

Harnessing Educational Cooperation in the EAS for Regional Competitiveness and Community Building

REPSF II Project No. 07/006

Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER)

Authors: Phillip McKenzie, Robert Horne, Andrew Dowling & Adrian Beavis

Final Report

14 July 2008

This report draws on a literature review, analysis of data, consultation visits to all 16 EAS countries between March and May 2008, a regional workshop held in Jakarta on 9-10 June 2008, and feedback on draft reports. The views expressed in it are those of the authors, and not necessarily of any government, organisation or individual.

The assistance of the ASEAN Secretariat, GRM International, and all of the governments, organisations and individuals involved in the consultations, workshop and responses to the draft reports is gratefully acknowledged.

ABSTRACT

At the Second East Asia Summit (EAS) meeting held in 2007, the 16 Country Leaders agreed to strengthen regional educational cooperation. Acting on behalf of the EAS, the ASEAN Secretariat has commissioned this project to develop strategies for EAS participants to enhance regional economic competitiveness and strengthen community building in a balanced and sustainable manner through cooperation in education. The project's scope encompasses regional cooperation in basic education (primary and secondary), technical and vocational education and training, and higher education.

This report draws on a literature review of experiences with international educational cooperation, analysis of published data, consultations with education and labour market authorities in each EAS country during the period from March to May, and inputs from organisations and individuals engaged in regional cooperative activities in education. An earlier draft was discussed at a Regional Workshop attended by EAS countries in Jakarta on 9-10 June 2008.

The report has eight chapters. Chapter 1 outlines the context for the project and the study's objectives. Chapter 2 outlines the methodology. Chapter 3 discusses the conceptual framework and terminology used to analyse international educational cooperation. Chapter 4 reviews the state of international cooperation in education in other parts of the world. Chapter 5 summarises what is known about the benefits of educational cooperation, and the processes by which the benefits can be harnessed. Chapter 6 provides an overview of the main forms of cooperation currently underway in the EAS region, and examples of good practice that could be potentially developed further. Chapter 7 includes a more detailed discussion of specific aspects of current arrangements in the context of free trade agreements, international student flows, and scholarship schemes. Chapter 8 proposes for consideration a statement of goals to be achieved through EAS cooperation, priority areas for joint action, and processes for working together.

The report also includes appendices that detail the issues and questions used to guide the consultations (Appendix 1), the governments, organisations and individuals involved in the consultations (Appendix 2), background data on the social, economic and educational contexts in each EAS country (Appendix 3), data on student flows (Appendix 4), and information on scholarship schemes (Appendix 5), and notes on the authors (Appendix 6).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The assistance of the ASEAN Secretariat, GRM International, and all of the governments, organisations and individuals involved in the consultations, the regional workshop held in Jakarta on 9-10 June 2008, and feedback on drafts, is gratefully acknowledged. We also wish to acknowledge the support of our ACER colleagues Peter McGuckian, Trish Firth, Pat Knight, Cathy Underwood and Ratna Dhamija.

The views expressed in the report are those of the authors, and not necessarily of any government, organisation or individual.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	III
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	IV
LIST OF TABLES.....	VII
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	VIII
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	10
1 CONTEXT AND PURPOSES OF THE PROJECT	18
1.1 CONTEXT.....	18
1.2 PROJECT PURPOSES.....	19
1.3 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT.....	20
2 METHODOLOGY.....	21
3 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND TERMINOLOGY	23
3.1 DEFINITION OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION COOPERATION	23
3.2 FORMS OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION	23
3.3 LEVELS AT WHICH INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION MAY OCCUR	24
3.4 FRAMEWORK USED IN THE PROJECT	26
3.5 RESPONSES TO THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	28
3.6 SUMMARY OF CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK PROPOSED FOR FUTURE USE.....	30
4 EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION IN OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD	31
4.1 THE BOLOGNA PROCESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION.....	31
4.2 EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION IN THE EUROPEAN UNION.....	34
4.3 EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION IN OTHER REGIONS.....	38
4.4 LESSONS FROM EXPERIENCE IN OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD.....	40
5 BENEFITS OF EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION	43
5.1 INTRODUCTION	43
5.2 INVESTMENT IN HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT	43
5.3 EDUCATION FOR ALL GOALS	44
5.4 CAPACITY BUILDING	45
5.5 THE BENEFITS OF TRADE IN EDUCATION SERVICES	46
5.6 COUNTRY PERSPECTIVES ON THE CONTRIBUTION OF COOPERATION	47
5.7 KEY SUCCESS FACTORS IN EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION.....	48
5.8 INFORMATION AND RESEARCH NEEDS	49
5.9 CONCLUSIONS ON THE BENEFITS OF EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION	50
6 CURRENT EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION IN THE EAS REGION	51
6.1 INTRODUCTION	51
6.2 GENERAL CONTEXT OF EDUCATION IN THE EAS.....	51
6.3 MEMBERSHIP OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS.....	52
6.4 TYPES OF EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION	54
6.5 EXAMPLES OF EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION	71
6.6 INTERNATIONAL PROJECTS ON EDUCATION INDICATORS AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	74
7 SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF CURRENT COOPERATION IN THE REGION	76
7.1 FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS AND EDUCATION	76
7.2 INTERNATIONAL STUDENT FLOWS	80
7.3 SCHOLARSHIP SCHEMES.....	84
8 OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES FOR HARNESSING EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION	87

8.1	OBJECTIVES OF ENHANCED EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION	87
8.2	PRIORITY AREAS FOR COOPERATION	89
8.3	SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED PRIORITY AREAS.....	94
8.4	PROCESSES FOR ENHANCED COOPERATION.....	96
8.5	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION	98
REFERENCES		100
APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONS FOR THE COUNTRY CONSULTATIONS		103
APPENDIX 2: ORGANISATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS INVOLVED IN THE CONSULTATIONS		106
APPENDIX 3: CONTEXTUAL DATA ON THE EAS COUNTRIES		116
APPENDIX 4: DATA ON STUDENT FLOWS.....		121
APPENDIX 5: SCHOLARSHIP SCHEMES OFFERED BY EAS GOVERNMENTS		125
APPENDIX 6: ABOUT THE AUTHORS		128

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 3.1: TYPES OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION EXAMINED IN THE STUDY	26
TABLE 3.2: GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS	27
TABLE 3.3: MAIN MODES OF THE INTERNATIONAL SUPPLY OF EDUCATION SERVICES	29
TABLE 6.1: THREE WAVES OF SCHOOL REFORM IN ASIA.....	52
TABLE 6.2: MEMBERSHIP OF EAS COUNTRIES IN SELECTED INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS WITH AN EDUCATION ROLE ¹	53
TABLE 6.3: SUMMARY OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION, BY COUNTRY.....	55
TABLE 6.4: PARTICIPATION OF EAS COUNTRIES IN SELECTED INTERNATIONAL PROJECTS ON EDUCATION INDICATORS AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	75
TABLE 7.1: FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS IN THE EAS AREA.....	77
TABLE 8.1: OBJECTIVES AND PRIORITIES	96
TABLE A.1: SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONTEXT INDICATORS ¹	117
TABLE A.2: EDUCATION ENROLMENT RATES BY SECTOR	118
TABLE A.3: LITERACY RATES 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY GENDER	119
TABLE A.4: RESOURCES FOR EDUCATION	120
TABLE A.5: STUDENTS FROM ASEAN COUNTRIES, BY HOST COUNTRY, 1999-2005	122
TABLE A.6: ALL STUDENTS FROM OTHER EAS COUNTRIES, BY HOST COUNTRY, 1999-2005	123
TABLE A.7: ALL STUDENTS FROM ALL EAS COUNTRIES, BY HOST COUNTRY, 1999-2005	124

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AADCP	ASEAN-Australia Development Cooperation Program
ACER	Australian Council for Educational Research
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AEI	Australian Education International
APEC	Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
APERA	Asia-Pacific Educational Research Association
APEMM	Asia-Pacific Education Ministers Meeting
APQN	Asia-Pacific Quality Network
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
AUN	ASEAN University Network
BFUG	Bologna Follow-Up Group
CERI	Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (OECD)
CLMV	Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam
EAS	East Asia Summit
ECTS	European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System
EFA	Education for All
EHEA	European Higher Education Area
ENQA	European Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education
EPA	Economic Partnership Agreement
EQAR	European Quality Assurance Register
EU	European Union
FTAs	Free Trade Agreements
GATS	General Agreement on Trade in Services
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GER	Gross Enrolment Rate
GNI	Gross National Income
GNP	Gross National Product
HDI	Human Development Index
HE	Higher Education
HEI	Higher Education Institution
ICT	Information and Communication Technologies
IDP	International Development Program
IEA	International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement
IICBA	International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa

ILO	International Labour Organization
IT	Information Technology
JENESYS	Japan-East Asia Network of Exchange for Students and Youths
LAS	League of Arab States
MRA	Mutual Recognition Arrangements
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NER	Net Enrolment Rate
NIC	National Information Centres
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PIRLS	Progress In International Reading Literacy Study
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
PPP	Purchasing Power Parity
R & D	Research and Development
RELC	Regional English Language Centre
REPSF	Regional Economic Policy Support Facility
RETRAC	Regional Training Centre
RIHED	Regional Centre for Higher Education and Development
RoK	Republic of Korea
SAARC	South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation
SADC	Southern Africa Development Community
SEAMEO	Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization
TEDS	Teacher Education and Development Study in Mathematics
TIMSS	Trends in International Mathematics and Science Education Study
TVE	Technical and Vocational Education
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education and Training
UK	United Kingdom
UMAP	University Mobility in the Asia-Pacific
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UIS	UNESCO Institute of Statistics
USA	United States of America
VET	Vocational Education and Training
VOCTECH	Regional Centre for Vocational and Technical Education and Training

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the Second East Asia Summit (EAS) held in 2007, the EAS leaders agreed to strengthen educational cooperation between their 16 countries. This decision reflects the importance of education in promoting economic and social development, the substantial size of the education sector in all countries, the growing internationalisation of the sector, and the gains that can flow from enhanced cooperation in education.

On behalf of the EAS, the ASEAN Secretariat commissioned this project to develop strategies for EAS participants to enhance regional economic competitiveness and strengthen community building in a balanced and sustainable manner through cooperation in education. It encompasses regional cooperation in Basic Education (Primary and Secondary Education), Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET), and Higher Education.

The report draws on a literature review regional educational cooperation, analysis of published data, consultations in each EAS country, a regional workshop, and inputs from organisations and individuals engaged in cooperative activities in education.

Conceptual Framework

It is important to have a shared understanding of the key terms and ideas that define what is meant by international educational cooperation. Educational cooperation occurs whenever two or more parties work together to achieve an educational objective. International partners working together towards an educational objective may be: playing similar roles – e.g. two countries cooperating on an exchange program; in a purchaser-provider relationship (i.e. trade in educational services); or in a donor-recipient relationship (i.e. development assistance). These different forms of cooperation should not be viewed as alternatives to each other, but as complements and mutually reinforcing.

The project focused on cooperation at government-to-government level, either bilaterally or multilaterally, and the role that governments can play in stimulating, supporting and, where necessary, regulating educational cooperation to maximise its contribution to economic and social development.

Educational Cooperation in Other Regions

Throughout the world there are groups of countries active in educational cooperation often linked to economic integration. These developments reflect a common concern to strengthen educational systems in order to compete in global markets.

The Bologna Process aims to establish by 2010 a European Higher Education Area (EHEA) in order to enhance quality and to promote mobility between the higher education systems of its 45 member countries. Among the EHEA's features would be a common system of credits for study, a common qualifications framework in three cycles – undergraduate, masters and doctoral, a diploma supplement to serve as a common format for certifying qualifications, and common criteria and methods of quality assurance.

A common higher education area offers a number of benefits to a group of countries aiming at economic integration. It facilitates the flow of highly qualified manpower across national borders, and hence economic integration; it promotes efficiency through widening choice for staff and students; and it enhances educational effectiveness and cultural awareness by promoting staff and student mobility. Diversity of standards and distance are larger issues for the EAS than for the Bologna Process countries, which bears upon the methods and the time-scale for achieving a common higher education area. However, some Bologna elements such as mutual recognition arrangements and credit transfer have already been piloted in East Asia.

Key features of the Bologna Process include biennial conferences of Education Ministers of the participating countries, supported by representatives of the universities and their

students. These meetings take stock of progress over the last two years and set directions for the next two, including the identification of targets, common data requirements and indicators of progress.

The EAS should aim to understand the experience with educational cooperation in Europe and other regions and to use it as one ingredient in its own shaping policies. East Asia has developed forums for dialogue with Europe which will enable it to draw on the European experience, and share its own.

The Benefits of Educational Cooperation

The benefits of educational cooperation relate to closely to the benefits gained by individuals and societies from increased participation in education and improvements in educational quality. All countries report an increased emphasis on ensuring that young people can meet the challenges and needs of rapid transformation, and can participate effectively in a globalised environment.

Cross-border exchange of education services and international student flows offers benefits in terms of improving the quantity, quality and diversity of education services. These are the kinds of benefits which might be expected to accrue from opening up international trade, and increasing competition, in the supply of any good or service. Furthermore, cross-border exchange offers special benefits such as the rapid transfer of ideas and increased cultural understanding from person-to-person interactions.

While there is strong support for enhanced educational cooperation, and general agreement about its benefits, there is a lack of hard evidence about which sorts of cooperation programs are most effective in different sectors of education. Nonetheless, it is possible to state some broad conclusions.

- Both staff and student interchange and transnational education operate to increase the quality and quantity of education on offer, and so enhance competitiveness. Through first hand experience of other countries they develop appreciation of diversity and common heritage, and foster community building.
- Information exchange and sharing of good practice builds capacity within and across nations, and is clearly an area in which educational cooperation can make a substantial contribution.
- Regulatory Reform has worked in Europe to align tertiary education systems, open up choice and strengthen quality assurance. It has begun to do so in East Asia.
- Cross-border exchange of education services offers benefits in terms of improving the quantity, quality and diversity of education services. These are the kinds of benefits which might be expected to accrue from opening up international trade. Furthermore, cross-border exchange offers special benefits such as the rapid transfer of ideas and increased cultural understanding from person-to-person interactions.
- Development Partnerships: there is a large literature on the effectiveness of development assistance. It is well established that aid can be effective in enhancing the quality and quantity of education in recipient countries, depending on the nature of the program and a number of success factors, including those listed below.

The benefits of education cooperation cannot be taken for granted. A number of factors are important for the success of cooperative activities and to ensure that they achieve their objectives. At international level key success factors include:

- Cooperation must be seen by all parties as meeting genuine needs.
- Cooperation needs to be viewed as a two-way process whereby each country shares its strengths to help others as well as receives assistance in meeting its needs.
- High level political support.

- Strong links into national ministries and networks of education providers.
- A program framework in which the various components are mutually reinforcing: 'piecemeal programs don't work'.
- Realistic timelines.
- A well-resourced coordinating group or secretariat able to maintain momentum, support national personnel, disseminate good practice, and develop future plans.

Current Educational Cooperation in the EAS Region

The most extensive types of educational cooperation in the region appear to relate to people exchange and information exchange, especially in the higher education sector. In regard to regulatory reform there appears to be increasing levels of interest in skills recognition, qualifications recognition, qualifications frameworks, and quality assurance.

All countries reported some form of cooperation in most of the types examined in the project. Many kinds of cooperation were reported, making it difficult to generalise. However, three broad categories can be distinguished:

- The relatively high-income countries (Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Japan, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea and Singapore) have initiated a wide range of cooperation activities, with a global outlook. They are significant exporters of education and promoters of transnational education. They are active as donors in the EAS region.
- An intermediate group of countries consists of China, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines and Thailand. Within this group China and India are able because of their size to cooperate on a wide scale. Most members of the group are education importers, but some have a growing export sector. Development assistance is still significant for some members, but group members may also be donors or engaged in mutual assistance programs with developing countries, including by sharing expertise on effective strategies for achieving Education for All goals. There is growing interest among these countries in aligning quality assurance mechanisms and qualifications frameworks to international developments.
- Among the developing countries (Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar and Vietnam) study abroad and exchanges may be constrained by the availability of external funding, and education and training for migrant workers are important issues. The multilateral organisations play a particularly important part in enabling these countries to tap external expertise, as do development partners. These countries are adjacent and assist one another.

These groupings are only approximations, not least because conditions vary as much within countries as between them.

Intra-regional grouping is also important. For example, the SEAMEO Centres do much to shape the pattern of cooperation among the ASEAN countries. China, the Republic of Korea and Japan form one geographical group with increasing education linkages, as does the Greater Mekong Sub-region in South East Asia.

Participation in international studies of student achievement involves eight EAS countries in the case of the OECD's PISA study and TIMSS, but only 3-4 countries for the other main achievement studies conducted by the IEA. A number of EAS countries lack data on their students' achievement that would enable them to benchmark performance with other countries. From the perspective of developing countries in particular, participation in international studies can be a very cost-effective means of capacity building. Developing

relevant measures of educational quality at primary school level could be a focus for the EAS countries in collaboration with groups such as the IEA and OECD.

Free Trade Agreements and Education

There is a growing number of Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) between EAS countries. The main points to emerge are:

- As yet few FTAs make more than permissive provision for mutual recognition of qualifications and periods of study. Some however establish processes through which recognition agreements could be developed;
- Commercial presence is the mode of supply most readily opened up by FTAs. Some FTAs do commit to significant liberalisation, especially in the tertiary education sector, but its impact is sometimes weakened by the absence of mutual recognition;
- FTAs usually allow the parties to make use of separately negotiated agreements on mutual recognition and other specified matters, so there is an opportunity to give effect to the outcomes of a Bologna-type process in East Asia.

International Student Flows

International student flows are of increasing importance in regional education. The data relate mainly to higher education and have a number of limitations. With those cautions, the main findings are:

- The total number of international students from EAS countries studying at tertiary level other countries across the world rose by almost 90% between 1999 and 2005, from 440,000 to 835,000. Of the students in 2005, about 140,000 are from ASEAN countries and about 695,000 from countries elsewhere in the EAS area.
- Almost 90% of the growth in numbers between 1999 and 2005 is accounted for by students from China and India.
- International flows of tertiary students have grown faster within the EAS area than the flows between EAS member countries and countries outside it.

An increase in such flows exerts pressure for convergence between national higher education systems in fields such as quality assurance, the transfer of study credits, the recording of achievements and qualifications, and information about qualification structures and pathways. Increasingly countries are recognising the need to address these matters, and the necessity of international cooperation in doing so, but with caution because of different starting points.

With respect to consumption abroad, it would be desirable to have the number of international students from other member states which each member country hosts, analysed by country of origin and by level of education – higher education, TVET and schools. With respect to commercial presence, data are needed about the number of foreign owned institutions at each educational level, and the numbers of international and domestic students which they cater for.

Scholarship Schemes

Scholarship schemes are quite small relative to international student flows. There seems to be consensus among donors and recipients that to get best effect from a limited number of scholarships, a focus on post-graduate studies and on students with high potential is needed.

The report suggests that:

- Where scholarships are offered as development assistance, an emphasis on helping the developing country to expand its own system of higher education and enhance its quality may be particularly effective;
- Where schemes aim to attract scholars and researchers from a global field, the EAS interest may be to support study in fields such as the sustainable use of energy and the moderation of climate change which the EAS leaders have identified as priorities for the region.

There is scope to expand scholarship schemes within the EAS area. Japan has indicated that it has in mind to bring proposals for an “Asian Erasmus” scheme to the next EAS Summit.

Objectives for Enhanced Educational Cooperation

The EAS leaders have not yet explicitly addressed the purpose of enhanced educational cooperation within the EAS area. There would be benefits from doing so in terms of clarifying the distinctive role that the EAS could play, and identifying priorities for collaborative action. It is important to have a sense of direction and an appreciation of how educational cooperation can contribute to social and economic development. Based on analysis of existing policy documents and the country consultations, the following recommendation is proposed.

Recommendation 1

The EAS Country Leaders consider adoption of the following objectives for enhanced educational cooperation in the area of the EAS:

To build communities among the peoples of the EAS countries, notably through

- Increasing the mobility of students, teachers and researchers in the area;
- The appreciation of one another’s heritage and history; and
- The learning of other languages.

To create competitive advantage for the EAS region by:

- Promoting excellence at all levels of education through the exchange of information on good practice, and by bench-marking; and
- Enlarging choice in tertiary education and in the labour market through measures to facilitate the movement of students, staff and tertiary-qualified personnel across national borders, and by enlarging access for tertiary education providers to national markets.

To reduce disparities in educational opportunity within and between countries in order to:

- Facilitate access to basic and non-formal education and promote high standards through networking and institutional collaboration;
- Promote tertiary education and training in home countries, especially in the fields of science and technology, as a means to economic development.

Priority Areas for Enhanced Educational Cooperation

There are many possible areas of education and training in which EAS governments could work together to achieve common objectives. It is important to identify priorities for the EAS so that resources are used effectively, relevant initiatives by other multilateral organisations are supported, and other work is not duplicated.

The ASEAN Secretariat could be asked to use existing networks to prepare a statement of objectives to be achieved through enhancing educational cooperation in the EAS, and outline priorities for educational cooperation drawn from this report. The statement of priorities could

be considered at the next EAS leader meeting. Based on analysis of existing programs and inputs from the country consultations, the following recommendation is proposed.

Recommendation 2

The EAS Country Leaders consider adoption of the following priority areas for enhanced educational cooperation:

- The teaching and learning of foreign languages.
- The teaching and learning of Mathematics and Science.
- Education for mutual understanding among the peoples of the EAS region.
- Enhancing the quality of school teaching.
- Enlarging access to education.
- Strengthening Technical and Vocational Education and Training, in particular through supporting moves towards more demand-driven TVET systems, the accrediting of TVET providers and statistical standards for monitoring and evaluation of the sector, and developing a regional network of leading TVET institutions.
- Strengthening Higher Education, in particular through the enhancement of mobility and choice through the harmonisation of quality assurance, study credit and qualifications systems, and the expansion of exchanges and scholarships.

Processes for Enhanced Educational Cooperation

If the EAS decides to pursue educational cooperation collectively, it will be important that organisational and secretariat structures are appropriate. The recent experience of the energy sector, in which an Energy Cooperation Taskforce and the Energy Ministers fed into the *Singapore Declaration on Climate Change, Energy and the Environment* signed by EAS leaders in November 2007 suggests a possible way forward for education.

Recommendation 3

The EAS Country Leaders establish an Education Cooperation Task Force to refine and operationalise the list of priorities and develop processes for the on-going strengthening of educational cooperation at EAS level. The Education Cooperation Taskforce's report would be considered by a meeting of EAS Education Ministers before proposals are drawn up for adoption at a subsequent EAS Leaders meeting.

Strengthening the Knowledge Base on Educational Cooperation

Countries often lack systematic information about their own international cooperation activities, developments in other countries or good practice in effective strategies for harnessing educational cooperation. There does not seem to be a regional organisation with the mandate to strengthen the knowledge base in these regards and to promote more rigorous and comparable data and evaluations of international cooperation programs.

Recommendation 4

The Education Cooperation Task Force be asked to investigate options for: (a) developing comparable data bases to document international education cooperation activities in the region, including more detailed data on student flows, (b) strengthening evaluation of the impacts of cooperation activities and the factors associated with program effectiveness; and (c) disseminating good practice in educational cooperation throughout the region.

To carry this agenda forward the ASEAN Secretariat will need additional resources, especially in terms of strengthening linkages with EAS countries that are not ASEAN members. The creation of an EAS Education Cooperation Taskforce would need to be accompanied by the provision of adequate resources, specification of clear tasks and reporting timelines, and a meeting schedule that enables all countries to participate effectively.

1 CONTEXT AND PURPOSES OF THE PROJECT

1.1 CONTEXT

At the Second East Asia Summit (EAS) held on 15 January 2007 in Cebu, the Philippines, the country Leaders agreed to strengthen regional educational cooperation.

The EAS comprises a total of 16 countries, as follows:

Australia
Brunei Darussalam
Cambodia
China, People's Republic
India, Republic of
Indonesia
Japan
Korea, Republic of
Lao People's Democratic Republic
Malaysia
Myanmar
New Zealand
Philippines
Singapore
Thailand
Viet Nam

Between them, these 16 countries have a total population of over 3.2 billion, or almost half of the world's total.¹ In some of the EAS countries (Cambodia, India, Lao PDR, Philippines and Viet Nam) at least 30% of the people are aged less than 15 years, which implies very substantial demand for education, especially in the context of relatively high population growth in those nations. By contrast, in Australia, Japan and the Republic of Korea less than 20% of the population is under 15.

The Australian International Development Program (IDP) has also predicted that student enrolments world-wide are likely to increase three-fold over the next two decades. The demand from Asia is forecast to be even stronger (Turpin, 2004).

While some of the EAS countries have achieved very high participation rates in education and their students perform at or near the top of international studies of achievement in reading, mathematics and science (e.g. Australia, Japan, the Republic of Korea, New Zealand and Singapore) other countries (e.g. Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar) are still well short of reaching the Millennium Goals of *Education for All* set for 2015. As well as the drive towards universal basic education, plans to increase participation in upper secondary and tertiary education are significant for the overall growth of the region's education systems.

In 2005 the total GDP of the 16 EAS nations was the equivalent of over US\$17 200 billion (in PPP terms), or about one-quarter of world GDP (Appendix 3). The region contains three of the world's largest economies (China, India and Japan). In 2005 ten of the EAS economies grew by more than 5%, which was well above the average for the world as a whole. The EAS is a highly dynamic region whose importance and global significance can only grow.

Despite the rapid growth experienced in recent years, there are still substantial challenges facing the region in terms of ensuring that all groups within the various societies can secure

¹ Appendix 3 includes data on the economic, social and educational contexts of the 16 EAS countries.

the benefits of economic and social development, and that problems of health, energy, the environment and security, among others, can be overcome.

Against this background the decisions taken by the 16 EAS Country Leaders to meet for the first time in 2005, to continue a regular cycle of meetings, to identify the benefits of working collaboratively on common problems, and to designate education as a priority area for greater cooperation, take on a particular importance.

The importance given by the EAS to education is consistent with the priorities of other regional organisations of countries such as ASEAN, SEAMEO, APEC and APEMM, as well as global intergovernmental organisations such as UNESCO and the OECD.² Such organisations have all identified the development and enhancement of human resources as a key strategy for generating employment, alleviating poverty and socio-economic disparities, and ensuring economic growth with equity. For example, ASEAN Ministers of Education have committed to promoting regional cooperation in education as a means of encouraging educational development and the economic integration goals set to be achieved by 2015 (see Hew, 2007).

1.2 PROJECT PURPOSES

This study was initiated by the ASEAN Secretariat on behalf of the EAS to develop educational cooperation into an important strategy for enhancing regional competitiveness and community building. It was supported through the Regional Economic Policy Support Facility (REPSF II) of the ASEAN-Australia Development Cooperation Program (AADCP).

The project defines 'regional competitiveness' as increasing the region's capacity to compete successfully in the global economy in terms of trading goods and services, attracting investment and improved living standards. 'Community building' refers to enhanced economic, social and cultural well-being throughout the region, the development of appreciation among diverse peoples both of common heritage and of differences, and the fostering of values which make for harmony between peoples, such as peace, tolerance and mutual respect.

The terms of reference were not specific about the geographic extent of the community to be built. The term "ASEAN community" is well established and occurs in ASEAN foundation documents like the Vientiane Action Program. In the consultations some countries were ready to conceive of an "EAS community"; others thought the notion of the whole EAS as a single community over-ambitious at the present time. In the Declaration³ establishing the EAS its leaders said:

"The efforts of the East Asia Summit to promote community building in this region will be consistent with and reinforce the realisation of the ASEAN Community, and will form an integral part of the evolving regional architecture."

This implies that community building within an EAS framework includes the building of communities among groups of EAS members.

Educational cooperation can take many different forms. The EAS strategies need to be based on a well-founded understanding of the forms of education cooperation already underway, and to be seen to 'add value' and a distinctive edge. The study is based on building that understanding and on identifying strategies that are likely to be feasible and cost-effective within the EAS context. The aim is to identify and develop a more coordinated and effective approach to regional educational cooperation that will benefit the EAS countries as a whole.

The Terms of Reference set the following specific objectives and questions:

² The membership of the 16 EAS countries in a range of international intergovernmental organisations with a role in education is outlined in Chapter 5.

³ The Kuala Lumpur Declaration, 14th Dec 2005.

1. Identify the educational resources and complementarities in the EAS region. What are the potentials for knowledge exchange, training and cooperation?
2. Canvass existing forms of education cooperation (including scholarship schemes) conducted by EAS countries bilaterally or regionally, and explore the possibility of expanding these within the EAS framework. What are the benefits of EAS-wide cooperation in education?
3. Examine the role that cooperation in education has played in deepening integration in other regional economic arrangements (e.g. the European Union), including to investigate the Bologna Process. Are there lessons for the EAS?
4. Identify good models of education cooperation initiatives and examine if they could be replicated or expanded within the EAS. What are the critical success factors for ensuring sustainability of education cooperation programs?
5. Suggest specific proposals for EAS cooperation in education in order to support balanced regional economic development, strengthen regional competitiveness, and contribute to community building.

The study was asked to address educational cooperation in three main sectors of education:

- Basic Education (primary and secondary education)
- Technical and Vocational Education and Training
- Higher Education

In focusing on these sectors the intention was to keep the project to a manageable scale. It is recognised that other important elements of education – such as pre-primary education, special education, and non-formal education – also involve significant international cooperation. These elements were beyond the scope of the present study, but should form an important part of potential education cooperation in the EAS area.

The project is designed to assist the EAS countries identify the goals that can be served by enhanced educational cooperation, priority areas for joint action, and processes for working together in an effective and sustainable manner.

1.3 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

Following this introduction, Chapter 2 outlines the methodology used in the project. Chapter 3 elaborates the conceptual framework and terminology used to analyse international educational cooperation in the project. Chapter 4 summarises what is known about the benefits of educational cooperation, and the processes by which the benefits can be harnessed. Chapter 5 discusses the experiences of educational cooperation in other regions of the world. Chapter 6 provides an overview of the main forms of cooperation currently underway in the EAS region, and examples of good practice that could be potentially developed further. Chapter 7 includes a more detailed discussion of specific aspects of current arrangements in the context of free trade agreements, international student flows, and scholarship schemes. Chapter 8 concludes the report and proposes for consideration a statement of goals to be achieved through EAS cooperation, some priority areas for joint action, and processes for working together.

The report also includes six appendices: the issues and questions used to guide the consultations (Appendix 1); the individuals and organisations involved in the consultations (Appendix 2); background data on the social, economic and educational contexts in each of the 16 EAS countries (Appendix 3); data on international student flows (Appendix 4); information on scholarship schemes offered by EAS governments (Appendix 5); and notes on the authors (Appendix 6).

2 METHODOLOGY

The project commenced in December 2007 and was of six months duration. The initial requirement was preparation of an *Inception Report* (Dowling *et al.*, January 2008) that detailed the conceptual framework to be used in the study, the results of an initial literature review, and a detailed work plan. That report was circulated by the ASEAN Secretariat in February 2008 among the participating countries, and feedback invited. A summary of the project design was presented to the joint ASEAN/SEAMEO meeting in March, for further feedback.

Key features of the methodology were:

- A review of the research literature on educational cooperation in the EAS region and in other parts of the world.
- Analysis of published data on student flows between countries.
- Preparation of an *Issues and Consultation Paper* that was widely circulated among EAS participants and other relevant groups. The paper was used to stimulate and structure information sharing and consultations.
- Personal visits by senior team members to all 16 EAS countries in order to meet face-to-face with representatives of national ministries and other key groups involved in education cooperation.
- The regional workshop in Jakarta in June to discuss the draft report and issues concerned with strengthening educational cooperation among EAS countries.

Appendix 2 provides an extract from the *Issues and Consultation Paper* prepared for each country, namely the questions that were the focus of the consultations. (The questions were adapted slightly to reflect each country's organisational structure.) Appendix 3 lists the individuals and organisations consulted during the country visits.

Four main groups were involved:

- A. national ministry of education
- B. national ministry responsible for TVE and/or higher education (where applicable)
- C. national ministry of labour (where applicable)
- D. other organisations involved in educational cooperation, for example associations of universities and R&D organisations

The questions were intended to stimulate dialogue as well as a means to collect information about each country's experiences with various forms of international educational cooperation and their views on priorities for future development. The most comprehensive and detailed questions were directed to the national ministry of education, which was seen as providing an over-arching perspective and source of information.

The face-to-face consultations in each country were important for introducing the project to key policy makers, encouraging discussion of the issues, stimulating inputs, and developing a better understanding of the varied contexts within the 16 EAS countries. The assistance provided by the countries was greatly appreciated.

There were some limitations in the approach. Due to the timeframe for the project, the country visits were short, and were largely limited to national capitals. There was no opportunity for discussions with government departments and organisations operating at sub-national levels (e.g. states or regions), and only limited discussions with organisations delivering education programs (mainly members of the ASEAN University Network), or

people outside official circles. Countries varied considerably in the breadth of the documentation and perspectives provided, and so there are a number of gaps in coverage.

The consultations suggested that in most countries consideration of issues around educational cooperation at the EAS level is at a fairly early stage. Policy makers generally indicated that they would prefer not to have any views on potential developments attributed to organisations or individuals at this point. For this reason the report expresses country views on potential future developments in broad rather than country-specific terms.

3 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND TERMINOLOGY

This chapter sets out the conceptual framework which has informed the project, and the preparation of this report. Possible conceptual frameworks were discussed in the *Inception Report*, where it was noted that different frameworks have been proposed in the literature, according to whether the focus is on trade in educational services, or on the whole field of educational cooperation, including non-commercial relationships.

The framework proposed in the Inception Report was of the latter kind. Following that report's acceptance, it was adopted for the Issues and Consultation Paper, and so formed an important part of the basis for discussion with countries. For that reason the chapter starts out by presenting the Inception Report framework. It then moves to discuss the challenges raised against that framework, and proposes some changes with a view to providing a sounder conceptual basis for further work on educational cooperation in the EAS area.

3.1 DEFINITION OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION COOPERATION

Educational cooperation in the broadest sense occurs whenever two or more parties work together to achieve an educational objective. In international education cooperation, which is the focus of this study, two or more of the parties working together are from different countries.

International partners working together towards an educational objective may be:

- a) Playing similar roles – e.g. two countries cooperating on an exchange program; or
- b) In a purchaser-provider relationship (i.e. trade in educational services); or
- c) In a donor-recipient relationship (i.e. development assistance).

Some of the literature on international education cooperation focuses wholly or mainly on type (a), and especially on government to government cooperation of that type. That is an important focus for this study too, but types (b) and (c) are also within its scope. The three types are not mutually exclusive – for example, type (a) cooperation may sometimes facilitate types (b) or (c).

3.2 FORMS OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION

International cooperation in education may take a number of forms, including:

- International mobility of students and staff. Examples are students studying in other countries, staff exchanges and study visits and scholarships;
- Supply of educational services across national borders. Examples are distance education, and the establishment by universities based in one country of international campuses in other countries;
- Regulatory reform in the interests of greater mobility in education and a more open labour market. Examples are mutual recognition of periods of study, of diplomas and degrees, and of teaching and other professional qualifications;
- Joint participation in international projects of common interest. There are already several examples common to groups of countries in the EAS area. The development of curriculum materials that promote common awareness and shared values among students in the EAS region has been cited as a further possibility;
- Knowledge networking and transfer of good practice. This is already established in the EAS area – some examples are cited below. Knowledge networking in education is assisted through enhanced Information Technology (IT) platforms;

- Partnerships for development. Numerous bilateral and multilateral partnerships operate in the EAS region, covering diverse forms of aid. The objectives for development aid include:
 - assisting the poorest countries, and less developed regions within countries;
 - achieving the UN millennium goals for participation in basic education, including the removal of gender disparities in access; and
 - building capacity to improve the quality and relevance of education.

3.3 LEVELS AT WHICH INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION MAY OCCUR

Cooperation in education may occur on at least four levels:

- Between governments;
- Between institutions;
- Between staff (teachers, trainers, researchers and so on); and
- Between students.

Inter-governmental cooperation

This type of cooperation may operate in different modes. At its simplest it may be based on a purely voluntary arrangement between two or more governments, for example, to exchange information or support study visits. As a second stage, the partner governments may formalise their cooperation through a memorandum of understanding, and perhaps introduce a measure of common regulation. At the other end of the spectrum, member countries in the European Union (EU) have assigned certain education functions to the EU itself as a 'supra-national' organisation; such functions are legally binding and the Union raises revenues to discharge them.

Government-to-government cooperation may be:

- i. **Multilateral**, which involves cooperation between a number of States, usually under the aegis of an international organization. For example, as well as ASEAN and the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO), different EAS members are involved in the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the Asia-Pacific Education Ministers Forum (see Chapter 6). In different ways such organizations are active in promoting multilateral education cooperation in the Asia-Pacific Region; or
- ii. **bilateral**, where two governments work together on a common agenda, sometimes within the framework of a Memorandum of Understanding. Where countries have federal or decentralized political structures bilateral cooperation may sometimes engage sub-national (e.g. provincial or state) as well as national governments.

Institutional cooperation

Institutional cooperation can also take many forms. It is most highly developed in the higher education sector where international campuses, joint degrees and research programs, franchising, study semesters abroad, and staff and student exchanges are all familiar in the Asia-Pacific region. The 2007 and 2008 Joint Statements of ASEAN Education Ministers emphasized the need to revive the ASEAN Student Exchange program and to strengthen ASEAN University Networking. At the school level the 2007 Statement committed ASEAN to the establishment of a network of Mathematics and Science High Schools. More informally, school twinning may raise awareness of other countries in the ASEAN/EAS region.

Teacher and student cooperation

Teacher and student cooperation is promoted by mobility of staff and students and their access to peers, ideas and materials from abroad. It can arise from a personal initiative to study abroad or with a foreign-based provider, or be stimulated by government provision of scholarships and other forms of assistance.

In some cases, institutional and teacher/student cooperation can be achieved simply through the enterprise and initiative of the institutions and individuals concerned. In other cases it may itself depend on government-to-government cooperation. For example:

- Researchers from different countries working together on areas of common interest often leads to post-graduate students studying in other countries and governments funding joint research programs; and
- The development of Mutual Recognition Arrangements by member governments will enhance student, staff and worker mobility among EAS countries.

Why this report concentrates mainly on government- to-government cooperation

The project was designed around using information from participating countries to document the operation of educational cooperation at these levels in the EAS region, and the role that governments can play in stimulating, supporting and, where necessary, regulating educational cooperation to maximise its contribution to economic and social development.

In practice, almost all of the material canvassed in the consultations related to cooperation at the inter-governmental level, and this is the main focus of the following analysis and discussions.

Most countries observed that very little data or documentation is collated at central level about international cooperation at the institutional level, let alone the staff and student levels. All of these were acknowledged as important, and a key objective of government action was to encourage and facilitate cooperation at the institutional and personal levels. Indeed, one senior official noted that the more successful a country's international collaborative activities are, the less is likely to be documented at central government level in that such activities have their own momentum at decentralised, institutional and personal levels.

3.4 FRAMEWORK USED IN THE PROJECT

Table 3.1 summarises the framework used in consultation phase of the study. It is organised around the concept of *exchange*. The idea of ‘exchange’ is important because it implies mutual benefit.

Table 3.1: Types of International Educational Cooperation Examined in the Study

1. People exchange	The oldest form of educational collaboration. It entails a direct personal exchange. It involves international exchanges of students, teachers, researchers and administrators through scholarships, study visits, curriculum projects and research collaborations. This form of cooperation includes the mechanisms and networks which facilitate people exchange as well as the exchanges themselves.
2. Transnational Education	This can involve educational institutions or centres jointly provided and funded by several countries, or the establishment of campuses in other countries, often in association with a local partner. It also includes the supply of distance education across national borders.
3. Information exchange	Information exchange is a key source of successful collaboration in education, often involving the establishment of information clearinghouses. Examples include the OECD’s <i>Education at a Glance</i> , first published in 1992 and now the principal source book for comparative indicators of educational participation and performance in OECD countries, and a stimulus to ongoing international data collection efforts: and, in the EAS area the SEAMEO Regional Centres and the ASEAN University Network. Other examples include IT platforms such as the European Union’s Information Network on Education in Europe (EURYDICE).
4. Regulatory reform	The enabling, administrative framework that makes other forms of educational exchange possible. Examples include multilateral arrangements for quality assurance recognising qualifications and allowing credit transfer (e.g., the Bologna Process, and the Lisbon Convention in Europe) and the establishment of cross-country quality assurance mechanisms (e.g., the European Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education, or ENQA, set up in 1999). Regulatory reform can help smooth the flow of students and qualified personnel between countries. Such agreements and frameworks are essential for creating a single market for education and for qualified manpower in a given region
5. Development partnerships	In a development partnership two or more countries enter into a systematic relationship, often within the framework of a Memorandum of Understanding, to enhance education in a less developed country through the cooperation of a more developed partner. This project is mainly concerned with technical, rather than financial, assistance.

Through the Issues Paper national Ministries of Education were asked to complete a matrix which had these five types of cooperation as the vertical axis, and the four levels listed at the start of Section 3.3 as the horizontal axis.

Table 3.2 is a glossary of some of the key concepts and technical terms used in the project.

Table 3.2: Glossary of Key Terms and Concepts

Concept	Meaning
“Capacity building”	Activities that enhance the expertise, knowledge base and infrastructure of countries, allowing these countries to become providers as well as recipients of educational services.
“Community building”	Economic, social and cultural well-being and development, including a specific “East Asian” identity.
“Cooperation”	Occurs whenever two or more parties work together to achieve an educational objective.” This is used in the light of the project’s objectives, which are to examine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- the potential for educational cooperation in the EAS region; -- existing forms of educational cooperation in the region; -- educational cooperation in other regions; -- models of best practice in educational cooperation; and -- proposals for implementing specific forms of educational cooperation in the EAS.
Development partnerships	In a development partnership two or more countries enter into a systematic relationship, often within the framework of a Memorandum of Understanding, to enhance education in a less developed country through assistance provided by a more developed partner. This project is mainly concerned with technical, rather than financial, assistance
Education	“Education” for the purposes of this study constitutes basic education (primary and secondary), technical and vocational education and higher education. Pre-primary education is outside the scope of this study.
Educational cooperation	Embraces all the five types of cooperation listed in Table 3.1.
Global market	Economic competition located in a global dimension constituted by cross-border relationships (Marginson, 2003).
Globalisation	The process of widening, deepening and speeding up worldwide interconnectedness (Joseph <i>et al.</i> , 2005). In education this can mean a situation in which providers supply, and students procure, education across national borders (Horne, 2002).
Information exchange	The exchange of information and data about education between countries. May be organised through multilaterals, as with OECD’s <i>Education at a Glance</i> , or the work of the UNESCO Institute of Statistics. Information exchange may also occur through networks such as the ASEAN University network and the SEAMEO Regional Centres.
Internationalised education system	An extension of the concept of globalisation whereby students, curricula, management and information systems closely interact, on a large scale, with those of other countries (Horne, 2002).

People exchange	Involves international exchanges of students, teachers, researchers and administrators through scholarships, self-funding arrangements, study visits curriculum projects and research collaborations
Regional competitiveness	Increasing a region's capacity to compete successfully in the global economy in terms of trading goods and services, attracting investment and improved living standards.
Regulatory reform	Changes in the administrative framework for education (usually tertiary education) in the interests of greater educational cooperation. Examples include multilateral arrangements for recognising qualifications and allowing credit transfer (e.g., the National Academic Recognition Information Centre network, and the Lisbon Convention in Europe) and the establishment of cross-country quality assurance mechanisms (e.g., the European Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education, or ENQA, set up in 1999).
Self-funded study abroad	Occurs when a student from one country travels to another country to undertake education in the latter country at the student's expense.
Transnational education	Involves educational institutions jointly provided by two or more countries, or the establishment by an institution domiciled in one country of a campus in another. Also the supply of distance education across national borders.

3.5 RESPONSES TO THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The framework set out in the *Issues Paper* attracted the support of most participating countries; many of them accepted it with little discussion. Some countries did, however, indicate that the framework was inadequate in some respects.

One country expressed a concern that, while the classification is useful in mapping various forms and levels of cooperation, it is not capable of addressing the 'why' issue. The country argued that to address the why of education cooperation, it is necessary to examine the linkages between education, innovation and productivity growth. (These linkages are examined in Chapter 4 of the present report.) Another country noted that while the classification did not necessarily help in identifying priorities and strategies, these could start to emerge through analysis of existing forms of cooperation and identifying the main gaps. Those issues are discussed in Chapters 6 to 8.

One country argued that Development Partnerships were not a type of cooperation on a par with the other four, but a mode which could apply to the other types; thus, for example, development scholarships promote People Exchange. Clearly there is truth in that, but the project opted to retain Development Partnerships as a separate type for two reasons:

- Whatever the content of the cooperation, the donor to recipient relationship constitutes a difference; and
- Development partnerships may have purposes, such as enlarging access to basic education in the recipient country, which are not found in other types of cooperation.

In order to keep the project manageable, the Terms of Reference focused on Basic Education, TVET, and Higher Education. There is no reason in principle why other important aspects of education such as Early Childhood Education; Special Education and Non-formal Education could not be included within the framework for discussing international

cooperation. There seems to be general agreement that a better approach might be to recognise the scope for such cooperation within all stages of education and to place that within a lifelong learning framework.

A further challenge to the framework was that it does not explicitly accommodate Self-Funded Study Abroad as a form of cooperation, whereas it is in fact the most prevalent form of interaction between students from one country and education providers in another. This appeared anomalous as two other kinds of commercial transaction – international campuses and distance education – were included under Transnational Education.

There is a framework which aligns the various modes of trade in education. The General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) has classified the modes of international supply of education services, as summarised in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3: Main Modes of the International Supply of Education Services

Mode	Explanation
1. Cross-border supply	The provision of a service where the service crosses the border (does not require the physical movement of the consumer).
2. Consumption abroad.	Provision of the service involving the movement of the consumer to the country of the supplier.
3. Commercial presence.	The service provider establishes or uses facilities in another country to provide the service.
4. Presence of natural persons.	Person travelling to another country on a temporary basis to provide the service.

Source: OECD (2002).

Note: The “Mode” and “Explanation” columns are based on the classification used by the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS).

The GATS classification is not suitable as the main basis for this study because it omits non-commercial activity, but it does suggest the need for an adjustment to the framework.

Governments have a role to facilitate all kinds of trade in education services. At governmental level, the field of cooperation can be described as:

Facilitation of Trade in Educational Services Actions taken between governments to facilitate Self-Funded Study Abroad, and Transnational Education.

At the government to government level this would take the place of Transnational Education within the list of types. At institution and student levels, the descriptors for this type of cooperation would need to be different, notably to reflect partnerships between institutions, and purchaser/provider relationship between institutions and students.

3.6 SUMMARY OF CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK PROPOSED FOR FUTURE USE

Drawing on the experience in this project, this section outlines a framework that could help guide future work on analysing international cooperation. The proposed framework covers all levels of education and training, including non-formal learning, recognises that cooperation can occur between different levels (e.g. governments and educational institutions), and incorporates trade in education services as an explicit focus.

Definition of International Education Cooperation

International education cooperation occurs whenever two or more parties from different countries work together to achieve an educational objective.

Education and Training Sectors

International education cooperation may occur at any stage of education, including primary, secondary and tertiary education, early childhood and special education, and in non-formal learning.

Levels

International education cooperation may occur at any of the four following levels, and also between the levels:

- between governments;
- between institutions;
- between staff; and
- between students.

Types of International Education Cooperation

At the government-to-government level, international education cooperation can be classified into five types:

- People Exchange;
- Information Exchange;
- Facilitation of Trade in Educational Services;
- Regulatory Reform; and
- Development Partnerships.

4 EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION IN OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD

The terms of reference required the project, among other things:

“to examine the role that cooperation in education has played in deepening integration in other regional economic arrangements (e.g. the EU) including to investigate the Bologna Process for the lessons learnt”.

The project was also asked to consider whether there were lessons for the EAS from the experience in other parts of the world.

This chapter first describes the Bologna Process in higher education, which now embraces 46 States, mostly in Europe; then the educational initiatives of the group of 27 European countries which form the European Union; and then experiences in other regions of the world. Its final section (4.4) considers what lessons the EAS might learn from the experience of others.

4.1 THE BOLOGNA PROCESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION⁴

The Bologna Process is a voluntary alignment of national systems of higher education, according to clear objectives and a schedule for implementation. Twenty-nine European countries launched the process by signing the Bologna Declaration in 1999. Their fundamental commitment was:

- *To establish by 2010 a European Higher Education Area (EHEA).*

The signatories to the Declaration wanted to establish a “Europe of Knowledge” capable of giving its citizens the necessary competences to face the challenges of the new millennium, together with an awareness of shared values and belonging to a common social and cultural space. They were also concerned to enhance the global competitiveness of European higher education institutions. The Bologna Process started as an educational and cultural, rather than a labour market, initiative.

The EHEA has six main components:

- A system of readily comparable degrees, using the Diploma Supplement;
- A framework of qualifications based on three cycles: Undergraduate or Bachelor (lasting at least three years full-time); Masters (1-2 years); and Doctoral;
- A system of credits for study, based on the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS);⁵
- Removal of obstacles to the mobility of staff and students within the EHEA;
- Cooperation in quality assurance, to achieve common criteria and methodologies;
- Promotion of the European dimension in higher education, through curriculum development, institutional cooperation and integrated programs of study and research.

The Bologna Declaration built on a long tradition of cooperation in higher education in Europe. It built on a series of steps, including the Lisbon Convention of 1997,⁶ which provided for the recognition of higher education qualifications in Europe, including:

- Qualifications giving access to higher education;

⁴ Material on the Bologna process, unless otherwise identified, is drawn from its official web-site

<http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/>

⁵ See http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/socrates/ects/index_en.html

⁶ Convention on the recognition of qualifications concerning higher education in the European Region - http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/Lisbon_convention.pdf

- Recognition of periods of study;
- Recognition of higher education qualifications;
- The establishment of National Information Centres to hold information about higher education systems and qualifications arrangements, and to give advice;⁷
- The use of the Diploma Supplement⁸ developed by UNESCO and the Council of Europe as a basic higher education qualifications “passport”.

The Lisbon Convention is a treaty of the Council of Europe, and has now been ratified by 45 countries. The Convention is also open to countries outside Europe; Australia, for example, has ratified it, as have Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan in central Asia.

Methods of Work and Membership

The Bologna Process has evolved over a long period of time and has required regular Ministerial endorsement of carefully structured steps. The Process is not underpinned by any single organization. It progresses through biennial conferences of Education Ministers of the participating countries, supported by representatives of the universities and their students. The Ministers take stock of progress over the last two years and set directions for the next two; this work program is coordinated by the Bologna Follow-Up Group (BFUG). The progress from Bologna can be tracked through the statements issued by the conferences held at Prague in 2001, Berlin in 2003, Bergen in 2005, and London in 2007. The BFUG is hosted by the country scheduled to host the next Ministerial conference; currently the Benelux countries, who will hold the 2009 conference, host the BFUG and the web-site.

The number of member countries within the Bologna Process has now grown to 45, including in Central Asia some member states of the former Soviet Union. Organizations participating in Bologna include the Council of Europe, the European Commission, and bodies representing the universities and students in Europe.

Achievements to Date and Challenges Ahead

Among their achievements, the Bologna Process members have adopted:

- An overarching framework for qualifications in the EHEA, comprising the three cycles of Undergraduate, Masters, and Doctoral;
- Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the EHEA, as developed by the European Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA); and
- An agreement to establish the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR) which will provide clear and reliable information about trustworthy quality assurance agencies operating throughout Europe.

A major consequence of the Bologna Process is that higher education institutions are now increasingly competing in a Europe-wide market for students. This is resulting in a much greater emphasis on quality assurance, and some reduction in institutional autonomy. For example, the Austrian Agency for Quality Assurance was established in 2004 to assist higher education institutions in Austria in implementing quality assurance procedures, and in coordinating evaluations. Without credible quality assurance mechanisms, it was felt that Austrian universities would be at a disadvantage in attracting students from outside the country or in retaining their own students.

⁷ See <http://www.enic-naric.net/index.aspx?c=Australia>

⁸ See http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/rec_qual/recognition/diploma_en.html

Box 1 provides a case study of the application of the Bologna process in one key area of higher education, namely teacher education.

Box 1: Reform of Teacher Education in Europe

Teacher education is particularly affected by the Bologna process as the structure, length and location (university or non-university) of teacher qualifications vary so much within Europe. For example, the length of initial teacher education ranged from three years (e.g. for some primary teachers in Ireland and Spain) up to seven years in some programmes in the Slovak Republic, and eight years for some secondary teachers in Italy (OECD, 2005b). There are also some quite large differences in duration within a single country, with courses for some upper secondary teachers lasting about twice as long as courses for primary teachers in Italy and Spain.

The broad implications are that by 2010 all teacher education will be provided in university-level institutions (e.g. in Austria the teacher training colleges are being replaced by new pedagogical universities), and that more countries will introduce consecutive models of teacher education (with a Bachelor's and Master's degree structure, and the Master's component providing teachers' professional training). Concurrent models of teacher education are currently the most common in Europe, particularly at the primary and lower secondary education levels (Eurydice, 2002).

The move to align the structure of teacher qualifications in Europe does not mean that there will be a common curriculum for teacher education in Europe in the foreseeable future. Countries are reluctant to cede such control, and there are formidable barriers to obtaining Europe-wide agreement on teacher preparation, not least because the models of schooling differ so widely (Ingvarson *et al.*, 2006).

Nevertheless, the European Commission (2005) has set out common European principles for teacher competencies and qualifications. These are intended to support policy makers at national and regional level in reforming teacher education. These include that teacher education should be a university-level qualification, and that programs should be delivered in all three cycles of European higher education under Bologna (Bachelor, Masters and Doctorate). These changes are intended to ensure that teacher education has status in the EHEA, and to increase teachers' opportunities for advancement and mobility within the profession, including across countries.

The need to satisfy European Commission requirements for the comparability of higher education qualifications under the Bologna Process is now one of the major drivers for reform of initial teacher education in Member countries. In countries where change in teacher education has been slow, and domestic vested interests have been strong, the political imperative to implement European-wide agreements is breaking down domestic barriers to reform (Ingvarson *et al.*, 2006).

The Communiqué from the London meeting in 2007, and the Bologna work program 2007-2009, indicate what needs to be done to complete the EHEA by 2010. Among the key areas in which further work is needed are:

- Removal of obstacles to mobility of staff and students, including those arising from lack of financial incentives, immigration requirements, difficulties in obtaining recognition and inflexible pension schemes;
- Full implementation of the ECTS, based on the recognition of both student workload and student outcomes;

- Clarification of the concept of “substantial difference” which underpins the justification for non-recognition of courses under the Lisbon Convention;
- The role of higher education in life-long learning, including the recognition of prior learning;
- Start-up of the EQAR;
- Development of the social dimension of the EHEA.⁹ This aims to improve equity of access to higher education through measures such as improved student services, and the opening up of more flexible learning pathways into, and through, higher education;
- “The EHEA in a Global Setting”, including promoting awareness of EHEA, strengthening its competitiveness, and the scope for enhancing dialogue and partnership with countries and organizations outside the EHEA;
- Improvements in data about Bologna implementation. The emphasis will be on improved data about equity in higher education participation rates and graduate employability, and on extending data coverage to all participating countries.

This represents a very large agenda, and the work program sets out correspondingly detailed arrangements for follow-up.

4.2 EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

The EU is a group of 27 European states bound together by treaties which provide for common legislation in certain fields, and a set of EU institutions which decide and administer laws, policies, and programs to apply throughout the EU. The EU raises its own revenues from member countries to fund its programs. In principle therefore the EU has greater powers of initiative and intervention than are available under the Bologna Process, which is based mainly on voluntary cooperation between sovereign states.

The EU began as an economic community. The *Treaty Establishing the European Community*¹⁰ makes provision for education and training within its Title XI, which is fundamentally about the creation of a healthy labour market. Article 149 of the Treaty limits the EU's responsibilities in the field of education to:

- Contributing to the development of quality education by encouraging cooperation between Member States and, if necessary, by supporting and supplementing their action, while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States for the content of teaching and the organization of education systems and their cultural and linguistic diversity.

The Treaty goes on to specify six fields where the Community *may develop, encourage or promote* action in education, and also draws attention to the need to foster cooperation with third-party countries. The six fields are:

1. Developing the European dimension in education, particularly through the teaching and dissemination of the languages of the Member States;
2. Encouraging mobility of students and teachers, by encouraging inter alia, the academic recognition of diplomas and periods of study;
3. Promoting cooperation between educational establishments;

⁹ See the report on Social Dimension and Mobility presented to the London Conference <http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/documents/WGR2007/Socialdimensionandmobilityreport.pdf>

¹⁰ See <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2006/ce321/ce32120061229en00010331.pdf>

4. Developing exchanges of information and experience on issues common to the education systems of the Member States;
5. Encouraging the development of youth exchanges and of exchanges of socio-educational instructors; and
6. Encouraging the development of distance education.

Article 150, which deals with vocational training, is also based on the principle of supplementing the action of Member States but, given the closer link with the labour market, assigns the Community a more interventionist role *to improve training and to facilitate access and adaptation*.

EU Policy on Educational Cooperation

While the Treaties give the EU a limited role in education, the EU institutions and the Member States can pursue more ambitious educational objectives through voluntary political cooperation. Thus the European Council at Lisbon in March 2000 declared that the EU must become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion. To achieve that goal, EU Heads of States and Government asked for a challenging program for the modernization of social welfare and education systems.

The Member States agreed that by 2010, Europe should be the world leader in terms of the quality of its education and training systems. To that end they set three strategic, and thirteen operational, objectives¹¹ to be achieved by 2010 ("the Lisbon objectives"). The three strategic objectives are:

- Increasing the quality and effectiveness of education and training systems in Europe;
- Facilitating the access of all to the education and training systems;
- Opening up education and training systems to the wider world.

The operational objectives spell out the need to improve in specific areas, such as: teacher training; basic skills; integration of ICTs; efficiency of investments; lifelong guidance; flexibility of the systems to make learning accessible to all; citizenship education; foreign language learning and mobility and exchanges.

Consistent with the treaties, this process of change is carried forward in each country according to national contexts and traditions, and by cooperation between Member States at European level, through the sharing of experiences, working towards common goals, and learning from what works best elsewhere. Two of the key institutions of the EU are the European Commission and the Council of Ministers. The Commissioner for Education, Training, Culture and Youth is one of the 27 Commissioners, and EU Education Ministers meet regularly within the Council of Ministers. The Commission has a Directorate-General for Education and Training to provide the staff capability to support cooperation and administer programs.

The progress of Member States towards the 2010 objectives for education and training is monitored through a set of benchmarks and indicators on which annual reports are produced. The 2007 report covers progress up to the end of 2006.¹² For the most part the indicators monitor the performance of Member States through their own education systems, rather than the results of EU actions or programs. Thus, for example, goals such as no more than 10% of students leaving school early, or a decrease of at least 20% in the number of low achievers in literacy, are not the subject of EU programs. But the monitoring of data and goal implementation does point up differences between Member States and lays the basis

¹¹ See the detailed work program at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/pri/en/oj/dat/2002/c_142/c_14220020614en00010022.pdf

¹² See http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/progress06/report_en.pdf

for enquiry and exchanges of information about good practice. There is an analogy here with the monitoring of progress in developing countries towards the EFA goals, discussed below.

Overall the results to date are mixed. For example, on only one of five core indicators (output of graduates in mathematics, science and technology) is the EU on course to exceed the Lisbon objective for 2010; on others, notably to decrease low achievement in literacy, current performance is falling well short of the targets.

The EU's Education Programs

The EU's funded Education Programs require a legal basis and so relate directly to the Treaty provisions referred to above. The programs have gone through a number of changes of content (and name) over the years. For the period 2007-2013, the *Lifelong Learning Program* is the flagship. For the first time, it covers within a single program learning opportunities from childhood to old age. It has a budget of €7 billion over the seven years to support projects and activities that foster interchange, cooperation and mobility between education and training systems within the EU.

The Lifelong Learning Program is built on four pillars, or sub-programs. Grants and subsidies are awarded to projects under each of these that enhance the trans-national mobility of individuals, promote bilateral and multilateral partnerships, or improve quality in education and training systems through multilateral projects encouraging innovation. The four pillars are:

1. The **Comenius Program** addresses the teaching and learning needs of all those in pre-school and school education up to the end of upper secondary education, and the institutions and organisations providing such education. It aims to involve at least three million students in joint educational activities, over the period of the program;
2. The **Erasmus Program** addresses the teaching and learning needs of all those in formal higher education, including trans-national student placements in enterprise, and the institutions and organisations providing or facilitating such education and training. It aims to support an overall total of three million individual participants in student mobility by 2012;
3. The **Leonardo da Vinci Program** addresses the teaching and learning needs of all those in vocational education and training, including placement in enterprise of persons other than students, as well as the institutions and organisations providing or facilitating such education and training. It aims to increase placements in enterprises to 80,000 per year by the end of the program;
4. The **Grundtvig Program** addresses the teaching and learning needs of those in all forms of adult education, as well as the institutions and organisations providing or facilitating such education. It aims to support the mobility of 7,000 individuals involved in adult education per year, by 2013.

These four pillars are joined by what is known as a '**transversal programme**', which pursues the following four key activities:

- a) policy cooperation and innovation in lifelong learning;
- b) promotion of language learning;
- c) development of innovative ICT-based content, services, pedagogies and practice for lifelong learning;
- d) dissemination and exploitation of results of actions supported under the Lifelong Learning Program and previous related programs, and exchange of good practice.

The activities of this transversal program are in effect themes to be pursued as appropriate through the four sectoral programs above: the EU Decision establishing the Lifelong

Learning Program sets out detailed objectives for each sectoral program, which include appropriate elements of the transversal program.¹³

The sectoral programs are complemented by the new **Jean Monnet Program**, which supports institutions and activities in the field of European integration. There are also small programs which engage the EU in cooperation with third countries. Of potential interest to EAS countries is **the Erasmus Mundus Program** which supports inter-university European Union Masters Courses. It also provides EU-funded scholarships both for third country nationals participating in these European postgraduate programs, and for EU nationals studying in third countries.

To underpin the Lifelong Learning Program, the EU has adopted the European Qualification Framework for lifelong learning which classifies qualifications into eight levels.¹⁴ The three highest of these levels correspond to the three cycles of higher education specified by the Bologna Process framework (namely, Bachelor, Masters, and Doctoral).

The EU Decision establishing the Lifelong Learning Program provides for the four sub-programs each to receive at least the following percentage of the total funding of €7 billion: Comenius 13%; Erasmus 40%; Leonardo 25%; and Grundtvig 4%. The high weighting for post-school education reflects the labour market and economic purposes of the EU's engagement with education.

The EU is able to commit to spending on this scale because it has its own revenues. Nevertheless, total expenditure on education and training of €1 billion a year is less than 1% of the total EU budget of €129 billion for 2008. Given the modest scope and scale of the EU programs, achievement of the Lisbon objectives must rest largely on the efforts of the Member States and their voluntary cooperation.

The Copenhagen Process

The European Union also runs a Process for Enhanced European Cooperation in Vocational Education and Training (VET), generally known as the Copenhagen process from the place where it started in 2002. The Helsinki Communiqué of 5th Dec 2006¹⁵ summarises progress up to that date. Like Bologna, the Copenhagen process features biennial Ministerial meetings, with follow-up at official level. The priorities set at Helsinki for the next two years were:

1. The image, status and attractiveness of VET. In this context, more emphasis should be placed on good governance of VET systems, institutions and/or providers.
2. Further development, testing and implementation of common European tools¹⁶. The aim should be for the agreed tools to be in place by 2010.
3. A more systematic approach to strengthen mutual learning. To support this, special attention should be given to improving the scope, comparability and reliability of VET statistics by 2008.
4. Active involvement of all stakeholders as the Copenhagen process moves towards an implementation phase.

¹³ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2006/l_327/l_32720061124en00450068.pdf

¹⁴ See http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/educ/eqf/index_en.html

¹⁵ http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/helsinkicom_en.pdf

¹⁶ By "tools" such things as a European Credit System for VET, a European Qualifications Framework and common quality assurance arrangements are meant.

4.3 EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION IN OTHER REGIONS

North America

The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) entered into force on January 1, 1994, with no expiration date. It is a trade agreement among the United States, Canada, and Mexico that liberalizes restrictions on trade among the three countries. Some of the agreement's objectives include:

- The elimination of tariff or duty rates (all qualifying products to Canada are now duty-free, and virtually all qualifying products to Mexico are now duty-free).
- Promoting conditions of free competition, and increasing market access and investment opportunities within the free trade area.

Since implementation, trade between the three countries has increased more than 200 percent (US Government Export Portal, <http://www.export.gov/fta/NAFTA/>).

Chapter Twelve (Trade in Services) of the NAFTA covers commercial education, amongst other services. It establishes principles that are designed to ensure that cross-border trade in services among the three Parties to the NAFTA – Canada, Mexico and the United States – is conducted in a non-discriminatory manner, according to the following principles:

- *National Treatment.* Each NAFTA Party agreed to accord the service providers of the other Parties treatment that is no less favourable than the treatment that it provides, in like circumstances, to its own service providers.
- *Most Favoured Nation Treatment.* Each NAFTA Party agreed to accord the service providers of the other Parties treatment that is no less favourable than the treatment that it accords, in like circumstances, to the service providers of any other country.
- *Local Presence.* No Party may require a service provider of another Party to establish or maintain a representative office or other presence, or to be resident in its territory, as a condition for the provision of a service.

Unlike the EU, NAFTA does not specifically emphasise educational cooperation; however, closer economic ties will inevitably have cultural and educational implications.

South America

There are currently over 30 regional initiatives in South America but the most prominent is the Southern Cone Common Market set up in 1995 among Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay and Peru, which signed a free trade agreement with the five countries of the Andean Community to take effect from July 2004. This is seen as “a step towards closer South American integration envisioned by the Rio Group, a channel for permanent political consultation and coordination created in 1986 by eight countries” (de Prado Yepes, 2006, p.113).

The Rio Group now includes 21 countries: Argentina, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela. A number of arrangements for higher education collaboration are also occurring at the regional level with UNESCO support (for example, the *Instituto Internacional para la Educacion Superior en America Latina y El Caribe*, or IESALC).

Africa

The Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) created in 1992 to advance economics, politics and social issues in 1997 signed a Protocol on Education and Training. SADC has the potential to develop a free trade area in this region (de Prado Yepes, 2006, p.120). The African Union, created in 1999, also aims to accelerate social, economic and political integration. It manages the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) – once known as the New Africa Initiative. NEPAD arose out of discussions by the Presidents

of South Africa, Senegal, Nigeria and Algeria and aims to eradicate poverty and promote good governance and economic development in Africa as a whole (Pretorius, 2002, p.2).

The UNESCO International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa (IICBA), was also established in 1999 and is mandated to strengthen the capacities of teacher education institutions of its 53 member states, and promote international cooperation for the development of education through NEPAD and the African Union.

The supply of trans-national higher education across Francophone Africa is not able to meet demand, particularly for in-country foreign provision as an alternative to the perceived low quality of domestic providers (Jokivirta, 2006, p. 8). Financial support from France through the Agence Universitaire de la Francophonie (AUF) helps guarantee supply to the 29 countries that constitute Francophone Africa. The African and Malgache Higher Education Council (CAMES) was established in 2000 and is also aiming to develop regulatory frameworks for trans-national higher education in this region.

South Asia

The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) was established in 1985 to jointly advance economic, social and cultural development in the South Asian Region. It has seven member countries: Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka.

Education was included in the agreed areas of cooperation in 1998, and a Technical Committee was formed to deal with priority areas including literacy, teacher development and research. In a major initiative in 2004, the Country Leaders agreed to establish a network of centres of higher learning and training, and Skill Development Institutes across South Asia to help strengthen human resource development (see de Prado Yepes, 2006).

In a concrete step towards this goal, in 2005 India proposed the establishment of a centre of excellence, in the form of a South Asian University, which is intended to provide world-class facilities, teaching and support for students and researchers drawn from every country of the region. Planning for the South Asian University, which will be based in New Delhi, is now well advanced.¹⁷

Middle East

There are a number of forums for regional cooperation in the Middle East. One is the League of Arab States, which has 22 members including Jordan, the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Tunisia, Algeria, Djibouti, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, and Somalia. Created in 1948, the league has as its purpose the strengthening of relations between member-states, the coordination of policies in order to achieve cooperation between them and to safeguard their independence and sovereignty; and a general concern with the affairs and interests of the Arab countries (Charter of the League of Arab States).

Another organisation that works with the League of Arab States is the "Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf," established in 1981 and including the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, Oman, Qatar, and Kuwait. This group has similar objectives to the League of Arab States but specifically aims to advance cooperation in "education and culture" amongst its six member-states (Charter). In 1985, it established the *Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States*, which aims to promote coordination, cooperation and integration among Arab Gulf States in the fields of education, culture and science. In December 2007, the leaders of the Cooperation Council also announced their plan to launch a common market in January 2008 and a currency union by 2010.

Other initiatives in the Middle East region include *The Federation of Arab Universities*, established by the Arab League Council in 1965, and the *Arab Open University* (AOU), established under the umbrella of the Arab Gulf Program for United Nations Development Organizations (AGFUND), in the late 1990s.

¹⁷ See: <http://www.saarc-sec.org/main.php?t=2.9.6>

4.4 LESSONS FROM EXPERIENCE IN OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD

Within the present project there was no provision to travel outside the EAS area. So the foregoing brief survey of developments in other regions is based solely on the literature, which suggests caution in drawing conclusions from the discussion. Moreover, educational cooperation is always embedded in the capabilities and values of the partners attempting it, and no other region of the world provides a close analogy to the EAS in terms of size, diversity and organisational structure. So learning lessons from others requires dialogue to establish similarities and differences, and to tease out what might effectively transplant. Examples of such dialogue are given below.

The Momentum to Cooperate

Throughout the world there are groups of countries active in economic integration and/or educational cooperation. The motives and forms of cooperation differ:

- In Africa countries are forming partnerships for development which may progress towards free trade and economic integration;
- North America has established a free trade association with a common market for education providers;
- South America has established a common market with four full and six associate members;
- Other parts of Asia, including South Asia and the Middle East, have formed regional groupings committed to advance cooperation and culture;
- Europe exhibits cooperation both within an organisation committed to economic integration (the European Union), and more widely within the Bologna Process.

The East Asia Summit area includes a sub-grouping with a scheduled commitment to economic integration (ASEAN), it has a tradition of working together to reduce disparities between developed and developing country members, and it has begun to foster mutual understanding through educational and cultural exchange. So potentially it can draw on many of the diverse traditions found on other continents.

From another perspective, it can hardly be coincidence that education cooperation initiatives are springing up in so many parts of the world. The globalisation of trade, and the mobility of staff and students, drive education systems, particularly in the tertiary sector, towards greater competition. Cooperation helps partners to compete more effectively with third parties.

In reflection of the terms of reference, the rest of this section is concerned with developments in Europe.

Implications of the Bologna Process for the EAS Area

In principle a common higher education area offers a number of benefits to a group of countries aiming at economic integration. It facilitates the integration of the labour market and free flows of professionals across national borders; it promotes efficiency in higher education through widening choice for staff and students; and it enhances educational effectiveness and cultural awareness by promoting staff and student mobility. Furthermore, as noted in the case of teacher education (see Box 1) the political imperatives to satisfy external requirements for the comparability of higher education qualifications can help to overcome domestic barriers to reform.

However, in drawing such lessons, differences between the European and EAS regions need to be recognized. Europe is much more compact than Asia, putting study and employment in another country in the reach of many more students and staff. Among the wealthier citizens of EAS there is a very strong tradition of study in English-speaking countries, including those outside the EAS area. Also, contrasts between stages of development in EAS countries are

stronger than they are in Europe, and constitute a greater challenge to progress towards common quality standards and mutual recognition.

Having said that, elements of the EHEA agenda are already in place in the EAS area. For example:

- University Mobility in the Asia-Pacific¹⁸ has since 1993 provided a small-scale scheme for study abroad within its area, with credit transfer arrangements derived from ECTS. All EAS members are members of UMAP;
- In order to facilitate freer movement of professionals within its region ASEAN has already begun to develop Mutual Recognition Arrangements (MRAs). MRAs for engineering and nursing are complete,¹⁹ with further professions to follow. To be fully effective, MRAs imply the need for a closer alignment of professional education within the area, perhaps based on principles similar to Bologna.

The Bologna Process deserves consideration as a process, as well as for its products. The Bologna Group is wider than the European Union. Like the EAS, it does not sit within a pre-existing multilateral framework of law and has no funds of its own. It works because the Bologna Ministers commit to meet every two years to pursue a long-term agenda, and have a rotating follow-up group to keep progress on track between the Ministerial meetings. Experience, in Asia as in Europe, is that agendas of the Bologna type need patient negotiation and dialogue, and periods of adjustment extending over long time-frames to secure substantial progress. The EAS may wish to take that into account in considering the processes to be adopted to progress its own educational cooperation agenda.

Implications of European Union Experience

By virtue of its treaty foundation and its own resources tax revenue, the European Union is a very different form of organisation from the EAS. However there are many links between Asia and Europe, at institutional as well as government level. These facilitate the interchange of ideas and the adaptation of European models to East Asian conditions.

At the Jakarta Workshop a speech by HE the Prime Minister of Japan²⁰ was tabled in which he expressed his hope for a dramatic expansion of university exchanges in the Asia Pacific region. Prime Minister Fukuda referred to his proposal as an Asian version of the Erasmus Program.

From the perspective of this study, the important point is not that there are specific opportunities to learn from European or other foreign experience, but rather that there should be systematic arrangements in place to enable governments and institutions to exchange perceptions and experiences with counterparts elsewhere in the world. Some recent developments point to a healthy dialogue about educational cooperation, at least between Asia and Europe:

- Education Ministers from Asian and European countries met recently in Berlin and agreed to strengthen dialogue and cooperation on matters of common interest²¹. ASEM members agreed, amongst other things, to set up a working group to identify the challenges connected with strengthening the mobility of students, teachers and researchers between Europe and Asia, and to make suggestions for improving the framework conditions for bi-regional exchanges with special regard to recognition of qualifications and degrees. ASEM also proposed the establishment of a bi-regional

¹⁸ <http://www.umap.org>

¹⁹ For nursing, see <http://www.aseansec.org/19210.htm>

²⁰ Speech by HE Mr Yasuo Fukuda to the 14th International Conference on the Future of Asia, Tokyo, 22nd May 2008.

²¹ First ASEM Ministerial Meeting on Education and Qualifications, Berlin, 5-5 May 2008.

forum involving stakeholders from the education and economic sector to strengthen the dialogue and cooperation between education and industry at local, national and international level. ASEM is to meet again in Vietnam in 2009;

- Consideration of the regional implications of the Bologna Process is a focus of the work of the SEAMEO Regional Centre for Higher Education and Development (RIHED)²²;
- At the institutional level, since 2001 the ASEM-DUO Fellowship Programme has supported exchanges of professors and students in tertiary education between Asia and Europe under the ASEM domain.

²² See: http://www.rihed.seameo.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=92&Itemid=44

5 BENEFITS OF EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the benefits of more extensive educational cooperation for individual countries and for the region as a whole. It draws on the literature review, information collected through the consultations, and discussions at the Jakarta Workshop to summarise what is known about the benefits of educational cooperation, and the processes by which they can be harnessed. The chapter focuses on the benefits of educational cooperation in relation to the two main goals specified in the project brief, namely enhancing regional economic competitiveness and contributing to community building.

The meaning of these goals was discussed in Chapter 3:

- ‘Regional competitiveness’ refers to increasing the region’s capacity to compete successfully in the global economy in terms of trading goods and services, attracting investment and improved living standards.
- ‘Community building’ refers to enhanced economic, social and cultural well-being throughout the region and the development of appreciation among diverse peoples both of common heritage and of differences.

Some particular forms of educational cooperation may contribute more to one of these goals than the other. For example, sharing expertise in languages education may contribute more to community building than regional competitiveness, in the short-term at least. However, the two broad goals of regional competitiveness and community building should be viewed as complementary and mutually reinforcing, and not as in conflict with each other. The same perspective applies to the benefits of different forms of educational cooperation. To continue with the example just given, improvements in language education will undoubtedly also facilitate trade and investment. The one form or area of educational cooperation can have multiple pay-offs, although it is often convenient to discuss the benefits separately.

The literature review and consultations indicate that, while there is general agreement that educational cooperation is beneficial, there is still uncertainty about the nature and strength of the benefits. In particular, there seem to have been few published evaluations of the impact of different forms of cooperation and how they apply in the main education sectors. The chapter concludes with an outline of priorities for data collection and research to support policy development in this regard.

To set the scene, the chapter commences by briefly reviewing the relationship between investment in human resources and economic development.

5.2 INVESTMENT IN HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

The literature sees investment in human capital as taking two main forms – health and nutrition, and knowledge and skills. This report is concerned with the returns on the latter. This type of analysis usually examines the impact of increased investment in education, although it also feeds into broader measures of social growth, such as the Index of Human Development (the HDI), which complements the traditional index of Gross National Product (GNP) and which focuses on life expectancy, adult literacy and participation in formal education as well as Gross Domestic product per capita. Recent research has shown that internationally there is a strong positive relationship between educational attainment and average earnings (OECD, 2007a). Across all OECD countries, individuals with tertiary and advanced research education have earnings that were at least 50% higher than individuals whose highest level of educational attainment was below upper secondary level of education (OECD, 2007). The research also shows that earnings increase with each level of education. European Commission research indicated that an additional year of schooling increases

wages at the individual level by around 7% across European countries (Fuente & Ciccone, 2002).

The benefits of education are reflected in the rapid growth of higher education enrolments worldwide in markedly different societies (Resnik, 2006). Taking a long-term view, Schofer and Meyer (2005) have calculated that the number of students enrolled worldwide in higher education institutions grew two-hundredfold between 1900 and 2000; from about 500,000 students, representing less than 1% of college-aged people in 1900, to 100 million people, representing about 20% of the cohort worldwide in 2000.

Although still positive and superior to many other forms of investment, it has been estimated that the social rate of return to tertiary education for males is on average around 2 percentage points lower than the private return (Fuente & Ciccone, 2002). These lower social rates are due the high costs of providing education and losses in tax receipts (when the individual in study foregoes earnings) relative to tax revenues (when the individual is working).

The estimated economic rates of return are in most cases lower bound estimates because of externalities, namely the positive impact on people in addition to the individual in receipt of education. These externalities include the positive effect of education on the health of the individual's family. For example, better educated men have a lower risk of death from heart disease, and children of better educated women have lower mortality rates (Feldman *et al.*, 1989). Some studies argue that health benefits can add up to 40% to the labour market return of schooling, while others show that children of better educated parents stay longer and do better in school (Wolfe and Zuvekas, 1997).

The literature also attempts to explain why education offers such positive returns on investment. The main reason identified is that the organisation of modern society demands a better-educated workforce. Workers with greater problem-solving and communication abilities perform better and learn faster and are able to operate more sophisticated technologies. Operating more sophisticated technologies has become increasingly important as production processes have become more knowledge intensive. The technologies flowing from ICT have demanded a more skilled workforce, and the growth of an educated, skilled workforce also fosters further technological change and diffusion (Fuente & Ciccone, 2002).

Other analysts emphasise the *quality* of education for improving individual and social productivity. A recent report for the World Bank emphasised that the quality of education, as measured by the knowledge that students gain in tests of cognitive skills, is substantially more important for economic growth than the quantity of education (Hanushek and Wößmann, 2007). This World Bank report emphasises that incentives should be used to improve students' cognitive skills, particularly through the introduction of local school autonomy, strong accountability systems, and better information about performance.

Findings such as these suggest a further important role for educational cooperation, namely in supporting national policy development and implementation aimed at improving educational quality, as well as lifting the overall quantum.

5.3 EDUCATION FOR ALL GOALS

The "Education for All" (EFA) initiative, announced in Jomtien, Thailand in 1990, provides a key part of the human resource development challenge facing many EAS countries. EFA aimed to massively reduce illiteracy and make basic education available to all school-age children by the end of the 20th century.²³ Although no region of the world was successful in achieving that goal, the Asia-Pacific region has made substantial progress towards achieving the EFA goals, and the rate of growth of enrolment of primary school children has outpaced

²³ For an overview on progress towards Education for All in East Asia, see: http://www.unesco.org/education/gmr2008/regional_overview/eastasia.pdf

that of other regions of the world (Maclean and Vine, 2003). Countries have since reaffirmed their commitment to achieve the EFA goals by 2015.

Nevertheless, major challenges remain: Asia contains the largest number of low-income people of any region in the world and the largest proportion of the world's illiterates. The situation in South Asia appears worse than that in East Asia, with, for example, a literacy rate of 42% in South Asia compared to 72% in East and South-East Asia (Maclean and Vine, 2003). The UNESCO Global Monitoring Report 2008 includes a very useful summary of regional progress towards the EFA Goals. It estimates that in 2005 9.2 million children in East Asia of primary school age were not enrolled in school.

EFA will require substantial improvements in school enrolment rates, school completion rates, gender parity, and learning outcomes. Although significant progress has already been made, further improvements will be difficult to achieve when key educational resources—teachers, support staff, buildings, equipment, textbooks—are already scarce and under intense pressure from population growth and increased school participation rates. International cooperation in education provides one means for countries to access greater resources, as well as to share knowledge about effective practice and learn from others' experience.

5.4 CAPACITY BUILDING

Another important strand of the literature focuses on the need to build scientific and technical depth and breadth in developing countries, and the mechanisms for doing so. In part this arises from a recognition that in a more globalised education environment developed economies have a substantial advantage in the depth and breadth of the research provided to overseas students, and the job opportunities that their qualifications can provide.

As an example in the EAS region, in 2007 Japan and China, along with the Republic of Korea, engaged in a first trilateral ministerial meeting on science and technological cooperation which included the exchange of young scientists and which aims to address common challenges in health, ecological, and energy-related matters. This initiative has been described in specifically capacity-building terms, as strengthening the status of East Asia "as a region committed to making science a driver of global societal and economic development in the 21st century" (Nagano and Hill, 2007).

As discussed further in Chapter 6, there are also various bilateral relationships, such as that between Singapore and China, that are designed to build capacity through, for example, the National University of Singapore and Peking University collaborating on an International Master of Business Administration program (Welch, 2007).

A joint OECD and World Bank study (Vincent-Lancrin, 2007) has examined the contribution of cross-border tertiary education towards capacity development. Capacity was defined as 'the ability of people, organisations and societies as a whole to manage their affairs successfully', and capacity development as 'the process whereby people, organisations and society unleash, strengthen, create, adapt and maintain capacity over time' (ibid, p. 53). The report noted that a number of countries lack the domestic capacity to meet all of their tertiary education demand or could benefit from expertise from other countries. The report argued that cross-border education can be used to expand provision, bring in new skills, benchmark the quality of education, and increase variety and choice to domestic systems.

The OECD and World Bank study also noted some cautions:

- cross-border provision can potentially adversely affect capacity development where the quality of foreign provision is low;
- there may be little impact at all if cross-border provision is kept separate from domestic provision or its scale is small;

- student mobility and the acquisition of foreign qualifications can lead to a brain drain rather than an increase in the stock of domestic human capital; and
- there may be concerns about equity of provision if access is based on wealth, or culturally inappropriate approaches by overseas providers.

The report observed that while the mobility of academics and students has long been part of countries' capacity development strategies, there is a lack of evidence about whether and how new forms of cross-border education have contributed to capacity development in tertiary education, mainly because they are as yet too recent and too small.

The report concluded that an appropriate regulatory framework is important for reaping the benefits of cross-border education and minimising the risks. Quality assurance mechanisms for both domestic and overseas tertiary education providers that are internationally recognised and implemented are important parts of a capacity-building agenda. Fundamental to this, the report argued, are independence and credibility in the quality assurance process, much stronger data systems, especially in regard to student learning outcomes, and a link to both rewards and sanctions.

Another aspect of the regulatory framework is consumer protection for students. Study abroad carries risk, because of its high cost, the frequent need for the consumer to pre-pay for services, and the greater difficulty for non-native speakers with limited rights of residence to avail themselves of legal protection. An important international initiative in this field was the promulgation of the UNESCO-OECD Guidelines for Quality Provision in Cross-Border Higher Education²⁴

Building capacity within and across nations is clearly an area in which educational cooperation can make a substantial contribution.

5.5 THE BENEFITS OF TRADE IN EDUCATION SERVICES

The case for expanded trade in education services is linked to the benefits of expanded trade in general. Trade expands the size of the market for providers, increases efficiency in resource use, assists the transfer of technology and ideas, and expands choice. The OECD (2005a) has documented that world trade expanded 16-fold between 1950 and 2000, and has been one of the main drivers of growth in economic prosperity. Among OECD countries overall trade flows relative to GDP ("trade openness") doubled from 1970-2000, and each 1% increase in trade openness was associated with an increase of per capita income of 0.5% to 2% (OECD, 2005a). Countries that were more open to international trade and investment grew at twice the rate of less open economies during the 1990s.

The Centre for International Economics (2008) examined the benefits of educational cooperation in the context of cross-border exchange of education services among APEC countries. They argued that education is both large in terms of share of GDP and number of people involved, and important in terms of its contribution to ongoing productivity and economic growth. They concluded that cross-border exchange of education services offers benefits in terms of improving the quantity, quality and diversity of education services. These are the kinds of benefits which might be expected to accrue from opening up international trade, and increasing competition, in the supply of any good or service.

Furthermore, cross-border exchange offers special benefits such as the rapid transfer of ideas and increased cultural understanding from person-to-person interactions. Against this background, the CIE report argued that government policies to facilitate cross-border exchanges through quality assurance, accreditation of providers and recognition of qualifications can make a substantial contribution to improving education and hence economic development.

²⁴ See <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001433/143349e.pdf>

5.6 COUNTRY PERSPECTIVES ON THE CONTRIBUTION OF COOPERATION

The interest in regional cooperation, including in education, is one example of a global trajectory that is influencing all the EAS countries. The scale of global competition demands a corresponding increase in the strength of competitors. As Singapore's deputy Prime Minister, Tony Tan, observed in 2000, "No country, if it wants to progress, can isolate itself from this globalised world of competition. You either keep up or you get left out" (cited in Sidhu, 2005). Individual countries will be better equipped to compete effectively in a global market if they can share costs and increase their capacity by joining forces with their neighbours.

The linkages between investments in human resources and economic and social development outlined above are reflected in the goals that countries see education cooperation can help to achieve.

For example, Indonesia noted that international educational cooperation is very important not only to monitor and 'tap' best practice developments internationally, but also to maintain and increase its competitiveness and national image internationally, including through trade in educational services. International cooperation in education is explicitly recognised as a key strategy for contributing to its three pillars of educational development policies, namely improved governance, accountability for quality, and public image.

India noted that educational cooperation in regard to facilitating greater student mobility is vital for helping it meet its participation targets. Even with the very large increases in capacity in TVET and higher education in recent years, and the even more rapid growth in tertiary education places being implemented under the current five-year plan, there will not be enough domestic capacity to meet student demand.

Vietnam indicated that it welcomed the opportunities for greater international cooperation as a means to increase the funding and other resources available to meet its developmental goals, as well as to strengthen its human resources within the education community as well as the wider society.

Australia indicated that it appreciates the benefits of developing long-term relationships and networks between students, researchers, academics, teachers, institutions and government agencies through education cooperation. Education cooperation also helps place Australia in the emerging global skills and knowledge economy, supports Australia's domestic and international education industry, contributes to the alleviation of skills shortages, promotes research collaboration and policy exchange and builds people-to-people linkages and mutual understanding with countries in the region.

"What are the main benefits of greater educational cooperation for this sector?" was one of the questions which participants at the Jakarta Workshop addressed in the groups which brought together participants with experience in the schools and tertiary sectors.

In the **schools** sector some of the benefits perceived were:

- For governments, sharing policy developments, educational resources and expertise, assistance with achieving EFA goals; regional initiatives to reach marginalised groups through informal education;
- For schools and teachers, assistance with equipping the next generation for a globalising world, bench-marking in curriculum standards;
- For pupils, supporting greater mobility between countries, and fostering mutual understanding and respect.

Benefits perceived for the **tertiary** sector were:

- For governments, greater choice in tertiary education with lower costs, alignment of system to the requirements of the globalised work-place, laying the foundations for regional economic integration;
- For institutions and their staffs, expanded educational networks, assistance with training the next generation of educators, shared experience and resources leading to stronger programs and standards, developing competitiveness with institutions in other regions;
- For students and graduates, increased mobility in tertiary education and in the labour market, more choice through more open and flexible education systems.

Participants did not have time to elaborate these points or to test them against evidence, but it was impressive that groups of experienced educators from the EAS countries could draw up, and agree on, lists of such diverse benefits so quickly.

5.7 KEY SUCCESS FACTORS IN EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION

Commentators have noted that competitive globalisation is often accompanied by strategic alliances with selected partners (Kehm and Teichler, 2007). Ongoing regional integration can thus be seen as a logical consequence of increased globalisation.

Studies have been undertaken on what constitutes “good” cooperation in this context, especially in the higher education sector. One theory, deriving from a resource-based view of the firm, states that organisations cooperate in order to gain access to strategic resources. For universities, these resources can range from physical resources like research facilities or library collections, to educational resources such as specific programs or teaching methods, human resources, or more symbolic organisational resources such as reputation and prestige. Universities thus need to be different in terms of the complementary resources they offer each other. The counter-argument is that more compatible partners will be more successful in collaboration and that the more similar the parties, the more likely a favourable outcome.

One study surveyed four consortia to test the relative strength of these factors. One of the consortia was the ASEAN University Network while the other three were from the EU. The survey analysed the results of 188 questionnaires from 61 universities in 38 countries (Beerkens and Derwende, 2007). The study found that both factors -- compatibility and complementarity -- were important in successful collaborations.

The research also found that universities cooperate for other reasons besides complementary resources. These other reasons include the need to reduce transaction costs involved in student mobility, to gain the cachet of a qualification from a well-known institution without having to study full-time there, and staff exchange. Another, more political reason, is that collaboration allowed universities to gain better access to authorities such as ASEAN or the EU if they spoke as one voice, although the research concluded that collaboration in the higher education sector is rarely fully exploited (Beerkens and Derwende, 2007).

The finding that successful higher education consortia are based on both complementarity and compatibility or, to put it another way, that both difference and sameness are important for success, is reflected in the broader notion that successful internationalisation depends on the right mix of competition and cooperation. In other words, for nations to compete successfully in the global education market, they need to foster both aspects. In the case of universities, for example, an appropriate policy mix would involve building up institutions' capacity to be more competitive in national research funding bids and encouraging universities to cooperate in national and international projects.

This literature also emphasises that while the individual nation-state decides how the national higher education system will function through regulatory and funding frameworks, increasing

globalisation and deregulation of the market makes the nation's steering capacity in this area more complex (van der Wende, 2007).

The literature review, along with the consultations with the EAS countries, institutions whose daily work involves educational cooperation (such as the SEAMEO Regional Centres and university members of the AUN), and organisations extensively involved in conducting and encouraging regional cooperation (UNESCO and the secretariats of AUN and SEAMEO) indicated that a range of factors are important in determining whether educational cooperation works effectively.

- The fundamental starting point is that cooperation must be seen by all parties as meeting genuine needs. A key first stage is to establish means of dialogue whereby countries share their experiences about common problems, successes in addressing the needs, and then jointly develop strategies for implementation.
- Cooperation needs to be viewed as a two-way process whereby each country, organisation or institution shares its strengths to help others as well as receives assistance in meeting its needs.
- In some priority areas sub-regions often are an effective grouping for cooperation as the differences within the groups are not so great, and there can be problems with generalisability of issues and effective practices across whole regions.
- High level political support is critical: there needs to be a strong sense of mission at the political levels that cooperation is contributing to national and regional goals, and the people responsible for implementing cooperation programs need to feel both encouraged and supported: 'international cooperation needs to be led from the top and from the bottom'.
- Cooperation activities need to build strong links into national ministries and networks of education providers. Within those organisational links, personal relationships are important: activities need to create a web of relationships at different levels to ensure sustainability.
- Cooperation activities need to be embedded within a program framework in which the various components are mutually reinforcing: 'piecemeal programs don't work'.
- Effective international cooperation takes time, and realistic timelines need to be agreed.
- Large initiatives often need to be sub-divided into smaller, more manageable parts, with clear interconnections between them and identifiable milestones, ongoing monitoring and review of progress.
- Pilot projects can help to assess effectiveness and resolve implementation problems and thereby build confidence for mainstreaming.
- There needs to be a well-resourced coordinating group or secretariat able to maintain momentum, support national personnel, disseminate good practice, and develop future plans.
- Technology can help to maintain communications and disseminate results without the costs of frequent person-to-person meetings. However, there can be some potential equity and accessibility issues for developing countries.

5.8 INFORMATION AND RESEARCH NEEDS

The literature review and consultations indicate that while there is strong support for enhanced educational cooperation, and general agreement about its benefits, there is a lack of hard evidence about which sorts of cooperation programs are most effective in different

sectors of education. This gap in the knowledge base is likely to become increasingly evident as countries commit more resources to cooperation.

Some of the priority areas for more focused evaluation and research include:

- Quality assurance mechanisms for education providers operating in increasingly internationalised markets.
- The return flow of graduates from study abroad, and their subsequent employment patterns or contribution to the science, technology and business infrastructure in their home countries.
- Comprehensive cross-country evidence as to the impacts of programs of international education cooperation.
- The barriers to effective international cooperation and how they might be overcome.

A general observation is that educational cooperation as a field is relatively little documented and cooperation activities are little evaluated, and there is a lack of shared understanding about how to better harness its benefits. Strengthening the knowledge base in these regards could be an important contribution of the EAS.

5.9 CONCLUSIONS ON THE BENEFITS OF EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION

Given the need for more evaluation, conclusions about the benefits of educational cooperation at this stage must be tentative, and expressed in broad terms. These are related to the types of cooperation listed in the conceptual framework.

- *People Exchange and Trade Facilitation.* Both staff and student interchange and commercial presence operate to increase the quality and quantity of education on offer, and to build capacity in the labour forces of the participating countries. Given the evidence of economic returns to increased levels of education, staff and student interchange will also tend to enhance competitiveness. By enabling staff and students to experience other countries at first hand, interchange also enhances the appreciation of diversity and common heritage, and so starts a process of community building, which alumni continue.
- *Information Exchange* comes in many different forms. Where what is at issue is the exchange of information and ideas between education systems, formal evaluation of benefits may be difficult, but this chapter reports a considerable body of testimony as to its value. In specific cases, such as cooperation between countries to produce teaching materials, evaluation of outcomes is possible in principle, though it may be hard to establish the value which the international cooperation has added.
- *Regulatory Reform* in the sense used in this report has been taken further in Europe than in East Asia. The next chapter sets out evidence of its effects in aligning tertiary education systems, opening up choice and strengthening quality assurance. In these ways regulatory reform helps to promote people exchange, and to realise the benefits of such exchange.
- *Development Partnerships.* There is a large, specialist literature on the effectiveness of development assistance. It is well established that aid can be effective in enhancing the quality and quantity of education in recipient countries, depending on the nature of the program and a number of success factors, including those listed above. Examples of successful development partnerships are cited in the next chapter.

6 CURRENT EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION IN THE EAS REGION

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The chapter seeks to provide a general overview of educational cooperation in the EAS region using the framework developed for the study. The material attempts to summarise a great range and number of individual activities. It was not possible to include all of the detail, within the scope of this report, and the information should be viewed as *indicative* only. The discussion tries to provide a 'snapshot' of where the EAS countries are currently positioned in regard to educational cooperation, as well as examples of interesting 'growth points' and programs that seem particularly effective.

Chapter 7 includes a more detailed discussion of specific aspects of current arrangements in the context of free trade agreements, international student flows, and scholarship schemes.

6.2 GENERAL CONTEXT OF EDUCATION IN THE EAS

A detailed examination of educational cooperation is timely given the transformed educational landscape in which EAS countries find themselves, following the mix of competition and cooperation that results from the recent, rapid increase in the internationalisation of education. Almost by definition, internationalisation breaches national boundaries and while it creates new challenges it also opens up new alliances, often regional in nature (Welch, 2004).

Internationalisation is not a new phenomenon in Asia (Mok, 2007). In the latter part of the 19th century, many countries, particularly China and Japan, made various endeavours to establish modern education systems by sending students and staff abroad for advanced study and research. Such activity has expanded to embrace more countries and wider topics; it continues unabated. But today, as in the past, there remains enormous variety in the relative position of Asian countries in educational development. Some indication of this diversity is provided in Appendix 3 which includes data on the social economic and educational contexts in the 16 EAS countries.

In regard to school education, the various countries illustrate a very diverse range of approaches. Cheng (2007) identifies three waves of school reform that have affected Asian countries since the 1980s, particularly Hong Kong, India, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Taiwan, Malaysia and mainland China. These waves are summarised in Table 6.1.

Cheng (2007) has raised questions about the potential negative impact of some of these changes in school systems, not so much because the reforms themselves are necessarily at fault, but rather because of a lack of attention to implementation questions and little research to support policy formation. This conclusion underlines the potential value of countries cooperating with each other to improve the knowledge base to support educational reform, share practice, benchmark their performance, and to learn from others facing similar challenges.

Table 6.1: Three Waves of School Reform in Asia

Type	Features
1st Wave – Internal effectiveness (1980 – 90s)	Education is to deliver knowledge more effectively. Focus is on improving specific factors of school process (e.g., teacher quality, curriculum design, teaching methods, school management).
2nd Wave – Interface effectiveness (1990s)	Education is to provide a service more effectively. Focus is on ensuring quality and accountability of schools to stakeholders (e.g., school monitoring, parental choice, student vouchers, performance-based funding, stakeholder satisfaction, market competitiveness).
3rd Wave – Future effectiveness (2000s).	Education is to ensure sustainable development in a context of globalisation and change. Focus is on making sure youth can meet the challenges and needs of rapid transformation (e.g., reform of broad aims, content and practice defined by world-class standards and global comparability and increased use of ICT).

Source: Cheng, 2007.

In regard to higher education, the countries of the region also show great diversity, especially in the extent to which universities provide programs in other countries, they enrol students from abroad, or students travel to other countries for undergraduate or graduate study (Huang, 2007). Such differences in the orientation of higher education systems are reflected in the nature of the education cooperation activities underway.

6.3 MEMBERSHIP OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS

Each of the EAS countries is a member of several intergovernmental organisations that play some role in education cooperation (see Table 6.2). All are members of UNESCO, almost all have been involved in the Asia-Pacific Education Ministers' Meeting, 13 of the EAS countries are involved in the Asia-Pacific Quality Network, 12 of the EAS countries are also in APEC, 10 are members of ASEAN and SEAMEO, and four countries are in the OECD. In addition, several countries have associate members arrangements with different intergovernmental organisations.

The various intergovernmental organisations play different functions although their broad agendas in regard to education and human resource development overlap in some regards. This is to be expected as there is a broad international consensus around education and human resource development goals and the contribution that improved educational quality and equity can make to social and economic development. The fact that similar issues and ideas are raised in different forums reinforces their importance and increases the prospects of joint action.

Nevertheless, some concerns were raised during the consultations about the resources entailed in maintaining active engagement in multiple intergovernmental organisations. This is a consideration for the EAS in terms of ways for it to play a 'value adding' role in education cooperation and not to duplicate the work of others (see Chapter 8).

Table 6.2: Membership of EAS Countries in Selected International Governmental Organisations with an Education Role¹

EAS country	ASEAN ²	SEAMEO ^{3,4}	APEMM	APEC	UNESCO	OECD	APQN ⁵
Australia ³			•	•	•	•	•
Brunei	•	•	•	•	•		•
Darussalam							
Cambodia	•	•	•		•		•
China ²			•	•	•		•
India			•		•		•
Indonesia	•	•	•	•	•		•
Japan ^{2,4}			•	•	•	•	•
Republic of Korea ²			•	•	•	•	
Lao PDR	•	•	•		•		•
Malaysia	•	•	•	•	•		•
Myanmar	•	•			•		
New Zealand ³			•	•	•	•	•
Philippines	•	•	•	•	•		•
Singapore	•	•	•	•	•		
Thailand	•	•	•	•	•		•
Viet Nam	•	•	•	•	•		•
<i>No. of EAS countries that are members</i>	10	10	15	12	16	4	13
<i>Total no. of member countries</i>	10	11	48	21	192	30	28

Notes:

- 1 All 16 EAS countries are also members of the Asian Development Bank (ADB), the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the World Bank (WB), each of which has substantial involvement in education issues.
- 2 China, Japan and the Republic of Korea are involved in the ASEAN Plus 3 cooperation process.
- 3 Australia and New Zealand are SEAMEO Associate Members
- 4 Japan is a SEAMEO Partner
- 5 The APQN membership includes quality assurance agencies in higher education. It is not an intergovernmental organisation although most of the member agencies are government-linked.

Key to acronyms

EAS – East Asia Summit
 ASEAN – Association of Southeast Asian Nations
 SEAMEO – Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization
 APEMM – Asia-Pacific Education Ministers' Meeting (Brisbane Communiqué)
 APEC – Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
 UNESCO – United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
 OECD – Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
 APQN – Asia-Pacific Quality Network

6.4 TYPES OF EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION

Table 6.3 in this section summarises for each EAS country the main features of educational cooperation classified in terms of five types of educational cooperation (people exchange; information exchange; transnational education; regulatory reform; and development assistance) and the three phases of education that are the main focus of the study (schools; vocational and technical education; and higher education). One sub-table is provided for each country, and the countries are listed in alphabetical order. To save space, activities that involve more than one sector are grouped together. As noted earlier, countries differed in the amount of information they were able to supply. It was not possible to include all the activities mentioned, or full details of all the activities cited by countries, within the report's scope. The summaries should be viewed as *indicative* only.

Based on the available information, the most extensive types of educational cooperation in the region appear to relate to people exchange and information exchange, especially in the higher education sector. In regard to regulatory reform there appear to be increasing levels of interest in skills recognition, qualifications recognition, qualifications frameworks, and quality assurance. These are areas in which governments are uniquely well placed to share policy experiences and to harmonise regulatory frameworks.

It is clear, though, that the available data underestimate the actual nature and volume of educational cooperation activities underway. As was noted in Chapter 3, cooperation at the inter-governmental level was the main focus of the consultations. Most countries noted that very little data is collated at central level about international cooperation at the institutional level, let alone the staff and student levels. Thus, Table 6.3 essentially indicates the main types of educational cooperation where some information is available at central government level.

Table 6.3: Summary of International Educational Cooperation, by Country
Table 6.3 Summary: Australia

Type	Schools	TVET	Higher Education
People Exchange	<p>Endeavour Language Teacher fellowships (for language teachers) and International Student Exchange Programs (for senior secondary students), designed to increase exchange.</p> <p>In 2007 Australia had 27,000 international student enrolments in Schools. The top 8 source countries are EAS countries.</p> <p>A study overseas portal (www.studyoverseas.gov.au) will be launched in mid-2008. This tool is aimed at senior secondary & first year university students.</p>	<p>The Endeavour VET Awards supports international students undertaking VET in any field in Australia.</p> <p>In 2007 Australia had 121,000 international enrolments in VET. The top 8 source countries are EAS countries.</p>	<p>Australia had about 8,000 tertiary students abroad in 2005.</p> <p>In 2007 Australia had 178,000 international enrolments in Higher Education (top 8 source countries are EAS countries).</p> <p>In 2007, over 100,000 international students in intensive English language courses.</p> <p>Australian Scholarships scheme supports residents of EAS countries to study in Australia, Australians to study in EAS countries, and student exchanges</p>
Information Exchange	<p>National Office for Overseas Skills Recognition (NOOSR) produces "Country Education Profiles" for all EAS countries.</p> <p>Information exchange across all sectors on a bilateral basis through cooperation agreements and multilateral basis e.g. OECD and APEC. Numerous institution to institution agreements are in place</p> <p>The National Centre for Vocational Education and Research exchanges research information on VET e.g. through UNEVOC network</p> <p>Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) is investigating "internationalization" in 2008-09.</p>		
Trans-national education	<p>Numerous institution to institution agreements are in place.</p> <p>The Australian List of Institutions and Courses in Other Countries (AusLIST) is an online directory of: Australian education and training providers; the Australian courses they deliver offshore; and the locations where courses are delivered.</p>		
Regulatory reform	<p>Seeks to eliminate barriers to education exchange through cooperation to improve qualifications recognition, quality assurance, and provider accreditation and registration arrangements.</p>		
Development partnerships	<p>Total assistance to ASEAN countries in 2008-09 of over \$900 million, including major bilateral programs (especially in basic education) for Indonesia, Vietnam, the Philippines and Cambodia. Also support for regional initiatives (\$130 million in 2008-09) to aid development and promote economic integration. Australian Scholarships (see above).</p> <p>Asia Pacific Technical College established in 2007 in Fiji to provide training in tourism and hospitality to international standards. 2002-07 Australia-China Chongqing Vocational Education and Training Project.</p> <p>Australia is a signatory to the 2005 Paris Declaration which aims to increase efforts in harmonisation, alignment and managing aid for results.</p>		

Table 6.3 Summary: Brunei Darussalam

Type	Schools	TVET	Higher Education
People Exchange	<p>Scholarships student & teacher exchange with other ASEAN countries and UK, Canada, Japan, India, Republic of Korea, China, Germany</p> <p>Initiative to provide Malay Language, and religious teachers, to Singapore, China</p> <p>Singapore-Brunei Darussalam School immersion programme</p> <p>Principals school attachment, Australia</p>	<p>Staff exchange, e.g. Philippines, Indonesia (specialists are on secondment); Malaysia</p> <p>Send staff for training at SEAMEO Regional Centres (e.g. RETRAC, RESAM), supports SEAMEO VOCTECH, including scholarships for regular training programmes e.g. SEAVERN to build capacity in ICT (supported by the Netherlands)</p>	<p>BUDI programme between Brunei Darussalam and China – English for diplomats</p> <p>Mindanao Scholars programs in school management and teaching Arabic as a second language</p> <p>AUN Distinguished Scholars programme</p> <p>MoUs for student and staff exchange with universities in ASEAN countries, Japan and the Republic of Korea</p>
Information Exchange	<p>Provision of information and data to international bodies e.g. UNESCO, ISESCO, APEC, Commonwealth</p> <p>Sponsoring annual Education fairs and exhibitions for local and overseas providers</p> <p>Staff attend seminars, forums and workshops, including at SEAMEO Centres</p>	<p>Extensive provision of print/online materials throughout the region, especially by SEAMEO VOCTECH</p> <p>Hosts an annual international conference on TVET</p> <p>VOCTECH maintains Edunet, a learning management system to provide ongoing access for program participants</p>	<p>Active participation in regional organisations e.g. SEAMEO RIHED, UMAP, AUN/SEED</p> <p>Various MoUs at institutional level</p>
Trans-national education		<p>MoUs with institutions e.g. Germany, UK, Netherlands</p> <p>SEAVERN Research / Capacity-Building Project; with the Republic of Korea</p>	<p>Participant in AUN Quality Assurance, AUN Credit Transfer System, and European Credit Transfer System</p>
Regulatory reform		<p>Skills Recognition Project coordinated to facilitate labour mobility</p> <p>Developing trade testing</p>	<p>Participant in AUN IPN (Intellectual Property Network)</p> <p>AUN Quality Assurance</p>
Development partnerships	<p>Providing technical support for capacity building and scholarship support</p> <p>Partnership between STEP centre & UNESCO focussing on Science & Technology</p>	<p>Building regional capacity through VOCTECH centre programs</p> <p>Partnership with VEDC-Malang, Indonesia through sub-regional training course on resources generation</p>	<p>MoUs among institutions</p> <p>AUN Credit transfer System</p>

Table 6.3 Summary: Cambodia

Type	Schools	TVET	Higher Education
People Exchange	Student exchanges low in numbers – mostly depend on external funding. Language is also a barrier. Limited numbers of teachers attend international training courses, e.g. at the SEAMEO Centres, or through donor projects.	Student opportunities to study abroad largely dependent on scholarships. Teacher exchange also limited – SEAMEO VOTTECH courses found useful. Concerned to promote legal worker migration and to obtain recognition for the skills of emigrant workers.	Cambodia had about 2000 tertiary students abroad in 2005, mostly in France, Vietnam and the US. Scholarships especially significant for post-graduate study. RUPP ²⁵ cited MoUs providing for exchanges with universities in China and Japan.
Information Exchange	Cambodia accesses such networks as are available to it. No SEAMEO centre or other international centre in country.	Often effected through participation in multilateral activities with development partners.	The Ministry cited its membership of multilateral activities and projects, such as the GMS ²⁶ HE Task-force and the project of the ASEAN Integration Initiative for HE Management in CLMV. RUPP cited its membership of the ASEAN University Network.
Trans-national education	NGOs provide some short-course training in TVET.		
Regulatory reform	Major emphasis on the establishment of a demand-driven TVET system, including qualifications framework intended to have international currency. The Ministry had participated in a recent RIHED workshop looking at an ASEAN qualifications framework. Some work is going on to develop mutual recognition within the CLMV region.		
Development partnerships	Many donors assist the development of basic education through the ESSP ²⁷ . These include the World Bank, ADB, Japan, the Republic of Korea and UNESCO.	ILO, Korea and Australia were mentioned, notably in the context of systemic reform of VET.	Not discussed, beyond the point that most development aid is for basic education.

²⁵ Royal University of Phnom Penh

²⁶ Greater Mekong Sub-Region

²⁷ Education Sector Strategic Plan

Table 6.3 Summary: China

Type	Schools	TVET	Higher Education
People Exchange	<p>Major ongoing cooperative projects between China and countries in Asia include the teacher exchange program with Japan and RoK, and the teenager exchange program with Japan.</p> <p>Student exchange agreements with all 16 EAS countries.</p> <p>Large numbers of Chinese students complete their schooling abroad on a self-funded basis.</p>	No VET specific data obtained.	<p>China had 358,000 students doing tertiary studies abroad in 2005, and hosted 78,000 foreign students in 2003, over 80% of them from Asia. China plans to triple provision for foreign students by 2020, including from ASEAN. China offers 5000 scholarships at doctoral level.</p>
Information Exchange	<p>China participates in many multilateral and bilateral forums, and maintains a large, cross-sectoral Institute of Educational Research.</p> <p>Mutual study visits are seen as an important way to learn about foreign education and training systems, and provide information about China's.</p>		
Trans-national education	A number of international schools, notably in development zones.	China has initiated some joint provision with foreign vocational education institutions to promote the development of Chinese vocational education.	By June 2004 there were 164 joint HE programs entitled to award foreign or Hong Kong degrees. Full –fledged international campuses exist, but are not common.
Regulatory reform	The MoE said that for the time being they preferred to approach mutual recognition on a bilateral basis, through free trade agreements. Agreements are in place or in negotiation with Japan, RoK, Thailand, Malaysia and the Philippines.		
Development partnerships	<p>China as a donor for basic education in the CLMV counties.</p> <p>Expanding scholarship program.</p> <p>ASEAN is an area of focus for China's drive to recruit more foreign students.</p>		

Table 6.3 Summary: India

Type	Schools	TVET	Higher Education
People Exchange	<p>Large numbers of Indian teachers are working overseas, especially in English language teaching & ICT – some linked to aid programs</p> <p>Award programs to send outstanding teachers and principals overseas for more experience e.g. Singapore, UK, USA</p> <p>Growing numbers of overseas teachers working in India, especially in international schools</p>	<p>Bilateral exchange programs with a number of EAS countries e.g. Australia, Japan, RoK</p> <p>Major capacity constraints in rapid expansion of TVET – looking to gain greater access to overseas training programs and employment opportunities</p>	<p>Rapid expansion of higher education a major priority, but facing capacity constraints; a key motivation for cooperation is to provide more student places and better train academics in teaching & research</p> <p>Scholarship program for 20,000 graduate places over seas</p> <p>Increasing numbers of overseas students (Middle East & Africa) mostly fee-paying</p>
Information Exchange	<p>Extensive dissemination & collaboration program through National Council of Educational Research & Training (NCERT), supported in part by World Bank</p> <p>International experience is important for driving internal improvements (the main priority)</p> <p>Transferring expertise in programs for out-of-school youth & rural women</p>	<p>Multilateral support from ADB and WB to lift polytechnics' quality and relevance to industry needs; using overseas experience (e.g. Australia, NZ)</p> <p>Seeking to benchmark TVET sector and performance against international data; lack evaluation data and a national R&D effort</p>	<p>Aiming to lift research capacity – making it easier for overseas academics to work in Indian universities e.g. facilitating spouse employment</p> <p>Joint India-UK annual Education Summit at Prime Ministerial level to plan and focus exchanges</p>
Trans-national education	Not discussed during the visit.		
Regulatory reform	Not discussed in relation to the school sector.	<p>ILO project on skills recognition framework; major priority is to increase labour mobility</p> <p>Working with Australia on developing a national qualifications framework</p>	<p>India a temporary member of Washington Accord on engineering qualifications</p> <p>Examining overseas models (e.g. NZ) on mutual recognition & quality assurance</p>
Development partnerships	Capacity building and teacher support programs for Sri Lanka, Bangladesh and Maldives through NCERT	Capacity building in SAARC countries and Africa through technical assistance and teacher training	Supporting the development of the South Asian University in New Delhi, partly to assist other SAARC countries

Table 6.3 Summary: Indonesia

Type	Schools	TVET	Higher Education
People Exchange	<p>Growing number of school twinning arrangements, and student and teacher exchanges; increasing use of ICT for communication, assisted by SEAMOLEC</p> <p>Supported schools in the APEC ICT Model School Network</p> <p>Outstanding educators and policymakers are sent overseas for training mostly supported through donor funds</p>	<p>Developing some TVET institutions with a focus on preparing people for overseas job markets e.g. in Australia and the Middle East</p> <p>Some staff exchange in TVET, but relatively little student exchange</p>	<p>Large numbers of Indonesian students study at overseas universities – a mix of fee-paying and scholarships</p> <p>Relatively few overseas students study in Indonesia, and are concentrated in a few institutions, but a priority to increase</p>
Information Exchange	<p>Active participant in OECD & IEA studies of student achievement – important for benchmarking and building capacity</p> <p>Hosted first Seminar on Education Research Networks (ER-NET) among SEAMEO countries in 2008</p> <p>Initiated the Southeast Asia School Principals Forum in 2007</p>	<p>Participates in a number of APEC & ILO projects on skills recognition and qualifications frameworks</p> <p>Study tours of senior policy makers e.g. to Australia and NZ</p> <p>Large number of international consultants working with Indonesian agencies</p>	<p>Have opened a web forum to document international cooperation opportunities – seen as especially important for the large private university sector</p> <p>Strengthening international cooperation in research e.g. through AUN</p>
Trans-national education	<p>Around 1600 Indonesian schools have been licensed to provide international programs</p>	<p>Growing number of TVET programs linked to overseas skill requirements; some training provided by overseas trainers (e.g. Australia, Japan, RoK)</p>	<p>Partnering of Indonesian and foreign institutions is possible for the delivery of foreign courses, subject to regulation</p>
Regulatory reform	<p>Have reached ASEAN agreement on qualifications recognition in engineering and nursing, but not yet implemented</p> <p>Have signed WTO protocol and is moving towards liberalization of labour mobility</p> <p>Participant in the APQN</p>		
Development partnerships	<p>Involved in a wide range of development partnerships with EAS countries. Major priorities are to achieve EFA goals in terms of participation and quality, upgrade teacher qualifications, improve infrastructure, strengthen TVET, support university autonomy, and to build policymaking capacity.</p> <p>Indonesia is also providing technical support and teacher training for other developing countries e.g. Cambodia, Vietnam</p>		

Table 6.3 Summary: Japan

Type	Schools	TVET	Higher Education
People Exchange	Japan sponsors exchange schemes for students (e.g. JENESYS, targeted at EAS students) and for teachers (e.g. JET and REX). Also a significant host for self-funded school students from abroad.	Not discussed during country visit.	In 2007 Japan hosted about 120,000 foreign students, of which 88,000 were from China and RoK. In 2004, there were 83,000 Japanese students overseas, of which 42,000 were in the US, and 19,000 in China. Japan provides scholarships and other support for foreign students.
Information Exchange	Japan participates in multilateral work on education, including OECD, APEC etc. Also maintains international education research capability.	Not discussed, but entry under schools would also apply to VET.	Exchanges information in HE, research and science through Govt. support of joint seminars, programs of study etc. Japanese universities prominent in international university networks.
Trans-national education	Not discussed during the visit.		
Regulatory reform	Japan aims to foster internationally active students, to attract good international students, and to strengthen competitiveness, but seeks to do so mainly through international academic cooperation rather than regulatory reform. Supports double-degree programs and credit transfers.		
Development partnerships	JICA supports basic education in SE Asia, especially improvements in the quality of teaching in mathematics and science. Also supports non-formal basic education for adults, within a poverty reduction strategy.	Japan expects Japanese companies investing in developing countries to do their own training, but has supported some skills training work, e.g. in Vietnam. Non-formal education may also impart vocational skills.	Japan cited as successful projects, the long-term work on engineering training through AUN-SEED Net and the network of education and research centres supported by JSPS which has conferred 490 PhDs.

Table 6.3 Summary: Republic of Korea

Type	Schools	TVET	Higher Education
People Exchange	Korea-Japan Teacher exchange program, Korea– Australia English Teachers. Camp for Global Understanding	Substantial numbers studying overseas in the VET sector, especially English language MoU between Ministries of Labour of Korea and Vietnam has covered exchange visits for vocational trainers and other activities.	In 2005, 192,254 Korean tertiary students were studying overseas, of which 57,896 were in the US, and 19,022 in Japan. RoK was host to 22,526 foreign students, of whom 13,091 were from China. Courses in English have been started in order to boost numbers. Scholarships available under MoUs – mainly with Asian countries. Joint study and researcher exchange programs. Student exchanges under the UNESCO/UNITWIN program. ASEM-Duo scholarship Program
Information Exchange	RoK participates fully in the work of multilaterals such as APEC and OECD – across all three sectors. RoK participates in many international forums. APCEIU (Asia-Pacific Center of Education for International Understanding)	KRIVET is a UNEVOC Centre and holds many international workshops. Joint KRIVET/ SEAMEO VOTTECH study of VET in six ASEAN countries.	International Joint Research program
Trans-national education	Not discussed during the visit.		
Regulatory reform	Selective approach to skills recognition; agreements on mutual recognition of IT skills already concluded with China and Vietnam.		
Development partnerships	Within education, KOICA (Korea International Cooperation Agency) gives priority to primary education and vocational training. Recent support to development of vocational training centres in Myanmar and Indonesia, within the EAS region.		

Note: Student data in this table are on a different basis from the RoK data in Appendix 4.

Table 6.3 Summary: Lao PDR

Type	Schools	TVET	Higher Education
People Exchange	Limited exchanges of students and teachers when funds available. Help for exchanges with Japan from JENESYS specifically acknowledged.	Partnership with RoK in training instructors for Skill Centres.	About 1000 to 2000 students abroad, about half in Vietnam. Very few foreign students in Laos. For Lao people study abroad largely reliant on scholarships.
Information Exchange	Help from the RETRAC and INNOTECH centres in providing training for teachers acknowledged. Laos has a Research Institute for Educational Sciences but its resources need up-dating. Just completed MDA assessment for UNESCO EFA initiative. The Ministry found its participation in the UNESCO Schoolnet project valuable.	Long-term partnership with Germany in the development of vocational and higher education. RoK also an important partner in VTE. Collaboration also with VOCTECH.	Help from RIHED was acknowledged. The National University of Laos benefits from its membership of AUN.
Trans-national education	Not discussed during the visit		
Regulatory reform	Laos is participating in the development of international skills recognition arrangements and acknowledges their potential value, especially to its migrant workers. Emphasised the need for concurrent work on illegal migration.		
Development partnerships	Laos has many development partners, with a particular emphasis on basic education. As well as those mentioned above, the ADB, Australia, and China were cited as important development partners.		

Table 6.3 Summary: Malaysia

Type	Schools	TVET	Higher Education
People Exchange	<p>Homestay program for students in Australia, Japan and France</p> <p>Attachment program and benchmarking in teacher training & best practices e.g. Australia, NZ, UK, Singapore & Thailand.</p> <p>Attachment programs for school leaders in the UK, Australia and NZ, and leadership training programs with Indonesia, Brunei, Maldives, Singapore</p> <p>Joint Working Council with ASEAN and Middle East countries, Australia and NZ.</p>	<p>11- month study programme by Japanese students and Malaysian students in Japan</p> <p>Extensive staff participation in SEAMEO regional training programs</p> <p>Malaysian Training Provider (MTP) placed in source countries to assist with training and certification of eligible foreign workers</p> <p>Centre for Instructor & Advanced Skilled Training provides training for overseas participants.</p>	<p>At 31/12/2007, 33,600 foreign students studying at private, and 14,300 at public, higher educational institutions. Target is to enrol 100,000 foreign students in universities (both public and private)</p> <p>AUN Student Exchange Scheme with other ASEAN countries and RoK</p> <p>Currently about 15% of university academics are from overseas; target is 30%</p>
Information Exchange	<p>Extensive participation in international studies e.g. by OECD, IEA</p> <p>Will host APEC Conference on Best Practices in School-Based Action Research in 2009</p> <p>Teacher Education Institutes facilitate the exchange of materials and expertise e.g. with other ASEAN countries</p>	<p>Participating in ASEAN and APEC working groups on skills recognition and labour mobility</p> <p>Information and student exchange on training in the hotel industry with Indonesian institutions</p>	<p>Extensive Ministry participation in international forums and projects</p> <p>Growing number of partnerships at institutional level</p>
Trans-national education	Overseas providers permitted in higher education		
Regulatory reform	Quality assurance processes & accreditation	National Occupational Skills Standard (NOSS) specifies expected competencies of skilled workers	Malaysian Qualification Agency established to implement the Malaysian Qualifications Framework. and oversee quality assurance of higher education
Development partnerships	Partnerships developed with various EAS countries and institutions for further training of school principals, senior teachers and officials	Technical assistance in educational management and educational quality assurance in Indonesia	Technical assistance and scholarships for other ASEAN countries

Table 6.3 Summary: Myanmar

Type	Schools	TVET	Higher Education
People Exchange	Limited at present. Training of schoolteachers by SEAMEO centres such as RECSAM and RETRAC is one example. India also helps with education management training.	Collaboration with RoK is acknowledged.	About 2000 Myanmar students studying abroad at any one time. Some scholarships and joint study programs available.
Information Exchange	JICA supported project on Strengthening child-Centred Approach 2004-2007. Comprehensive Quality Education Program (2006-2010) is now being implemented, with help from EU. Just completed MDA assessment for UNESCO EFA initiative.	The Ministry of Labour cited participation In the ASEAN Skills Recognition Project.	The ASIA Research Centre at University of Yangon is supported by RoK. SEAMEO CHAT in Yangon organises workshops etc for humanities researchers in both ASEAN and other EAS countries.
Trans-national education	SEAMEO CHAT has proposed a model history curriculum for secondary schools in SE Asia, and prepared materials.		
Regulatory reform	The Ministry of Labour has established a National Skill Standards Authority and collaborates in international work, with a view to enhancing labour mobility.		
Development partnerships	As well as countries cited above, Myanmar carries out international education projects with ASEAN Countries, China, Germany and EU Countries.		

Table 6.3 Summary: New Zealand

Type	Schools	TVET	Higher Education
People Exchange	International student exchange programs for senior secondary school students.	Overseas student enrolments; New Zealand trainers are working overseas.	Large numbers of overseas students are studying in New Zealand.
Information Exchange	Participation in international studies allowing cross-country comparisons to be made. The construction and maintenance of clearinghouses.	The construction and maintenance of clearinghouses	Typically at an institutional level. Education counselors in eight countries support these exchanges.
Trans-national education	New Zealand Development Scholarships and capacity development for government officials especially in English language development targeted at Lao, Cambodia, Vietnam Indonesia, Myanmar Philippines and China.	New Zealand Development Scholarships and capacity development for government officials especially in English language development targeted at Lao, Cambodia, Vietnam Indonesia, Myanmar Philippines and China.	New Zealand Development Scholarships and capacity development for government officials especially in English language development targeted at Lao, Cambodia, Vietnam Indonesia, Myanmar Philippines and China.
Regulatory reform	<p>New Zealand Qualifications authority is providing a basis for recognition of overseas qualifications.</p> <p>The New Zealand Vice Chancellors Committee has entered into mutual recognition arrangements with several countries.</p>		
Development partnerships	<p>NZAID, as part of its Asia Strategy, provides educational assistance to Indonesia, Viet Name, Cambodia, Philippines and Timor-Leste. New Zealand development scholarships.</p>		

Table 6.3 Summary: Philippines

Type	Schools	TVET	Higher Education
People Exchange	<p>Relatively limited number of school exchange programs at present due to resource constraints; however, increasing use of ICT to facilitate student and staff dialogue with other countries</p> <p>Growing number of teachers working overseas, especially in English language teaching; seeking wider international recognition of Philippines teaching qualifications</p>	<p>Encouraging exchanges of VTE trainers and students e.g. with Australia, Japan, RoK</p> <p>Established Language Skills Institutes throughout the country to assist trainees improve language skills in English and other regional languages to improve employability – draw on expertise from other countries, and share expertise with non-English-speaking countries</p>	<p>Strong traditional of internationalization in the higher education sector</p> <p>Government policy to promote greater staff and student mobility, and participation in international research studies</p> <p>Participation in UMAP, AUN-SEED and other regional networks</p> <p>Large number of universities have MoUs governing exchanges with institutions in other countries</p>
Information Exchange	Not discussed during the visit	<p>Participation in a wide range of ASEAN and APEC working groups on skills recognition and labour mobility</p> <p>Information exchanges with international R&D organisations in TVET</p> <p>Extensive participation in seminars, technical meetings and conferences</p> <p>Seeking to expand data comparability and R&D capacity</p>	<p>Participation in AUN and other regional networks</p> <p>MoUs on academic cooperation and joint research in a wide range of countries</p>
Trans-national education	Implemented new guidelines in 2008 on transnational education in the higher education sector		
Regulatory reform	Not discussed during the visit	Working towards multilateral arrangements in skills recognition and comparability of training standards. Seeking to facilitate Filipino labour mobility and internal transfer of expertise	Pursuing bilateral and multilateral agreements to facilitate trade in education services e.g. Japan-Philippines Economic Partnership Agreement, & GATS
Development partnerships	Providing technical assistance and teacher training in CLMV countries	Sharing expertise with other countries in areas such as competency-based training, gender and development and industry role in TVET	Public and private universities engaged in development programs, often through providing technical support to NGOs

Table 6.3 Summary: Singapore

Type	Schools	TVET	Higher Education
People Exchange	<p>Extensive range of school twinning programmes and student and staff exchanges with schools in ASEAN and other EAS countries</p> <p>About 80,000 international students are currently studying in Singapore (all sectors)</p>	VTE institutions in Singapore host regular study visits and sharing sessions with their counterparts from ASEAN and EAS countries	<p>Growing number of overseas students studying in Singapore, and Singapore students studying abroad</p> <p>Singapore universities have ongoing and regular exchanges with universities in other countries, including through MoUs</p>
Information Exchange	<p>Participates in a wide range of international research studies e.g. IEA, UNESCO</p> <p>Holds regular bilateral meetings and professional forums with education ministries from ASEAN and EAS countries.</p>	Participation in ASEAN and APEC working groups on skill development and qualification frameworks	<p>Conduct regular sharing, joint research and information exchanges with universities in ASEAN and other EAS countries</p> <p>Active participation in AUN</p>
Trans-national education	Not discussed during the visit	Not discussed during the visit	Joint programmes with foreign universities in the EAS region.
Regulatory reform	Not discussed during the visit		
Development partnerships	<p>Provision of ASEAN scholarships</p> <p>Training teachers from countries like Vietnam and Philippines, including in English language teaching</p> <p>School leadership attachments for principals from developing countries</p> <p>Expertise sharing in the learning and teaching of English and other languages through the SEAMEO Regional English Language.</p>	Provision of VTE training programs for trainers and officials from developing countries	<p>ASEAN scholarships for university study in Singapore</p> <p>Institutional support through AUN and other higher education networks</p>

Table 6.3 Summary: Thailand

Type	Schools	TVET	Higher Education
People Exchange	<p>Current national economic and social development plan emphasises preparation of Thai students for global engagement</p> <p>MoUs on educational cooperation, including exchanges of students, staff and officials with Australia, Cambodia, India, Lao PDR, NZ, Singapore & Vietnam</p> <p>Increasing use of ICT to facilitate staff and student dialogue across countries</p> <p>Seeking to strengthen language teaching including through expertise from other countries</p>	<p>Increasing number of bilateral arrangements to strengthen TVET, including by exchanging expertise with industries investing in Thailand and countries with which Thailand has FTAs</p> <p>Developing joint programs in training for tourism and hospitality industries with Philippines and CLMV countries to ensure consistency with international standard and to facilitate labour mobility</p>	<p>Thousands of Thai university students study abroad (including 4000 on Thai government scholarships), and there is an emphasis on attracting more foreign students to study in Thailand</p> <p>Over 700 programmes offered in public and private universities using English as medium of instruction</p> <p>Large number of MoUs governing staff and student exchange and joint research projects between Thai and overseas universities</p>
Information Exchange	<p>Thailand is an active participant in international research studies e.g. by IEA and OECD</p> <p>Hosts a large number of international conferences and study visits on school priority issues</p>	<p>Strengthening networking arrangements in the region through staff exchanges, joint research projects, and knowledge and management systems</p>	<p>Active participation in AUN and other university networks</p>
Trans-national education	<p>Not discussed during the visit</p>	<p>Not discussed during the visit</p>	<p>Support for foreign universities wishing to establish campuses and partnerships in Thailand</p>
Regulatory reform	<p>Developing a competency-based training and qualifications systems with assistance from donor countries and multilateral organisations, and seeking to ensure that standards and qualifications are internationally comparable</p>		
Development partnerships	<p>Extensive range of development partnerships with ADB, WB and donor countries aimed at building Thai capacity, improving access to education and lifting quality</p> <p>Provides technical assistance and teacher training to developing countries in the region</p> <p>Shares expertise in language training, and in non-formal education with both Thai government and donor support</p>		

Table 6.3 Summary: Viet Nam

Type	Schools	TVET	Higher Education
People Exchange	In all three sectors, the aid projects active in Vietnam bring in foreign experts and provide training for Vietnamese staff. SEAMEO RETRAC specialises in education management and provides training and workshops for all CLMV countries.	Foreign direct investors, such as Singapore and Germany, support and in some cases supply skills training. Foreign investors also demand competence in English. Vietnam works with RELC and RETRAC on that.	Fast-growing number of students abroad – 17,000 in 2005. US, Europe, Australia, Japan main destinations. About 2000 foreign students in Vietnam. Australia, China, RoK and Japan all offer scholarships. Recent agreement with Japan to train 500 PhDs to assist Vietnam's HE expansion plan.
Information Exchange	Not discussed during the visit	ASEAN and World Skills Competitions were cited as effective in bringing staff and students together and recognising excellence.	Two universities – one in Hanoi and one in HCMC – belong to the AUN. Vn National Economic University partners a university in Laos.
Trans-national education	Vietnam builds materials about ASEAN identity into the school curriculum, and has proposed a multilingual, multimedia pack to promote cultural exchange within ASEAN. Vietnam – Singapore collaboration in training for school principals.	Some international providers have opened up in Vietnam.	Several international campuses in Vietnam, notably RMIT. Also partnerships (e.g. with Chinese universities) where courses leading to foreign degrees are offered partly in Vietnam partly abroad.
Regulatory reform	Not discussed during the visit	Vietnam has participated in the ASEAN Skills Development project, but notes that progress on a multilateral basis has been slow. Vietnam has worked bilaterally to meet the skills demands of foreign investors.	The case for common arrangements for quality assurance, credit transfer and qualifications recognition was acknowledged – but there was no time to go into detail.
Development partnerships	Within ASEAN, Australia, China, RoK and Japan are important development partners. Vietnam fosters partnerships with fellow ASEAN members.		

6.5 EXAMPLES OF EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION

This section summarises the features of a number of the educational cooperation activities listed in the previous section which the consultations suggested were particularly effective. These have been selected on the basis of the potential lessons they could hold for enhancing educational cooperation among EAS countries. The examples are grouped in terms of the three main education sectors that are the focus of the project.

Schools Sector

Schoolnet

The UNESCO Schoolnet project was established in 2003 to explore and promote ICT-based learning in mathematics, science and language through a network of 24 schools in eight ASEAN countries. It was supported by the ASEAN Foundation and by Japanese Funds-in-Trust. The project ran from 2003 to 2006.

The project's aims and methods have a number of attractive features:

- Promotes collaboration between developing countries;
- Uses ICT to innovate in key areas of the school curriculum;
- Through e-learning circles engages sustained sharing between students and teachers in schools in different countries;
- Emphasises teacher training in the techniques of tele-collaboration, and has prepared toolkits.

Comments on the project emphasise the need to address problems of Internet connectivity and to keep materials in English concise and easy to understand. But participants found the experience positive. Schoolnet was cited to us in Laos as a model for future initiatives.

Targeted Budget Support – Education for All in Vietnam

The Government of Vietnam has designed and implemented a Targeted Budget Support (TBS) program designed to support the implementation of Vietnam's plan to achieve Education for All by 2015. The TBS program provides additional resources for provinces and districts to improve their services within seven "projects", including the completion of universal access to basic education, provision for ethnic minorities and disadvantaged regions, and qualitative improvements in such fields as curriculum materials and the use of ICT in education.

Vietnam identified a shortfall of about 20% between the needs requiring to be met by the program, and the resources which could be allocated from the State Budget. Over the period 2006-2008 a consortium of donors led by the World Bank is making up this short-fall (about US\$135m over the three years). The TBS partners (as the donor group is known) include a second multilateral – the EU – and five individual countries, one of which – New Zealand – is an EAS member. The Partners provide technical assistance as well as funding.

The TBS-EFA program illustrates how donors can form consortia to support Education for All plans designed and managed by recipient countries. Such partnerships raise difficult issues, notably for accountability and reporting. But by pooling resources they have the potential to deliver support across wide-ranging programs rather than just projects, and so to make some impact on key issues such as the attainment of Millennium Development Goals. They aim to build the recipient country's capacity to manage its programs and systems, rather than having to engage with the project management arrangements of a multiplicity of donors.

EAS donor countries could consider teaming up with multilaterals to undertake this type of project with the less developed EAS members in fulfilment of the proposed objective to reduce regional disparities in the provision of education within the EAS.

School-Based Action Research – Malaysia and Australia

The Programme for Innovation, Excellence and Research (PIER) commenced in 1993 as a collaborative undertaking between Malaysia and Australia with funding support from the World Bank. Australian consultants worked with Malaysian educators and ministry officials to develop a country-wide approach to action research by teachers within their own schools. Frameworks were developed, training provided, and the Ministry of Education has provided a substantial platform for this approach. Each state and region now has its own action research network, annual conferences are held, and the teachers' work is widely disseminated throughout Malaysian schools.

Malaysia is now assisting neighbouring countries to develop their own capacity and strategy for action research. The Ministry of Education is also currently undertaking an action research-based international project on gender education funded by the Commonwealth Secretariat, London. In 2009 Malaysia will host the APEC Conference on Best Practices in School-Based Action Research.

Human Values in Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Education

The project on Human Values in Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene Education (HVWSHE) was launched in 2003 as a collaborative activity involving the SEAMEO Secretariat, several SEAMEO Regional Centres (INNOTECH, SEAMOLEC and RECSAM), the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT) and the Asian Development Bank (ADB). It is focused on developing teaching and learning materials for Southeast Asian primary and secondary schools in four main strands: water and environmentally sustainable development; water for health, sanitation and recreation; water, human dignity and social equity; and water in culture, traditions and religious practices. The project is intended to serve as a demonstration project for effective values-based water and sanitation education practices in the region. It has a particular emphasis on 'training the trainer' including through the innovative use of distance education technologies.²⁸

Technical and Vocational Education and Training Sector

TVE Skills Competitions

The World Skills Competitions have a 55 year history. Every two years they bring together groups of young people from around the world to compete against each other in the execution of test projects in a wide variety of skill areas. National and regional competitions feed into the World Competition. The Seventh ASEAN Skills Competition will be held in Kuala Lumpur in November 2008.

The competitions aim to:

- promote the development of quality vocational skills and work values;
- foster technical cooperation in VTE among member countries; and
- recognise excellence within the new generation of highly skilled workers.

The competitions bring groups of students and trainers from different countries together not just in talking but in working. They help vocational trainers to benchmark themselves against best practice in other countries. Since many of the non-ASEAN members of the EAS participate in the World Skills Competitions there is potential to develop this activity on an EAS basis.

KRIVET – SEAMEO VOTTECH Educational Cooperation 2007-2009

The Korea Research Institute for Vocational Education and Training (KRIVET) and the SEAMEO Regional VOTTECH Centre in Brunei Darussalam have concluded a

²⁸ For further information see: <http://vbwse.seamolec.org/>

memorandum of understanding aimed at finding mutually beneficial ways for further cooperation.

They have embarked on a joint study of TVE provision in six countries – Brunei, the Philippines, Indonesia, Singapore, Thailand and Malaysia. The study will seek to map the availability of basic data, TVE providers, qualification systems, quality issues and financing arrangements. The study builds on work which KRIVET did in 2007 with Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam.

This cooperation illustrates the potential for research institutes in developed countries within the EAS region to partner SEAMEO Centres in joint research projects of wider regional benefit.

Higher Education Sector

ASEAN University Network (AUN)

The AUN concept was initiated at the Fourth ASEAN Summit held in Singapore in 1992, where the ASEAN leaders recognised the importance of cooperation in higher education and human resource development. Country leaders directed that ASEAN should help hasten the solidarity and the development of a regional identity by considering ways to further strengthen the existing network of the leading universities and institutions of higher learning in the region. That idea was later developed into ASEAN University Network (AUN) which was established in November 1995 with the signing of its Charter by the Ministers responsible for Higher Education from ASEAN countries, and the signing of the Agreement on the Establishment of the AUN by the presidents/rectors/vice-chancellors of participating universities (see AUN, 2006). The network now has 21 member universities from 10 ASEAN countries, and is coordinated through a Board of Trustees representing member institutions, and a Secretariat hosted by Thailand. The network has facilitated closer interactions between the member universities in the region at both staff and student levels through academic exchange, for example, through the distinguished scholars fellowship, and student conferences, e.g. the annual educational forum and youth cultural forum. The strengthening of quality assurance processes is a major focus of AUN activities.

AUN-SEED-Net

The South –East Asia Engineering Education Network (SEED-Net) unites the 21 universities of the ASEAN University Network with 11 support universities in Japan in a joint endeavour to improve research and teaching capacity in the field of engineering education. It supports universities in developing education and research capacities and promotes academic collaboration and solidarity within the region. The main funding for the project's activities is through the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA). The project fosters three forms of cooperation:

- between members generally on a bilateral basis;
- between universities in the least developed countries and other developing countries; and
- between Japan and the ASEAN countries.

The main products of AUN-Seednet are:

- the network between engineering education specialists in the participating universities;
- support to pursue advanced study at Masters and Doctoral level;
- support for research and for organising workshops and seminars.

The project has helped to upgrade staff qualifications through supporting higher degree study. It has awarded over 400 scholarships for Masters and PhD study, encouraged the launch of new graduate and international programs, supported journal publications and

conferences in the field of engineering, and facilitated over 150 collaborative research projects.

AUN-SEED-Net is a long-running collaboration which builds on existing structures and adds value to them. It could be a model for further initiatives in the field of higher education.

The Asia-Pacific Quality Network (APQN)

The APQN aims “to enhance the quality of higher education in Asia and the Pacific region through strengthening the work of quality assurance agencies and extending the cooperation between them.” It was founded in 2004 with launch funding from the World Bank, and has 47 members in one or more of its membership categories. There are members from most EAS countries, as well as from other countries in the APQN region, which covers the whole of Asia except the Gulf states, and the Pacific islands. The APQN provides resources discussion forums and training for its members. It is an interesting example of an organisation which brings together professionals from different countries to progress a critical aspect of international cooperation in education.

6.6 INTERNATIONAL PROJECTS ON EDUCATION INDICATORS AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Participation in international collaborative studies on education indicators and student achievement is an important way for countries to share information, benchmark their relative performance and identify priorities for policy development. Table 6.4 summarises the participation of the 16 EAS countries in a range of international indicator and achievement projects.

All of the EAS countries are involved in the work of the UNESCO Institute of Statistics, which provides key international data on education inputs, processes and outcomes, as well as progress towards meeting the EFA goals. Six of the countries are also involved in the World Education Indicators project, a joint activity of the UIS and OECD which seeks to collect data on policy-relevant indicators of the type reported annually in the OECD’s *Education at a Glance* (and to which the four EAS countries that are OECD members – Australia, Japan, RoK and New Zealand contribute).

Participation in international studies of student achievement involves eight EAS countries in the case of PISA and TIMSS, but only 3-4 countries for the other main achievement studies conducted by the IEA. It would seem therefore that quite a few EAS countries do not have available to them data on their students’ achievement that would enable them to compare and contrast performance with other countries.

Although care is needed in making international comparisons, this broader perspective can help to generate new ideas for overcoming deficiencies, and strengths can be better appreciated. From the perspective of developing countries in particular, participation in international studies can be a very cost-effective means of capacity building by providing direct contact with experts and researchers in other countries.

One potential issue for a number of EAS countries is that a number of the international student achievement studies are focused on secondary education. For developing countries in particular, the higher priority is likely to be student achievement in primary education as secondary participation rates are relatively low (see Appendix 3). Developing relevant measures of educational quality at primary school level could be a focus for the EAS countries in collaboration with groups such as the IEA and OECD.

Table 6.4: Participation of EAS Countries in Selected International Projects on Education Indicators and Student Achievement

EAS country	UIS	EAG	WEI	PISA	ICCS	TIMSS	TEDS	PIRLS
Australia	•	•		•		•		
Brunei	•							
Darussalam								
Cambodia	•							
China	•		•	•				
India	•		•					
Indonesia	•		•	•	•	•		
Japan	•	•		•		•		
Republic of Korea	•	•		•		•		
Lao PDR	•							
Malaysia	•		•			•	•	•
Myanmar	•							
New Zealand	•	•		•	•	•		•
Philippines	•		•				•	
Singapore	•			•		•	•	•
Thailand	•		•	•	•	•	•	
Viet Nam	•							
<i>No. of EAS countries taking part</i>	16	4	6	8	3	8	4	3
<i>Total no. of countries taking part</i>	192	30	19	67	40	62	17	41

Key to acronyms

EAS – East Asia Summit

UIS – UNESCO Institute of Statistics

EAG – Education at a Glance: OECD Education Indicators

WEI – World Education Indicators, a joint UIS-OECD project that develops policy-relevant indicators in collaboration with national coordinators

PISA – Programme for International Student Assessment 2009, an OECD project that measures 15 year-olds' competencies in reading, mathematics and science.

 ICCS – International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2009, conducted by the IEA (International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement). The study will investigate the ways in which students in the 8th grade are prepared to undertake their roles as citizens

 TIMSS – Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study 2007, conducted by the IEA. The study is measuring trends in achievement in mathematics and science; among 4th and 8th graders

TEDS – Teacher Education and Development Study in Mathematics 2008, conducted by the IEA. The project is studying the preparation of teachers of mathematics at primary and lower secondary levels

 PIRLS – Progress in International Reading Literacy Study 2006, conducted by the IEA. The study is assessing trends in 4th graders' reading literacy.

7 SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF CURRENT COOPERATION IN THE REGION

This chapter provides a more detailed discussion of particular aspects of educational cooperation in the EAS region, namely free trade agreements, international student flows, and scholarship schemes.

7.1 FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS AND EDUCATION

Introduction

The project examined 19 free trade agreements (FTAs) between countries of the EAS, including both bilateral and multilateral agreements. This section briefly examines their significance and potential for international trade and cooperation in education services.

Education Services fall within the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). The sections of FTAs which deal with services follow a framework derived from GATS. Some of its main features are:

- Supply is classified by the four modes – (1) cross-border supply, (2) consumption abroad, (3) commercial presence, and (4) presence of natural persons (see Table 3.3 of this report);
- Liberalisation of trade is based on the three concepts of market access, national treatment and most favoured nation treatment;
- Parties to an FTA make commitments going beyond their commitments in GATS to liberalise trade in services. Commitments are listed in schedules to the FTA either on a positive or negative basis (i.e. liberalisation takes place only in the sectors specifically committed in the schedules, or in all sectors except those covered by reservations in the schedules).

As noted below, some FTAs also include commitments to non-commercial educational cooperation between the parties.

ASEAN concluded its own Framework Agreement on Services (AFAS) in 1995. The five priority areas for liberalisation under AFAS are air travel, e-ASEAN, healthcare, tourism and logistics. Mutual recognition of education, licenses and certificates is a field within AFAS. The EAS has initiated some work on free trade. At their next summit EAS leaders expect to receive a report from scholars and academics on a Comprehensive Economic Partnership for East Asia (CEPEA).

There does not seem to be any literature specific to the negotiation of education services within Asia-Pacific FTAs, but there is a significant body of literature about services aspects of FTAs generally. Within the ASEAN area, two examples of REPSF work may be cited. Thanh and Bartlett (2005) found slow progress with the achievement of AFAS objectives, including the conclusion of just one mutual recognition arrangement (MRA), for the engineering profession.²⁹ Ochiai (2006) made a similar finding in relation to the ASEAN priority service sectors. He also looked at the impact of existing trade barriers relating to the priority service sectors and concluded that, at least in some countries, prices were significantly higher as a result of trade barriers.

Some of the barriers to trade commonly perceived in education are:

- Non-recognition of periods of study and qualifications is a potential barrier in all modes of supply;

²⁹ There is also now a MRA for nursing services.

- Visa requirements and restrictions of various kinds affect consumption abroad and movement of natural persons. However immigration controls are usually exempted from FTAs;
- In seeking commercial presence education suppliers may encounter, for example, delays in obtaining approvals to operate, and requirements such as a level of local ownership in their business.

The Current Agreements

The 19 agreements reviewed for the report are summarised in Table 7.1.

Table 7.1: Free Trade Agreements in the EAS Area

Multilateral agreements	
1	ASEAN Free Trade Area (AFTA)
2	ASEAN - China Framework Agreement
3	ASEAN-Republic of Korea FTA
4	Trans-Pacific Strategic Economic Partnership (SEP) between Brunei, Chile New Zealand and Singapore (P4 Agreement)
Bilateral agreements	
5	Australia New Zealand Closer Economic Relations Trade Agreement (ANZCERTA)
6	China -Thailand Free Trade Agreement
7	India -Thailand Free Trade Agreement
8	Japan-Brunei Darussalam Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA)
9	Japan-Indonesia EPA
10	Japan-Malaysia EPA
11	Japan-Philippines EPA
12	Japan-Singapore New Age Economic Partnership
13	Japan-Thailand EPA
14	Republic of Korea and Singapore FTA
15	New Zealand-China FTA
16	New Zealand-Singapore Closer Economic Partnership
17	Singapore-Australia FTA
18	Thailand-Australia FTA
19	Thailand-New Zealand FTA

Note: The list of numbers is used to facilitate discussion in the text, and does not indicate the date at which the respective agreement was enacted.

This may not be a full list of completed agreements; certainly many others are in course of negotiation. Within the list numbers (2), (5), (6) and (7) have no substantive provisions on services.

Areas of interest in FTAs for this study include:

- The extent to which one party to the FTA accords market access, national treatment and most favoured nation status to suppliers of education and training services domiciled in the area of another party;
- The treatment of professions, including recognition of qualifications; and
- Specific commitments to educational cooperation.

Commitments to Market Access

The analysis of (a) - commitments made - is a matter of some complexity. In a schedule of commitments Education Services are divided into Primary, Secondary, Higher, Adult and Other. Commitments are specific both to the five levels and to each of the four modes of supply, and may be subject to limitations. Within the same FTA Party A and Party B may make different commitments with respect to education. Commitments also need to be read in the context of the FTA as a whole, which may contain separate relevant provisions about matters such as recognition and exemptions e.g. for immigration control and services supplied in the exercise of government authority. For all these reasons the analysis of education commitments needs to be the subject of a specialist study; the following just provides some examples:

- Typically in its EPAs Japan makes no commitment for Primary and Secondary Education in respect of Modes 1, 2 and 4 but commits Mode 3 (Commercial Presence) with the limitation that Formal Educational Institutions must be established by “school juridical persons” (a form of not-for-profit status recognised in Japanese law). Japan commits Higher Education, Adult Education and Other Services without limitation, other than applying the school juridical persons limit to Higher Education. Japan makes clear that its commitments are not to be construed so as to apply to the recognition of credits, degrees and certificates by formal education institutions;
- In the ASEAN-Korea FTA, the Republic of Korea commits higher education and parts of adult education and vocational training, in respect of Modes 2-4. Mode 1 (Cross-Border Supply) is excluded from the agreement. There are some limitations in Mode 3 – institutions have to be established by juridical persons and will not normally be approved in the Seoul area.
- Under the Singapore-Australia FTA, Singapore has provided full national treatment and market access commitments for university, adult and vocational and technical education, with only limited exceptions.

Greater liberalisation in the market for tertiary education than for school education is a common feature of FTAs. An overall conclusion, however, is that relatively few EAS countries have made any commitments to market access in the education sector in either bilateral FTA negotiations or in the WTO Doha Round.

Mutual Recognition of Study Credits and Qualifications

As noted above, mutual recognition is a key issue in all modes of supply, for example to facilitate:

- The movement of teaching staff and students across national borders; and
- To give confidence to education investors that their products will be accepted in countries where they propose to establish commercial presence.

AFAS includes a permissive provision (Article V) relating to recognition:

“1. Each member state may recognise the education or experience obtained, requirements met, or licenses or certifications granted in another member State, for the purpose of licensing or certification of service suppliers. Such a recognition may be based upon an agreement or arrangement with the Member State concerned or may be accorded autonomously.

2. Nothing in paragraph 1 shall be so construed as to require any Member State to accept or enter into such mutual recognition agreements or arrangements.”

Most FTAs include similar permissive provisions; some include commitments to an early start on negotiations to achieve mutual recognition. For example the China-New Zealand FTA establishes Joint Working Groups to explore academic recognition, and recognition of

vocational qualifications. Similar process commitments are built into some other FTAs. Some of the sharpest commitments are found in the Singapore-India FTA and the P4 Agreement. In both cases as well as a general commitment to processes to achieve mutual recognition the parties identify a list of professions as priorities for early action, and agree to time-limited negotiations. The Singapore- India agreement includes in a separate section on education direct provision for the mutual recognition of university degrees awarded in Singapore and India.

Educational Cooperation

A number of FTAs provide for educational cooperation in some shape or form. The fullest provision is made in the Singapore-Australia FTA and the P4 Agreement which are very similar in this respect, specifying cooperation across eight broad fields. Some of this is clearly related to trade facilitation (e.g. work on mutual recognition) but there are also items like joint research programs and staff exchanges which are commonly found elsewhere in memoranda of understanding between national ministries of education. The Republic of Korea and Singapore agree to facilitate the launch of double degree programs between their higher education institutions, and re-affirm support for their Third Country Training Programme in providing technical assistance.

Developing the Potential of FTAs to Enhance Educational Cooperation

Recent years have seen a great expansion in international trade in educational services, especially in Consumption Abroad and in Commercial Presence. In view of their recent conclusion and, in many cases, limited scope, it seems likely that hitherto FTAs have had no more than a modest impact in facilitating this expansion.

The absence of mutual recognition of educational and vocational periods of study and qualifications seems a key issue which applies to all modes of supply. If the relevant authorities were able to negotiate recognition agreements which could be adopted into FTAs, the FTAs would have greater impact. Alternatively mutual recognition can be built directly into FTAs as with Singapore-India, though this latter course might overload the already complex FTA process.

Mutual recognition will only occur if each party to an FTA has confidence about the equivalence of the educational systems of the other parties. That in turn implies robust arrangements for the regulation of key aspects of provision in each country, notably for quality assurance and provider accreditation. The EAS could consider an initiative to build capacity in these fields among its member countries, as a means to make education systems in the area more open, and so to pave the way for closer co-operation. Such capacity building could also embrace the skills needed to negotiate trade agreements in education services.

In terms of the individual supply modes it may be appropriate to give priority to the removal of restrictions on Commercial Presence and Cross-Border Supply, not least because these restrictions are usually trade-related, while restrictions relating to Consumption Abroad and Movement of Natural Persons often relate to matters such as immigration rules which do not lend themselves to transaction through FTAs.

In principle, the EAS could play a valuable role in facilitating mutual recognition agreements, discussing other trade barriers, notably in the Commercial Presence mode, and drafting model provisions which could be built into individual FTAs, or indeed into CEPEA if it develops in that direction. Many FTAs have already been concluded and others are close to settlement, and such agreements may be hard to renegotiate. However, most such FTAs allow discretion to apply at least recognition agreements subsequently negotiated. There may be scope to factor in other common provisions if EAS members can agree them.

7.2 INTERNATIONAL STUDENT FLOWS

The international mobility of students, especially at higher education level, is an increasingly important aspect of the internationalisation of education, with implications for bilateral and multilateral arrangement between countries (Resnik, 2006). This was reflected in the terms of reference, where the study was asked to collect some basic data on international student flows between countries.

The data on international student flows are somewhat limited. The tables prepared by the UNESCO Institute of Statistics are the only source which provides data on flows of students between the majority of EAS countries on a comparable basis; these data focus on study at ISCED Levels 5 (tertiary education) and 6 (advanced research qualifications). As such they are commonly used by researchers (e.g. the Centre for International Economics in their 2008 report on APEC and international education) as well as in this report. More recent and extensive data are available for some EAS countries from national sources, but for many EAS countries that is not the case, and the available national data are not always comparable in the definitions and methodologies they use. Given the importance of international student flows, improving the coverage and comparability of the data is a priority for EAS member countries.

Students Studying in Other Countries

This section examines statistics compiled by UNESCO³⁰ to examine the flows of students traveling from countries within the area of the East Asia Summit to other EAS countries, and to selected countries in the rest of the world (i.e. those known to host large populations of overseas students). The results are shown in Appendix 4 (Tables A.5 to A.7). They relate to students at ISCED Levels 5 and 6 in tertiary education. The use of the UNESCO statistics was necessary because only a few EAS member countries (e.g. Australia, Japan and New Zealand) have readily accessible collections of international student statistics, and the time-scale of this study did not permit the collection of new data on student flows. Some conclusions from the available national data are noted below.

As is recognised by UNESCO and users, the available data have a number of limitations. Among the most important are:

- a) For most countries the latest available figures are for 2005, and there are significant gaps, reflecting gaps in the data which countries were able to give to UNESCO;
- b) The tables cover only higher education and the “high-end” aspects of TVE included in ISCED Level 5. There are no comprehensive data for international flows of students for the whole TVE sector, or for schools; and
- c) The tables cover only those students who cross borders to obtain tertiary education, not those who access it from a foreign-based provider while remaining in their own country.

These data limitations mean that:

- as regards (a) UNESCO has no data for the number of students hosted in China. China indicated that they hosted about 140,000 students in 2007; and
- as regards (b), Australia, Japan and New Zealand publish much fuller data about international students in their territories. The UNESCO tables show Australia with 142,000 tertiary education students from all EAS countries in 2005. In the same year

³⁰ Specifically, Tables 17 and 18 from the set published by the UNESCO Institute of Statistics Data Centre – see <http://stats.uis.unesco.org/unesco/ReportFolders/ReportFolders.aspx> Singapore was not a member country of UNESCO during the period covered by the data.

Australia's own statistics show it to have 262,000 overseas students from Asia³¹, of whom 137,000 are in Higher Education, 50,000 in the general TVE sector, 52,000 in the English language sector, and 23,000 in schools.

The data drawn from UNESCO (Table 18 in their collection) do not include gender as a field. Table 17 does, but gives only an overall gender ratio for all foreign students in each host country. Australia and Japan are two countries in the EAS area which host large numbers of students from elsewhere in the area. In each year between 1999 and 2005 the percentage of foreign students who were female rose in Japan from 43% to 49%. In Australia the trend was less steady but in the opposite direction, declining slightly from 49% to 46%. In New Zealand male and female international students stayed very close to 50:50 throughout the period.

With all these caveats, the UNESCO data enable the following broad conclusions to be drawn.

- The total number of international students from EAS countries studying at tertiary level in all the countries covered by the tables rose by almost 90% between 1999 and 2005, from 440,000 to 835,000. Of the students in 2005, about 140,000 are from ASEAN countries and about 695,000 from countries elsewhere in the EAS area.
- Nearly all³² the growth in numbers between 1999 and 2005 is accounted for by students from EAS countries outside ASEAN. In 1999 there was 1 international student from ASEAN for every 3.3 from other EAS countries; by 2005 the ratio was 1:5.
- International flows of tertiary students have grown faster within the EAS area than the flows between EAS member countries and countries outside it: in Table A.7 the total intra-EAS flow grew between 1999 and 2005 by a factor of 2.3, while the flow of students from EAS countries to selected other hosts grew by a factor of 1.7.

The dominant factor in overall numbers is China. The total increase between 1999 and 2005 in the number of students from China studying in all the selected countries was 264,000. The equivalent figure for India is 85,000. These two countries account for 89% of the net increase in international student numbers over the period of 390,000.

In interpreting these figures relative populations are important. The UNESCO figures can be arranged by country of origin as well as by host country. These show in 2005 358,000 overseas students from China and 130,000 from India, making 488,000 in all. By comparison the total of ASEAN origin is 134,000. However, the populations of China and India are 1.3 billion and 1.1 billion respectively, together 4.2 times the population of ASEAN (570 million). So ASEAN still sends rather more students overseas pro rata to population than do China and India combined.

UNESCO included a valuable survey of cross-border student flows in its *Global Education Digest* (GED) 2006. The GED makes the point that between 1999 and 2004, the East Asia and Pacific region grew to be the largest source of international students among the world's regions. But the region's outbound mobility ratio (OMR)³³ at just under 2% is around the world average and has been fairly stable over the period. In other words, the reason for East Asia's prominence in international student flows is not a higher propensity to travel to other countries for study, but an average propensity to travel applied to a very large and fast growing tertiary student population.

Among individual EAS countries, China has an OMR of 1.8%, close to the world average, and India at 1.1% is well below average; some ASEAN countries, such as Malaysia and

³¹ Actually from the three regions, South and Central, South-East and North-East Asia. These regions are wider than the EAS area, but EAS accounts for the great bulk of the overseas students from them.

³² Table A.5 shows numbers from ASEAN growing from 135,000 in 1999 to 139,000 in 2006; it probably understates the true growth slightly because the table lacks data for Singapore..

³³ Mobile students from the region as a percentage of students enrolled in the region.

Brunei are well above average, while others such as Indonesia and the Philippines are well below; Vietnam is now close to the average.

Having said that, there may be concern at the relatively slow growth in international student numbers from ASEAN countries. Among this group, in 1999 Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand and Singapore had relatively large numbers of students studying overseas. None of these experienced growth in the total number studying overseas from 1999 to 2005. There was some growth in numbers from some other ASEAN countries – e.g. numbers from Vietnam grew significantly, although from a small base.

Some of the ASEAN countries emerged as significant hosts for international students over the period, notably Malaysia. In the tables on student flows in Appendix 4, the data for Malaysia stop at 2003, when Malaysia had 20,339 international students from all the EAS countries at ISCED Levels 5 and 6. Malaysia has provided supplementary data which showed the numbers of international students in their public and private higher education institutions at 20,275 in 2004 and 21,562. Students from China and Indonesia accounted for three-quarters of the total. . There are no data for Singapore as a host in the UNESCO tables in Appendix 4 because it was not a member at the time, but Singapore has indicated that it currently had about 80,000 international students enrolled in all sectors.

In 1999 the top three host countries for students from ASEAN were the United States, the United Kingdom and Australia. By 2005 Australia was showing a small increase in numbers of students from ASEAN countries, the UK a small decline and the US a significant decline. By contrast France, Germany, the Netherlands and Japan all showed increases in numbers of students from ASEAN of over 50% over the period, starting from much lower bases than the US, the UK and Australia.

The US is far the largest host for EAS students outside the EAS area. Its relatively slow rate of growth in recruitment of students from the EAS goes far to explain why intra-EAS flows grew faster than external flows, as noted above. Between 1999 and 2005 the total number of tertiary students from the EAS studying in the US grew by a factor of 1.5, whereas for the other hosts outside the EAS shown in Table A 7 the growth factor was 2.1. The US has always been strongly positioned in the mature markets of Japan and the Republic of Korea where growth was slower over this period.

Commercial Presence and Cross-border Supply

As noted above, cross-border student flows are only one way for students in one country to access education managed or delivered by a supplier based in another country. The other modes are:

- Commercial presence, where providers based in one country establish international campuses in another country, or franchise courses etc; and
- Cross-border supply, typically where courses are offered through distance education.

There are no systematic international data on the take-up of these modes. Such data as are available underscore their growing significance. For example, in 2006 Australia recorded 68,000 higher education enrolments with Australian providers based outside Australia, and 20,000 in distance education provided from Australia. Fifteen foreign universities are now established in Singapore, and together provide for over a third of its higher education students.

International campuses are perhaps most associated with “enterprise zones” like Hong Kong and Singapore which are close to major markets. But they also occur in countries such as Indonesia and Vietnam where the risks may be greater, as well as in the most developed countries of the EAS region. As well as access to growing markets, the degree of ease or difficulty of establishing in different countries appears to be a significant factor in their distribution. EAS countries vary in the extent to which they are ready to open up the domestic

market for education to entry by foreign suppliers through free trade agreements, and in the degree of domestic partnering which may be required.

Issues Raised in the Consultations

Developing countries stressed that their demand for foreign tertiary education could not be met wholly or mainly through self-funded study; scholarships continued to be important. Most of the developed countries in the region offer scholarship schemes (see section 7.3 below).

A striking finding in several countries was the magnitude of plans to expand provision for foreign students:

- China aims to go from 140,000 foreign students in 2007 to 500,000 by 2020;
- the Republic of Korea aims to go from 12,600 foreign students in 2005 to 50,000 by 2010³⁴;
- Japan aims to go from 118,000 foreign students in 2007 to 300,000 by 2020.
- Malaysia has set itself a goal to enroll 100,000 international students at secondary and tertiary levels by 2010;
- Singapore aims to enroll 150,000 international students by 2015.

There was no opportunity to explore these plans in detail; they often embrace all types of international student and so do not compare directly with the tables in this report. Nonetheless such expansion implies the need for a varied menu, to match the diverse needs and resources of prospective students. This might include for example:

- Courses delivered partly in the home country (2+2 etc), or wholly in the home country (commercial presence);
- Measures to overcome language barriers, such as teaching in English;
- Partnerships with foreign institutions to provide pathways from undergraduate to postgraduate courses, foundation years and other preparatory courses etc.

A further expansion of self-funded study overseas will only happen if it provides benefits to students and their families as well as to suppliers. As competition in the market intensifies, students should have more choice and lower prices, but countries recognise that a market which takes young people far from home and requires substantial pre-payments, needs careful regulation to protect student interests, and the reputation of bona fide suppliers. Another question raised was whether there are saturation points where the sheer number of foreign students pressing to pursue a particular field of study in a particular institution was such as must change fundamentally the nature of the education received, and perhaps compromise the benefits sought.

International Student Flows - Conclusions

Two conclusions stand out from this analysis of international student flows:

- a) An increase in such flows exerts pressure for convergence between national higher education systems in fields such as quality assurance, the transfer of study credits, the recording of achievements and qualifications, and information about qualification structures and pathways. Increasingly countries, including in the EAS region, are recognising the need to address these matters, but with caution because countries have different starting points, and different capacities and time-frames for effecting change:
- b) The data currently available are not adequate to support an active policy stance on international flows at EAS level. With respect to consumption abroad, it would be desirable to have for each member country the number of international students which it hosts from other countries, analysed by country of origin and by level of

³⁴ Korea will set a new goal as its 2010 goal is already accomplished.

education – higher education, TVET and schools. With respect to commercial presence, data are needed about the number of foreign owned institutions at each educational level, and the numbers of international and domestic students which they cater for.

The next chapter considers whether the EAS might have a role in promoting dialogue and change in the field in regard to conclusion (a). Conclusion (b) needs further study, perhaps by the Task-Force of education experts from EAS member governments recommended in Chapter 8. Issues include what data can be supplied from existing sources at least by the major education exporters who have the strongest interest in keeping it, and what priority the developing countries can accord to international student data in their wider efforts to enhance their statistical collections.

7.3 SCHOLARSHIP SCHEMES

This section focuses on schemes which offer scholarships to international students from the EAS region for study within the region. It thus excludes schemes offered by EAS countries to their own nationals and schemes offered by countries outside the EAS region to students from within it. Both of these types of excluded scheme are important sources of support for students within the EAS region.

Within the EAS area a variety of providers offer scholarships to international students. These include:

- Universities and research institutes, which in some cases have their own scholarship funds;
- NGOs, often in association with private foundations. An example well-known in the region is the Asian Scholarship Foundation in Bangkok which is linked to the Ford Foundation;
- Companies which offer scholarships for prospective employees and in fields of interest to them; and
- Governments and multilateral bodies.

Because of the diversity of providers and schemes it would be beyond the capability of this project to attempt a thorough map of schemes, even within the limits set above. At their meeting in Kuala Lumpur in March 2008 the ASEAN Education Ministers tasked the ASEAN Secretariat in close cooperation with the SEAMEO Secretariat to collaborate with the Ministries of Education to produce a guidebook on existing scholarship programmes. UNESCO Bangkok already maintains a directory along these lines³⁵.

This section looks at government scholarship schemes, which are the ones which EAS governments have the most scope to influence. A table of some of the main schemes is given at Appendix 5. The material was compiled from web-sites, and may have omitted schemes and detail which more systematic enquiries would have captured.

It is apparent that governments have different motives for supporting scholarship schemes and sometimes (e.g. Australia) draw up separate schemes for the different motives:

- Some schemes are explicitly developmental, as shown by the countries and the personnel which they target, by the fields of study, and sometimes by stipulations about returning to the home country to give service. These developmental schemes are often open to undergraduates and VTE students as well as to graduates;

³⁵ *Directory of Scholarships and Grants for Students and Researchers in Asia and the Pacific* - see <http://www2.unescobkk.org/elib/publications/dirscholarships/summary.pdf>

- Other schemes, especially at the post-graduate level aim to attract excellent students world-wide, with a view to raising the prestige and productiveness of higher education and science in the awarding country;
- Schemes may serve to advertise the attractions of a country's tertiary education system with a view to recruiting not just scholars but also self-funded students.

Given that scholars may always return to their home countries on completion these aims are not necessarily in conflict, but motivation needs to be clear.

Schemes also vary in their ways of specifying eligible countries of origin:

- Developmental schemes may be open to all developing countries in the target region (as with the ADB-Japan Scholarships) or to a selection of them based on the aid priorities of the country of offer;
- Scholarships aiming at excellence may have regional rather than world-wide ambit;
- Few schemes explicitly target regional groups of countries. One example is Singapore's ASEAN Scholarship Program.

The criteria for selecting scholars include:

- Academic excellence;
- Field of study relevant to developmental objective, other objective supported by the awarding country;
- Strong personal qualities, including future leadership potential.

Scholarships - Conclusions

Scholarship schemes are expensive, and therefore highly selective. In terms of absolute numbers even the largest schemes are quite small relative to total international student flows. There seems to be consensus among donors and recipients that to get the best effect from a limited number of scholarships, a focus on post-graduate studies and on students with high potential is needed.

In the developmental field it seems particularly effective to use the scholarships to help the developing country to expand its own system of higher education and enhance its quality. In particular, developed countries can offer facilities for doctoral studies which may simply not exist in some specialisations in some developing countries. High cost disciplines like science and technology were also advocated, especially where the studies aligned with home country development priorities.

Where schemes aim to attract excellent scholars from a regional or global field, the issue for the EAS may be whether the proposed fields of study match regional interests, such as the need for research into sustainable uses of energy and the moderation of climate change.

The terms of reference asked whether scholarship schemes could be expanded within the EAS framework. They could be, and some possible target areas are outlined above. An expansion of scholarships might best be addressed within the framework of broader proposals to enhance mobility and interchange in tertiary education in the EAS area. It is noted that the Government of Japan sees the need for a dramatic expansion of exchanges among the universities of the Asia-Pacific and proposes to hold consultations on an Asian version of the European Erasmus program (which includes scholarships as well as other measures) with a view to reaching conclusions at his year's East Asia Summit.

As well as expanding provision for scholarships, it would also be possible to re-brand existing schemes so that their availability and relevance to students from other EAS countries was more apparent.

8 OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES FOR HARNESSING EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION

Following on from the review in the preceding chapters of models of cooperation and their benefits, and of the forms which it currently takes in the EAS area, this chapter proposes objectives, priority areas themes, and processes for enhanced educational cooperation in the EAS area, and makes recommendations for further action.

8.1 OBJECTIVES OF ENHANCED EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION

Objectives are discussed first because choices about priorities and working methods should be founded in the objectives which the EAS countries wish to achieve through educational cooperation.

Sources for a Statement of Objectives

The EAS leaders have not yet explicitly addressed the purpose of educational cooperation within the EAS area. When they agreed at their Second Summit to strengthen educational cooperation, they went on to welcome “initiatives to improve regional understanding and the appreciation of one another’s heritage and history”³⁶ At the Third Summit the leaders welcomed the progress with the revival of Nalanda University as a centre for cultural exchange and inter-religious study, and the progress of youth exchange in East Asia³⁷. These statements suggest that the EAS leaders would welcome the inclusion of an objective to enhance mutual understanding among the peoples of the EAS countries- a purpose which found wide support in the consultations.

The following measures for educational cooperation in ASEAN are built into the Vientiane Action Programme (VAP), under the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community pillar:

- a) Facilitating universal access to education and promoting high standards through networking and institutional collaboration;
- b) Promoting science and technology in ASEAN to improve regional human resources by developing science and technology culture and increasing usage of applied science and technology in socio-economic activities.
- c) Developing and enhancing human resources in the work-force through the net-working of skills training institutions, and the development of regional assessment and training programs; and
- d) Mainstreaming the promotion of ASEAN awareness and regional identity in national communications plans and educational curricula, people to people contact through arts, tourism and sports, especially among the youth, and the promotion of ASEAN languages learning through scholarships and exchange of linguists.

ASEAN Education Ministers have done further work to define objectives for educational cooperation in the ASEAN area:

- Promoting ‘ASEAN-ness’ among ASEAN citizens, particularly youth;
- Strengthening ASEAN identity through education;
- Building ASEAN human resources in the field of education; and
- Strengthening ASEAN University networking.

It was against the background of all these statements that the main objective set for this study was expressed as “to strengthen community building and enhance regional competitiveness in a balanced and sustainable manner through cooperation in education”.

³⁶ Chairman’s Statement of the Second East Asia Summit, Cebu, Philippines, 15th Jan 2007, para 7.

³⁷ Chairman’s Statement of the Third East Asia Summit Singapore, 21 Nov 2007, paras 17 and 18.

In discussing objectives during the country visits, there general support for the following points:

- Mutual understanding was important, recognising the size and diversity of the EAS region and should be pursued through language learning as well as heritage and history. The English language has a special place as a medium of intercourse between the different peoples in the region, and their partners from other continents, but learning the languages of neighbouring countries is also important for mutual understanding;
- The objectives should cover all phases of education, to an appropriate extent;
- The objectives should reflect a concern to enhance educational opportunities for those people in the EAS least able to access them now, especially in the developing countries of the region; and
- The objectives should aim at excellence in education as a value in its own right, and to promote the economic competitiveness of the EAS in world markets.

Participants at the Jakarta Workshop in June 2008 made a number of comments on objectives. Those which were specific to the text before them have been built into the revised statement below. In more general discussion it was argued on the one hand that the objectives should be more original and visionary, more specific about goals, and include time frames; and on the other hand that account had to be taken of the diversity of the EAS area. According to the latter view there is more prospect of countries agreeing to move together if the objectives and priorities are expressed in broad terms. It is not easy to satisfy all those requirements. But two points may be helpful:

- A statement of objectives to be adopted by the EAS might be preceded by a preamble setting out the considerations which the leaders had taken into account, as with the Singapore Declaration on Climate Change. These considerations would include some which are time-bound, such as the EFA goals and ASEAN Economic Integration, both of which have targets for 2015;
- The EAS could consider establishing some goals for its work on educational cooperation, in a form such as: "By 2020 the EAS should establish a cooperative zone for tertiary education, characterised by common systems for quality assurance, qualification structures and statements of attainment". Or the EAS could follow Europe in adopting a few strategic objectives for education buttressed by a larger number of specific objectives³⁸. However the debate needed to reach consensus on such specific goals or objectives lies beyond the scope of the present project.

Formulation of Objectives

With these considerations in mind, the following objectives are proposed for cooperation in the EAS. These seek to reflect the role that education can play in community building, promoting economic competitiveness, and reducing inequalities.

1. *To build communities among the peoples of the EAS countries, notably through*
 - *Increasing the mobility of students, teachers and researchers in the area;*
 - *The appreciation of one another's heritage and history; and*
 - *The learning of other languages.*
2. *To create competitive advantage for the EAS region by:*
 - *Promoting excellence at all levels of education through the exchange of information on good practice, and by bench-marking; and*
 - *Enlarging choice in tertiary education and in the labour market through measures to facilitate the movement of students, staff and tertiary-qualified personnel across national borders, and by enlarging access for tertiary education providers to national markets.*

³⁸ See the Lisbon objectives at http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/rep_fut_obj_en.pdf

3. *To reduce disparities in educational opportunity within and between countries in order to:*
 - *Facilitate access to basic and non-formal education and promote high standards through networking and institutional collaboration;*
 - *Promote tertiary education and training in home countries, especially in the fields of science and technology, as a means to economic development.*

8.2 PRIORITY AREAS FOR COOPERATION

In principle the distinction between objectives and priority areas is clear-cut. Objectives are the purposes for which cooperation is undertaken; priority areas are the fields in which cooperation is pursued. In practice the relationship between the two concepts is close. This section considers which areas of endeavour deserve priority within the EAS region.

Criteria for Assessing Possible Priorities

There is a natural temptation to advocate international cooperation to advance any aspect of education one feels strongly about. It was generally recognised in the consultations that educational cooperation between countries is necessary in order to achieve common goals, and is often professionally rewarding. But it can also be time-consuming and expensive. As resources are limited, countries and multilateral organisations select areas for cooperation, according to priority to those which are most germane to their objectives.

Respective Roles of EAS and the Member States

Some advocate that the EAS should undertake educational cooperation only in those areas where progress is not possible without international collaboration, leaving all else to the member states (the “subsidiarity principle”). However different member states may reach different conclusions if the subsidiarity test is left in its starkest form. The European Union Treaty provides that

“The Community shall contribute to the development of quality education by encouraging cooperation between Member States and, if necessary, by supporting and supplementing their action, while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States for the content of teaching and the organization of education systems and their cultural and linguistic diversity.”

This formulation of the spheres of multilateral and member state action may be suggestive for the EAS.

Duplication between Multilaterals

Member countries expressed concerns about the number of multilateral organisations – UNESCO, APEC, OECD, APEEM etc – already active in educational cooperation in the region and the need to avoid duplication and waste, including in any new initiatives stimulated by the EAS. This is not a straightforward issue, because some EAS members are not members of the other organisations in question and because those other organisations have somewhat different emphases, and may choose to pursue a topic in ways which do not always suit EAS interests. Perhaps the best approach will be for the EAS to set its own objectives and priority themes in the first instance, mapping the extent to which these match the interests of other multilaterals as it does so. Once objectives and priorities are identified, the EAS can choose whether to initiate action itself, to collaborate with another multilateral organisation, or not to initiate action for the time being on the grounds that its interests are adequately covered by the work of another multilateral.

Priority Areas Already Suggested

As noted above, the EAS Country Leaders have not as yet explicitly defined areas of priority for educational cooperation, but they have implied support for cultural cooperation and student exchange as priorities, in line with the proposed objective of enhancing mutual understanding among peoples.

Following the 2nd EAS Summit the ASEAN Education Ministers agreed to explore possible cooperation with EAS partner countries in the following areas:

- Teacher training
- Teaching and learning of languages, especially English language,
- Vocational and technical education
- Use of ICT in education³⁹.

During the visits several countries remarked on the resemblance between the list suggested by ASEAN and the one drawn up by APEC for consideration at the APEC Education Ministers' Meeting in June 2008, namely:

- Mathematics and Science
- Career and Technical Education
- Learning each others' Languages
- Information and Communication Technologies and Systemic Reform.⁴⁰

In the consultations countries were invited to comment on the four priorities suggested by ASEAN. All four received widespread support. Having said that, there were some differences between countries in the interpretation of these four priorities.

As APEC observes, Teacher Training is not a content theme on a par with, say, English Language, but a cross-cutting support theme. Most countries took the view that the Teacher Training priority embraced the whole range of training in its relationship to the quality of teaching, including both pre-service and in-service training, and other forms of professional development. This latter view is supported by the formulation in the Kuala Lumpur Joint Statement. There are centres of expertise in the region which take such a comprehensive view of teacher training.

All countries visited were active in using Information and Communications Technology to support education in a variety of ways. Some priorities in this field were suggested in the consultations:

- Enlarging access to ICT for education. This includes supplying electricity to schools, translating software into local languages, and making software more affordable;
- Developing ICT as a tool to support the professional development of teachers, with priority in some countries for teachers working in rural and remote areas;
- Developing ICT applications in the teaching of the curriculum at all levels of education. The potential here is very wide. The priorities for EAS cooperation might be applications linked to EAS's "content" priorities, such as language learning.

There are strong centres for ICT development in many EAS countries, including ones which have an international remit.

Given that the ASEAN Education Ministers have brought the phrase "Upgrading the Standard of Teaching" into the debate, it is suggested that that could be the focus of a priority area which includes teacher training and ICT, as both are means of achieving the common end of better teaching across the curriculum.

There was general agreement about the importance of the Learning of Foreign Languages for community building and mutual understanding, in accordance with the First Objective proposed for EAS cooperation. English is the most common medium of international communication in the EAS area, and it is the official language of ASEAN. Often it will be the

³⁹ The Joint Statement of the 3rd ASEAN Education Ministers' Meeting held at Kuala Lumpur on 15th March 2008 re-formulated this list as follows: (a) Up-grading the standard of teaching; (b) English language training; (c) Vocational and technical training; and (d) ICT in education.

⁴⁰ According to APEC, systemic reforms must be adopted in order that all students receive the requisite standards and assessments, teachers and instruction, resources and tools.

first foreign language students learn. Several countries commented on the difficulty of recruiting and retaining an adequate supply of teachers capable of teaching English, in particular in imparting speaking and listening skills; and described measures which they had taken to overcome this, and other, difficulties. There seems no difficulty in principle about the exchange of good practice in this field, which is already supported by the SEAMEO RELC and other regional centres.

It was felt at the Jakarta Workshop that the EAS should encourage and support the learning of a second foreign language. The choice of foreign languages to offer to students will need to be at the discretion of countries and institutions, in the light of national and local interests. Where the languages of neighbouring countries are offered, there will be particular scope for sub-regional cooperation.

Technical and vocational education and training is a sector of education in its own right. Countries raised a number of issues as worthy of EAS-wide cooperation. Several countries noted that they were attempting to reorient their TVET systems from supply to demand-driven, and that international expertise and experience were important in encouraging these developments. Common features of these efforts were: the definition, through close cooperation with employers, of sets of skills and competencies, and the building of these into competency and qualifications frameworks. The case for international cooperation rested on the similarities between jobs and skill sets required in different countries, the mobility of labour across national borders, and the need to share experience in implementing structural reform. In this connection attention was drawn to the work of the project “Enhancing Skills Recognition Systems in ASEAN”. It is understood that ASEAN Labour Ministers have recently decided to adopt an incremental approach based on developing the existing national skills frameworks before proceeding to regional arrangements⁴¹.

Other specific concerns raised during the consultations were:

- The provision of TVET for migrant workers, from the perspectives of exporting or host countries;
- The need of particular industries such as tourism and hospitality where customers expect international standards;
- The TVET sector, which has many private as well as public providers, can be hard to define and regulate. Some countries were interested in establishing common standards for statistical and accreditation purposes.

There are a number of international bodies and institutions active in this field in the Asian Region, including the ILO⁴², UNESCO through the UNEVOC Centres and the SEAMEO VOTEC Centre. In the university sector networks of leading institutions have shown themselves to be a particularly effective means of sharing good practice through contact person to person and by telecommunication, joint projects and so on. There are a large number of UNEVOC centres in the Asia-Pacific⁴³ but they do not form a network of ongoing collaboration like, say, the ASEAN University Network. The consultations revealed wide support for the establishment in the EAS region of a network of leading TVET institutions.

Other Possible Priority Areas

Few voices were raised during the consultations in favour of reducing the number of priority areas. The most specific suggestion for an addition in the consultations was an expansion of scholarship schemes, raised by the developing countries. There was a good deal of discussion not specifically directed at additions to the list of priority areas, but suggesting the need to review them. It is convenient to summarise these in terms of access to schooling, content of the curriculum, and higher education, including scholarships.

⁴¹ See the Joint Communiqué of the 20th ALMM, paras 6-7.

⁴² See <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/region/asro/bangkok/skills-ap/index.htm>

⁴³ Listed at <http://www.unevoc.unesco.org/unevocdir.php?akt=34>

Access to basic education remains a major issue in the developing countries within East Asia, as shown in Appendix 3. In some cases resources are insufficient to offer any basic education to a significant proportion of the relevant age-group across the country as a whole; in other cases access is low in remote regions or for ethnic minorities, or students in basic education only receive part-time schooling. The role the EAS could play in assisting the achievement of Education for All needs to be debated. The discussions suggested that donor countries did not see the EAS as a forum for organising large-scale financial assistance for improved access. Technical cooperation seemed to have wider support. An interesting suggestion was that the EAS might promote technical cooperation between members who had recently achieved Universal Basic Education (UBE) and those who were working to achieve it. For example, countries such as India, Malaysia and Thailand have achieved considerable success in recent years in non-formal education and adult literacy programs, and the expertise and lessons from that work could be highly relevant to developing EAS countries. If the position of Access as one of the EAS's objectives for educational cooperation is confirmed, it is suggested that it ought to figure within the list of priority areas.

The only content theme selected as a priority by the ASEAN Education Ministers is the learning of foreign languages. Other possibilities would include Literacy, and Mathematics and Science. The teaching of literacy in schools was not raised as a priority in the consultations, perhaps because countries saw it as encompassed within the drive to UBE, and/or as less suitable for international collaboration because of the importance of local languages, scripts and values. There was more support for the teaching of literacy to adults, often as part of community development and poverty reduction schemes. Such education is often non-formal in style, and may not be confined to literacy; improvements in farming technique are another common theme. It may also be part of recruiting community support for the introduction of UBE. Provision for this could be made within a priority area for Access. As noted above, a number of countries have recent experience with successes in these areas, and their expertise could be highly relevant to less developed EAS countries.

Mathematics and Science were supported as a priority in the consultations. All countries recognise the importance of these disciplines for the intellectual growth of young people. As acknowledged in the Objectives proposed earlier, the acquisition of mathematics and science at school is fundamental to human resource development for developing countries and the increase of their scientific and technological capacity; developed countries also look to continuing improvements in mathematics and science education to sustain and enhance their competitiveness. The universal concepts and numerical content of these disciplines lend themselves to international collaboration, perhaps more so than in other curriculum areas.

There is already considerable experience among the developed EAS countries of exchanging good practice in mathematics and science education and benchmarking performance, based notably on the work of PISA and TIMSS. There is widespread interest in

- establishing age- specific standards of attainment for maths and science, and in evaluating students' progress against them;
- improving teaching techniques; and
- producing and sharing effective curriculum materials.

The SEAMEO RECSAM Centre is one of a number of centres for mathematics and science education in the region which have an international outlook.

Many countries see higher education as the phase in which the case for international collaboration is most compelling, because staff and students are more mobile, knowledge and research are globally disseminated, and costs are high. Chapter 7 set out the evidence of a very rapid expansion in recent years in international student flows at the tertiary education level; and also the plans of host countries to open up their systems to a substantial further expansion. The expansion in transnational and distance education is harder to document but is also on a steeply rising path.

There is widespread interest among EAS countries in how to facilitate and regulate study abroad, and to secure acceptance of qualifications which migrant workers acquire in their home countries. This interest embraces such themes as quality assurance, transfer of study credits and recognition of educational and professional qualifications – the agenda of the Bologna process in Europe and, in this region, of the Asia-Pacific Education Ministers' Meeting (APEMM). In February 2008 SEAMEO RIHED hosted a seminar to explore the applicability of Bologna Process ideas in the ASEAN region.

During the visits, countries recognised that the issues were being transacted through bilateral free trade negotiations, as well as through the multilateral forums. Some caution was expressed about the likely rate of progress towards mutual recognition in the area of the East Asia Summit; it was argued that the area was more diverse than that of the European Union.

Nevertheless, quality assurance authorities in the Asia-Pacific have begun to make progress with the Brisbane Communiqué agenda: see for example the draft quality assurance principles recently drawn up by a working group at Chiba in Japan.⁴⁴ Within the context of this process, smaller groups of countries (such as all or some EAS members) may be able to reach consensus within which they could draw upon to achieve more rapid progress than is possible across the whole range of Brisbane Communiqué signatories.

The EAS countries could also examine:

- the scope to standardise the arrangements in free trade agreements under which transnational education providers get access to national markets;
- the establishment of National Information Centres in each country on higher education qualifications and course structures so as to provide information to potential users in other countries, along the lines of the network of the ENIC-NARIC network now established in Europe, parts of north-west Asia, and in Australia and New Zealand; and
- the implementation of a Graduation Statement (or Diploma Supplement in Bologna terms) that would be attached to a degree and provide details on the nature of the higher education studied so as to facilitate credit transfer and mobility.

The work reported in Chapter 7 also showed that the recent expansion in cross-border flows of students at tertiary level has been very largely accounted for by self-funded students, and so has brought most benefit to those countries where the population able to afford international tertiary education has expanded most rapidly. Such countries are also the most attractive to trans-national education providers, as bases for international campuses and distance education initiatives. Scholarships remain an important form of access for students from developing countries to forms of higher education not readily available in their home countries.

To achieve high impact with relatively small numbers scholarship schemes need to be carefully targeted. One area which seemed likely to have a strong multiplier effect is the provision of scholarships linked to the expansion of tertiary education in developing countries. Facilities to undertake doctoral and masters study within the developing countries in certain specialisms are limited, and foreign-trained lecturers can play an important part in developing those specialisms.

As noted above under TVET, the universities have found inter-university networks to be an effective form of collaboration. Such networks are often formed at the universities' own initiative and may be regional or global in their scope. Academic Consortium 21, ASEA-Uninet, APRU and Universitas 21 are examples of university networks which bring together

⁴⁴ <http://www.brisbanecommuniqué.deewr.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/9546790F-2C83-4B43-989F-216E1278D2A6/21201/QAPrinciples.pdf>

universities in the region with universities on other continents⁴⁵. Member countries and institutions felt that the ASEAN University Network (AUN) has been a very successful venture, which exemplifies the scope for collaboration within ASEAN, and between ASEAN institutions and other member states of the EAS.

Some of the people in the consultations remarked that at 20 members AUN was about the right size for the functions which it performed, but that the limited membership restricted its impact in countries with large high education sectors. The EAS could consider assisting the foundation of additional university networks, to bring together universities in the region either on a whole of institution basis, or around specific disciplines or themes.

In terms of defining a priority area for higher education, the promotion of mobility and choice in the region are the key concepts, and would embrace the issue of scholarships, and the dramatic expansion of university exchanges recently advocated by Japan, as well as all the ideas which make up the notion of a common space for higher education in the EAS region.

In approaching such issues, it is important that whatever arrangements the EAS group of countries decide on should be consistent with developments in the rest of the world. Issues of human capital development and social transition are global challenges, and it will be in the EAS countries' long-term interests if their cooperative arrangements are open and inclusive, and mesh with developments in other regions, rather than inward-looking and exclusive (Drysdale, 2004). A similar thought was expressed by the European Union leaders at Lisbon in 2001 when they set "Opening up education and training systems to the wider world" as one of their three strategic objectives for education in Europe.

8.3 SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED PRIORITY AREAS

The areas suggested as priorities for educational cooperation within the framework of the EAS are as follows.

Content Priorities

Three content areas are suggested as priorities for educational cooperation:

- *The teaching and learning of foreign languages.*
- *The teaching and learning of Mathematics and Science.*
- *Education for mutual understanding among the peoples of the EAS region.*

As content areas, these priorities apply to all levels of education, and include teacher preparation, teaching methods, curriculum materials, and standards and assessment. The priority on mutual understanding can be pursued through a variety of curriculum areas, and also through exchanges. It can also emphasise the core values of EAS member countries, such as peaceful co-existence and tolerance.

Quality and Access

There was widespread support in the consultations for according priority to improving the quality of teaching. All countries are seeking to improve their schools to meet higher expectations, and there is substantial international evidence that quality teaching is the key driver of school improvement (OECD, 2005b). The quality of teaching is dependent on the recruitment and preparation of high-quality people as teachers and school leaders, but also on the environment within which they work and the incentives and support to continue improving their practice. These are all aspects in which sharing of research and good practice across countries are seen to have an important role to play, as does the facilitation of opportunities for teachers to work in different countries throughout their careers.

⁴⁵ The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education has listed networks as they stood early in 2006 – see <http://www.obhe.ac.uk/cgi-bin/keyresource.pl?resid=32>

As noted above, a particular emphasis within the EAS could be on networking and exchange in order to improve the quality of teaching through the more effective training of teachers, both initial and in-service, and through enlarging access to ICT and by developing and disseminating ICT applications.

- *Enhancing the quality of school teaching*

There was widespread recognition throughout the consultations that there would be substantial benefits from countries working together in order to achieve the six *Education for All* goals, especially through universal basic education and through non-formal education for adults. It was noted a number of times that the challenges of ensuring equitable access to education are not confined to developing countries, but apply in all countries albeit in different ways.

- *Enlarging access to education*

Tertiary Education

*Technical and Vocational Education and Training*⁴⁶

TVET is widely seen as having a critical role to play in promoting economic competitiveness, contributing to individual and enterprise development, and reducing inequalities. Countries have commonly identified the need to reorient TVET systems to a more demand-driven approach, and to better monitor and evaluate programs for their quality and cost-effectiveness. International cooperation is seen to have particular contribution to make in terms of networking and the sharing of good practice in areas such as competency and qualifications frameworks, TVET for migrant workers or associated with foreign direct investment, the accrediting of TVET providers and statistical standards for monitoring and evaluation of the sector. There was widespread support for the idea of developing a regional network of leading TVET institutions along the lines of the AUN in higher education.

Accordingly, the suggested priority in TVET can be expressed as follows:

- *Strengthening Technical and Vocational Education and Training, in particular through supporting moves towards more demand-driven TVET systems, the accrediting of TVET providers and statistical standards for monitoring and evaluation of the sector, and developing a regional network of leading TVET institutions.*

Higher Education

Within this area, there are two key concepts that relate to international cooperation:

- the enhancement of mobility and choice for staff and students including measures to enhance the portability of study credits and qualifications, the right to “national treatment” for transnational providers and the expansion of exchange and scholarship schemes; and
- networking and the sharing of good practice, with a particular emphasis on science and technology and the promotion of sustainable economic development. The latter includes the need for the EAS higher education sector to respond through their research and teaching capabilities to EAS-wide concerns such as climate change and food security.

Accordingly, the suggested priority in higher education can be expressed as follows:

- *Strengthening Higher Education, in particular through supporting the enhancement of mobility and choice through the harmonisation of quality assurance, study credit and qualifications systems, and the expansion of exchanges and scholarships.*

⁴⁶ This name is suggested because the priority area includes skills training – the responsibility of separate Ministries in some countries – as well as Vocational and Technical Education.

Relating Priorities to Objectives

Table 8.1 shows the principal relationships between the Objectives and Priorities recommended in this chapter.

Table 8.1: Objectives and Priorities

Priority areas	Objectives		
	Building Communities	Creating Competitive Advantage	Reducing Disparities
Foreign Languages	**	*	
Mathematics and Science		**	*
Education for Mutual Understanding	**		
Quality of Teaching	*	**	*
Enlarging Access	*	*	**
Technical and Vocational Education and Training	*	**	*
Higher Education	*	**	*

Note: ** = The primary relationship between a priority and its objective.
 * = A secondary relationship between priority and objective.

8.4 PROCESSES FOR ENHANCED COOPERATION

The EAS is not in itself an executive body. It has no legal status, no standing secretariat and no funds. Reflecting that position, processes for cooperation have up to now largely been ad hoc, and dependent on the initiative and goodwill of individual countries and the ASEAN Secretariat. This section considers changes in processes that may be needed in order to strengthen educational cooperation. The processes to be adopted depend on the objectives and priorities which the EAS wishes to pursue in the field of educational cooperation.

A Statement of Objectives and Priorities

In order to give direction and shape to the development of educational cooperation in the EAS region, it is suggested that as a first step the EAS leaders might be invited to adopt a broad statement of objectives and priorities. The suggestions in Sections 8.2 and 8.3 are intended as raw material for such a statement, to be worked up through discussion between member governments. In addition to setting objectives and priorities the EAS leaders might also wish to set out the principles informing their choice. Such principles are proposed above, under the heading, "Criteria for Assessing Possible Priority Areas".

An EAS statement of objectives and priorities could:

- Confine itself to priorities which are suitable for implementation by individual member states at their discretion; or
- In addition to (a) look to joint working among member states in order, for example, to harmonise the regulation of some aspect of educational provision, or to establish a common program.

Option (a) represents the status quo. It would put limits on what cooperation at EAS level could achieve. The participants in the Jakarta Workshop in June 2008 took the view that an effective statement of objectives would need to encompass both (a) and (b). On that basis, some mechanism for joint working is needed. At the workshop there were two main strands of thinking:

- Members from ASEAN countries generally argued that, at least in the first instance, existing mechanisms – in particular ASEAN, SEAMEO and its Regional Centres and

the ASEAN University Network provided an adequate basis for educational cooperation in the region; the existing mechanisms had proven their worth and any new mechanism would add to the burden on member states and risk duplication.

- From the perspective of the six countries who are not ASEAN members, it was generally argued that arrangements which gave all EAS members an equal say in shaping the implementation of educational cooperation in the EAS area were crucial for the success of the initiative. ASEAN+ 3 did not engage all the six countries, and Dialogue Partner status with ASEAN, or Associate status with SEAMEO, fell short of an equal say.

If the East Asia Summit decides to pursue educational cooperation collectively, it will be important that organisational and secretariat structures are appropriate. At present ASEAN Education Ministers meet separately but back-to-back under the aegis of ASEAN and SEAMEO; the latter has the larger secretariat resources in education and is the managing agent for the SEAMEO Centres. At their March 2008 meeting in Kuala Lumpur, ASEAN Education Ministers agreed that future cooperation under EAS would be undertaken under the coordination of the SEAMEO Secretariat in close cooperation with the ASEAN Secretariat. Building on the experience of an existing Secretariat is attractive, but the structure within which the Secretariat is working needs to accommodate the interests of all EAS members.

The recent experience of the energy sector in the EAS suggests a possible way forward for education. At the Cebu Summit in January 2007 the EAS leaders:

- signed the Cebu Declaration which set five goals for East Asian energy security;
- established an Energy Cooperation Taskforce, based on existing ASEAN mechanisms to follow up the discussion and report recommendations to the next summit; and
- welcomed Singapore's offer to host an EAS Energy Ministers meeting to consider ways to enhance energy cooperation.

The work done by the Taskforce and the Energy Ministers fed into the *Singapore Declaration on Climate Change, Energy and the Environment* which the EAS leaders signed at their summit in November 2007. Follow-up to the Declaration is now in hand, including through meetings of EAS Energy and Environment Ministers.

Following that precedent the following steps to establish a process for EAS educational cooperation are suggested:

- The ASEAN Secretariat uses existing networks to prepare a statement of objectives to be achieved through enhancing educational cooperation in the EAS, and outline priorities for educational cooperation at the EAS level on the basis of this report, for consideration at the next EAS Summit;
- if Summit leaders approve the statement, they also establish an Education Cooperation Taskforce to work through the list of priorities, and to propose processes for the on-going handling of educational cooperation; and
- the Education Cooperation Taskforce's report is considered by a meeting of EAS Education Ministers before proposals are drawn up for adoption at the subsequent EAS Leaders Summit.

8.5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

In summary, it is suggested that the EAS Country Leaders are invited consider the following set of recommendations.

Recommendation 1

The EAS Country Leaders consider adoption of the following objectives for enhanced educational cooperation in the area of the EAS:

To build communities among the peoples of the EAS countries, notably through

- Increasing the mobility of students, teachers and researchers in the area;
- The appreciation of one another's heritage and history; and
- The learning of other languages.

To create competitive advantage for the EAS region by:

- Promoting excellence at all levels of education through the exchange of information on good practice, and by bench-marking; and
- Enlarging choice in tertiary education and in the labour market through measures to facilitate the movement of students, staff and tertiary-qualified personnel across national borders, and by enlarging access for tertiary education providers to national markets.

To reduce disparities in educational opportunity within and between countries in order to:

- Facilitate access to basic and non-formal education and promote high standards through networking and institutional collaboration;
- Promote tertiary education and training in home countries, especially in the fields of science and technology, as a means to economic development.

Recommendation 2

The EAS Country Leaders consider adoption of the following priority areas for enhanced educational cooperation:

- The teaching and learning of foreign languages.
- The teaching and learning of Mathematics and Science.
- Education for mutual understanding among the peoples of the EAS region.
- Enhancing the quality of school teaching.
- Enlarging access to education.
- Strengthening Technical and Vocational Education and Training, in particular through supporting moves towards more demand-driven TVET systems, the accrediting of TVET providers and statistical standards for monitoring and evaluation of the sector, and developing a regional network of leading TVET institutions.
- Strengthening Higher Education, in particular through the enhancement of mobility and choice through the harmonisation of quality assurance, study credit and qualifications systems, and the expansion of exchanges and scholarships.

Recommendation 3

The EAS Country Leaders establish an Education Cooperation Task Force to refine and operationalise the list of priorities and develop processes for the on-going strengthening of educational cooperation at EAS level. The Education Cooperation Taskforce's report would be considered by a meeting of EAS Education Ministers before proposals are drawn up for adoption at a subsequent EAS Leaders meeting.

A final recommendation relates to strengthening the information base about educational cooperation in the EAS region, improving data quality and sharing good practice about effective cooperation programs. A common observation made in the consultations was that countries often lack systematic information about their own international activities, let alone what is happening in other countries that could usefully inform their own development. There does not seem to be an organisation in the region with the mandate to strengthen the knowledge base in these regards and to promote more rigorous and comparable data and evaluations of policies and programs.

Some of the priority areas for more focused evaluation and research include:

- Quality assurance mechanisms for education providers operating in increasingly internationalised markets.
- The return flow of graduates from study abroad, and their subsequent employment patterns or contribution to the science, technology and business infrastructure in their home countries.
- Comprehensive cross-country evidence as to the impacts of programs of international education cooperation.
- The barriers to effective international cooperation and how they might be overcome.

Recommendation 4

The Education Cooperation Task Force be asked to investigate options for: (a) developing comparable data bases to document international education cooperation activities in the region, including more detailed data on student flows, (b) strengthening evaluation of the impacts of cooperation activities and the factors associated with program effectiveness; and (c) disseminating good practice in educational cooperation throughout the region.

To carry this agenda forward the ASEAN Secretariat will need additional resources, especially in terms of strengthening linkages with EAS countries that are not ASEAN members. The creation of an EAS Education Cooperation Taskforce would need to be accompanied by the provision of adequate resources, specification of clear tasks and reporting timelines, and a meeting schedule that enables all countries to participate effectively.

REFERENCES

- ASEAN University Network (2006). *ASEAN University Network: Partnership and Progress 1995-2005*. Bangkok: AUN Secretariat.
- Beerens, Eric and Marijk Derwende. (2007). "The paradox in international cooperation: Institutionally embedded universities in a global environment." *Higher Education*. Vol 53. pp. 61-79.
- Centre for International Economics. (2008). *APEC and International Education*. A report prepared for the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. Canberra & Sydney: CIS.
- Cheng, Yin Cheong. (2007). "Future developments of educational research in the Asia-Pacific Region: Paradigm shifts, reforms, and practice." *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*. Vol 6, No 2, pp. 67-85.
- Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf. Charter. Accessed 14th May 2008. <http://www.gcc-sg.org/eng/index.php?action=Sec-Show&ID=1>
- Dale, R. and S. L. Robertson. (2002). "The Varying Effects of Regional Organisations as Subjects of Globalisation of Education." *Comparative Education Review*. Vol 46. No. 1. pp. 10-36.
- de Prado Yepes, C. (2006). "World Regionalisation of Higher Education: Policy Proposals for International Organisations." *Higher Education Policy*. Vol 19. pp. 111-128.
- Dowling, A., Horne, R., McKenzie, P., McGuckian, P., Beavis, A. & Knight, P. (2008). *Harnessing Educational Cooperation in the EAS: Inception Report*. Melbourne: ACER.
- Drysdale, P. (2004), *The New Economy in East Asia and the Pacific*. Routledge, London and New York.
- East Asia Study Group (EASG). (2002). *Final Report of the EASG*. ASEAN+3 Summit, 4th November 2002, Phnom Penh, Cambodia.
- European Commission (2005). *Common European Principles for Teacher Competencies and Qualifications*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Eurydice (2002). *The Teaching Profession in Europe. Report 1: Initial Training and Transition to Working Life. General Lower Secondary Education*. Brussels: Eurydice.
- Feldman, J., Makuc, D., Kleinman, J. and Cornoni-Huntly, J. (1989). "National trends in educational differences in mortality." *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 129, pp. 919-933.
- Fuente, A. De la and A. Ciccone (2002), *Human Capital in Global and Knowledge-based Economy*, European Commission, Brussels.
- Hanushek, Eric A. and Ludger Wößmann. (2007). *Education Quality and Economic Growth*. The World Bank, Washington DC.
- Hew, Denis. (Ed.) (2007). *Brick by Brick. The Building of an ASEAN Economic Community*. Canberra: Asia Pacific Press. The Australian National University.
- Horne, Robert. (2002). "Internationalisation of Australian Education, Including the Australian Export Industry." Report submitted to the Australian Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST), 27th June 2002.
- Huang, Futao. (2007). "Internationalisation of Higher Education in the Developing and Emerging Countries: A Focus on Transnational Higher Education in Asia." *Journal of Studies in International Education*. Vol 11, no 3/4, Fall / Winter 2007. pp. 421-432.

- Ingvarson, Lawrence., Elliott, Alison., Kleinhenz, Elizabeth and McKenzie, Phillip. (2006). *Teacher Education Accreditation: A Review of National and International Trends and Practices*. Canberra: Teaching Australia.
- Jokivirta, Lisa. (2006). "Foreign Higher Education Activity in Francophone Africa." *Campus Review*. Vol 16. No 5. February 08, 2006. pp. 8-9.
- Joseph, Cynthia, Simon Marginson, and Rui Yang. (2005). "Special Issue: International education in the Asia-Pacific region. Introduction by the Guest Editors." *Australian Journal of Education*. Vol 49, No. 1, 2005, pp. 3-9.
- Kehm, Barbara M. and Ulrich Teichler. (2007). "Research on Internationalisation in Higher Education." *Journal of Studies in International Education*. Vol 11, no 3/4, Fall / Winter 2007. pp. 260-73.
- League of Arab States. *Charter of the League of Arab States*. Accessed 14th May 2008. http://www.arableagueonline.org/las/english/details_en.jsp?art_id=134&level_id=40
- Maclean, Rupert and Ken Vine. (2003). "Achieving Education for All in the Asia-Pacific Region." In *International Handbook of Educational Research in the Asia-Pacific Region, Part One*. John P. Keeves and Ryo Watanabe (eds). London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003. pp. 17-27.
- Marginson, Simon. (2003). "Markets in higher education: National and global competition." AARE Radford Lecture. NZARE / AARE Joint Conference. Auckland, New Zealand, 29 Nov – 3 Dec 2003.
- Mok, Ka Ho. (2007). "Questing for Internationalisation of Universities in Asia: Critical Reflections." *Journal of Studies in International Education*. Vol 11, no 3/4, Fall / Winter 2007. pp. 433-454.
- Nagano, Hiroshi and Christopher T. Hill. (2007). "New Cooperation in East Asia." *Science*. Vol 316, p. 1393. 8 June 2007.
- Ochiai, Ryo. (2006). *Overview: Impediments to Trade in the Priority Service Sectors*. AADCP: REPSF 06/001a.
- OECD (2002). "The Growth of Cross-Border Education," in *Education Policy Analysis 2002*. Paris, OECD.
- OECD (2005a). *Employment Outlook 2005*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2005b). *Teachers Matter: Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2007a). "What are the economic benefits of education?" in *Education at a Glance, 2007*. Paris, OECD.
- OECD (2007b). *Education at a Glance, 2007*. Paris, OECD.
- Pretorius, K. (2002). "Accommodating social and economic priorities in developing countries." Australian International Education. http://www.idp.com/16aiecpapers/program/thursday/development5/Pretorius_p.pdf
- Resnik, Julia. (2006). "International Organisations, the "Education-Economic Growth" Black Box, and the Development of World Education Culture." *Comparative Education Review*. May 2006. pp. 173-95.
- Schofer, Evan and John W. Meyer. (2005). "The Worldwide Expansion of Higher Education in the Twentieth Century." *American Sociological Review*. Vol. 70, pp. 898-920.
- Sidhu, Ravinder. (2005). "Building a global schoolhouse: International education in Singapore." *Australian Journal of Education*. Vol 49, No. 1, 2005, pp. 46-65.

- Thanh, Vo Tri and Bartlett, Paul. (2005). *Ten Years of the ASEAN Free Trade Agreement on Services*. AADCP: REPSF 05/004.
- Turpin, Tim. (2004). "Higher Education and Regional Development: Tensions, Challenges and Options in East and South East Asia." Presentation to the 18th IDP Australian International Education Conference, *International Education: The Path to Cultural Understanding and Development*. Sydney, Australia, 5 – 8 Oct 2004.
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2006). *Global Education Digest 2006*. Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics.
- US Government Export Portal. Accessed 14th May 2008. <http://www.export.gov/fta/NAFTA/> & http://tcc.export.gov/Trade_Agreements/Exporters_Guides/List_All_Guides/NAFTA_chapter12_guide.asp
- van der Wende, Marijk. (2007). "Internationalisation of Higher Education in the OECD Countries: Challenges and Opportunities for the Coming Decade." *Journal of Studies in International Education*. Vol 11, no 3/4, Fall / Winter 2007. pp. 274-289.
- Vincent-Lancrin, S. (Ed.) (2007). *Cross-border Tertiary Education: A Way Towards Capacity Development*. Paris: OECD & The World Bank.
- Welch, Anthony. (2004). "Malaysia – China Relations in Higher Education, in Light of GATS." *Bulletin of Higher Education Research*. Number 3, 2004. pp. 3-5.
- Welch, Anthony. (2007). "The Minnow and the Whale: Singapore-China relations in Higher Education." *International Higher Education*. Number 46, Winter 2007.
- Wolfe, B. and Zuvekas, S. (1997). "Non-market outcomes of schooling." *International Journal of Education Research*. 27, pp. 491-502.

APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONS FOR THE COUNTRY CONSULTATIONS

QUESTIONS FOR THE *MINISTRY OF EDUCATION*

A. Definitions of international educational cooperation

1. What does your government understand by “educational cooperation”?
2. To what extent does your government see international educational cooperation as necessary for national development?
3. Is the classification of five main types of educational cooperation (“People exchange”; “Trans-national Education”, “Information exchange”; “Regulatory reform” and “Development Partnerships”):
 - (a) Comprehensive? (Does it cover the main types? Are there major gaps?)
 - (b) Helpful in identifying priority areas and strategies?

B. Current forms of international educational cooperation

4. What types of educational cooperation is your currently pursuing in the following areas? Provide where possible examples that could fit in the cells of the following table.

Type of exchange	Levels of cooperation			
	Between governments	Between education institutions	Between education staff	Between students
People exchange				
Information exchange				
Trans-national education				
Regulatory reform				
Development partnerships				

5. With which other regional countries (bilateral and multilateral) is cooperation occurring in the above respects?
6. What is the cooperation intended to achieve?
7. What evidence is there on the size, costs and effects of the cooperation?
8. What data and evaluations are available on the different forms of educational cooperation? (Please provide key documents or summaries.)

C. Future improvements and strategies

9. How could the current forms of educational cooperation be improved?
10. What are the main difficulties in expanding educational cooperation?
11. Looking ahead, how might educational cooperation need to develop in the region in order to better contribute to regional competitiveness and community building? Is there a need, for example, to accelerate work on mutual recognition of educational and professional qualifications?
12. Would your government prefer educational cooperation to remain on a voluntary basis, or is it likely to favour a move to greater international regulation and joint funding of common programs?
13. What are your country's current priorities for development assistance in the education sector?
14. (For donor countries): Does your country see scope to focus its development assistance for education more explicitly within the region?
15. (For recipient countries): Do you see scope for regional countries to cooperate more effectively in support of your country's educational objectives? What would be your country's priorities for such cooperation?
16. Is there a preferred form (or forms) of educational cooperation for your nation and the region?
17. What changes are needed to implement these desired forms of cooperation?
18. What should be the main priorities for EAS nations as a group in harnessing educational cooperation? Please comment specifically on the four priority themes which ASEAN Education Ministers identified for EAS cooperation:
 - Teacher training;
 - Teaching and learning of languages, especially English;
 - Vocational and technical education;
 - Use of ICT in education.
19. How can educational cooperation in the region address the needs of the less developed countries?

QUESTIONS FOR THE *MINISTRY OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING* (where applicable)

1. ASEAN has identified "Vocational and technical education" (VET) as a priority area for cooperation between ASEAN and EAS partners. What aspects of VET does your country see as most fruitful for cooperation?
2. ASEAN has also identified "Teaching and learning of languages, especially English" as a priority area for cooperation between ASEAN and EAS partners. Could cooperation between VET systems in the EAS area enable more adults to acquire the language skills they need? What would be your country's priorities in this regard?
3. The European Union has developed a series of initiatives to enhance the portability of VET study units and qualifications between member countries. Do you envisage a similar development for countries in this region to promote closer labour market and economic cooperation?
4. Throughout the region there is great interest in how to adapt VET systems so as to make them more responsive to the needs of students and employers. Are existing mechanisms for transferring knowledge of good practice in this field across national

borders working well? Is there more that could appropriately be done in a regional context?

5. Have multilateral agreements a part to play in coordinating assistance for skills development in its least developed countries and regional areas? What processes could be put in place to achieve this objective?

QUESTIONS FOR THE *MINISTRY OF LABOUR* (where applicable)

1. Economic cooperation agreements in regard to labour mobility can include several elements such as: allowing permanent migration; allowing temporary movement for particular types of workers; mutual recognition of qualifications; and mutual occupational registration. In what forms of cross-national labour mobility is your country currently involved (both bilateral and multilateral), and what were the reasons behind such initiatives?
2. What role do you see for the greater mobility of labour across national borders in promoting economic development? How can this potential be better harnessed? What national concerns are there about greater mobility? What safeguards need to be put in place?
3. What arrangements are currently in place, or being developed, for recognition of skills and qualifications between your country and other countries? Is there any evidence available on their impact in helping to meet skills shortages and national economic needs? What are the key enabling factors in successful skills recognition initiatives?
4. Have multilateral agreements a part to play in developing a regional framework for facilitating labour mobility, including recognition of skills and qualifications? If so, what processes could need to be put in place to achieve this objective?

QUESTIONS FOR *OTHER ORGANISATIONS INVOLVED IN EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION*

1. How and why did your particular form(s) of educational cooperation commence? What role did government play in starting the program and/or its current development?
2. What evaluations or other evidence do you have on the success or impact of the educational cooperation? Have the program's objectives changed over time? Has it had any unanticipated effects?
3. In your experience what are the main enabling factors in successful forms of educational cooperation? What are the main inhibiting or blocking factors? How can they be overcome?
4. To what extent have you been able to draw on models of 'good practice' in developing your form of educational cooperation? How could the more systematic sharing of knowledge about educational cooperation assist your program? In what ways could your program be involved in sharing experience about good practice in educational cooperation?
5. In what ways can national governments better promote and support educational cooperation programs such as yours?
6. What scope is there for more regional initiatives to support and expand educational cooperation programs such as yours? What role could regional groups play in facilitating these developments?

APPENDIX 2: ORGANISATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS INVOLVED IN THE CONSULTATIONS

Note: The consultations are grouped in terms of the visits to the 16 EAS countries. Regional organisations are listed in the country where their relevant office is located. The views expressed in the report are those of the authors and not necessarily of any government, organisation or individual. During the consultations the discussants were informed that any views were intended to assist the consultants' understanding, and that individuals would not be named in the report or have views attributed to them.

AUSTRALIA

27-28 May 2008

Dr Phillip McKenzie & Dr Andrew Dowling, ACER

Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR)

Mr Peter Davies, Director, Trade Agreements and Multilateral Unit, International Cooperation and Recognition Branch, International Education Group

Ms Fiona Buffinton, Group Manager, International Education Group

Ms Susan Bennett, Branch Manager, International Cooperation and Recognition Branch, International Education Group

Ms Di Weddell, Manager, International Cooperation and Scholarships Branch, International Education Group

Dr Claire Atkinson, Director, Quality Assurance, Higher Education Group

Ms Margaret Proctor, Director, Educational and Professional Recognition Unit, International Cooperation and Recognition Branch

Mr Greg Clarke, A/Manager, Skills Analysis and Quality Systems Branch, Strategic Analysis and Evaluation Group

Ms Paula Chevalier, Director, Economic Analysis and International Section, Strategic Analysis and Evaluation Group

Ms Shannon Madden, Director, International Education Indicators and Liaison, Strategic Analysis and Evaluation Group

Ms Claire Findlay, Assistant Director, Quality Framework, VET Quality Branch, Industry Skills and Development Group

Ms Janice Anderson, Director, International Engagement and Innovation, National Training Directions Group

Ms Katrina Dorrington, Assistant Director, International Engagement and Innovation, National Training Directions Group

Ms Cathie Maguire, Director, Schools Coordination Taskforce

Mr Rob Mason, Director, Languages and Asian Studies Section, Curriculum Branch

Mr Chris Foster, Principal Advisor, Economic and Labour Market Analysis Branch, Labour Market Strategies Group

Ms Jane Press, Director, Migration Policy and Analysis Section, Labour Market Strategies Group

Mr Niclas Jönsson, Assistant Director, APEC and Asia-Pacific Section, Workplace Relations Policy Group

Ms Anni Chilton, Director, Trades Recognition Australia, Workplace Relations Services Group

Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID)

Mr Cameron Bowles, Director, Education Thematic Group

Ms Paula Henriksen, Program Manager, Education Thematic Group

Mr Steve Passingham, Principal Advisor, Education Thematic Group

Mr John Fahy, Senior Adviser, Vocational Education & Training, Education Thematic Group
(by telephone)

Australian National University (ANU)

Professor Peter Drysdale, Crawford School of Economics and Government, ANU College of Asia and the Pacific

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)

Dr Catherine Dobbin, Executive Officer, ASEAN, Regional Issues and East Timor Section
Ms Lynda Worthaisong, Director, ASEAN, Regional Issues and East Timor Section

BRUNEI DARUSSALAM

31 March – 1 April 2008

Dr Phillip McKenzie, ACER

Ministry of Education

Mr Othman bin Haji Simbran, Head, International Affairs Unit and Secretary, National Accreditation Council

Mr Haj Moksini bin Haji Abdul Rahman, Senior Education Officer, National Accreditation Council

Mr Adinin bin Md Salleh, Senior Education Officer, National Accreditation Council

Ms Hajah Azizan Dato Haji Othman, Senior Manager, International Affairs Unit

Dr Dayang Hajah Aishah binti Haji Muhd Husain, A/Director, Schools

Dr Teh Keng Watt, Education Officer, Schools

Department of Labour, Ministry of Home Affairs

Ms Siti Nursalwana Haji Awang, Assistant Commissioner of Labour, Planning and International Affairs Section

Brunei Institute of Technology

Dr Haji Kassim b. Haji Daud, Director

University of Brunei Darussalam

Dato Dr Haji Ismail Duraman, Vice-Chancellor

Dr Junaidi Abd Rahman, A/Assistant Vice-Chancellor

Ms Datin Rosnah Ramly, Director, International Office

Sultan Sharif Ali Islamic University

Dr HjH Masnon Binti Hj Ibrahim, Assistant Rector

**SEAMEO Regional Centre for Vocational & Technical Education & Training
(VOC TECH)**

Mr Mohamad Saiful Hj Omar, Deputy Director, Administration

Dr Milagros C. Valles, Deputy Director, Professional

Mr Teo Boon Wah, Finance Manager

Dr Corazon Dauz Sampang, Information Manager

CAMBODIA

21-22 April 2008

Mr Robert Horne, ACER

Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport

Mr Koeu Nay Leang, Director-General

Mr Suong Sarun Deputy DG, Administration and Finance

Mr Mak Ngoy, Deputy DG Higher Education

Mr Chroeng Lim Sry, Director of General secondary Education,

Mr Sophal Deputy Director of Primary Education

Ms Mak Nang, Deputy Director of Higher Education

Mr Nop Vuthy, Deputy Director of Information and ASEAN Affairs Department

Ms Phon Tara, Head of Project Management and Monitoring Office

Mrs Kan Neary Deputy Director of Cultural Relations and Scholarships

Mr Sok Tha, Chief of ICT in Education

Mr Nham Sinith, Staff of Department of Planning

Mr Suong Savath, Chief of the ASEAN Bureau

Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training

Mr Tep Oeung, Deputy D-G of Technical and Vocational Education and Training

Mr Ouk Ravuth Chief of Cambodian Worker Control Office

Mr Chuop Narith, Deputy Director Employment and Manpower

Mr Khuon Mr Saingpagnarith, Deputy Director of International Co-operation Department

Royal University of Phnom Penh

Mr Hang Chanthon, Dean of the Faculty of Science, and Director of the International Relations Office

CHINA

5-7 May 2008

Mr Robert Horne, ACER

Ministry of Education

Dr Xue Yanqing, Director, Division of Asian and African Affairs

Ms Geng Jinglu, Programme Officer in the same Division

China National Institute for Educational Research (CNIER)

Professor Yuan Zenghuo, President

Mr Li Jianzhong, Director for International Exchange

Professor Fang Xiadong, Director of Research Department for Educational Theory

Professor Meng Wanjin, Director for Psychology and Special Education

Associate Prof Wang Su, Centre for Science and Technology Education

Associate Prof Peng Xiaguang, Department of Psychology and Special Education

Xiaona Ding and Zhang Xiaoguang, interpreters from the Department for International Exchange

INDIA

12-14 May 2008

Dr Phillip McKenzie & Ms Ratna Dhamija, ACER

Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD)

Mr Arun Rath, Secretary of Education

Mr Subhash C Khuntia, Joint Secretary, Secondary and Vocational Education

Mr N.K. Sinha, Joint Secretary, Technical Education

Mr Shailendra K. Sharma, Director, Department of Higher Education

Ministry of Labour and Employment

Mrs Sudha Pillai, Secretary

Mr Sharda Prasad, Director-General, Employment and Training

National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT)

Prof G. Ravindra, Joint Director

Prof R.L. Phutela, Head, International Relations Division

Dr Davinder K Vaid, Head, Department of Educational Surveys and Data Processing

Prof B.K. Sharma, Department of Education in Science and Mathematics

Prof. K. Dorasami, Head, Department of Teacher Education and Extension

Ministry of External Affairs

Mr N. Ravi, Secretary (East)

INDONESIA

2-4 April, 2008

Dr Phillip McKenzie, ACER

Ministry of National Education (MONE)

Mrs Yun Widiati, Head, Division of International Cooperation, Bureau of Planning and International Cooperation

Dr R. Agus Sartono, Head, Bureau of Planning and International Cooperation

Dr. Ramon Mohandas, Deputy Secretary, National Office for Educational Research and Development

Prof Dr Soekartawi, Special Duty Office, Secretariat General

Dr Surya Dharma, Director of Education Personnel

Ms Ratna Dumasari, Planning Division, Directorate General of Quality Improvement of Teachers and Education Staff

Dr Abi Sujak, Manager of Program and Development, Directorate General of Quality Improvement of Teachers and Education Staff

Dr Siswantari Daryanto, Office of Educational and Cultural Research and Development (by email)

Ministry of Manpower and Transmigration

Ms Ratna Purwaning Wardhani, Senior Program Officer, International Relations

Dra. Hj. Ligia Emila, Deputy Director, Bilateral Cooperation

Dr Ronald Hutapea, Deputy Director, Indonesian Professionals Certification Authority

Mr Guntur Witjaksono, International Cooperation Center

Mr Muchtar Azis, Directorate of Competency Standard and Training Program

Universitas Gadjah Mada

Ms Daniar Rahmawati Natakusumah, Head, Office of International Affairs (by telephone)

Mr Djoko Moerdiyanto, Executive Secretary (by telephone)

Prof Retno, Senior Vice Rector, Education, Research and Community Service (by telephone)

SEAMEO Regional Open Learning Centre (SEAMOLEC)

Dr Gatot Hari Priowirjanto, Director

Ms Dina Mustafa, Head, Research and Development

JAPAN

12-14 May 2008

Mr Robert Horne, ACER

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT)

Ms Sonoko Watanabe, Director of the Office of Planning and Co-ordination, International Affairs Division

Mr Ryo Watanabe, Director for International Research and Co-operation, National Institute of Educational Research

Ms Miho Kobayashi, Higher Education Policy Planning Division

Mr Rikutarō Hamada, International Science and Technology Affairs Division

Ms Haruka Urata, International Affairs Division

Japanese International Co-operation Agency (JICA)

Mr Takizawa Masahiko, Senior Program Officer South-East Asia Division

Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Ms Mariko Ugata, Regional Policy Division

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

8-9 May 2008

Mr Robert Horne, ACER

Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MEST)

Ms Sang-eun, Jung, Deputy Director, Multilateral Co-operation Division

Dr Leeh, Jhong-Kyu, Deputy Director, Bilateral Co-operation Division

Ko, Young Hoon, Deputy, Director, Co-operation Co-ordination Division

Dr Choi, Young Real, Senior Research Fellow, Korea Research Institute for Vocational Education and Training (KRIVET)

Hae Lim, Chun, Office of International Co-operation, Korea Educational Development Institute (KEDI)

Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation (KICE)

Dr Kun-Nim Lee, Head of External Relations

Dr Yun, Young-Sun, External Relations Department.

Mr Min, Byungsoo, External Relations Department.

Ministry of Labour

Mun-Sil Kim, Deputy Director, Qualification Policy Division

Bae, Sujin, Deputy Director, International Negotiation Team

Yoon-hye Kim, Foreign Workforce Policy Division.

LAO PDR

16-19 April 2008

Mr Robert Horne, ACER

Ministry of Education (MoE)

Mr Ouam Sengchandavong, Director-General for Planning and Co-operation

Mr Sengsomphone Viravouth, Deputy D-G for Planning and Co-operation

Dr Kongsy Sengmany, Director-General for Higher Education and TVET

Mr Khamhoung Sacklokham, Director-General, General Education and Co-ordinator for Education for All

Ms Phouangkam Somsanith, Director, Research Institute for Educational Sciences

Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare

Mr Thongdeng Singthilath, Deputy Director-General for Skills Development

MALAYSIA

27-28 March 2008

Dr Phillip McKenzie, ACER

Ministry of Education

Mrs Adibah Hanum Hussein, Assistant Secretary, International Relations Division

Mr Zainurin Bin Supraman, Assistant Director, Planning and Research Division, Department of Technical Education

Dr Zahri b Aziz, Deputy Director (Policy), Educational Planning and Research Division

Faridah Hanim Ariffin, Private Education Division

Dr Soon Seng Thah, Educational Planning and Research Division

Syed Sharil Nizam, International Relations Division

Dr Chetrilah Othman, Educational Planning and Research Division (by email)

Ministry of Higher Education

Dr Adbul Rahim Ahmad, Department of Polytechnic & Community College Education

Muzlan Zurin Zulkifli, Department of Higher Education

Norazizah Ibrahim, Planning and Research Division

Ahmad Mohd Norzi, Policy and International Division

Malaysian Qualifications Agency

Najmi Mohd. Noor

Ministry of Human Resources

Mrs Junaidah Bt Kamarruddin, Undersecretary, International Division

Mrs Jainthi Rajoo, Skills Development Division

University of Malaya

Dr Khoo Boo Teong, Director, International & Corporate Relations Office

Prof Dato' Dr Mohd Amin Jalaludin, Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Academic and International

Dr Azmi Mat Akhir, Senior research Fellow, Asia-Europe Institute

Dr Kamila Ghazali, Deputy Director, International Relations

MYANMAR

23-25 April 2008

Mr Robert Horne, ACER

Ministry of Education (MoE)

At the Department of Basic Education 1 (DBE 1) in Yangon

U Tun Hla, Deputy Director-General Planning

U Tin Nyo, Retired Director-General, now EFA National Co-ordinator

U Myint Swe, Director DBE 1

At the MoE in Nay Pyi Taw

U Myo Nyunt, Deputy Minister (HE)

Brig-General Aung Myo Min, Deputy Minister (Basic Education)

U Bo Win, Director-General for Educational Planning and Training

U Mae Aung, Deputy Director-General, Department of Educational Planning and Training

U Ko Lay Win, Assistant Director, Department of Educational Planning and Training

Ministry of Labour

U Chit Shien, Director-General

Daw Khin Swe Than, Director, Employment and Training Section

U Aung Hlay Win, Director (Administration Section)

Daw Aye Man Soe, Asst Director, Employment and Training

SEAMEO Regional Centre for History and Tradition (CHAT)

Daw Carole Anne Chit Tha, Centre Director

U Myo Aung, Senior Programme Officer

Daw Ni Ni Myint, Senior Consultant

Daw Myint Myint Ohn, International Relations Officer;

Daw Khin Lay Soe, Information and Documentation Officer,

Daw San San Nyunt Ohn, Assistant Administration Officer

U Win Myat Aung, Senior Research Officer,

Daw Naw Si Blut, Senior Research Officer

U Paw Aye, Assistant Finance Officer.

NEW ZEALAND

5-6 May 2008

Dr Adrian Beavis, ACER

Ministry of Education

Ms Rachel Cates, Advisor (Southeast Asia), International Division

Mr Neil Scotts, Senior Manager, International Division

Mr Paul Lister, Policy Manager, International Division

Mr Steve Benson, A/Senior Manager, International Division

Mr Brett Parker, Senior Policy Analyst, International Division

Ms Melaine Chapman, Senior Advisor (India), International Division

Ms Mary Camp, Senior Advisor (Korea), International Division

Ms Cecily Lin, Advisor (China), International Division

Mr Sushrutha Metikurke, Policy Analyst, International Division

Mr Daniel Tasker, Assistant Advisor (Japan), International Division

New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA)

Ms Pamela Hulston, Manager, Qualification Recognition Services

Ms Janine McCardle, Policy Analyst, International Unit

New Zealand Vice-Chancellors Committee (NZVCC)

Ms Megan Watson, Policy Analyst (International)

Department of Labour

Ms Christine Hyndman, Manager, International Relations

Mr Chris Hubscher, Senior Analyst, International Relations

Tertiary Education Commission (TEC)

Ms Janice Shiner, Chief Executive Officer

Mr Peter Palmer, Group Manager, Policy and Advice

PHILIPPINES

16-18 April 2008

Dr Phillip McKenzie, ACER

Department of Education

Atty. Franklin C. Sunga, Undersecretary, Legal and Legislative Affairs

Ms Milagros T. Talino, Officer in Charge, Director III

Commission on Higher Education

Dr Elena S. Jane, Director, International Affairs Service

Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA), Department of Labor and Employment

Dr Irene Isaac, Executive Director, Qualifications and Standards Office

Mr Urbano B. Budtan, Director, Planning Office

De La Salle University

Br Armin Altamirano Luistro, President

SEAMEO Regional Center for Educational Innovation and Technology (INNOTECH)

Dr Erlinda C. Pefianco, Director

Dr Philip J. Purnell, Director for Programs

Mr Benito E. Benoza, Corporate Planning Officer

SINGAPORE

25-26 March 2008

Dr Phillip McKenzie, ACER

Ministry of Education

Ms Cindy Eu Ching Har, Senior Officer, International Relations, Planning Division

Ms Lim Wan Yong, Deputy Director, Planning and International Cooperation, Planning Division

Mr Sriven Naidu, Deputy Director, Higher Education Division

Ministry of Manpower

Mr Lim Tze Min, Senior Manager, International Relations Unit

Mr Tan Jing Koon, Senior Deputy Director, Labour Relations Department

Ms Geraldine Lau, Assistant Director, Quality Assurance Division, Singapore Workforce Development Agency

National University of Singapore

Ms Angela Tan, Senior Manager, International Relations Office

Ms Chooi Foong Sin, Project Officer, International Relations Office

Professor Loh Hong Sai, International Relations Office (by email)

Mr Lee Puay York, International Relations Office (by email)

SEAMEO Regional Language Centre (RELC)

Mrs Tay Sor Har, Director

Dr Christopher S Ward, Deputy Director

THAILAND

8-10 April, 2008

Dr Phillip McKenzie, ACER

Ministry of Education

Bureau of International Cooperation

Ms Churairat Sangboonnum, Director

Mrs Kanittha Hanirattisai, Chief, Regional Cooperation Unit

Ms Khun Walamon, Foreign Relations Officer

Mr Somsong Ngamwong, Foreign Relations Officer

Office of the Basic Education Commission

Dr Somkiat Chobphol, Deputy Secretary-General

Dr Benjalug Namfa, Director, Bureau of Academic Affairs and Educational Standards

Dr Darunee Jumpatong, Educator

Mr Jackrapan Onnom, Foreign Relations Group, Bureau of Policy and Planning

Office of the Vocational Education Commission

Dr Siripan Choomnoom, Deputy Secretary-General

Chatree Chananart, Supervisor, Bureau of Vocational Education, Standards and Qualifications

Maturode Sumranpon, Head, External Relations Section, Bureau of Policy and Planning

Ministry of Labour, Department of Skill Development

Ms Siriporn Chiansanong, Chief, International Cooperation Section

Dr Areeya Rojvithee, Deputy Director-General

Teerasak Yuphech, Vocational Training Official

Narong Chamboonrot, Vocational Training Officer

Sandon Themsawanglert, Senior Expert in Skill Development

Commission on Higher Education

Ms Aporn Kanvong, Director, Bureau of International Cooperation Strategy
Dr Sunee Churaisin, Director, Management of Policy on Liberalization of trade in Education Services Group
Ms Sumantana Chantaroagwong, Educational Officer, Bureau of International Cooperation Strategy
Ms Chadarat Singhadechakul, Educational Officer, Bureau of International Cooperation Strategy
Dr Ekaphong Lauhathiansind, Director, Strategy for International Cooperation Networking and Development Group
Mr Saran Vajraphai, Educational Officer, Bureau of International Cooperation Strategy

Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO) Secretariat

Dato' Dr Ahamad bin Sipon, Director
Dr Tinsiri Siribodhi, Deputy Director, Administration and Communication

ASEAN University Network

Prof Dr Piniti Ratananukul, Executive Director

UNESCO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok

Mr Hameed A. Hakeem, Coordinator, Asia-Pacific Programme of Education for All (APPEAL)
Mr Ko-Chih Tung, Regional Advisor for Asia and the Pacific, UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS)
Ms Le Thu Huong, Programme Specialist, Education Policy and Reform Unit
Mr Toshiyuki Matsumoto, Assistant Programme Specialist, Education Policy and Reform Unit
Mr Benjamin L. Vergel de Dios, Programme Officer, ICT in Education, Asia-Pacific Programme of Educational Innovation for Development (APEID)
Ms Hye Rim Kim, Associate Expert in Higher Education, APEID
Mr Mikko Cantell, Associate Expert, Education for Sustainable Development

VIETNAM

14-16 April 2008
Mr Robert Horne, ACER

Ministry of Education and Training, Hanoi

Mr Mai Anh, Deputy Director General, International Co-operation
Mr Tuan Le Quoc, International Co-operation Department
Mr Cuong, Secondary Schools Department

Ministry of Labour Invalids and Social Affairs, Hanoi

Associate Prof Dr Duong Duc Lan, First Deputy Director General,
Mr Cao Quang Dai, Director National Skill Testing and Certification Department

SEAMEO Regional Training Centre (RETRAC), Ho Chi Minh City

Dr Ho Thanh My Phuong, Dean of Education Management Division
Mr TB Duy, International Program Co-ordinator

APPENDIX 3: CONTEXTUAL DATA ON THE EAS COUNTRIES

Table A.1: Social and Economic Context Indicators¹

Country	Country population 2006 (mill.)	Rate of population growth, 2005 (%)	Proportion of population aged <15 years, 2006 (%)	GDP equiv. US\$ converted using PPPs 2005 (bill.)	GDP per capita equiv. US\$ 2005	GDP growth rate, 2005 (%)	Unemployment rate (%) ²	Adult literacy rate 2006 (%)		Life expectancy at birth 2005 (years)
								Male	Female	
Australia	21	1.2	18	736	31,800	2.8	4.2 ²⁰⁰⁸	-	-	81
Brunei Darussalam	0.4	2.2	27	19	-	1.7 ⁴²⁰⁰⁴	4.0 ²⁰⁰⁷	95	96	77
Cambodia	14	2.0	34	23	2,700	13.4	-	86	67	57
China	1,321	0.6	20	6,092	6,800	10.2	9.5 ²⁰⁰⁷	96	90	72
India	1,151	1.4	30	2,740	3,500	9.2	7.2 ²⁰⁰⁷	76	53	64
Indonesia	229	1.4	26	770	3,800	5.6	9.1 ²⁰⁰⁷	95	87	68
Japan	128	0.0	13	4,081	31,300	2.6	3.8 ²⁰⁰⁸	-	-	82
Republic of Korea	48	0.4	17	1,113	22,000	4.0	3.2 ²⁰⁰⁸	-	-	78
Lao PDR	6	2.3	36	11	2,000	7.0	-	80	66	56
Malaysia	26	1.8	29	327	10,900	5.2	3.0 ²⁰⁰⁸	94	89	74
Myanmar	48	1.0	25	40	...	5.0	-	-	-	61
New Zealand	4	0.9	20	107	25,000	1.9	3.6 ²⁰⁰⁸	-	-	80
Philippines	86	1.7	33	272	5,100	5.0	7.4 ²⁰⁰⁸	92 ²⁰⁰³	94 ²⁰⁰³	71
Singapore	4	2.4	20	200	29,700	6.4	2.0 ²⁰⁰⁸	94	97	80
Thailand	63	0.8	20	482	8,700	4.5	1.5 ²⁰⁰⁸	96	92	71
Viet Nam	85*	1.2	30	199	3,100	8.4	-	83 ⁹⁹⁹	93 ⁹⁹⁹	71

Sources:

¹ Data for Primary and Secondary school enrolments, and Government spending on education taken from UNESCO Institute of Statistics (2005), retrieved 19 December 2007, from <http://stats.uis.unesco.org/unesco>. GDP per capita, GDP growth rate, adult literacy rates, and life expectancy at birth from UNESCO Institute of Statistics. Total GDP from World Bank statistics.

² Unemployment rates taken from The Economist (2008), retrieved 2 June 2008, from <http://economist.com/markets/indicators>

* World Population Prospects: The 2006 Revision Population database taken from the United Nations, (2007), retrieved 2 June 2008, from <http://esa.un.org>.

Table A.2: Education Enrolment Rates by Sector

Country	Compulsory education ages	Primary school enrolments [Net Enrolment Rate] ¹		Secondary school enrolments [Net Enrolment Rate] ¹		Tertiary studies enrolments [Gross Enrolment Rate] ²		Tertiary studies enrolments by ISCED level (% of students enrolled by gender, totals 100) ³					
								ISCED 5A ^{#1}		ISCED 5B ^{#2}		ISCED 6 ^{#3}	
		Males %	Females %	Males %	Females %	Males %	Females %	Males %	Females %	Males %	Females %	Males %	Females %
Australia	5 - 15 yrs	96	97	86	87	64	80	45	55	48	52	50	50
Brunei Darussalam	5 - 16 yrs	93	94	85	90	10	20	31	69	36	64	87	13
Cambodia	5-14 years	97	96	26	22	5	2	68	32	-	-	73	27
China	6 - 14 yrs	-	--	--	-	22	21	-	-	-	-	-	-
India	5 - 14 yrs	90	87	--	--	-	-	48	52	37	63	57	43
Indonesia	7 - 15 yrs	96	93	58	57	19	15	58	42	51	49	65	35
Japan	6 - 15 yrs	100	100	-	-	59	52	59	41	38	62	71	29
Republic of Korea	5 - 16 yrs	97	97	92	89	111	70	63	37	63	37	63	37
Lao PDR	6 - 10 yrs	85	80	38	33	9	7	58	42	59	41	-	-
Malaysia	6 - 12 yrs	98	97	81	72	28	36	42	58	48	52	62	38
Myanmar	5 - 9 yrs	98	100	43	43	--	--	-	-	-	-	--	--
New Zealand	5 - 16 yrs	99	99	92	92	66	99	41	59	42	58	48	52
Philippines	6 - 12 yrs	92	94	55	66	25	31	46	54	47	53	39	61
Singapore	6 - 16 yrs	--	-	--	--	-	-	-	-	-	--	--	-
Thailand	6 - 14 yrs	--	--	-	-	42	44	48	52	52	48	46	54
Vet Nam	6 - 14 yrs	96	90	70	68	19	13	53	47	71	29	72	28

Sources:

1. Data for Primary and Secondary school enrolments, taken from UNESCO Institute of Statistics (2005), retrieved 19 December 2007, from <http://stats.uis.unesco.org/unesco>.
 2 and 3. Data for Tertiary studies enrolments taken from Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2008, retrieved 2 April 2008, from <http://www.unesco.org/education/gmr2008/annexes/annex5.pdf>.

NOTES:

1. Net Enrolment Rate: Enrolment of the official age group for a given level of education, expressed as a percentage of the population in that age group.
2. Gross Enrolment Rate: Total enrolment in a specific level of education, regardless of age, expressed as a percentage of the population in the official age group corresponding to this level of education. For the tertiary level, the population used is that of the five-year age group following on from the secondary school-leaving age. The GER can exceed 100% due to early or late entry and/or grade repetition.
- ^{#1}. ISCED 5A is defined as a tertiary university course (for example a Bachelors degree).
- ^{#2}. ISCED 5B is defined as a tertiary non-university course (for example an Associate diploma).
- ^{#3}. ISCED 6 is defined as a tertiary course at the doctoral level.

Table A.3: Literacy Rates 15 years and over, by Gender

	Males (%)	Females (%)
Australia	99	99
Brunei Darussalam	95	90
Cambodia	85	64
China	95	87
India	73	48
Indonesia	94	87
Japan	99	99
Republic of Korea	99	99
Lao PDR	77	61
Malaysia	92	85
Myanmar	96	93
New Zealand	99	99
Philippines	93	93
Singapore	97	89
Thailand	95	91
Viet Nam	94	87

Source: Data for literacy rates taken from CIA - *The World Fact Book 2007*, retrieved 10 July 2008, from <http://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/>. The data for individual countries refer to single years within the period 2000 to 2006.

Table A.4: Resources for Education

Country	Student-teacher ratio. Primary¹	Student-teacher ratio. Secondary¹	Spending per student (% of per capita GDP). Primary³	Spending per student (% of per capita GDP). Secondary³	Spending per student (% of per capita GDP). Tertiary³
Australia ²	16	12	14	16	22
Brunei Darussalam	13	11	5*	11*	9*
Cambodia	50	28	6*	11*	44*
People's Republic of China	18	18	5*	12*	90*
Republic of India	-	-	9	17	58
Indonesia	20	12	-	-	12*
Japan	19	12	22	23	19
Republic of Korea	28	18	19	25	9
Lao PDR	31	25	9	5	25
Malaysia	-	-	15	21	71
Myanmar	30	34	4*	7*	29*
New Zealand	16	15	18	21	26
Philippines	35	37	8	9	11
Singapore	23	18	11*	13*	34*
Thailand	18	22	14	16	25
Viet Nam	21	23	8*	-	150*

¹. UNESCO Institute of Statistics, 2006 data. See

http://www.oecd.org/document/30/0,3343,en_2649_39263238_39251550_1_1_1_1,00.html

². OECD *Education at a Glance 2007b*, Table D2.2. 2005 data. Custom tables for each country,

http://stats.uis.unesco.org/unesco/TableViewer/document.aspx?ReportId=136&IF_Language=eng&BR_Topic=0

³. World Bank. *Country Profiles. Education Trends and Comparisons. 2006 data*. See:

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTEDUCATION/EXTDATASTATISTICS/EXTEDSTATS/0,,contentMDK:21605891~menuPK:3409559~pagePK:64168445~piPK:64168309~theSitePK:3232764,00.html>

* Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, and Vietnam had 1995 data; China and Myanmar had 1995 data for primary and 2000 data for secondary and tertiary; Singapore had 1995 data for secondary and tertiary and 2000 data for primary; Cambodia had 2000 data.

APPENDIX 4: DATA ON STUDENT FLOWS

TABLE A.5: Students from ASEAN Countries, by Host Country, 1999-2005

A. ASEAN Host Country							
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Vietnam	424	572	581	781	1,003	-	1,838
Thailand	621	-	476	630	-	-	-
Singapore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Philippines	309	-	304	240	587	344	213
Myanmar	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lao PDR	11	11	25	9	-	-	-
Malaysia	1,406	6,959	5,788	7,131	8,351	-	-
Indonesia	157	-	19	19	-	35	-
Cambodia	11	11	25	9	-	-	-
Brunei	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Darussalam	52	45	132	-	34	145	118
Totals	2,991	7,598	7,350	8,819	9,975	524	2,169
B. Other EAS Host Country							
Australia	47,821	38,496	-	57,126	58,782	47,478	51,550
China	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
India	-	724	645	597	1,362	1,386	-
Japan	5,296	5,656	5,845	6,211	6,725	7,906	8,319
Republic of Korea	-	170	185	219	354	644	819
New Zealand	2,476	2,205	2,205	2,083	2,141	2,726	2,893
Totals	55,593	47,251	8,880	66,236	69,364	60,140	63,581
C. Selected Other Hosts							
Canada	1,926	-	-	1,869	-	-	-
USA	41,731	-	35,487	41,864	38,820	35,986	36,112
France	3,051	2,766	2,988	3,171	4,408	5,090	5,750
Germany	4,225	4,427	4,570	4,953	5,546	6,421	7,089
Netherlands	517	504	636	724	919	522	937
United Kingdom	24,591	20,656	18,968	17,532	18,952	23,011	23,299
Totals	76,041	28,353	62,649	70,113	68,645	71,030	73,187
ASEAN students in all countries							
	134,625	83,202	78,879	145,168	147,984	131,694	138,937

Notes

1. The figures come from Table 18 in the UNESCO Institute of Statistics Collection "International Flows of Mobile students at the Tertiary Level". See: <http://stats.uis.unesco.org/unesco/TableViewer/tableView.aspx?ReportId=171>
2. The tertiary level comprises ISCED levels 5 and 6, i.e. higher education and the most advanced courses in TVET.
3. 2005 was the latest year for which data were available for most EAS countries.
4. Series breaks for some countries require caution in drawing inferences from totals.

Table A.6: All Students from Other EAS Countries, by Host Country, 1999-2005

A. ASEAN Host Country	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Brunei	2	18	10	-	0	9	7
Cambodia	2	5	9	20	-	-	-
Indonesia	125	-	265	265	-	302	-
Lao PDR	13	5	15	6	3	27	26
Malaysia	262	7,073	5,973	12,307	11,988	-	-
Myanmar	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Philippines	1,662	-	1,067	1,379	2,491	966	2,698
Singapore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thailand	632	-	803	1230	-	-	-
Vietnam	55	21	51	115	28	-	178
Totals	2,753	7,122	8,193	15,322	14,510	1,304	2,909
B. Other EAS Host Country							
Australia	31,498	26,186	-	53,333	63,938	69,109	90,357
China	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
India	-	72	181	149	193	160	-
Japan	44,743	47,065	50,449	60,695	71,389	100,096	106,587
Republic of Korea	-	1,512	1,859	2,407	3,206	5,097	7,589
New Zealand	1,661	2,787	5,115	11,107	19,635	31,046	30,106
Totals	77,902	77,622	57,604	127,691	158,361	205,508	234,639
C. Selected Other Hosts							
Canada	9,704	-	-	13,790	-	-	-
USA	171,655	-	189,423	237,784	277,135	272,393	287,853
France	5,190	5,541	6,673	9,564	16,631	16,995	19,381
Germany	13,536	15,131	17,871	24,073	31,835	37,954	39,595
Netherlands	329	370	626	1,056	1,635	1,227	2,405
United Kingdom	26,761	28,559	33,297	41,368	60,710	84,971	92,482
Totals	227,175	49,601	247,890	327,635	387,946	413,540	441,716
Grand totals	307,830	134,345	313,687	470,648	560,871	620,352	679,264

Notes

1. The figures come from Table 18 in the UNESCO Institute of Statistics Collection "International Flows of Mobile students at the Tertiary Level". See: <http://stats.uis.unesco.org/unesco/TableViewer/tableView.aspx?ReportId=171>
2. The tertiary level comprises ISCED levels 5 and 6, ie higher education and the most advanced courses in TVET.
3. 2005 was the latest year for which data were available for most EAS countries.
4. Series breaks for some countries require caution in drawing inferences from totals.

Table A.7: All Students from All EAS Countries, by Host Country, 1999-2005

A. ASEAN Host Country	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Brunei	54	63	142	0	34	154	125
Cambodia	13	16	34	29	-	-	-
Indonesia	282	0	284	284	0	337	-
Lao PDR	73	72	128	129	87	205	169
Malaysia	1,668	14,032	11,761	19,438	20,339	-	-
Myanmar	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Philippines	1,971	-	1,371	1,619	3,078	1,310	2,911
Singapore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thailand	1,253		1,279	1,860	-	-	-
Vietnam	479	593	632	896	1,031	-	2,016
Totals	5,793	14,776	15,631	24,255	24,569	2,006	5,221
B. Other EAS Host Country							
Australia	79,319	64,682		110,459	122,720	116,587	141,907
China	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
India	-	796	826	746	1,555	1,546	-
Japan	50,039	52,721	56,294	66,906	78,114	108,002	114,906
Republic of Korea	-	1,682	2,044	2,626	3,560	5,741	8,408
New Zealand	4,137	4,992	7,320	13,190	21,776	33,772	32,999
Totals	133,495	124,873	66,484	193,927	227,725	265,648	298,220
C. Selected Other Hosts							
Canada	11,630	-	-	15,659	-	-	-
USA	213,386	-	224,910	279,648	315,955	308,379	323,965
France	8,241	8,307	9,661	12,735	21,039	22,085	25,131
Germany	17,761	19,558	22,441	29,026	37,381	44,375	46,684
Netherlands	846	874	1,262	1,780	2,554	1,749	3,342
United Kingdom	51,352	49,215	52,265	58,900	79,662	107,982	115,781
Totals	303,216	77,954	310,539	397,748	456,591	484,570	514,903
Grand Totals	442,504	217,603	392,654	615,930	708,885	752,224	818,344

Source: UNESCO Institute of Statistics Collection, Table 18

Notes

1. The figures come from Table 18 in the UNESCO Institute of Statistics Collection "International Flows of Mobile students at the Tertiary Level". See: <http://stats.uis.unesco.org/unesco/TableViewer/tableView.aspx?ReportId=171>
2. The tertiary level comprises ISCED levels 5 and 6, ie higher education and the most advanced courses in TVET.
3. 2005 was the latest year for which data were available for most EAS countries.
4. Series breaks for some countries require caution in drawing inferences from totals.

APPENDIX 5: SCHOLARSHIP SCHEMES OFFERED BY EAS GOVERNMENTS

Country and Name of Scheme	Countries Eligible in EAS Area	Nature of Scheme	Size/ Quantity
ADB-Japan Scholarship Program (JSP)	Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand, Vietnam.	The JSP, established in 1988 with financing from the Japan aims to provide an opportunity for well-qualified citizens of ADB's developing member countries to pursue postgraduate studies in economics, management, science and technology, and other development-related fields at participating academic institutions in the Asian and Pacific Region. Upon completion of their study programs, scholars are expected to contribute to the economic and social development of their home countries.	About 300 scholarships annually
Australia Australian Development Scholarships (ADS)	Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Laos, the Philippines and Vietnam.	Public sector: Applicants are public sector employees who are nominated by their governments for an ADS award through competitive selection. Applicants are required to return to their public service role on completion to strengthen public service capacity in their home country. Open/equity: Applicants do not need to be nominated by their government or employer. Anyone who meets the selection criteria may apply under this category. Applicants are required to return to their country of citizenship on completion to contribute to the development of the identified priority sector in their country.	Up to 1000 a year across 31 countries

Australia Endeavour Awards	Most EAS countries	The Endeavour Awards is the Australian Government's merit-based scholarship program providing opportunities for citizens of the Asia-Pacific and Middle East regions to undertake study, research and professional development in Australia. Most EAS countries are listed as participants. For international applicants the Awards come in three categories: Post graduate, VET and Executive	In 2009 228 post grad awards, 60 VET awards and 98 Executive awards for international applicants + unquantified research scholarships.
Leadership Awards	Within EAS, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Laos, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam	The Australian Leadership Awards (ALA) offer scholarships and fellowships with a view to developing leadership and building partnerships and linkages within the Asia-Pacific.	Not specified.
China Chinese Government Scholarships	Not specified	China Scholarship Council offers scholarships as follows: *Foreign StudentsAŽ Scholarship * Great Wall Scholarship * Distinguished Foreign Student Scholarship * HSK Winner Scholarship Program * Chinese Culture and Research Fellowship * Short-term Studies Scholarship Program for Foreign Teachers Teaching Chinese	Not specified
Japan Japanese Government Scholarships	World-wide for research and Japanese Studies Scholarships, developing countries for undergraduate, teacher training and VET scholarships.	Scholarships available in the following categories: Research/ postgraduate Teacher training Undergraduate Japanese studies College of technology Special training college	In 2007, the nos. of awards available: 4030 for research 155 for TT 478 undergraduate 340 Japanese studies 90 coll. of technology 110 STC.

Republic of Korea Korean Government Scholarships	Eligibility varies between categories. -Undergraduate schools are for CIS and Asian countries. -Postgrad schemes have wider regional eligibility or worldwide.	Scholarships available in the following categories: *MEST Scholarship program - Scholarship program - Undergraduate - Graduate - Research fellowships in science and engineering *IT scholarships and IT policy and technology scholarships *MOFAT scholarship program - Graduate study fellowships for Students in RoK - Korean language training scholarship	About 500 scholarships annually
New Zealand New Zealand Development Scholarships <u>Public sector</u>	Within SE Asia, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Timor Leste and Vietnam.	NZDS-Public scholarships is a bilateral scheme available to individuals from selected partner countries in Southeast Asia and the Pacific . The selection criteria are determined by the partner government and NZAID. Shortlisted applications, mostly from public sector employees, are endorsed for a scholarship by the partner government.	Between the two schemes, about 60 scholarships annually appear to be available for Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos and Vietnam.
New Zealand Development Scholarships <u>NZDS Open</u>	Open to some developing countries, including China, Indonesia, Myanmar, Philippines, and Viet Nam.	NZDS-Open scholarships are a non-bilateral scheme. Candidates independently apply for a scholarship. NZDS-Open scholarships are generally directed at employees of private sector or civil society sector organisations, including non-governmental organisations. In some countries, public sector employees can also apply. New Zealand also offers English Language Training for Officials and Short-term Training Awards.	
Singapore	All ASEAN countries	Under the its Co-operation Programme the Singapore Govt offers the Singapore Scholarship for ASEAN Countries as well as bilateral assistance. The scholarships are tenable for degree study at Singapore Universities; entry qualifications are at undergraduate level.	Not specified.

APPENDIX 6: ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Phillip McKenzie BEd (Hons), DipEd, MEd, PhD (*Monash*)

Phillip McKenzie is Research Director of the Transitions and Post-School Education and Training program at the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER), and a Director of the Monash University-ACER Centre for the Economics of Education and Training (CEET). He has worked on a wide variety of research projects on the costs, financing and labour market outcomes of education and training, and education policy issues. He was a member of the Prime Minister's *Youth Pathways Action Plan Taskforce* which produced the report *Footprints to the Future* (2001). His international experience includes working at the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) on the *Transition from Initial Education to Working Life* (1996-98) and *Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers* (2002-04). He edited the OECD's *Education Policy Analysis* in 2002 and 2003.

Robert Horne MA (*Oxford*)

Robert Horne is an independent consultant who specialises in building capacity for policy change and reform within government, especially in the fields of education, training and employment. In his former role as First Assistant Secretary in the Australian Government Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs (1998-2001) he was responsible for facilitating inter-national government to government relations in education and training, and the analysis and evaluation of policy for education and training, and equity issues. He has also held senior public service positions in the United Kingdom, including as Director, Finance and Planning, UK Employment Service (1995-97). His most recent consultancy involved developing a framework for financial management for the National Targeted Program for Education, on behalf of the Ministry of Education and Training of Vietnam. He has also conducted extensive consultancies in Papua New Guinea, and visited widely throughout Asia on work assignments.

Andrew Dowling BA (Hons), GradDipTeach, MA, Executive MBA, PhD (*Sydney*)

Andrew Dowling is a Principal Research Fellow in ACER's Policy Analysis and Program Analysis program. Andrew joined ACER in July 2007 from his role as manager of schools resourcing policy in the New South Wales Department of Education and Training. In that role, Andrew was part of a team conducting national financial analysis of school funding and coordinated external consultants on large-scale education costing projects. Since starting at ACER, Andrew has written a widely reviewed policy brief on "Australia's School Funding System" and has also worked on a number of projects involving countries from the South East Asian region. Andrew has 20 years experience in the education sector, having taught at both schools and universities and worked in university and school policy at senior levels.

Adrian Beavis BA, MEd (*Melbourne*)

Adrian Beavis is the Research Director of the Policy Research and Program Evaluation program at ACER, a position he has held since 2007. He has a wide range of research interests: vocational interests and their influence on school subject choice and tertiary course preferences, intergenerational social mobility, teachers and teacher education; and arts education. He has a particular interest in the relationship between evaluation and policy development. Dr Beavis left ACER in 2006 after thirteen years to take up the position of Principal Researcher with The Smith Family. In this role he was responsible for program evaluation, original research and commentary on research and policy documents. Prior to ACER he worked in the Victorian Ministry of Education and the State Training Board, the then-peak body responsible for the TAFE sector, and the Centre for Program Evaluation at the then-Melbourne College of Advanced Education.