

**Hundred and fifty-fifth Session**

155 EX/6  
PARIS, 25 August 1998  
Original: English

Item 3.2.1 of the provisional agenda

**REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL ON CO-ORDINATION  
AMONG UNESCO EDUCATION INSTITUTES AND BETWEEN  
THE INSTITUTES AND THE SECRETARIAT**

**SUMMARY**

By 29 C/Resolution 7 the General Conference invited the Director-General to present a report on co-ordination among UNESCO education institutes and between the institutes and the Secretariat. The Executive Board may wish to take note of this report.

Decision required: paragraph 26.

## Background

1. By 29 C/Resolution 7 the General Conference invited the Director General to present a report on co-ordination among UNESCO education institutes and between the institutes and the Secretariat (cf. Annex I). This resolution was preceded by a decision of the Executive Board at its 152nd session (decision 3.4.3 II, para. 3) and reconfirmed and complemented by decision 4.5, paragraph 3 at its 154th session.

2. The resolution was adopted in the context of the proposed establishment of three new UNESCO institutes in the field of education, namely the UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education (IITE) in Moscow, the conversion of the Regional Centre for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean (CRESALC) in Caracas into an International Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean (IESALC) and the projected creation of an International Institute for Capacity-Building in Africa in Addis Ababa. With reference to the Director-General's Introduction to the Draft Programme and Budget for 1998-1999 (29 C/5, paras. 35 and 36, cf. Annex II), the General Conference invited the Executive Board to examine in more depth the principle of functional decentralization to institutes as complementing the geographical decentralization to field offices, and to 'design appropriate arrangements to formulate a coherent strategy and set up priorities throughout all the UNESCO education institutes in line with the Medium-Term Strategy (C/4) and the Programme and Budget (C/5) with the full participation of Member States'.

## Definitions

3. Before examining in more detail some of the co-ordination issues, it might be useful to recall briefly the main characteristics of UNESCO education institutes and to compare them with other institutes that are associated with the Organization through agreements or other forms of co-operation.

4. UNESCO education institutes are institutes that:

- (i) are established within the framework of the Organization by a formal decision of the General Conference and have statutes that are approved by the Organization;
- (ii) have a council/governing board that is elected/appointed by UNESCO and reports to the General Conference;
- (iii) have a director who is a UNESCO staff member appointed by the Director-General following UNESCO's rules and regulations;
- (iv) are guided by programme resolutions adopted by the General Conference which specify their programme priorities and fix the financial contribution of the Organization;
- (v) receive a global allocation under Major Programme I which covers staff costs, direct programme costs and indirect costs. Their budgets include, in addition, voluntary contributions from Member States, international organizations and other donors, in particular the host countries. It is on the basis of actual resources received that the governing board/council of each institute approves the detailed programme and budget.

5. In application of these criteria, the UNESCO International Bureau of Education (IBE), the UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), the UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE) and the UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education (IITE) can be defined as fully-fledged UNESCO institutes. Once the adoption of the statutes and appointment of a governing board and director are completed, two more institutes will be included in this category, i.e. the UNESCO Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean (IESALC), Caracas, and the International Institute for Capacity-Building in Africa, Addis Ababa.

6. There are several other international centres and institutes that are closely connected with the Organization and participate actively in the implementation of its programme. Some were founded with the assistance of UNESCO; in some cases UNESCO agreed that its name and logo could be used. Relations with these centres and institutes are usually based on agreements or contracts, in some cases even decisions of the General Conference. Financial support given to them is considered a programme activity under a given subprogramme. In order to distinguish this category of institutes from the first one, they may be called 'UNESCO associated institutes'. In spite of their close association with UNESCO they are neither supervised by an international governing board reporting to the Organization nor directed by a UNESCO staff member appointed by the Director-General. Institutes which belong to this category include the International Research and Training Centre for Rural Education (INRULED) in Baoding, China, the International Literacy Institute (ILI) at the Pennsylvania University in Philadelphia (United States) and the proposed International Academy for Education and Democracy in Denmark. A number of other institutes and centres may also be included under this category.

7. Whereas the UNESCO institutes are an integral part of the Organization and co-ordination among them a matter of internal management, the 'associated institutes' are partner institutes which assist the Organization in achieving its objectives. Their expansion - for a more balanced geographical distribution - and integration as a relevant component of the educational network of the Organization, are a permanent objective of the Director General, who is promoting at present an International Institute for Education of Children with Special Needs in New Delhi, an International Institute for Youth in Lilongwe, Malawi and a Pan-African Network on Human Resources in Education, Science and Culture in South Africa. The Director-General hopes that, jointly with ILO, the Unit on Vocational Education and Training (Berlin), set up with the support of Germany, will become before long a fully-fledged International Institute.

### **History, mandate and present situation of UNESCO education institutes**

8. The development, mandate and present situation of UNESCO education institutes is intimately linked with the historic context in which they were founded and the educational needs existing at that time.

9. The IBE was founded in 1925 as a non-governmental association before becoming an intergovernmental institution in 1929. It was born out of the educational reform movement of the 1920s and 1930s and the beginning of multilateral co-operation at the intergovernmental level within the framework of the League of Nations. With the launching of the International Conference of Public Instruction in 1934 (later renamed International Conference on Education, ICE), it established the first truly international forum for intergovernmental dialogue and exchange. The ideas and principles leading to the foundation of UNESCO in 1945 were deeply influenced by the international debate on education animated by the IBE.

Since its integration into the Organization in 1969 and the emergence of parallel fora for educational co-operation, IBE's specific role and influence has slowly changed, in particular after the periodicity of the International Conference on Education had been modified. Under the guidance of its Council (governmental representatives from 28 Member States), the Bureau is currently engaged in a process of programmatic renewal aimed at re-establishing the IBE as an international reference centre for information on educational contents and methods, as well as their renewal.

10. IIEP was established in 1963 in response to the rapidly increasing demand from Member States for assistance in educational planning and management. It has focused its programme from the outset on capacity-building through training programmes, research and exchange of information in the field of educational planning and management. IIEP's broad acceptance as policy adviser and provider of technical services stems in a large extent from the valuable services it rendered to so many officials from developing countries during the very first years of their independence. IIEP has a Governing Board composed of 12 designated and elected specialists. Its extrabudgetary resources come mainly from ministries and agencies in charge of international development co-operation and technical assistance. In line with these priorities, IIEP has been an active supporter of the Jomtien process and has promoted the establishment of new frameworks for international co-operation in the field of education such as the International Working Group on Education (IWGE) and the Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA).

11. UIE's creation and development cannot be understood without looking at the political situation in Europe after the Second World War. Founded in 1951, when the Federal Republic of Germany joined UNESCO, it initially had as a main task to facilitate the reintegration of German educators into the international community and to promote dialogue between education specialists from Western and Eastern Europe. A major reform process which was influenced by the International Commission on the Development of Education (chaired by Edgar Faure) led in 1972 to a programmatic and organizational reshaping of the Institute. Since that time, UIE has been acting as an international centre specialized in the field of adult education and lifelong learning. With the organization of the fifth International Conference on Adult Education in Hamburg (1997), it reconfirmed this programmatic priority. For the next few years, it will serve as focal point for the follow-up of CONFINTEA V, which represents a turning point in adult education, with a new approach based on intensive skills learning and improving the quality of life. UIE has an international Governing Board composed of 11 specialists appointed by the Director-General.

12. The initiative to establish a new UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education (IITE) in Moscow was launched by the second International Congress on Education and Informatics held in Moscow in 1996. The statutes of the Institute were approved by the General Conference at its 29th session (resolution 6). The Governing Board, composed of 11 members appointed by the Director-General in their personal capacity, held its first session from 19 to 22 July 1998. In the context of this report, it is important to note that the foundation of IITE not only coincides with unprecedented development in the field of information technologies but also took place in the context of dramatic political and socio-economic changes in the Russian Federation and in the countries of the former Soviet Union. As in the case of IBE, IIEP and UIE, the creation of the new institute is not simply a response to expressed educational needs; it is as much a reaction to a specific political context. It is to be hoped that in five to ten years from now IITE will have reached similar achievements as did the other institutes in their time.

13. The conversion of CRESALC from a secretariat unit into an institute, IESALC, is different in so far as more than 25 years of experience have proven the usefulness of its programmes. Proposed by the participants of the Regional Preparatory Conference of the World Conference on Higher Education (La Havana, November 1996) and endorsed by the General Conference at its 29th session, the creation of IESALC marks an upgrading and expansion of existing programmes rather than the launching of a new initiative. It is expected that IESALC will reinforce the development of higher education programmes in the region and facilitate co-ordination of governmental and non-governmental initiatives in this rapidly evolving field.

14. The initiative to establish an International Institute for Capacity-Building in Africa reflects the commitment of African countries to reinforce co-operation and exchange among themselves and among developing countries in general. This commitment was endorsed recently by the seventh Conference of African Ministers of Education (MINEDAF VII), held in Durban, South Africa, from 20 to 24 April 1998. Once operational, the new institute is expected to organize regional and subregional training programmes in the fields of educational management, curriculum development and teacher education and distance education.

### **General observations**

15. It is interesting to note that the creation of UNESCO institutes has always responded to the emergence of specific needs expressed by Member States. On the eve of the twenty-first century, the Organization is confronted with increasing complexity and new and diversified demands for more specialized services requiring highly professional, autonomous and yet effectively interlinked units and networks. The establishment of new UNESCO institutes and the reinforcement of the existing ones represent a dynamic response to these demands. It reflects a general trend towards more flexible and autonomous structures which are crucial for the efficiency of modern organizations. As clearly indicated in the Medium-Term Strategy 1996-2001, increasing the delegation of authority in conjunction with functional or geographical decentralization is a necessary condition to serve Member States more efficiently.

16. The Education Sector is already today the most advanced in terms of geographical decentralization to field offices (50.2 per cent of the budget under Major Programme I is decentralized to field offices) and has decentralized 15 per cent of its regular budget under Major Programme I (40.4 per cent of the direct programme costs) to the four institutes approved by the General Conference at its 29th session (cf. Annex III). The creation of new institutes will increase the decentralization rate both in terms of the overall percentage and in terms of the distribution of funds between institutes and field offices. It is the wish of the Director-General to fully decentralize their respective functions, in such a way that co-ordination and overall supervision can be exerted in agreement with the Medium-Term Strategy as approved by the General Conference. As a consequence the role and function of the Education Sector at Headquarters is being redefined. It will be much more concerned with general policy matters and with the overall co-ordination of programmes (planning, monitoring, evaluating, backstopping) and less with the execution of programme activities and projects itself, except those of a global nature and those requiring particular attention and support. In this perspective the challenge of co-ordination is mainly to ensure full coherence between the objectives and programmes of the institutes and the overall strategy and priorities of the Organization, while maximizing flexibility at the level of implementation.

17. Among the measures by which co-ordination is being ensured by the Director-General are the following:

ensuring active representation of the Director-General at the different governing boards/councils of the institutes;

inviting the directors of the institutes to define their programmes and prepare their budget in close consultation with the different programme sectors and the general services of the Secretariat (BPE, BB, PER);

regularly evaluating the implementation of the institutes' programmes and activities;

organizing regular meetings with the directors of the different institutes;

encouraging direct contacts between the directors of the institutes;

making budgetary allocations according to the overall priorities of the Organization.

Furthermore, in the process of decentralization and delegation of authority, constant efforts have been made to obtain coherence in the distribution of tasks among the institutes and between the institutes and the different units of the Secretariat (Headquarters and field), as well as to avoid any kind of overlapping.

The Executive Board may wish to keep these general observations in mind when discussing the following more technical aspects of co-ordinating the work of the UNESCO education institutes.

#### **The role of the institutes in the C/4 process**

18. The programmes of the Organization are guided by the Medium-Term Strategy 1996-2001 which was adopted by the General Conference at its 28th session. Although the institutes participated actively in its preparation, it might be desirable to include more specific references to their respective role in the implementation of the Organization's strategy and programme. In line with document 28 C/4 Approved, IIEP, IBE and UIE have developed their own Medium-Term Plan (IIEP)/Strategy (IBE, UIE). In a similar way, the new UNESCO institutes may be invited to prepare a medium-term strategy within the framework of the Organization's overall strategy.

#### **The institutes in the biennial Programme and Budget (C/5)**

19. The institutes are presented under Major Programme I 'Education for all throughout life', after Programme I.1 'Basic education for all' and Programme I.2 'Reform of education in the perspective of education throughout life', which are implemented by the Education Sector and the field offices. Under Programmes I.1 and I.2 several references are being made to the contributions the institutes are expected to make to individual programme actions. References can also be made in other programmes and interdisciplinary projects where relevant, as is the case for the IBE in relation to the transdisciplinary project 'Towards a culture of peace'. This presentation ensures that the institutes and their specific responsibilities are clearly identified. By adopting separate programme resolutions for each institute, Member States approve the programme and the corresponding financial allocation proposed by the Director-General, and may give, if necessary, specific instructions to the respective governing bodies. In addition, separate work plans for each institute are also

presented which enable Member States to examine and compare the programme priorities of the different institutes.

### **Reports submitted to the General Conference**

20. According to their statutes the governing bodies of the institutes submit a report to the General Conference in order to inform Member States about the execution of their programmes as well as on the general development of the institute during the period under consideration. Based on these reports the General Conference approves the proposed resolution on the institute and the work plan for the coming biennium. These documents have proven to be extremely useful for informing Member States, partner organizations and the broader public about the activities of the institutes, for giving recognition to the support of donors and for mobilizing voluntary contributions. The periodic information provided is also useful to the Director-General, for the purpose of highlighting activities or redressing trends. They should therefore be maintained and widely disseminated. In addition, it should be noted that the major activities of the institutes are also included in the report of the Director-General on the execution of the programme (C/3) and in the reports the Director-General submits to the Executive Board.

### **Work plans**

21. The institutes prepare annual work programmes which are approved by their respective governing bodies. Since a representative of the Director-General - usually the Assistant Director-General for Education - participates in all sessions of these governing bodies, the Secretariat is fully informed of these work programmes and takes them into account when preparing or adjusting its own work plans. With the information received, the Director-General can decide to adopt pertinent measures and to report to the following session of the Executive Board. With a view to maintaining the principle of functional autonomy of the institutes in the framework adopted by the General Conference, this procedure should be maintained. Certain minor modifications, however, might be foreseen to improve the communication and the flow of information: (i) once approved by the governing body of the institute concerned, the work programmes should be disseminated systematically to all relevant units of the Secretariat, in particular the field offices in order to inform them in good time of any activities in their respective regions or countries; and (ii) ensure that the institutes are systematically informed about the work plans prepared by Headquarters, field offices and the other institutes.

### **Programme implementation at country and regional levels**

22. In the process of geographical decentralization, UNESCO has transferred major responsibilities for implementing regional and country level activities to the respective field offices, including the responsibility for co-ordinating UNESCO's action at the regional and national levels. For regional- and country-level activities executed by Headquarters and by the institutes, this devolution of responsibility implies that close consultations with the relevant field offices need to take place during all phases of a given activity. As the institutes have developed their own networks of co-operation in Member States and in the regions, efforts have to be made to improve the information flow between institutes and field offices. This being said, it has to be emphasized that many field offices co-operate in an exemplary manner with the various institutes, in particular the Regional Offices. They have participated in the preparation and follow-up of major international conferences (ICE, CONFINTEA) and assist in the identification of participants for meetings and training courses. The Harare Office, to

give but one example, has co-operated closely with IIEP in the development of the Southern African Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ).

### **Extrabudgetary activities**

23. All institutes receive, in addition to the financial allocation from UNESCO, contributions in cash and in kind from various donors including the host country, and maintain close relations with them. This practice has proven to be successful and should not be modified. In addition, the institutes are entrusted with the implementation of projects funded under the various United Nations and fund-in-trust agreements concluded with UNESCO and co-ordinated by the Bureau for Relations with Extrabudgetary Funding Sources (BER). The procedures for submitting project proposals to a given donor for possible funding are the same for the institutes, Headquarters and field offices. As many donor agencies have decentralized negotiations concerning the funding of extrabudgetary projects to their local embassies, directors of field offices may have to negotiate project proposals prepared by the institutes or Headquarters in the same manner as they do for proposals prepared by themselves.

### **Co-ordination and communication among the institutes**

24. As long as there were only three UNESCO education institutes, co-ordination and communication among them was relatively easy. The directors were well known to each other, they met frequently among themselves or at Headquarters on the occasion of technical meetings. The Assistant Director-General for Education has maintained close contacts with all of them. The Bureau for Programme Co-ordination in the Education Sector supported the information flow and managed the day-to-day contacts with the institutes. The creation of new institutes located at greater geographical distance from Headquarters and having specialized fields of competence requires new and flexible co-ordination and communication mechanisms. Whereas the contacts among the institutes themselves should continue to develop in their own right, there is a need to develop task-oriented horizontal co-operation networks pooling together the resources of the Organization (Headquarters, institutes, field offices) and using to the fullest extent modern information and communication technologies. At the same time close programmatic linkages between the institutes and the relevant programme divisions need to be strengthened. For the new IESALC, for instance, it would be necessary to maintain a close association with the other regional programmes in the field of higher education. The Moscow Institute must be associated with the Learning Without Frontiers programme, the new Institute for Capacity-Building in Africa with the follow-up given to the seventh Conference of African Ministers of Education (MINEDAF VII). Through the programme divisions and the Bureau for Programme Co-ordination in the Education Sector, the Assistant Director-General for Education will continue, in close contact with the Director-General to ensure a systematic flow of information and to provide support, in particular to the new institutes. In addition to frequent exchanges by electronic communication means, it is suggested that at least once a year a co-ordination meeting be organized to review the contribution of the institutes to the implementation of the programme. Furthermore it is envisaged to reinforce the capacities of the Secretariat (Headquarters and field) in the use of modern technologies including the establishment of local area networks and the training of personnel.

### **Conclusion**

25. The process of improving the co-ordination among UNESCO education institutes and between the institutes and the Secretariat is an ongoing task. The items addressed in this report represent only a selection of questions which could and should be addressed in future



consultations on this subject. The Executive Board may wish to take note of the above report and to formulate a number of recommendations on the subject under consideration.

### **Draft decision**

26. In the light of the above, the Executive Board may wish to adopt the following draft decision:

The Executive Board,

1. Having examined document 155 EX/6,
2. Recognizing the important contribution of UNESCO education institutes, as well as of the associated institutes, to the efficient implementation of the programme,
3. Considering that the functional autonomy granted to UNESCO education institutes contributes to an effective implementation of the programmes and projects of the Organization and in particular of Major Programme I 'Education for all throughout life',
4. Emphasizing, however, the need to improve the co-ordination among the institutes and between the institutes and the Secretariat in order to preserve the unity of UNESCO's education programme and to avoid overlapping,
5. Considers IBE, IIEP, UIE, IITE as fully-fledged UNESCO education institutes, as well as IESALC and the International Institute for Capacity-Building in Africa (Addis Ababa) once their statutes are approved;
6. Approves the inclusion of a separate section on each institute in the Draft Programme and Budget for 2000-2001 (30 C/5) under Major Programme I as well as the preparation of a separate resolution on each institute;
7. Invites the Director-General to continue his consultations with the governing bodies of all six institutes aimed at preparing a coherent programme for the biennium 2000-2001 (30 C/5);
8. Further invites the Director-General to ensure the development of a modern communication infrastructure allowing Headquarters, field offices, and UNESCO education institutes and associated institutes alike, to co-operate as a dynamic network of specialized institutes at the service of Member States.

## ANNEX I

### **29 C/Resolution 7: Co-ordination among UNESCO education institutes**

*The General Conference,*

*Having taken note of 152 EX/Decision 3.4.3,*

*Considering the need for better co-ordination among existing UNESCO education institutes and the further demand for such institutes,*

*Recalling 151 EX/Decision 5.1, paragraph 22, to the effect that a more coherent approach should be achieved for the UNESCO education institutes with a view to ensuring a clear division of tasks and avoiding duplication of efforts among the institutes and vis-à-vis the Secretariat,*

*Considering the need to design appropriate arrangements to formulate a coherent strategy and set up priorities throughout all the UNESCO education institutes in line with the Medium-Term Strategy (C/4) and the Programme and Budget (C/5) with the full participation of Member States,*

*Invites the Director-General to submit to the Executive Board at its 155th session a report for this purpose together with his proposals to improve co-ordination among existing, new or planned institutes and between such institutes and the Secretariat taking into account the debate during the 29th session of the General Conference.*

## ANNEX II

### Document 29 C/5: Introduction by the Director-General

35. The UNESCO institutes for education - the UNESCO International Bureau of Education (IBE), the UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) and the UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE) - represent a different form of decentralization, which is more functional than geographical. Efforts have been made in recent years to ensure that there is a clear division of roles between these institutes and the Education Sector, and that they take a more active and direct part in achieving the Organization's priority objectives. IIEP is henceforth fully responsible for capacity-building in the planning, administration and management of education, and it will also take part in action carried out to reform and reconstruct education systems. Adult and continuing education come under UIE, which will thus be responsible for the follow-up to the fifth International Conference on Adult Education. As for the IBE, under the guidance of its Council, it has embarked upon a process of reorienting its programme priorities. The proposals contained in document 29 C/5 are intended to make it an international reference centre for information on education, and on the renewal of educational curricula, content and methods. The emphasis has initially been placed on the teaching of values and on education for peace, human rights and democracy. Consequently, the IBE will be called upon to play a very active role in implementing the transdisciplinary project 'Towards a culture of peace', in particular by encouraging the revision of history textbooks and the adoption of national agreements bringing together the chief partners in the education process, with a view to developing education for tolerance, peace and democratic values.

36. The operational flexibility of these institutes has on the whole been a success. It is true, nevertheless, that all three are located in Europe, the same region as the Organization's Headquarters. There should be an examination of whether these arrangements - which have proved their worth - could be applied, with the necessary adaptations, to other regions of the world so as to increase the Organization's influence by bringing it closer to the countries and communities it serves. Several institutions, such as the International Centre for Rural Education in Baoding (China), the Regional Centre for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean (CRESALC) in Caracas, the International Institute for Capacity-Building, which is due to be set up in Addis Ababa, and the new UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education, which will be founded in Moscow, might represent a first step towards this more balanced presence of UNESCO in the various regions.

**ANNEX III**

<b>Distribution of resources in US \$ under Major Programme I (cf. 29 C/5 Approved, Technical annex)</b>										
	<b>Direct costs</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Personnel costs</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Indirect costs</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total costs</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Extrabudgetary (estimates)</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Education Sector (at Headquarters)</b>	8 460 000	21.8	27 395 850	46.3	636 600	09.6	36 492 850	34.8	28 000 000	31.1
<b>IBE</b>	7 000 000						7 000 000		500 000	
<b>IIEP</b>	6 000 000						6 000 000		4 000 000	
<b>IITE</b>	1 000 000						1 000 000		3 000 000	
<b>UIE</b>	<u>1 700 000</u>						<u>1 700 000</u>		<u>3 500 000</u>	
<b>Total institutes</b>	15 700 000	40.4					15 700 000	15.0	11 000 000	12.2
<b>Field offices</b> (including allocation for CRESALC and the International Institute for Capacity-Building in Africa)	14 699 600	37.8	31 780 700	53.7	6 024 000	90.4	52 504 300	50.2	51 000 000	56.7
<b>Total, MP I</b>	<b>38 860 000</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>59 176 550</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>6 660 600</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>104 697 150</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>90 000 000</b>	<b>100</b>