but since 2009 this has been partly addressed by the establishment of a new, Commonwealth-wide Endowment Fund. Students and alumni of the Plan represent a major potential resource for the Commonwealth, which remains under-utilised.

51. The Association of Commonwealth Universities is the only civil society membership organisation of the four, with over five hundred universities throughout the Commonwealth, and employing over a hundred staff. The financial health of the ACU comes primarily from its success in winning and managing external programmes which are complementary to its objectives. Most notable of these are the management of three major international scholarship schemes on behalf of the UK government and specific externally funded projects. Recent examples include work to increase the uptake of research from African universities, to generate international fellowships studying climate change, and to produce distance learning programmes to help the development of academic staff in

developing countries. ACU-funded programmes for members include substantial benchmarking exercises, grants for activities to encourage gender equity, an annual summer school and small grants for the mobility of early career academics. Recent international seminars have considered the role of faith in universities, and graduate employability. The latter led to a session being planned for the 2018 Conference of Commonwealth Education Ministers.

52. The Commonwealth of Learning is financed by Commonwealth governments, independently of the Secretariat, with a focus on open and distance learning. The reach of COL programmes is substantial. It calculates that over 97,000 individuals have benefited from its 'lifelong learning for farmers' programme; over 25,000 girls and women were trained in skills and livelihoods under the 'Girls Inspire' project in 2016; 2,756 learners enrolled on the Commonwealth Executive MBA/MPA programme in 2015, and over 1000 learners have enrolled in its Virtual University for Small States of the Commonwealth. Like the ACU, it retains confidence of major donors, with around a quarter of its income being generated by additional projects, many of which have been competitively won.

53. The Commonwealth Education Trust is the smallest of the four. An independent charity charged with managing endowment funds from the former Commonwealth Institute, it has in the past funded a Chair in Commonwealth Education at the University of Cambridge. Alone amongst the four, it has decided to focus the bulk of its activity at primary and secondary level. CET reports over 400,000 enrolments for their MOOC on *Foundations of Teaching and Learning*, with 140,000 currently participating. The course was created specifically to address the SDG requirement to 'substantially increase the supply of qualified teachers'. It has also produced a range of Commonwealth themed books and teaching materials.

54. The four entities each owe their origins to the Commonwealth (or empire), but none of them relies on Commonwealth funds for current income. In the case of COL, CSFP and ACU, success derives mainly from an ability to retain the confidence of individual governments or other donors, and the creativity to devise new approaches. In these circumstances, it should be recognised that the incentives, time and resources available for them to contribute to central Commonwealth activities might be less than their headline expenditure might appear to suggest.

55. Nonetheless, there is a critical need for the four organisations to play a leadership role in any re-vitalisation process. Closer collaboration between them, and with the Secretariat, could identify new areas for intervention and significantly increase the attractiveness of the Commonwealth 'offer' to other international external bodies. Some mechanisms are already in place. The ACU has recently signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Secretariat and has an arrangement with COL through which each is represented at Board meetings of the other. The CSFP has strong historic links with the ACU, which manages its UK activity and the recently developed Endowment Fund. Other links could be developed further. CET reported that its mechanism for meetings with the Secretariat had not been utilised in recent years; closer relations with COL might be expected given their common interest in distance learning. COL plays a prominent role in CCEMs, but its location away from London can result it being unintentionally overlooked when Commonwealth consultations are taking place. The limited attention it was given in the 2011 EPG Report was cited to the author as an example of this relative neglect. A specific proposal for closer collaboration is made in paragraph 138 below.

56. Active leadership from the four organisations will be crucial to the successful implementation of the recommendations made later in this report. But contributions from across the spectrum of Commonwealth education groups will also be needed.

57. Although none approach the scale of activities of the 'Big Four', other Commonwealth organisations report significant achievements. A recent study by the Royal Commonwealth Society cites the case of Malawi, where 'the National Museum has become the #1 HIV AIDS testing station in the country - and the HIV AIDS rate has dropped - as a result of the Commonwealth Association of Museums programmes'. The Commonwealth Association of Technical Universities and Polytechnics in Africa played a critical role in developing education about entrepreneurship in the region. The Commonwealth Girls Education Fund annually supports around 350 girls who would not otherwise be able to continue their education, and has started to develop tracer activities for its 4000 plus alumni. In 2017, several organisations worked with the Commonwealth Secretariat to produce a *Commonwealth Curriculum Framework for the Sustainable Development Goals*. The Commonwealth Teachers Group played the leading role in developing the *Commonwealth Teacher Recruitment Protocol* (paragraphs 33-34). Other examples included the collaboration between the Commonwealth Human Ecology Council and Friends of the Earth to launch a report on *Bees and Pollinators: A Commonwealth Concern* at the 2015 CHOGM, and the programmes in primary schools organised by the Commonwealth Association for Science, Technology and Mathematics Educators.

58. Another way of looking at these activities is through the networking and discussion opportunities that they provide. Recent work by the Royal Commonwealth Society and IFCO has suggested that Commonwealth Accredited Organisations can collectively boast at least 1700 institutional affiliations, some 41 million individual members and a combined budget of £55 million. These figures are based on known examples; the author makes the point that actual figures will almost certainly be higher. They would also be multiplied many times if the numbers of staff and students of accredited organisations were calculated.

59. Many specific examples of this potential can be cited. The Commonwealth Association of Polytechnics and Technical Universities in Africa has 170 members (some of which some may overlap with the ACU). The Commonwealth Association of Museums has 300 institutional and individual members. The Association for Commonwealth Literature and Language Studies has some 1500 individual members in ten branches, each of which organises its own conferences. The Council for Education in the Commonwealth estimates that over 1000 individuals have been reached during the past two years through its conference and meetings; five times its formal membership. All of these examples are potentially dwarfed by the Royal Overseas League and English Speaking Union, which between them have access to tens of thousands of individuals. Other bodies, such as the Commonwealth Teachers Group and potentially the Commonwealth Students Association, do not have direct individual membership but have access to huge numbers through their constituent organisations.

Barriers and Constraints

60. Set against the achievements reported above, many Commonwealth organisations lead a 'hand to mouth' existence. The minority that can employ paid staff includes the Royal Commonwealth Society, Commonwealth Education Trust, Commonwealth Association of Technical Universities and Polytechnics in Africa and Commonwealth Girls Education Fund. Most, however, rely entirely on voluntary labour. Many could barely cover costs, despite operating on a low turnover. Several were fighting hard to maintain a presence even at the current level. Some were visibly struggling. One described its activities as 'a shadow of their former self', another as 'stuttering'.

61. Lack of resource was the most commonly cited constraint on activity. Membership subscriptions rarely provided a viable model to sustain activity at the desirable level. Some did not feel able to charge membership fees at all; others noted that individual membership barely paid for

itself. The Chair of one organisation was considering doing away with membership fees, instead trying to build interest through advocacy work. He argued that even small membership fees were a barrier to participation, and were taken up in servicing basic administrative functions. This was particularly true of bodies with an individual, rather than institutional membership, and which seek to utilise developing country subscriptions in more expensive developed countries. One commented that '(name of profession) workers are not well paid in developed countries, let alone developing ones where most of our members live'.

62. There was much criticism of the recent policy decision of the Commonwealth Foundation, the arm of the official Commonwealth with responsibility of supporting civil society involvement, to stop allocating a defined proportion of its grants to Commonwealth-accredited organisations. Since 2013 the Foundation has adopted a competitive process, through which any eligible organisation can apply for that share of its funds that was previously reserved for Commonwealth accredited organisations. The amounts allocated to individual Commonwealth organisations had usually been small, but significant in the context of their overall budget. They had supported functions such as part-time clerical assistance, conferences or the production of a journal. One said that the withdrawal of Foundation funding could cause their organisation to close. Another argued that:

'It makes no sense for the Foundation to fund NGOs that are eligible to apply for other international sources, and not support its own 'family'; they don't have the resources to operate the type of funding programme that they're attempting and the organisations that they founded are suffering. I understand that some Commonwealth organisations are more effective than others. Being a Commonwealth Organisation should not automatically mean that you get funding – they should have to deliver'.

63. The question of 'delivery' is critical to the debate. The Foundation Director General argued that the move to an open, competitive process with no preference for Commonwealth organisations was a matter of self-defence. The Foundation itself was reliant on funding from member governments, which had to be justified against specific development criteria. Many of the previous grants to Commonwealth organisations could not be justified on this basis, and failure to recognise this would endanger future funding for the Foundation. Commonwealth organisations could still apply for grants, although these were confined to Foundation priority areas. A small number, such as the Commonwealth Nurses and Midwives Council, had done so successfully.

64. How well placed are Commonwealth organisations to seek project grants, in a highly competitive market place? In principle their contacts, professional expertise and convening power should make them well equipped to do so. A few, such as the Royal Commonwealth Society, have enjoyed some success. Smaller organisations feel that they are effectively excluded from the process in a catch 22 situation. Applying for competitive grants requires a time and infrastructure that they do not have, by contrast with the increasingly professional approaches adopted by many NGOs. Some Commonwealth organisations would not meet the minimum management requirements of donors. Collaboration could be used to avoid this. An example is the work done by the Commonwealth Human Ecology Council and Commonwealth Foundation, in a recent project on fisheries.

65. Project funding does not represent a viable, or even desirable, model for all Commonwealth bodies. Some would struggle to deliver on donor aims. Attracting significant projects on a one-off basis might bring its own dangers; the most often expressed need was for stability and underpinning of activities at a level that could be maintained. Where there is nevertheless a realistic desire to

compete for funding, there may be a need to for guidance and training, in 'grantsmanship', grant management and the evaluation techniques required by donors.

66. Difficulties in accessing project funding, the lack of core funding (which is any event was small in most cases) and the inability of membership income to support a viable range of activities present a major threat to the future of some Commonwealth organisations. Realistically, not all will be able to contribute effectively to the increased collaboration anticipated in the Secretariat Strategic Plan.

Possible Responses

67. Restoring direct financial support for such organisations would be one way of addressing this issue. This is unlikely in the present environment. In any event, past support was in most cases small, and there would be a strong case for any such funding to be more competitive in nature. In the absence of such funding, difficult decisions may be needed about which organisations offer the best prospect of increasing their contribution. Creative means of support are needed, which focus on organisations which have some capacity on which to build, and the ability to help themselves. Four approaches could be considered.

68. For large numbers of people, contact with Commonwealth activity – through a school or Commonwealth Day event, conference or grant to undertake study - provides a momentary, rather than an ongoing association with Commonwealth activity. Finding a way to consolidate and build on this involvement could provide the foundation for a substantial community of support, which could in turn help to nurture Commonwealth organisations. Previous attempts have been made to build a Commonwealth wide community of individual supporters but have either not attracted sufficient numbers or achieved the necessary longevity. In 2009 Commonwealth Foundation launched a 'Friends of the Commonwealth' programme, aiming to connect with large numbers of individuals. Recent years saw the establishment of the Commonwealth Education Hub, which sought to bring together a more restricted group of policy makers and influencers together in electronic debate, but has had to compete for the time of an already heavily committed audience.

69. Second, specific measures could be taken to recruit targeted groups of individuals to contribute to Commonwealth education issues. At present many Commonwealth organisations rely on disproportionate effort from one or two individuals. The attraction of even small numbers with the relevant expertise or enthusiasm, therefore, may have a strong catalytic effect.

70. Third, although the collective contribution of the Commonwealth in education is substantial, this is rarely brought together in a single place. The development of a stronger 'brand' for Commonwealth activity would increase recognition of the role that the Commonwealth can play in the area, and provide a vehicle for organisations to promote their own achievements and activities. Some respondents were sceptical of the Commonwealth 'brand' – one described it as 'strong but tired' and another found it damaging in funding applications. More, however, considered it an asset. One described its value in the following terms:

'We would go as far as to say that the Commonwealth brand generates a wider range and number of participants than most other (even international) organisations. Our conferences are characterised by participation from across the entire Commonwealth; an analogy would be how much more broadly international the Commonwealth Writers Prize was compared to the Man-Booker Prize.

'Further, the Commonwealth brand is vital in identifying the organisation with the wide range of other civil society organisations, including through the Education Consortium, and with the cultural and educational activities of the Commonwealth. We have the opportunity

to gain insight through attendance at meetings, and to have input through submissions, on such issues, being of enormous significance to our organisation and what it can contribute'

71. Finally, Commonwealth organisations could be further incentivised through clear opportunities to contribute to wider Commonwealth policy. The emphasis of the Secretariat on seeking collaboration and partnerships should, in principle, provide such opportunities, although the need to be selective will have to be balanced with the need to be genuinely open to new ideas. The opportunity to formally propose ideas to the Secretariat, or for consideration by Commonwealth Education Ministers, would in many cases give a focus to the work of an organisation.

72. Each of these four stands feed into the recommendations at the end of the report. For now, this section concludes that Commonwealth education organisations have significant capacity and desire to contribute to a renewed presence for the Commonwealth in education. This capacity is, however, very uneven, with the largest organisations being looked to for exercising a clear leadership role.

The Role of Governments

73. Individual Commonwealth governments tend to be regarded as sponsors or consumers of Commonwealth activity. There has been relatively little consideration of whether they could be more active in the design and delivery of activities. At a time when partnership and co-operation are being encouraged, there is potential to increase such involvement.

74. At present, the main functions of governments vis a vis Commonwealth business are focused on the three inter-governmental organisations. They are represented on the Governing Board of the Commonwealth Foundation, and at the Commonwealth of Learning. The individual country programmes produced by COL also provide a focal point for interest. High Commissioners in London also sit on the Board of the Commonwealth Secretariat, including overseeing the setting of budgets. Other key areas of involvement are Ministerial meetings, and structures such as the Education Ministers Action Group, set up to review progress between them. Individual governments also receive assistance for specific projects under the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Cooperation.

75. The Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan (paragraph 50) provides an interesting model through which governments can work bi-laterally, but within a multilateral, Commonwealth branded framework. Individual governments determine the extent to which they contribute to the Plan financially, but virtually all contribute to the management of awards offered to citizens of their country. This structure has proved durable and cost effective, despite having minimal central administration in recent times. Only in recent years, as a central endowment fund has been created, has a day to day central management developed. This is based at the ACU, but still relies on individual hosts for the much of the award management.

76. It is possible to envisage several ways in which governments could become more involved. Governments could make more use of Commonwealth mechanisms to promote and deliver their existing programmes, following the example of the Indian government at the 2015 CCEM to provide places under its technical assistance programmes and create a new 'Commonwealth Chair', or of the UK in promoting its contribution to Commonwealth Scholarships. Governments could make more use of the Commonwealth as a means of testing and generating new ideas and policies. One

respondent suggested that comparative data could be generated using an adaptation of the PISA system, currently used by five developed Commonwealth countries. An alternative method of benchmarking could be based on intensive discussions of specific policy challenges, utilising the process benchmarking system used by the ACU amongst its members. Government representatives could also be included in the policy working groups proposed in the recommendations of this report. Governments could be encouraged to use the Commonwealth as a means of staff development, making staff available on secondment to assist with individual projects.

77. Involvement of this type has the potential to provide a new form of engagement, in which governments use the Commonwealth as a mechanism to advance their own policy objectives, and involve staff with a wider range of seniority. It would potentially provide an additional resource to the Secretariat, facilitate direct contact between governments and civil society and increase the profile of the Commonwealth in national government thinking. This possibility will be re-visited in the section of the Report setting out 'A Programme for Renewal' (Paragraph 122 *et seq*).

The Role of the Commonwealth Secretariat

78. It is important to recognise the extent to which resources for education within the Secretariat have declined. Two decades ago, Secretariat functions extended to the provision of technical assistance to member governments (still offered through CFTC but on a much smaller scale), actively orchestrating Commonwealth views on common problems, promoting, developing and even managing Commonwealth education infrastructure, representing education within the Commonwealth, and on behalf of the Commonwealth to outside bodies, as well as organising CCEMs and interim Ministerial consultation. Since that time the staff component has reduced from fifteen staff members, to a current provision based around one senior professional post.

79. It might be argued that the substantial role played by other Commonwealth bodies in education *supports* the case for Secretariat withdrawal. This argument is rejected. Some core functions must be retained by a strong central Secretariat. These include acting as the main point of contact with member governments, to whom it is accountable; implementing the decisions of governments with regards to funding and priorities; and maintaining control of the agenda negotiated with governments for major Commonwealth conferences. Beyond this, it is important to be realistic about the role the Secretariat. In the immediate future, this is likely to be one of facilitation, brokering and coordination, with capacity to perform even these stretched. The Secretariat is unlikely to provide 'thought leadership' from its current resources.

80. Secretariat staff stressed that it was their role to implement the decisions of member governments, which had called for a more focussed agenda. This approach should be regarded as promoting inclusion, since it called for more working together. Education would need to make its case alongside other priorities, since mandates could be provided only by Heads of Government, and in forms that would lead to SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound) deliverables. In the past communiqués were said to be vague and all embracing. It was stressed that organisations able to deliver on this agenda would continue to find opportunities to work with the Secretariat.

81. A further Secretariat response has been to seek external funding for its work in education. This has resulted in £250,000 funding towards a project on Faith in the Commonwealth, supported by the Khalili Foundation. This work is designed to lead to new materials and insight, and should be

welcomed. There is a limit, however, to which external project funding can compensate for core Secretariat activities. Too high a proportion may lead to external funders dictating the Secretariat agenda, and the Secretariat competing with non-core funded Commonwealth organisations for resources.

Supporting the Secretariat

82. Stuart Mole predicted, in 2012, that the Secretariat would become ‘more of an enabler, building working partnerships with Commonwealth civil society and other partner organisations, which will be increasingly perceived as a resource.’ In education, at least, this is proving to be the case. It is therefore important to list ways in which the Commonwealth education community can support the Secretariat. These include:

- *Provision of Information and Reports* – This function can both inform the Secretariat, and increase the visibility of the Commonwealth as a whole. Organisations are required to submit annual reports as a condition of accreditation. A small additional step which would be consistent with the theme of ‘bringing together’ Commonwealth education activity would be to ensure that all Annual Reports and public reports produced by Commonwealth organisations are sent to the Secretariat Library and published on-line.
- *Recasting Existing information* – a technique that has proved successful for the Commonwealth of Learning has been the categorisation of its achievements and activities by country and region, so that each can identify activities relevant to its interests. The Secretariat is best placed to provide such analysis on a Commonwealth-wide basis, but Commonwealth education organisations could help by producing information in a common format.
- *Providing platforms* – Conferences of Commonwealth organisations can provide the Secretariat with audiences to which it would not otherwise have access. An example of this was a seminar on Faith, Tolerance and Respect arranged by the ACU in 2017, which allowed the Secretary-General to make a powerful media statement about the Secretariat’s presence in this area, to an international multi-faith audience.
- *Providing evidence* – Commonwealth organisations can provide evidence for the success of the Commonwealth brand that the Secretariat cannot. This can include the results of formal monitoring and evaluation, but also anecdotal evidence and individual news stories. These should be widely taken up in Secretariat publicity.
- *Advocacy* – Commonwealth organisations can advocate in ways that the Secretariat cannot – both on explicitly Commonwealth issues and other causes (such as LGBT rights) which appear on the wider Commonwealth agenda. Informal discussions (both between organisations and involving the Secretariat where appropriate) on key messages to be promoted can form a useful element in this area.
- *Contacts and Expertise* – The professional networks of Commonwealth organisations can provide access to a wider range of expertise than that available to the central Secretariat.

Alternative Approaches

83. The Commonwealth Secretariat acts as the 'official agent' for delivering education as a Commonwealth function, and reporting the outcomes of this activity to member governments. This function has legitimacy, since donor governments make their core contributions to the Commonwealth through the Secretariat, which has governance and accountability mechanisms in place. It should ensure coordination between policy areas, since education in the Secretariat sits alongside complementary functions. The London base of the Secretariat provides physical proximity to High Commissioners and many of the civil society organisations mentioned in this report.

84. Other approaches to the provision and coordination of Commonwealth education activities are, however, conceivable. It is worth briefly considering these, not least in case a situation should arise in which the Secretariat no longer wishes to perform an education function. Two alternatives could be posited.

85. First, the Commonwealth already has a formal, inter-governmental mechanism for the delivery of education through the Commonwealth of Learning. COL receives its core funding directly from member governments (on a voluntary-contribution basis), and has in place accountability mechanisms to them, both individually and through CCEMs. With an annual budget of around C\$12 million (£7 million) COL expenditure on education is almost twelve times that of the Secretariat budget. Given the current emphasis on streamlining and consolidation, it might be asked whether it would be more efficient for these two pots to be merged. COL's range of activities is multi-sectoral and Commonwealth-wide, and the scope of activities has extended beyond open and distance learning, for example to include training courses and quality reviews. COL's work appears to be well regarded by donor governments and other funding agencies, as evidenced by an ability to generate new projects to supplement core funding.

86. The issue was raised of whether a separate focal point was needed for Commonwealth education activity, perhaps mirroring the role of UNESCO, which performs the education specialist role in the United Nations. If this model were adopted, COL would be an obvious candidate to perform this role, given its existing mandate and relations with governments.

87. It is possible to envisage a situation in which COL could take over the full education brief for the Commonwealth, absorbing the budget currently available to the Secretariat education function. This is currently understood to be around £600,000, including support received from external sources and expenditure on 20CCEM organisation. Such an approach might allow individual governments to decide how they wished to contribute towards education as a Commonwealth function, as they already effectively do through their existing COL contributions. Utilising Vancouver as the base might be seen a step towards Commonwealth de-centralisation.

88. A second approach would be to 'contract out' delivery of Commonwealth education activity. This might involve asking relevant organisations (individually or in partnership) to come forward with proposals for what they could deliver for the resource currently available within the Secretariat, taking account of any additional funding that they could contribute or attract. Such an approach could be participative, generate new thinking and possibly reduce costs, especially if expenditure were incurred in countries with a lower cost base than London. Whilst radical, similar solutions have been applied to other areas of public provision. The ACU has successfully provided the management of UK government scholarship programmes for over sixty years, and is regularly judged to do so more efficiently than government could itself.

89. Neither of these approaches is being recommended for implementation at present. The second alternative would raise significant questions of accountability and continuity, particularly given the need for the supplier to be reviewed at regular intervals. Given the relatively small budget involved, it would run the risk of Commonwealth education activity becoming a series of individual, time-limited projects, hard to distinguish as a form of provision from the grant giving of the Commonwealth Foundation. A devolved approach could reduce synergy with other policy areas within the Secretariat, at a time when the location of education alongside youth, gender and health functions should increase the potential for collaboration.

90. The option of re-locating education with the Commonwealth of Learning might also reduce coordination with complementary policy areas within the Secretariat. Some might also be concerned lest focussing provision on COL could lead to a concentration on its traditional areas of activity. The Vancouver base, whilst helping Commonwealth de-centralisation, might be problematic for liaison with other Commonwealth activities, and (not being a capital city) with the Commonwealth diplomatic community. Some argued that education policy coordinated by COL might not have the same status or impact as that organised by the Secretariat in the eyes of member governments.

91. The arguments for and against using COL as the main inter-governmental agency for Commonwealth efforts in education are more finely balanced than those for and against contracting out more generally. If the decline in the Secretariat education function cannot be reversed over time, or if the Secretariat were to decide to abandon education as a distinct function, the option of stronger COL leadership may need to be re-visited.

The Potential for Collaboration

92. Education in the Commonwealth is an activity where ‘the whole’ represents more than ‘the sum of the parts’. Realising this collective value relies on the ability of Commonwealth organisations to work together. Some informants commented on the tendency of Commonwealth bodies to work independently, or ‘in silos’. This section considers the potential for, and barriers to, greater collaboration.

93. The question of how to generate effective working between Commonwealth organisations, and between civil society and the Secretariat, is not a new one. Attempts to address it have included, at various times, the establishment of locally based Commonwealth Liaison Units, various models of support within the Secretariat and a growing civil society presence at Ministerial meetings.

94. Most recently, the importance of partnerships has been highlighted in the current *Strategic Plan*, section 3.6.1 of which proposes ‘strengthened partnerships and innovations to support member countries and Commonwealth organisations’. The Plan commits the Secretariat to increase the number of effective partnerships, ‘building on results achieved in improving engagement with Commonwealth accredited organisations’.

95. The Secretariat will look outside the Commonwealth community for many of these relationships, to external Foundations, NGOs and other international bodies such as UNESCO. Its convening power and status with member governments leaves it well placed to do this, despite a lack of financial resources. Within Commonwealth circles, collaboration can be analysed at three levels:

- * collective effort (through joint or umbrella bodies)
- * free standing collaboration (where two or more bodies get together of their own volition)
- * collaboration between Commonwealth organisations and the official Commonwealth.

96. The study identified examples of all three. The Consortium itself is an example of the first approach. Interviews suggested that its role was particularly appreciated by organisations based outside the UK, for which it formed the main point of contact with the central Commonwealth. Examples of the second type included collaborations as diverse as the Council for Education in the Commonwealth and the Commonwealth Legal Education Association, the Commonwealth Association for Museums with the Association for Commonwealth Literature and Language Studies and the Commonwealth of Learning with the Commonwealth Association for Polytechnics and Technical Universities in Africa. A novel example of collaboration, cited by the Commonwealth Girls Education Fund, involved the Secretariat utilising one of their alumnae who had become a leading campaigner against FGM in her home country as a key speaker at a London event.

97. Other structures have been developed to facilitate collaboration. The Secretariat organises meetings of Commonwealth bodies to report on key developments. An Informal Forum of Commonwealth Organisations (IFCO) meets, amongst other things to seek agreement and put forward civil society views on key issues for discussion at the forthcoming CHOGM. Another example of informal collaboration was the creation, nine years ago, of a group of Commonwealth-friendly organisations through the Council for Education in the Commonwealth to support the work of the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan.

98. Why, given these initiatives, do interviewees perceive an evident reluctance to collaborate? Some constraints on collaborative working were internal to organisations, particularly concerned with time and incentives. Most of the organisations interviewed were being run by volunteers, or individuals for whom it was not their main job. Of the limited time available for Commonwealth activity, effort was focussed on keeping the organisation afloat. For organisations with full-time staff, priority was necessarily given to meeting the requirements of external donors. In short, most Commonwealth organisations have needs, ambitions and accountabilities that are independent of the core Commonwealth.

99. A recent analysis of reports submitted to the Commonwealth Accreditation Committee, conducted on behalf of IFCO, noted further historic barriers. These include poor coordination and communication; partnerships often being based (only) on the Secretariat's strategic objectives, an over concentration of partners in London to the detriment of others, and lack of trust between civil society and government. It was emphasised that these comments were largely reflecting on past relationships; they may not all apply to the present.

100. Several respondents felt that whilst the Secretariat sought help from civil society to achieve its objectives, little was offered by way of support or recognition in return. One commented that the Secretariat had 'no clear definition of what such partnerships should entail'. Another called for 'an overall framework for partnerships between the Secretariat and Commonwealth organisations setting out key policies, principles and operational modes'. These should involve goals that were 'jointly set and products that were jointly owned', indicating a willingness by the Secretariat to contribute to projects proposed by partners, as well as the reverse.

101. Collaboration and partnerships do happen, but are constrained by scarce time and resources. A first step to overcoming these barriers could be a multi-organisation partnership, facilitated by the

Secretariat, which is designed to raise the profile of Commonwealth education and identify new opportunities for intervention. This proposal is pursued further in Paragraph 137.

Conferences of Commonwealth Education Ministers

102. Triennial Ministerial Conferences are the flagship activity of Commonwealth educational cooperation, both between member governments and between governments and external groups. This section considers their function, how far they meet fulfil their potential and whether anything can be done to increase their impact.

103. Recent conferences have sought to fulfil four functions. First, they provide a platform for sharing of expertise and collaboration between governments, comparing experience for example on progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals. Second, they seek to provide guidance and accountability to the official Commonwealth, taking reports from the Secretariat, Commonwealth of Learning and Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan. Third, they aim to frame and articulate a collective 'Commonwealth view' expressed through the Communique. Finally, they facilitate interchange with and between potential partners, whether multilateral organisations or civil society education organisations.

104. The influence of the 2012 CCEM on re-framing the international SDGs (paragraphs 31-32), the 2003 conference in encouraging the Commonwealth Teacher Recruitment protocol (paragraphs 33-34) and the 2006 and 2009 conferences in agreeing and launching the CSFP Endowment Fund (paragraph 50) are practical examples of impact. The CCEM remains the largest free-standing Commonwealth Ministerial meeting, the last four having attracted 35-40 national delegations, although the seniority of developing country representation has been greater than that from developed ones. Despite their differing opinions on the role of education as a Commonwealth priority, and resulting cuts to its education budget, all of the government representatives interviewed were supportive of the 2018 CCEM going ahead.

105. Around ten civil society organisations attend CCEMs on a regular basis; others, and some major charities and NGOs, more selectively. The main channel for civil society association in recent years has been through the 'parallel forums' of stakeholder groups that have been held alongside the main conferences. Opportunities also exist for civil society representatives to observe Ministerial discussion. The level of engagement described above supports the retention of the CCEM as a free-standing activity, rather than one conducted in the margin of other international conferences that Commonwealth Ministers may be attending.

106. Despite these strengths, there was a wide measure of agreement amongst interviewees that the Conferences did not realise their potential. Concerns can be categorised under four headings – content, preparedness, follow-up and the involvement of civil society.

107. Although relevant to member states, content was often general in nature. There was a degree of repetitiveness between meetings, and a perception that controversial issues were avoided, perhaps reflecting a defensiveness or lack of confidence from the Secretariat. One developing country official involved in the organisation of a previous CCEM recalled topics and speakers being rejected because there may be objections from another country. Observation of recent CCEMs leads the author to conclude that the distinctive informality and openness of the Commonwealth are not fully utilised, despite introducing 'Ministerial Round Tables' and the large number of delegations contributing to formal debate.

108. A lack of prior planning amongst delegations may be one reason for this limited interaction, as might be the inevitable lack of continuity amongst Ministers themselves. Some Ministers attending may be asked to deal with issues outside their responsibilities, since several Commonwealth countries divide responsibility for education between two Ministries. One respondent described the issues as follows:

In discussing CCEMs one of the problems in recent years has been poor briefing of Ministers before attending so that they arrive without any background or clear idea of what they and their country hope to achieve from the Conference. And it makes follow up very difficult when, as now, the last CCEM chair is no longer a host Minister, and the host Minister for the Fiji conference will be someone who did not attend the previous CCEM'

109. Although Ministers make interesting and useful comments from their national perspectives, too often there appears to be no means to collate these or translate them into practical action, with a lack of resources for implementation and no ability to mandate the Secretariat. Efforts have been made to overcome the lack of continuity between conferences by the establishment of an Education Ministers Action Group (EMAG), the effectiveness of this has been impaired by a lack of resources to host free standing meetings, and discontinuities in membership.

110. Significant criticisms have been expressed by participants in the 'parallel forums' that have taken place alongside the CCEM. The idea of a 'stakeholder forum' was introduced in 1997. By 2012, the conference provided the platform for four such forums – for teachers, youth, higher education and other stakeholders. The higher education forum did not take place in 2015, and at the time of writing the 20th CCEM in 2018 was expected to include a single, merged, stakeholder event.

111. A report prepared by Alex Wright following the 2015 CCEM points out that stakeholder conferences can bring both potential and complications:

'This 'multi-stakeholder constituency has real advantages, lending a great variety of perspectives to discussions and offers a point of difference, with few such international conferences drawing on such a broad range of contributions. However, the same variety makes it difficult to develop a coherent, impactful statement as the different actors are likely to hold differing views on policy issues'.

112. The Wright report raises two other problems. Whilst successful as events, stakeholder conferences have failed to deliver the meaningful interaction with Ministers that delegates had hoped for. Second, the fee paying and largely (although not entirely) self-selecting nature of those attending leads to questions about what views and interests would be represented to Ministers, even if adequate channels were made available. At the 2015 event, 62 of the 151 delegates were from private corporations, 32 from countries outside the Commonwealth but only one from Asia. For the 2018 event, the fee requirement has been removed, although other attendance costs remain significant.

113. By 2015, calls for reform had become widespread. The Statement from the 19CCEM Stakeholder Forum to Ministers argued that 'The CCEM is in need of urgent reform to ensure that meetings are fit for purpose and able to compete with other international forums'. Wright's report concluded that 'the Commonwealth Secretariat, together with partners, should urgently review the format of CCEMs as a whole'

The Potential for Reform

114. CCEMs can play a critical role at the head of Commonwealth education collaboration. The need is to find a formula which combines an attractive agenda with tangible incentives for Ministers (most critically) and civil society to attend. Setting expectations is critical; it is important to be clear about what can be delivered.

115. If Ministers are to engage, there is a need to create a vision of Commonwealth conferences as places where 'business is done'. One High Commission representative stressed that the key element in determining whether Ministers attended was the potential to speak with each other – most other functions could be achieved by deputies and senior civil servants. This could be achieved both through more active facilitation of side meetings and within the main conference. One government representative used the phrase 'structured informality' in this respect; it was a term which summed up the style of interaction that CCEMs should seek to provide.

116. A second mechanism might be for Ministerial meetings to give greater visibility and access to opportunities that already exist. National delegations could be encouraged to use CCEMs as a platform to announce initiatives, or discuss the impact of existing ones, where these offer opportunities to other members. At the 2015 conference India publicised training opportunities that it would make available. Where this cannot be achieved within the formal conference agenda, time could be found for planned media announcements in the programme of 'fringe' events,.

117. Third, consideration should be given to the process of selecting agenda items, reflecting the need to offer new insights and contacts. Proposals could be rigorously assessed against set criteria, including likely importance to, and engagement from, member states; availability of similar information and debates elsewhere; and likely impact and follow-up from any discussion. Relevant external organisations might be pro-actively approached to present new findings, taking advantage of the high level audience and potential media profile of the event. A degree of competition for Ministerial time could be introduced, with Commonwealth organisations being invited to put forward proposals, in a highly selective process. This measure could also incentivise the organisations themselves.

118. Civil society attendance also requires clear incentives. As Stuart Mole points out in his 2012 report, such participation involves 'a financial and resource investment which in most cases is significant' (in relation to their budgets). Some, he argues, are motivated by a desire to achieve recognition as a body involved in implementing core Commonwealth programmes, or to seek out new forms of collaboration. Others focus on lobbying opportunities, either by influencing the formal outcomes of the conference (Mole uses the phrase 'communique chasing') or by influencing key individuals through personal meetings. Some seek Ministerial endorsement of their programmes, either collectively or individually, in the belief that this might provide future funding and growth opportunities. The three examples of CCEM impact cited in paragraph 105 above all reflected lobbying – from the 2012 Higher Education Parallel Forum, Commonwealth Teachers Group and ACU respectively. If these examples can be replicated, then to quote Mole, 'the better established and equipped Commonwealth organisations and international NGOs will not need any encouragement' to participate.

119. CCEMs carry less political weight than CHOGMs, yet they can be more informal, offering greater potential for personal meetings. Invitations to attend more formal conference events, and a more active mixing of official delegations and civil society within these, can further develop this, as could prior encouragement and facilitation of Ministers to take part in fringe and stakeholder

events. The more informal culture created by the 2015 organisers was widely regarded as a welcome step forward.

120. Ministerial contact is difficult to guarantee, and should not be the sole driver for civil society participation. Many Ministers decide whether to attend at a late stage, their programmes are subject to change and preferences about which events to attend are often decided on the day itself. Security issues can provide additional obstacles. Ministers are notoriously hard to 'deliver', even for official functions. In these circumstances, it is important to ensure that the networking, collaboration and content of stakeholder meetings remain significant magnets in their own right.

121. At the time of writing, it is not known whether the interest expressed by Kenya in hosting the next CCEM has been confirmed, or taken up. A 2021 conference in Nairobi would be an ideal opportunity to re-shape the CCEM, and re-launch education as a Commonwealth priority more generally. The venue would be accessible, and attractive to both developing and developed countries, who would see it as important for both development and public diplomacy reasons. The location would be well suited to civil society participation, given the number of NGOs based locally. This report recommends that planning for such a CCEM should begin as soon as possible.

A Programme for Renewal

122. Table 2 identifies a programme of measures to address both the substance and the profile of the Commonwealth's place in education, to confirm a clear role for the Secretariat in supporting Commonwealth education organisations, and to strengthen their leadership. The programme is intended as a coherent package, but not all elements need be implemented simultaneously. A reasonable target would be for implementation over a three-year period leading to the 2021 CCEM.

123. The recommendations break down into three key strands of activity – increasing the policy impact of Commonwealth education discussions; increasing participation in Commonwealth education; and increasing awareness of the Commonwealth as a vehicle for educational activity. These would be underpinned by a small additional Secretariat presence in education.

Increasing the Policy Impact

124. This section primarily relates to recommendations 1 and 2. Recommendation 1 proposes the establishment of (say, six) working parties which would produce high profile reports in the three-year period leading up to the 2021 CCEM. The working parties would also contribute to other needs identified in the report. They would offer an outlet for new expertise and encourage cross-working between groups. They would also provide an opportunity to involve representatives of member governments.

125. The proposal to focus activity on small working groups reflects the confidence expressed by respondents in the distinctive value of Commonwealth collaboration. One independent development expert put this as follows:

Small technical advisory groups under a Commonwealth umbrella can offer disinterested analysis and a coherence that is difficult for UN institutions. This can have a legitimacy that is different to the in-house politicised process of many other reports and the think tanks associated with special interests

126. The suggestion that such activity be designed to lead up to a Ministerial conference would enhance proposals for reform of CCEMs at paragraphs 114-121. It also replicates a finding made by

the independent review of the 2013-17 Secretariat Strategic Plan in relation to Heads of Government Meetings. This proposed that:

Collaboration should include special task forces, working groups on specific issues, and forums prior to each CHOGM looking at how to synthesise learning and influence the CHOGM agenda

127. The topics would be determined in consultation with the Secretariat, with opportunities for member governments and Accredited Organisations/CCfE members to propose ideas. Given the synergies identified in paragraph 40, several would be likely to contribute directly to wider Commonwealth priorities, however they should not be restricted to these. This would make an important statement that education is seen as having an importance to the Commonwealth in its own right.

128. The production of six themed Commonwealth reports over a three-year period might not appear particularly ambitious. It is important to set targets that are achievable in relation to anticipated budgets, and to remember that many Commonwealth bodies are working at near capacity. The spin off effects in terms of cross working, involving a greater range of participants and the profile that could be generated at the 2021 CCEM, could be significant.

Increasing Participation

129. The proposals to increase participation relate to recommendations 3 and 4. These reflect earlier findings that many Commonwealth organisations are already working to the limits of their capacity. Two strands of activity are suggested. These are recruitment of more established experts who would use the Commonwealth as a channel for their activities; and attraction of a younger, ambitious cohort of 'future leaders'. Ensuring the recruits come from throughout the Commonwealth would conform with the Eminent Persons Group recommendation of measures to achieve a better geographical balance amongst participants in Commonwealth activities.

130. Non-monetary incentives will be critical. Association with the Commonwealth needs to appeal to personal ambition and career development, as well as altruism. Packages need to be devised which are prestigious and which open doors. At senior level, these might include the designation as a 'Commonwealth Chair', providing opportunities to present research to new and influential audiences, and the ability to use Commonwealth connections to develop new funding routes. The example of UNESCO Chairs, which are sought after and competitive but without significant monetary remuneration might be considered. Early discussions are recommended with COL, which offers similar roles, including some in conjunction with UNESCO.

131. For younger recruits, such a package should target those with future leadership potential. It could include involvement in one of the high-level working groups, receiving named credit in publications, or assuming a named position in a Commonwealth association, all of which would enhance their curriculum vitae. There should be opportunities to network – meeting the Secretary-General, High Commissioners and attend key Commonwealth meetings and receptions. Discussions might take place with the English Speaking Union and / or Royal Overseas League, who are also keen to encourage younger members, about access to their facilities. The package would be distinguished from the Secretariat's Young Professionals Scheme since it would not require a full-time presence, and could take place alongside other work and study.

Table 2: Revitalising Education in the Commonwealth: Summary of Recommendations

<i>Increasing Policy Impact</i>	
Recommendation 1: Target specific issues for policy attention over a three year period, leading to high profile reports published under the Commonwealth brand.	Establish Commonwealth commissions / working parties to work on specific topics. (Paragraphs 124-128).
Recommendation 2: More engagement with government representatives in policy discussions outside formal meeting structures.	Governments to be invited to participate in, or sponsor, individual working parties (Paragraphs 124-125), and to explore other avenues for participation (Paragraphs 76-77).
<i>Increasing Participation</i>	
Recommendation 3: Increase the range of expertise available to Commonwealth education discussion	Create network of prestigious Commonwealth Chairs/ experts to contribute ideas and raise profile of Commonwealth debate. (Para. 130).
Recommendation 4: Increase the age range and geographical diversity of participants in Commonwealth education debates	Recruit a new cohort of young ‘potential leaders’, through an initial pilot amongst present and future Commonwealth Scholars. This would also be a first step towards the EPG recommendation that Commonwealth organisations diversify activities to include more non-UK participants. (Paragraph 131).
<i>Increasing Awareness</i>	
Recommendation 5: Increase the visibility of the Commonwealth in education	Creation of a Commonwealth Education brand – bringing together several strands of existing activity in one place. (Paragraphs 134).
Recommendation 6: Increase the audience for Commonwealth education work	Develop new media to attract a new audience, and retain contact with individuals touched by Commonwealth activity. (Paragraph 68 and 133-137).
Recommendation 7: Encourage cross working between Commonwealth education groups.	Establish a new forum for brainstorming meetings including key Commonwealth education organisations (Paragraph 137).
<i>Generic</i>	
Recommendation 8: Reform CCEMs as the showcase for Commonwealth education activity	Early planning towards the 2021 CCEM as a re-launch of the Commonwealth’s education presence, with a package of measures to increase Ministerial and civil society participation. (Paragraphs 71, 114-121 & 138).
Recommendation 9: Establish a small group to oversee implementation of an agreed programme of action	Secretariat to convene group with involvement from, COL, CCfE and other Commonwealth education associations. (Paragraph 138).

132. It is therefore recommended to commence with two pilot programmes, each with a target recruitment of 5-10 individuals. These could target specific groups. At the senior level, initial selection could reflect the expertise required for the working groups proposed above. The younger group could be recruited from current or recent Commonwealth Scholars, over 700 of whom from all over the world are in the UK at any given time, many for a three-year period. Recruitment from this pool would be a first step towards increasing geographical diversity of participants, at relatively small cost.

Increasing Awareness

133. To complement the above proposals, a package of measures is proposed to increase awareness of the extent of Commonwealth activity in education. These relate to proposals 5-7 in Table 2. The aim is both to introduce new individuals to the work of the Commonwealth, and encourage those who already have 'one-off' contact with Commonwealth activities to consolidate their involvement.

134. Three activities are proposed. The first is the creation of a simple 'Commonwealth Education' brand, through which Commonwealth organisations signal that their work and achievements form part of a wider Commonwealth effort in the field of education. To succeed, the brand would need to be adopted by all the Commonwealth inter-governmental organisations, and at least the four largest Commonwealth education organisations (paragraph 50-53). It should supplement, rather than compete with, their existing brands. The brand might be something as simple as a newly designed logo, or strapline succinctly stating that an activity or organisation contributes to a wider Commonwealth effort.

135. A second proposal is the creation of publicity outlets that provide an overview of Commonwealth activities in the field – from major development programmes, advice to governments and scholarship programmes to small locally based events and prizes. These would reinforce past publications from the CCfE, for example its *Directory of Commonwealth Education* and regular *Calendar*, but with significantly greater coverage and readership.

136. Approaches could be tailored to available resources. These might include a simple web site pointing the way to the sites of individual providers, or a more interactive, regularly updated one. A periodic (quarterly or half yearly) four or eight-page newsletter could also be produced. This would be circulated by the Secretariat to contacts in governments and other key stakeholders, but the main distribution would be through Commonwealth education organisations themselves. This should generate greater reach than previous Secretariat publications. Distribution would be in electronic format, although organisations with a high profile hard copy distribution – such as the *Common Knowledge* magazine of the Commonwealth Scholarship Commission in the United Kingdom – might wish to include the material with their existing publications.

137. Finally, it is recommended to establish a regular mechanism to bring together the more substantial Commonwealth education stakeholders for regular brainstorming on future opportunities. The group should ideally be convened by the Secretariat, with a core membership including the Secretariat, COL and the four largest Commonwealth education organisations. To be effective, meetings should not comprise more than twelve participants, but these may vary according to subject matter. The group would be tasked with identifying new areas for Commonwealth interventions. Examples of possible topics might include the role of the market in education (paragraphs 37-39) and the potential for a greater Commonwealth role in benchmarking national systems (paragraph 76).

Implementation and Resources

138. These recommendations are intended as the first stage of a renewal process, to be undertaken over a specific timeframe, leading to the 2021 CCEM, which would itself be reformed in line with the recommendations of paragraphs 114-121, and could act as a platform for a significant re-launch of the Commonwealth education function. It is suggested that a small group, convened by the Secretariat, but with involvement from other Commonwealth education organisations including CCfE, will oversee the development of an implementation plan. Membership of this group could

overlap with that of the brainstorming group proposed in paragraph 137, but their purposes would be distinct – the former being confined to identifying issues and generating proposals for possible joint work, and the latter actually agreeing programmes of collective action in education and devising means of collaborative implementation that capitalise on the particular strengths of individual partners.

139. Although designed to reflect likely resource constraints, the proposals will require some additional resource. It is not possible to quantify precise requirements at this stage, and in any event implementation could be at different levels. Indicative costs are shown in Table 3. This recognises that enhanced Secretariat support will be required for implementation. Additional functions would include convening some of the new working parties, the proposed recruitment exercises and contributing to more active engagement with governments prior to CCEMs. The requirement has been estimated at 1-2 additional medium-level staff for present purposes. The figures relate to direct costs only.

140. Even the higher cost level quoted is comfortably under ten per cent of the current budget for the combined Social Policy Development Team, of which education will form part and to which the proposals will contribute. The cost need not, however, fall entirely on the Secretariat. Possible funding sources might include the following:

- Within the Secretariat, some of the proposals being advanced may directly relate to wider Commonwealth themes, while others may promote cross working with other areas of the Economic, Youth and Sustainable Development Directorate. This could enable alternative budgets to be drawn upon.
- The Commonwealth Foundation, whilst having ceased to reserve a defined proportion of its grants for Commonwealth organisations, remains open to grant applications which increase civil society involvement in other ways. They and other charitable bodies may be willing to consider specific proposals which extend the work of Commonwealth education to new regions and groups.
- Some Commonwealth organisations may be willing to provide in-kind assistance, or even limited sponsorship of proposed activities in which they have an interest. It is important, however, to avoid any perception that groups are being allowed to ‘buy’ a place on the Commonwealth education agenda.
- The idea of the ‘six reports’ lends itself well to funding applications for support from individual governments or organisations with an interest in each particular field, and who would be attracted both by the issues and exposure at or around the 21 CCEM.
- New approaches to 21 CCEM, combined with the new agenda proposed, longer planning time and attractive location, might provide more opportunities for income generation at the event itself.

Table 3: Indicative Cost of Main Recommendations

Recommendation	Total Estimated Annual Budget Range (Direct Costs) £stg	Potential for Joint Funding	Notes
Creation and maintenance of Education digital presence	1,000 - 10,000	In-kind support from member organisations.	Range depends on level of interactivity.
Production of Commonwealth education news vehicle	3,000 - 9,000	In kind support and distribution from member organisations	Assumed to be electronic. Any hard copies financed by organisation concerned.
Pilot recruitment of expert / young Commonwealth participant groups	20,000 - 50,000	Possible support from host organisations (or Commonwealth Scholarship providers	Range depends on package and numbers recruited. Assumed to be 5-10 in each case.
Establishment and support of six working parties / commissions	30,000 - 50,000	Possible sponsorship of specific groups or in-kind support from governments or other organisations.	Assumes 6 groups with 5-8 members, with small honorarium for the convenor.
Refreshment of 21 CCEM		Stronger participation from AOs and others. Income stream from sponsorship.	Not clear at this stage whether additional resource would be needed.
Additional Staff Secretariat Support	50,000 - 100,000		Assumed that 1-2 further fte staff would be needed across the above proposals.
Total	104,000 – 219,000		

Conclusion

141. The extent of support for education as a priority for the 'official' Commonwealth is determined by the decisions of member governments and the availability of resources. It does not necessarily reflect the intrinsic importance of education to Commonwealth countries, but the perception of governments on the impact that their investment is thought to make, relative to other funding channels and policy areas.

142. The terms of reference for this report were confined to education. It is not possible, therefore to make definitive comment on the importance of education to other policy areas. The report can and does conclude, however, that much would be lost if the decline in Secretariat support for education is not reversed. Without a strong central presence, the Secretariat cannot hope to restore the international presence that it once held in the field. Other Commonwealth groups in the field may lose visibility to governments, recognition of their work may reduce, and key personnel be disincentivised. Some developing countries may lose confidence in the Commonwealth as an organisation that reflects their interests. At a time when the Secretariat is being encouraged to 'play to its strengths' it will fail to utilise some of its most recognisable assets.

143. The recommendations above seek to avoid these consequences, through practical and affordable measures to increase the visibility and impact of the Commonwealth in education, encourage partnership working and provide an infusion of new thinking. They represent a first step in arresting decline, but one which should be pursued as a matter of urgency.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Terms of Reference

The following terms of reference were included in the Project Brief issued to the author.

- a) Introduction: Education & Commonwealth identity:
To reflect briefly on the place and role of education in the Commonwealth's collective existence, and the contribution that it can make, for example in maintaining Commonwealth awareness and identity, in developing personal relationships and mobility and in supporting other areas of Commonwealth activity. The author may in addition wish to adduce evidence about whether and how the reputation of the Commonwealth in the outside world is affected by its activities in education.
- b) Mapping:
To summarise the nature and extent of existing co-operation in education taking place under a Commonwealth banner. Preparing a brief summary record of current resources, activities and programmes in CW educational co-operation undertaken by/through Commonwealth-branded institutions, whether intergovernmental or non-governmental. These would necessarily be considered in the wider context of global educational interchange.
- c) The added value of Commonwealth collective activity in education:
Recognising the need for selectivity, to consider what particular value, if any, beneficiaries and donors derive from working with or through Commonwealth programmes and platforms in the education sector compared with alternative bilateral, multilateral and international channels. To identify areas of activity where the Commonwealth community can add particular value in delivering outputs and outcomes to address the priorities of and constraints on (a) member states, (b) the Commonwealth IGOs and (c) relevant professional Commonwealth and civil-society bodies. If time permits the Consultant might also canvass views from international organisations active in the education sector on the extent to which CW groupings collectively do or could play any helpful role in reaching international consensus and whether the Commonwealth can be helpful in representing particular interests and viewpoints (small states, diversity etc).
- d) Intra-Commonwealth consultation in education
To canvass views on options for strengthening and improving Commonwealth consultative mechanisms in education and to make observations on the same..
- e) Collaboration within the Commonwealth education community
In the light of the study's findings under sections a)-d) above to explore ways in which the range of Commonwealth bodies working in the field of education could work together more effectively, without detriment to their individual identities, mandates and programmes. In particular to consider how the expertise of Commonwealth professional and civil-society bodies can be more effectively mobilised in the service of Commonwealth education, and how partnerships with Commonwealth inter-governmental organisations can most productively develop.

In conclusion, the consultant is invited to identify options for more effective collaboration among the CW organisations (inter-governmental and non-governmental) committed to Commonwealth

educational co-operation, using existing or new mechanisms. These might include *inter alia* improved information-sharing and co-ordination, joint initiatives and project work, shared public platforms and advocacy. The Report would identify scope for taking full advantage where relevant of new information and communication technologies.

A written report of up to 30 pages (plus relevant appendices) including c.10 clear recommendations addressed to Commonwealth education stakeholders (including member states, intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations). An executive summary of key findings and the recommendations should preface the report.

September 2017

Appendix 2: Membership of the Commonwealth Consortium for Education (CCfE)

Association of Commonwealth Examination and Accreditation Bodies (ACEAB)

Association for Commonwealth Literature and Language Studies (ACLALS)

Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU)

Building Understanding through International Links for Development (BUILD)

Commonwealth Association of Museums (CAM)

Commonwealth Association of Technical Universities and Polytechnics in Africa (CAPA)

Commonwealth Association of Science, Technology and Mathematics Educators (CASTME)

Commonwealth Council for Education Administration and Management (CCEAM)

Commonwealth Girls Education Fund (CGEF)

Commonwealth Human Ecology Council (CHEC)

Commonwealth Legal Education Association (CLEA)

Commonwealth Students Association (CSA)

Commonwealth Teachers Group (CG)

Commonwealth Youth Exchange Council (CYEC)

Council for Education in the Commonwealth (CEC)

English Speaking Union (ESU)

Link Community Development International (LCDI)

Royal Commonwealth Society (RCS)

Royal Overseas League (ROSL) (Associate Member)

Special Members

Commonwealth Foundation

Commonwealth of Learning (COL)

Commonwealth Secretariat

Appendix 3: List of Accredited Commonwealth Organisations

Commonwealth Intergovernmental Organisations

Commonwealth Secretariat

Commonwealth Foundation

Commonwealth of Learning

Associated Organisations

Commonwealth Association for Public Administration and Management

Commonwealth Association of Tax Administrators

Conference of Commonwealth Postal Administrators

Conference of Commonwealth Meteorologists

Commonwealth Games Federation

Commonwealth Education Trust

Commonwealth Local Government Forum

Commonwealth Parliamentary Association

Commonwealth Telecommunications Organisation

Civil Society Organisations

African Centre for Democracy and Human Rights Studies

Association of Commonwealth Archivists and Record Managers

Association of Commonwealth Literature and Language Studies

Association of Commonwealth Universities

Association of Emerging Leaders Dialogue

Association of International Accountants

Basic Needs

Building Understanding through International Links for Development

Common Age

Commonwealth Association for Health and Disability

Commonwealth Association Legislative Counsel

Commonwealth Association of Architects

Commonwealth Association of Law Reform Agencies

Commonwealth Association of Museums

Commonwealth Association of Paediatrics Gastroenterology and Nutrition
Commonwealth Association of Planners
Commonwealth Association of Public Accounts Committees
Commonwealth Association of Science, Technology and Mathematics Educators
Commonwealth Association of Surveying and Land Economy
Commonwealth Boxing Council
Commonwealth Businesswomen's Network
Commonwealth Consortium for Education
Commonwealth Council for Education Administration and Management
Commonwealth Countries League
Commonwealth Dental Association
Commonwealth Engineers Council
Commonwealth Enterprise and Investment Council
Commonwealth Fashion Council
Commonwealth Forestry Association
Commonwealth Geographical Bureau
Commonwealth HIV/AIDS Action Group
Commonwealth Human Ecology Council
Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative
Commonwealth Journalists Association
Commonwealth Judicial Education Association
Commonwealth Lawyers Association
Commonwealth Legal Education Association
Commonwealth Magistrates and Judges Association
Commonwealth Medical Association
Commonwealth Medical Trust
Commonwealth Nurses and Midwives Federation
Commonwealth Organisation for Social Work
Commonwealth Pharmacists Association
Commonwealth Resounds
Commonwealth Royal Life Saving Society

Commonwealth Trade Union Group
Commonwealth Veterinary Association
Commonwealth Women's Network
Commonwealth Youth Orchestra and Choir
Corona Worldwide
Council for Education in the Commonwealth
Forum of Federations
Institute of Certified Bookkeepers
Institute of Certified Management Accountants
Institute of Commonwealth Studies
International Confederation of Free Trade Unions
International Council of Social Welfare
International Federation of Human Rights
Muslim Aid
Pacific Federation for the Advancement of Women
Pacific Island Association for NGOs
Ramphal Centre
Rotary International
Royal Agricultural Society of the Commonwealth
Royal Commonwealth Ex-Services League
Royal Commonwealth Society
Royal Overseas League
SightSavers International
Soroptomist International
Sound Seekers
The Commonwealth Association
The Commonwealth Equality Network
The Duke of Edinburgh's International Award Federation
The Roundtable
Transparency International
World Alliance for Citizen Participation – CIVICUS.

Appendix 4: List of Informants

The author extends grateful thanks to those who participated in the study, either through interviews, submitting written comments or attending consultative meetings. Whilst their contributions were of immense use to the author, those involved bear no responsibility for the contents of the final report.

** Denotes those who participated in face to face interviews.*

*** Denotes those who while not interviewed individually, attended consultative meetings.*

Margaret Adrian-Vallance, Director of Humanitarian and Education Projects, Royal Overseas League*

David Archer, Head of Programme Development ActionAid; Board Member, Global Partnership for Education; Board Member, Global Campaign for Education.

Richard Bourne, Trustee Ramphal Institute**

Lalage Bown, Professor Emerita of Adult and Continuing Education, University of Glasgow

Catherine Cole, Secretary-General, Commonwealth Association of Museums, Canada

Trevor Coombe, former Deputy Director-General Department of Education, South Africa

Michael Crossley, Professor of Comparative and International Education, University of Bristol

Gajaraj Dhanarajan, former Vice-Chancellor and CEO of Wawasan Open University, Malaysia; former President, Commonwealth of Learning

Samidha Garg, International Relations Officer, National Education Union (NUT branch)*

Dorothy Garland, Institute of Education and former Deputy Secretary-General, Association of Commonwealth Universities *

Nabeel Goheer, Assistant Secretary-General and Lauren Stasinowsky, Commonwealth Secretariat*

Judith Hanratty, Chair, Commonwealth Education Trust*

Steve Hillier, Commonwealth and United Nations Department, Department for International Development, UK*

Ghaleeb Jeppie, Department of Higher Education and Training, South Africa*

Helen Jones, Director of Youth Affairs and Education Programmes, Royal Commonwealth Society*

Asha Kanwar - President and CEO, Commonwealth of Learning, Vancouver, Canada*

Winnie Anna Kiap, Papua New Guinea High Commissioner to the United Kingdom*

Nasir Kazmi, Education Adviser, Commonwealth Secretariat*

Crispus Kiamba, Chair, Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Task Force and former Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Higher Education and Science, Kenya*

Kabiru Isyaku, Faculty of Education, Bayero University, Nigeria; formerly Federal Ministry of Education, Nigeria.

Beth Kreling, Secretary, Commonwealth Consortium for Education*

Vijay Krishnarayan, Director-General, Commonwealth Foundation*

Gail Larose, former Secretary-General, Canadian Alliance of Education and Training; and previously Head, Higher Education Unit Commonwealth Secretariat

Sonny Leong, Chair, Council for Education in the Commonwealth*

Keith Lewin, Emeritus Professor of International Education and Development, University of Sussex

Lord Luce, President, Royal Overseas League*

Nick Maurice, Chair, Building Understanding through International Links for Development*

Simon McGrath, UNESCO Chair in the Political Economy of Education, University of Nottingham

Penny O'Regan and Rita Odumosu, Trustees, Commonwealth Girls Education Fund*

Olubunmi Owoso, Secretary-General, Commonwealth Association of Technical Universities and Polytechnics in Africa, Nairobi*

C T Akumu Owuor, Director of TVET Programmes and Partnerships, The Technical University of Kenya*

Steve Packer, Former Deputy Director, Education for All Global Monitoring Report, Deputy Head (Policy and Programme Development) Education Department, DFID and one time Commonwealth Secretariat staff member*

Duncan Partridge, Director of Education and Melanie Aplin, Head of International Programmes and Cultural Exchange, English Speaking Union *

Hilary Perraton, former Deputy Chair, Commonwealth Scholarship Commission in the United Kingdom; and, earlier, staff member Education Programme, Commonwealth Secretariat**

Colin Power, Chair Commonwealth Consortium for Education, and former Deputy Director-General for Education, UNESCO

Chris Prentice, Chair, Association for Commonwealth Literature and Language Studies, New Zealand

Rosemary Preston, Council for Education in the Commonwealth (formerly Executive Chair, CEC)**

David Rampersad, Senior Adviser to the Vice-Chancellor, University of the West Indies

Layne Robinson Head of Social Policy Development, and Amina Osman, Education Adviser, Economic, Youth and Sustainable Development Directorate, Commonwealth Secretariat*

Mark Robinson, Commonwealth Human Ecology Council and Alternate Chair, Commonwealth Consortium for Education*

Madhu Sethi, First Secretary, Political & International Organisations, Indian High Commission. London*

Michael Sinclair, Consultant, Canada; formerly Assistant Director Education Programme, Commonwealth Secretariat

Elizabeth Stephen, Political Officer, Canadian High Commission, London*

Keith Stephenson, Director of Finance and Resources, Association of Commonwealth Universities**

Lucy Steward, Consultant, Barbados; formerly Registrar, Caribbean Examinations Council; previously with Education Programme Commonwealth Secretariat

Melanie Torrance, The Round Table *

Lady (Sue) Tunnicliffe (Chair) and Kath Nugent (Vice-Chair), Commonwealth Association for Science, Technology and Mathematics Education.*

Tim Unwin, Former Chair, Commonwealth Scholarship Commission in the United Kingdom and Former Secretary-General, Commonwealth Telecommunications Organisation

Nicholas Watts, Institute of Commonwealth Studies, University of London*

Peter Williams, President and Acting Secretary, Commonwealth Consortium for Education *

Alex Wright, Association of Commonwealth Universities *

Appendix 5: Select Bibliography

Bown, Lalage (Ed), *Education in the Commonwealth – The first 40 years. From Oxford to Halifax and Beyond*. Commonwealth Secretariat, 2003

Commonwealth Consortium for Education / Commonwealth Foundation. *Directory of Commonwealth Education 2015*. Edited by Peter Williams and Peter Lockwood, June 2015

Commonwealth Consortium for Education. *Educational Co-operation: Jewel in the Commonwealth Crown. A 2012 Update*. Edited by Peter Williams and James Urwick

Commonwealth Foundation, *Strategic Plan 2017-21*

Commonwealth Foundation, *The People's Commonwealth. More Voices for a Fairer World*. 2017.

Commonwealth Girls Education Fund, *Annual Report, 2016-17*

Commonwealth Human Ecology Council, *Annual Report, 2015 and 2016*

Commonwealth Scholarship Commission in the United Kingdom. *Successes and Complexities: The Outcomes of UK Commonwealth Scholarships. 1960-2012*. Matt Mawer, Shireen Quraishi and Rachel Day. 2016.

Commonwealth Secretariat. *Agendas for Conferences of Commonwealth Education Ministers*. 2003, 2006, 2009, 2012, 2015.

Commonwealth Secretariat. *A Commonwealth of the People: Time for Urgent Reform*. Report of the Eminent Persons Group to Commonwealth Heads of Government, Perth, 2011

Commonwealth Secretariat. *Learning from Each Other: Commonwealth Studies for the 21st Century*, Commission on Commonwealth Studies, 1996

Commonwealth Secretariat (1988). Memorandum of Understanding on the Commonwealth of Learning. London, Commonwealth Secretariat

Commonwealth Secretariat. *Report of the Secretary-General's Dialogue with Commonwealth Accredited Organisations*, Marlborough House, 6 October 2017

Commonwealth Secretariat. *Strategic Plan 2016-17 – 2020-21*

Commonwealth Secretariat. *The Commonwealth – A Quick Guide*. 2017

Commonwealth Secretariat (1987). Towards a Commonwealth of Learning: proposal to create the University of the Commonwealth for Co-operation in Distance Learning, report of the Expert Group on Commonwealth Co-operation in Distance Education and Open Learning (Chair: Lord Briggs). London, Commonwealth Secretariat.

Commonwealth Teachers Group. *Newsletter Issue 2*. Special Issue for the Teacher Forum at the 17th Conference of Commonwealth Education Ministers, Kuala Lumpur, 2009

Commonwealth Teachers Group. *Survey on the Impact of the use of Technology on Teaching and Learning*. 2012.

Commonwealth Teachers Grouping. *Working Group on the Professional Development of Commonwealth Teachers. Interim Report to the 16th Conference of Commonwealth Education Ministers.* Cape Town, 2006.

Drayton, Richard. *The Commonwealth in the Twenty-First Century.* Annual Lecture to the Commonwealth Association, June 2015

English Speaking Union. *Speaking Frankly – The Case for Oracy in the Curriculum.*

Friends of the Earth / Commonwealth Human Ecology Council. *Bees and Pollinators: A Commonwealth Concern.* Report to the Commonwealth Heads of Government and Civil Society, CHOGM, Malta 2015

Mole, Stuart. *Commonwealth Organisations, Civil Society and the Commonwealth's Intergovernmental Consultations – Towards a Framework of Engagement.* 2012

Ochs, Kimberly. *Revisiting the Implementation of the Commonwealth Teacher Migration Protocol, in Next Steps in Managing Teacher Migration.* Edited by Jonathan Penson, UNESCO / Commonwealth Secretariat, 2012

Schreuder, D. (ed.) (2013). *Universities for a new world.* New Delhi (volume to celebrate the Centenary of the Association of Commonwealth Universities). Sage.

The Round Table, *Distinctiveness and Diversity: 50 Years of Commonwealth Co-operation in Education.* Edited by Peter Williams and Michael Lee. Issue 405, December 2009

United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation. *Mobility in Higher Education, UNESCO Science Report: Towards 2030.* 2014.

University of Wolverhampton, Centre for International Development and Training. *Review of the Commonwealth Secretariat Strategic Plan, 2013-17.* Ella Horuna, Kimberley Kane. 2017.

Williams, Peter. *Critical Champions: Civil Society and Commonwealth Education.*

Williams, Peter (Ed.) (2005). *Implementing the Commonwealth Edinburgh Action Plan for Education: Ways Forward. Report on a series of Exploratory Discussions* (orchestrated by the Commonwealth Consortium for Education. London, Commonwealth Secretariat.