Synthesis Report on the State of Community Learning Centres in Six Asian Countries

Bangladesh, Indonesia, Mongolia, Republic of Korea, Thailand and Viet Nam

DECEMBER 2016

United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

UNESCO Institute
for Lifelong Learning

NILE
National Institute for Lifelong Education

As part of the follow-up activities of CONFINTEA VI for the Asia-Pacific region, the National Institute for Lifelong Education of the Republic of Korea (NILE) has been conducting a research project aimed at comprehensively analysing the wider benefits of community learning centres (CLCs). Six countries (Bangladesh, Indonesia, Mongolia, the Republic of Korea, Thailand, and Viet Nam) in the Asia-Pacific region are participating in the project. The UNESCO Asia-Pacific Regional Bureau for Education, Bangkok, and the UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning are participating as supporting institutions.

Contents

Abbreviations

ALE	Adult learning and education
APPEAL	Asia and Pacific Programme of Education for All
BeLL	Benefits of Lifelong Learning
BNFE	Bureau of Non-Formal Education, Bangladesh
BRAC	Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee
CiLL	Competencies in Later Life
CLC	Community learning centre
CONFINTEA	UNESCO world conferences on adult education
EFA	Education for All
LLC	Lifelong learning centre
NFE	Non-formal education
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NILE	National Institute for Lifelong Education, Republic of Korea
PIAAC	Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
QE	Quality enhancement
SAGS	Special community action groups
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SEAMEO	Southeast Asia Ministers of Education Organization
UIL	UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning
VFM	Value for money
VHS	Volkshochschule (community adult education centre in Germany)
WBL	Wider benefits of learning
WEF	World Education Forum

Introduction

In a time of constant flux, lifelong learning is more important than ever. To thrive and adapt to new challenges in today's ever-changing, complex world, individuals need to acquire knowledge, skills and competencies through multiple forms of learning throughout their lifetimes. Several countries in Asia and the Pacific region have identified lifelong learning as a key priority in their constitutions, laws and national policies, especially with regard to promoting sustainable development. The global Education for All (EFA) and Education 2030 Framework for Action agendas, both of which were launched in Asia and the Pacific region, endorse and embrace the UN's Sustainable Development Goal 4, which promotes inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning for all.

Community learning centres – or CLCs – serve as local institutions for said lifelong learning, performing important functions to improve access to education. They are increasingly recognized as fundamental for revitalizing the pursuit of knowledge at a local level and building community bonds to address sustainable development problems and needs. CLCs are therefore not just education or training centres, but establishments where information and resources related to the local community are gathered and disseminated and where a future vision for the development of those communities is cultivated. They act as networking channels for local people and related organizations, and promote human development by providing opportunities for educational advancement and skills development at the local level, thereby enabling personal empowerment, social transformation and improved quality of life. The UNESCO Recommendation on Adult Learning and Education highlights the importance of 'creating or strengthening appropriate institutional structures, like CLCs, for delivering adult learning and education and encouraging adults to use these as hubs for individual learning as well as community development' (UNESCO, 2015a).

CLCs are a significant feature of learning opportunities in many Asian countries. According to the UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education in Bangkok, as many as 170,000 CLCs operate throughout the region, which is widely considered to have responded most rapidly and positively in recognizing the importance of institutionalizing lifelong learning at local level within easy reach of community members.

In the six countries where the studies included in this report have been drawn – Bangladesh, Indonesia, Mongolia, Republic of Korea, Thailand and Viet Nam – CLCs have been formally recognized as part of the national education policy because they provide a wider understanding of where, why and how adults learn compared to earlier forms of formal and non-formal education. CLCs should be generated, governed and managed from and by local communities, and their benefits are designed to be public and communal. Active participatory citizenship and enhanced quality of life for all, as well as the acquisition of knowledge, skills and an increase in income for individual learners, are just some of the common goals and benefits derived from CLCs.

The presentations and discussions held during the Regional Follow-up Meeting in Asia and the Pacific to the Sixth International Conference on Adult Education (CONFINTEA VI) raised important questions on how the shared vision and goals of CLCs are put into practice. Following this meeting, held in Jecheon City, Republic of Korea, in October 2013, the National Institute for Lifelong Education (NILE) of the Republic of Korea initiated regional

research on the wider benefits of CLCs. The following institutions from the six relevant countries took part:

- BRAC University (Bangladesh)
- Directorate General of Early Childhood and Community Education, Ministry of Education and Culture (Indonesia)
- National Centre for Lifelong Education (Mongolia)
- National Institute for Lifelong Education (Republic of Korea)
- Chiang Rai Provincial Office of the Non-Formal and Informal Education (Thailand)
- Research Institute for Development of Learning Society, Viet Nam Association for Learning Promotion (Viet Nam)

The UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning and the UNESCO Regional Bureau for Education in Bangkok facilitated the research by enlisting national partners and providing advice on the processes.

The central purpose of this exploratory research is to raise socio-political awareness of the significance of CLCs. It is hoped that government support for the centres will be increased when there is sound evidence of the benefits adult populations gain when they participate in the learning and education activities that are being organized; thus, the research is looking more explicitly at the wider benefits that can enable the inclusion of individuals' less tangible gains as well as the advantages to communities.

UNESCO has consistently advocated for lifelong learning and education in terms of its wider benefits. A 'wider benefits of learning' approach was developed and received significant attention from the European educational policy community, especially in the UK. It grew out of a desire to counteract educational trends from the 1980s that tended to limit the purpose of schooling and training to that which provided learners with the skills they needed for employability; a strong tendency to measure and report on progress in terms of immediate results was also in favour at that time. The 2007/08 worldwide economic crisis raised doubts about the sustainability of these educational priorities and questioned the ethos of prioritizing efficiency and results-based learning.

This synthesis report on the state of community learning centres in six countries provides an overview within the contexts of policy, practice and achievements at the beginning of research in 2015/16. More importantly, it identifies the factors that make a CLC approach relevant and significant. The report is organized into seven sections: in the first, an international overview on the place and importance of CLCs in global educational discourse is given; in sections two and three, each country's social, historical, economic and cultural terms are put into context, and analyses of the policies and frameworks related to each country's CLCs are provided. Section four focuses on the operation of a centre, including its governance and management, and its administration of activities, human resources and finances. Section five looks at how a CLC's achievements and benefits are monitored and evaluated. Open discussion is raised in section six, with several questions drawn from the country review. In the final section, research implications for establishing guiding principles to widen the scope and number of CLCs are described and proposals are made for the future promotion and development of quality centres. More details on the state of community learning centres are available in the individual country reports.

Policies and their implementation within CLCs differ among the countries involved. The level of government commitment, the mix of responsibilities, the scale and onset of resources including human resources, and the level of continuing professional development also vary; however, there were significant common needs that were identified through the analysis of individual county reports. Given the desire to make a strong case for policy, governance and funding for adult learning and education, and in particular for CLCs with their wide range of ambitions in Asian countries, this paper suggests ways to sustain and enhance the process, which include:

- Provision of sufficient financial support in absolute terms and as a proportion of the total education budget from national government.
- Reliable government support at all levels, allowing sustained planning and development and the institutionalizing of CLCs.
- Recognition and support for 'soft' infrastructure and human resources.
- Engagement of higher education, training and research institutions for professional development, credit recognition, and participatory and applied research.
- Practical methods to monitor and evaluate, which enhance and not just audit.

It is the authors' opinion that, in East Asia, the CLC concept is significantly more ambitious and holistic; whether this translates into more advanced centres or simply different CLC practices is a question this study raises.

The writing of this report and the review of national reports were managed by the UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning (UIL). UIL is grateful to Chris Duke and Heribert Hinzen for their collaborative efforts in analysing the national reports and for providing their extensive knowledge and experience; UIL also thanks the authors of the national reports for documenting the current state of CLCs and responding to questions from authors. Several colleagues at NILE, UIL and UNESCO also provided feedback during the process of writing this report. A special thank you to Boram Kim for her support in preparing the tables.

It is hoped that this report will serve as a reference when the results from questionnaires collected in the participating countries are analysed. It is intended to provide knowledge for other interested parties and encourage more stakeholders to lend greater support to invigorate CLCs in additional communities in the future. Special thanks are extended to NILE for entrusting UIL with this initial step of research.

1   The place and importance of CLCs in international lifelong learning policy discourse

UNESCO is committed to lifelong learning and learning for all, and advocates the wider benefits of learning. The lauded Faure report, *Learning to Be* (1972), and the later Delors report, *Learning: The Treasure Within* (1996), championed lifelong learning as the paradigm for the future of education systems as well as for the learning needs of the individual and society. These values, perspective and priorities are sustained for twenty-first century conditions in the UNESCO report *Rethinking Education: Towards a Global Common Good?* (2015b).

The primary focus of the UNESCO International Conference on Adult Education (CONFINTEA), held every ten to twelve years since 1949, is to improve and enlarge education and learning opportunities for adults, and to develop adult education as a profession. Attention is called to the necessity for better resources and the development of 'institutions' rather than schools, as well as the need to coordinate and facilitate qualified staff and not classroom teachers.

The outcome documents from CONFINTEA V in Hamburg (1997) strongly favoured lifelong learning and the respective institutional arrangements:

> The new concept of youth and adult education presents a challenge to existing practices because it calls for effective networking within the formal and non-formal systems, and for innovation and more creativity and flexibility. Such challenges should be met by new approaches to adult education within the concept of learning throughout life (UNESCO, 1997).

An agenda for the future was drawn up at the conference; it calls for

> ensuring accessibility and quality: (a) by adopting legislation, policies and cooperation mechanisms with all partners to make access easier, to facilitate the participation of adults in formal education and in the workplace and in the community… (d) by facilitating cooperation among adult learning initiatives related to different institutions and sectors of activity (UNESCO, 1997).

Other outcome documents from the conference reiterated the call for lifelong learning and the building of related systems and institutions, blended with new developments in the media and communication technologies. Even then, however, the focus was on the individual – the onus was not on local, community-driven CLC-type approaches or on the 'wider benefits' as such.

The 1990 World Declaration on Education for All conference in Jomtien, Thailand, also looked at community learning centres, although this term was not yet in use:

> Learning does not take place in isolation. Societies, therefore, must ensure that all learners receive the nutrition, health care, and general physical and emotional support they need in order to participate actively in and benefit from their education. Knowledge and skills that will enhance the learning environment of children should be integrated into community learning programmes for adults. The education of children and their parents or other caretakers is mutually supportive and this interaction should be used to create, for all, a learning environment of vibrancy and warmth (UNESCO, 1990).

Similarly, CLCs were part of sub-Saharan Africa's regional framework for action during the World Education Forum in 2000.

CONFINTEA VI was even more explicit in its advocacy of CLCs with its Belém Framework for Action:

> Lifelong learning 'from cradle to grave' is a philosophy, a conceptual framework and an organizing principle of all forms of education, based on inclusive, emancipatory, humanistic and democratic values; it is all-encompassing and integral to the vision of

a knowledge-based society… We recognize that adult education represents a significant component of the lifelong learning process, which embraces a learning continuum ranging from formal to non-formal to informal learning' (UIL, 2010, Clauses 7 and 8).

Paragraph 15 on 'Participation, inclusion and equity' calls for '(d) creating multi-purpose community learning spaces and centres …' (UIL, 2010). This appears to be UNESCO's first direct commitment to CLCs in an international setting, although the term is not used explicitly. What followed may suggest that the role played by East and South-East Asia was by then beginning to be world defining.

CONFINTEA VI was the birthplace of this present study. The subsequent report from the conference stated that

> Adult education and learning (ALE) is recognized by most governments as a vital response to the challenges societies are confronting in the twenty-first century. It forms an integral part of a holistic and comprehensive lifelong learning and education system, and is a key element in sustainable development. However, as discussed in the meeting, ALE is the least institutionalized part of education systems. ALE remains invisible in most Member States, with little involvement of all relevant actors and with few effective implementation mechanisms and practices. As a consequence, inclusion and participation remain low. (UIL, 2013)

The meeting resulted in an action plan with the aim of developing policy, governance and funding to ensure high-quality provision and broad participation in ALE.

This action plan for adult learning and education resulted in a number of recommendations, projects and interventions. It shared responsibilities for implementation widely between national and regional bodies, governments and NGOs, and supported 'promoting community learning centres as a potential model' (UIL, 2013). Some of the suggested projects were to 'carry out comparative research in specific topics of ALE (policy, governance, financing, participation, quality); carry out research/a survey on the wider benefits of learning and its effective promotion; carry out cross-country impact research on community learning centres' (ibid.). The present CLC study takes up several of the challenges raised in the meeting and brings an integrated perspective to the wider benefits of these centres.

The World Education Forum 2015 in Republic of Korea concluded a fifteen-year interval since its predecessor in Dakar. It took stock of what had and had not been achieved in implementing 'education for all'. It also came up with a well-designed new agenda expressed in the Incheon Declaration, *Education 2030*, and the related Framework for Action; both have a vision aligned with the new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The declaration includes 'recognizing the important role of education as a main driver of development and in achieving the other proposed SDGs', with SDG 4 proposing as previously mentioned to 'ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all' (UN, 2015).

The education goal has several targets, means of implementation, and an indicative strategy related to the need to develop adequate institutions; these include a plan to 'make learning spaces and environments for non-formal and adult learning and education widely available,

including networks of community learning centres and spaces and provision for access to IT resources as essential elements of lifelong learning' (World Education Forum, 2015).

The SDGs were adopted by the UN General Assembly in September 2015 and will be the guiding policy document for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The landmark 1976 UNESCO Recommendation on Adult Education was also being revised at this time and was adopted at the UNESCO General Conference in November 2015. Apropos definition and scope, the Recommendation on Adult Learning and Education (UNESCO 2015a) now reads:

> Adult learning and education constitutes a major building block of a learning society, and for the creation of learning communities, cities and regions, as they foster a culture of learning throughout life and revitalize learning in families, communities and other learning spaces, and in the workplace.

Apropos participation, inclusion and equity, the recommendation continues its task of creating or strengthening appropriate institutional structures **such as community learning centres** with the aim of delivering adult learning and education and encouraging adults to use these as hubs for individual learning as well as community development.

A review of lifelong learning and development took place in Lao People's Democratic Republic in 2014 which reflected the experience of South-East and East Asian countries and summarized among key issues the need for good commitment and support, good data collection and analysis, and effective devolution to win diverse community energy. 'Community learning centres (whatever the exact title) are a valuable means for achieving this. They need minimum essential resources and a culture of DIY (do-it-yourself) empowerment' (Duke and Hinzen, 2014).

2   The six countries in historical, social, economic and cultural terms

The CLCs from six countries in the Asia and Pacific regions were selected for study out of twelve possible countries. The choice was based on their CLC record and their capacity to take part. Selection criteria were (a) breadth and track record of CLCs, and (b) diversity in terms of economic and education development.

The CLC approaches of those chosen were all described as government-led; of the six selected, Bangladesh and Indonesia were identified as having active NGO operations. And yet, as the country reports show, all except Viet Nam have NGO-managed CLC activities.

Those conducting the country reports within a common framework were asked about possible environmental factors in light of the social, economic, cultural and educational influences that affect the operation of community learning centres and the initiatives in this field in their chosen country; to these we might add political factors and specify the demographic.

The reports in general provided insight into these issues; however, what is less clear is why CLCs were adopted more rapidly and confidently in some countries over others. The range of studies and mode of learning supported, including material and personal support, also varied widely. At the risk of generalizing too freely and creating another league table, one reason for these variations could be that (a) UNESCO played an important part in promoting and

disseminating the idea and attempted practice, and (b) the most economically and demographically advanced East Asian countries tended to lead the way within the Asia and Pacific region and perhaps even beyond.

The country reports provided thorough feedback regarding the scale and structure of their CLC systems and the general national contexts in which these are developing; some also specified different ethnic minority and otherwise disadvantaged groups for whom CLCs were considered particularly useful. Through UIL, we sought supplementary information where needed. At the most evident level of the criteria used to choose the six participant countries, they range in a provisional hierarchy as follows:

Table 1. Criteria for the selection of the six countries

Country	Economy	Education
Republic of Korea	High income	Above global average
Mongolia	Upper-middle income	Above global average
Thailand	Upper-middle income	Below global average; above average for South-East Asia
Indonesia	Lower-middle income	Below global average; above average for South-East Asia
Viet Nam	Lower-middle income	Below global average; above average for South-East Asia
Bangladesh	Lower-middle to low income	Average for South Asia

Across the Asia and Pacific region, one country from the west (Bangladesh), three from the south-east (Indonesia, Thailand and Viet Nam), and two from the east (Republic of Korea and Mongolia) are represented. The Pacific region (Oceania and Australasia) is not included because, although it comprises familiar continental sub-regions, it obscures as much as it reveals about diversity.

Population structure. Bangladesh is in the distinctive South Asia sub-continent: monsoonal, geographically confined and densely populated. It has the youngest population, with close to half of inhabitants under the age of 24, and a large emigrant population working overseas. Mongolia is at the other extreme: vast in area, very sparse in population, with traditionally nomadic peoples in remote steppe country. In the Republic of Korea, longevity, a large and rising elderly population, mega-city regions and low birth rates are characteristic.

Similarly, components and conditions within and between the three middle-income and middle-education countries of South-East Asia vary widely. Indonesia has the largest population, with multi-ethnic culture and beliefs. Both the Republic of Korea and Thailand are ageing societies with over 7% of the population being age 65 and over. Median ages ranged from 25.6 in Bangladesh to 40.6 in the Republic of Korea. The adult population, aged 15 and above, make up the majority in all six countries.

Table 2. Population profile of the six countries

	Bangladesh	Indonesia	Mongolia	Republic of Korea	Thailand	Viet Nam
Total population in thousands (2015)[1]	160,996	257,564	2,959	50,293	67,959	93,448
Median age of the total population in years (2015)	25.6	28.4	27.3	40.6	38.0	30.4
Age 0–14 population (2015)	29.4%	27.7%	28.4%	14.0%	17.7%	23.1%
Age 15–24 population (2015)	19.5%	17.1%	16.9%	13.5%	13.2%	16.9%
Age 25–64 population (2015)	47.9%	52.1%	52.3%	63.6%	62.4%	55.3%
Age 65 and above	5.0%	5.2%	4.0%	13.1%	10.5%	6.7%
Rural populations (% of total in 2014)	66%	47%	29%	18%	51%	67%
Net migration in thousands (2012)[2]	-2 226	-15	-700	+300	+100	-200

Economy. The Republic of Korea, often called the miracle economy, came from savage mid-twentieth-century war and poverty to booming economic prosperity and world education leadership. The gross national income is the highest among the six countries. Viet Nam and Bangladesh have high official development assistance while Thailand has negative figures with assistance to countries and payment of loans. There is wide disparity in terms of availability of information technology. There are only 10 internet users per 100 people in Bangladesh compared with 84 per 100 in the Republic of Korea.

Society. Political systems and recent histories differ sharply; there is also convergence between communist and non- or anti-communist worlds. Bangladesh, Indonesia and Republic of Korea are democratic republics. Religions and their accompanying traditions differ, but mainly comprise Buddhist, Christian and Muslim faiths; these are increasingly salient in some parts. Big cities exist in most of the six countries included, but there are also many large rural areas.

Education. Thailand's share of education in total government expenditure is high (32%) compared with other countries. In terms of adult people's educational profile, Republic of Korea has the highest (twelve years) and Bangladesh has the lowest (four years) average years of schooling. This corresponds with the adult literacy data in Table 4. Illiteracy remains a significant problem in some countries (Bangladesh, Indonesia, Thailand and Viet Nam); altogether, there were over 59 million adults reported as illiterate in the four countries in 2015. Republic of Korea has no data on literacy, while Mongolia's literacy data follow a different pattern: here, more men than women are illiterate and almost one in five illiterates are young adults aged between fifteen and twenty-four. In countries with an over 95% literacy rate, it is

---

[1] All population data in this table, except for migration data are from UN, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. 2015. World Population Prospects: The 2015 Revision, Key Findings and Advance Tables. New York, UN.
[2] World Development Indicators database. Retrieved 7 September 2016.

now a matter of closing gaps in education and skills that arise from new information technologies. In addition, there remain deep internal divisions between rural and urban, mainstream and ethnic minorities, etc. The relatively high level of out-of-school children and adolescents in Bangladesh and Indonesia shows the need for CLCs to provide educational services for these younger age groups. The speed of change and the rate of 'development' are underlying issues permeating this whole study.

Table 3. Socio-economic data of six countries

	Bangladesh	Indonesia	Mongolia	Rep. of Korea	Thailand	Viet Nam
Economy						
Gross national income per capita (2014)[3]	3,330	11,120	10,190	34,620	14,870	5,350
Net ODA (2013)[4]	$2.7 billion	$428.3 million	$53.3 million	n/a	-$23.7 million	$4.1 billion
Society						
Human Development Index (2014)[5]	0.57	0.68	0.73	0.90	0.73	0.67
Official language[6]	Bangla 98.8% (official)	Bahasa Indonesia (official)[7]	Khalkha Mongolian 90% (official), Turkic, Russian	Korean	Thai (official) 90.7%, Burmese 1.3%, other 8%	Vietnamese (official)[8]
Political system[9]	parlia-mentary democracy	republic	parlia-mentary	republic	constitu-tional monarchy	communist state
Major religions[10]	Muslim 89.1%	Muslim 87.2%	Buddhist 53%	Chris-tian 31.6%	Buddhist (official) 93.6%	Buddhist 9.3%, Catholic 6.7%
Internet users per 100 people (2014)[11]	10	27	17	84	35	48

---

[3] GNI per capita, PPP (current international $) for year 2012. Retrieved from UIS. stat. 22 March 2016

[4] World Development Indicators database. Retrieved 7 September 2016.

[5] UNDP. 2015. *Human Development Report 2015*. New York, UNDP

[6] CIA (Central Intelligence Agency). 2013. *The World Factbook 2013–2014*. Washington, DC, Central Intelligence Agency. https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/index.html (Accessed 7 September 2016)

[7] Note: More than 700 languages are used in Indonesia

[8] Note: Chinese, and Khmer, mountain area languages (Mon-Khmer and Malayo-Polynesian)

[9] CIA (Central Intelligence Agency). 2013. *The World Factbook 2013–2014*. Washington, DC: Central Intelligence Agency. https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/index.html (Accessed 7 September 2016)

[10] Ibid.

[11] World Development Indicators database. Retrieved 7 September 2016.

Table 4. Education data of the six countries

	Bangladesh	Indonesia	Mongolia	Rep. of Korea	Thailand	Viet Nam
GER pre-primary (2012)	26%	48%	86%	118%	119%	77%
Out-of-school children	5% (2010)	7% (2014)	4% (2014)	4% (2013)	8% (2014)	2% (2013)
Out-of-school adolescents	23% (2010)	14% (2014)	0.4% (2014)	1% (2013)	8% (2014)	n/a
Adult literacy rate (2015)	61%	95%	98%	n/a	94%	95%
Adult illiterate population [A] (aged 15+) (2015)	43.8 million	8.5 million	34,669	n/a	3.4 million	4.0 million
Share of female in [A] (aged 15+) (2015)	54%	68%	45%	n/a	63%	67%
Share of youth in [A] (aged 15-24) (2015)	12%	1%	21%	n/a	4%	8%
Nos. years of schooling	4 years (2001)	8 years (2011)	10 years (2010)	12 years (2010)	8 years (2013)	n/a
Share of education in total government expenditure (2012)	14%	18%	12%	25%	32%	21%

Source: UIS. stat. Retrieved 7 September 2016

In summary, CLCs emerge as increasingly important to each of these six countries. All apart from the Republic of Korea still have substantial proportions of both young people and older adults who are illiterate or do not have literacy skills at a functional level; therefore, many require alternative basic education. All countries need to expand access to easy-to-reach non-formal education and informal learning opportunities. The Republic of Korea, for example, stresses the importance of local and community approaches to solving problems. Many of the six countries confront problems of urbanization, an ageing population, the need for decentralization, and the social consequences of privatization; CLCs are being seen as a key to shared local-level lifelong learning and community bonding to address these needs.

To anticipate what follows, the terms of reference on country reports did not explicitly seek commentary on any wider benefits of learning derived from the CLCs. The fourth section of the country report frameworks did, however, ask about the concept and type of benefits acquired from taking part in community learning via CLCs and specific examples, as well as criteria and modes of evaluation.

In looking at the wider benefits of learning via CLCs, this present document moves beyond the individual education gains that are most often recorded and assessed and which form the usual basis of such monitoring and evaluation. Looking more explicitly at the wider benefits might (a) lead us to include individuals' less tangible gains, and (b) refer to community and civic benefits – these are also less tangible and harder to measure and evaluate.

3   Policies and frameworks related to CLCs

What follows is a brief summary of what the country reports revealed about the state of government policies and community-based operational frameworks on CLCs.

> A community learning centre (CLC) is defined as an educational centre established to provide local citizens with a variety of educational opportunities. It is established and run by local citizens on the basis of support from government, NGOs and private companies. (UNESCO Bangkok, 2013).

> A CLC is an educational organization that is located outside the standard educational setting, with the objective of improving the quality of life of local citizens. (Literacy Watch Committee of Nepal, 1999).

> A CLC is not a mere education training centre but a place where information and resources related to the regional community are gathered and distributed and where a future vision for the development of regional communities is established, thereby acting as networking channels for local citizens and related organizations alike. (UNESCO, 1999, quoted from Bangladesh country report).

In the following paragraphs, we look at each country reports in alphabetical order of country names; thereafter, we adopt a thematic approach, so the order varies. The six reports start with a diversity of definitions and terms used for a type of institution now commonly called 'CLC'. Where citations are not provided, they are taken from the country reports.

In Bangladesh, NGOs are the major conveners: the largest number of CLCs (2,425) is run by BRAC, where they are referred to as 'People's Centres'. Secondary schools often host CLCs, as they 'provide access to a wide range of learning, skills development and cultural activities to address the needs of the drop-out children as well as rural people; they reach all sections of the community'. A first definition and recognition of CLCs by the Bangladesh Government is given in the Non-formal Education Act of 2014: 'Learning centres established and managed by local people to provide need-based education and training for development of the community and to improve the quality of life of people'. At the time of presenting the country report, this act had not yet been made operational by government.

In Indonesia, the latest CLC definition from 2013 reads: 'Community Learning Centre (CLC) is a non-formal education unit that organizes a variety of learning activities based on the needs of the community, and is established on the basis of the initiative of, by and for the community'. The country report, in discussing what community means in this context and what the role of government is, makes several important points.

> It means that CLC is an institution owned and managed by the community. Besides, the word 'community' indicates that it should be owned by the community not by the government. The contribution of the government is to facilitate and monitor the process, well-being and sustainability of it. In other words, the contribution of the government should be shown with the budget given to CLC.

In Mongolia, CLCs are now called lifelong learning centres (LLCs). The Ministry of Education, Culture and Science provided a definition in 2010:

> LLC in local areas such as provinces, cities, *soums* and districts is an educational government organization to serve training, advocacy and information for local people through non-formal education and motivate participation of community people to contribute for local development.

However, 'despite progress made in establishing the legal and policy basis for LLCs, full implementation of the policies has not yet been realized. … LLCs have not been able to meet the responsibilities assigned to them due to gaps in their human and material resources'. The backbone of LLCs in Mongolia is the Education Law of 2002, which included non-formal education and supported the former 'NFE Enlightenment Centres'.

In the Republic of Korea, there are two ways to look at CLCs:

> In a broader context, all types of lifelong learning institutions operated at the local level can be referred to as CLCs. … However, in line with the narrower concept of a CLC (defined as an institution that directly provides its service to the 'local ', operated from the 'local community', and offers lifelong learning programmes without seeking profit), institutions running under different names, such as lifelong learning halls and centres, community centres, small libraries, and lifelong learning centres in the public sector, fit this description.

The legal basis is founded deep in the constitution, which requires the state to promote lifelong education and the right to learn throughout life for all citizens within the Framework Act on Education. The Lifelong Education Act, meanwhile, prescribes the promotion of lifelong education for the state and local government, and asks for the establishment of the respective institutional infrastructure for national, provincial, metropolitan, city/county/district, and town/village levels. Every five years, the basic plan for the promotion of lifelong education, established by the minister of education, provides a variety of support policies and assistance; the third plan called for lifelong learning centre operation at village and town level.

Thailand introduced lifelong learning through the National Education Act of 1999. In 2008, the Promotion of Non-formal and Informal Education Act defined the CLC as a 'place for providing non-formal education activities in order to improve the quality of Thai people lives [sic]' . The Office of Non-formal and Informal Education in the Ministry of Education set out principles, objectives and guidelines for those who want to establish and run a CLC, with the key principle being that it:

> Belongs to the people, is operated by the people and is for the benefit of the people. It is established as a local institution for villagers in rural or urban areas and is managed by local people in providing various learning opportunities for community development and people quality of life improvement.

In Viet Nam, the CLC model is characterized by its nature as 'of the community, by the community and for the community [and has] applied the main principle of education which is that all educational issues must derive from the community, and the solutions of which would serve the community'. It is therefore:

> defined as a Continuing/Non-formal Education Institution of the national education system. It is a learning centre outside the formal setting (primary and lower secondary schools) in the

community to provide lifelong learning opportunities for all local citizens to improve the quality of their life and to ensure sustainable development of the community.

This is in accordance with the Education Law of 2005, which 'affirms that CLCs are continuing education institutions at commune, ward, and town levels' . This is interwoven with the prime minister's decision to have a national project to build a 'learning society for the period 2012–2020', where the need is stressed for strong CLCs, improved in quality and enlarged in numbers.

This chapter has clearly shown that while all countries have the policies and legislation in place, not all have the financial means to run a CLC sufficiently – nor are they all geared towards improving the CLC sector. Often the sector and activity is called 'community education', 'adult education', 'non-formal education' or, more often now, 'lifelong learning'. The institutions called CLCs are also known as 'lifelong learning' or 'people's centres'. Despite the different definitions and characteristics of CLCs across the countries, what they have in common is their community orientation: this is where they are rooted and where they get their strength in supporting lifelong, life-wide, and life-deep learning activities. This will grow in importance as concepts such as the building of learning societies get implemented in learning cities or learning societies, and where the need is felt to have strong, reliable and creative institutions where people meet, live and learn together across gender and generations (Yang and Yorozu, 2015).

4   The current operational status of CLCs

Policies and implementation of policies on CLCs in the six countries differ widely. Governments play a significant role: in some cases, they are instrumental and supportive; in others, there is much less evidence of full understanding and commitment. The level of government support fluctuates, from national level, district and more local. Even if there are detailed regulations for the establishment and running of CLCs in several countries, systematic monitoring and collection of relevant data is generally much less developed than in other areas of the education sector. The extent to which NGOs are significant for the creation and support of CLCs also varies: it is not always immediately evident from scanning the country reports.

The mix of responsibilities also differs due to varied national political histories and resulting management arrangements; however, the country reports are a rich resource on the status of CLCs. Within this synthesis report only some highlights can be mentioned. For more specific details that go beyond this synthesis, the country reports should be consulted separately.

4.1 Governance, management and administration

In the distinctive case of Bangladesh, where a large number of CLCs are run by strong NGOs, the centres are embedded in the overall operations of the programmes and projects of the NGOs. It is important, specifically with respect to CLCs, that:

> Both the facilitator and the management committee, representing the community, working in harmony, constitute the foundation and condition *sine qua non* for the sustainability of any CLC. In terms of the financial viability of a CLC project in a given community, the full

involvement of all village inhabitants is a must. It has been seen that only those CLCs survive which have managed to identify local resources and at the same time meet the learning needs of the community.

In Indonesia, all educational institutions – formal and non-formal – are required to 'obtain permission from state or local government' before their establishment ; the registration process can be done online and a detailed list of documents is then provided, to be handed in for the licence prior to the start. In the registration process the respective communities as well as the district education offices are involved.

In the Republic of Korea, the Lifelong Education Act provides for a fully-fledged system from the central/national government to the provincial/metropolitan level, and from this to the local government (city/county/district) on to the town/village level. At each of these levels there are dedicated bodies (such as NILE and the Provincial Offices of Education), administrative bodies (including the Ministry of Education and provincial government offices) and consultative bodies, like the Promotion Councils for Lifelong Education.

In the case of Mongolia, the regulation specifies that the country's NFE Lifelong Learning (also called 'Enlightenment') centres can be established and operate in three different ways: as independent organizations, affiliated to educational institutions or affiliated to other organizations. To be associated with an education institution such as a secondary school provides the advantage of more personal and material resources. On the other hand, for adults who did not have a good experience with schools and teachers in the past, 'association with the formal school system and facilities may actively discourage the participation of adults in training offered by the centre' .

The guidelines for CLCs in Thailand state that

> Administration of the centre is the responsibility of a management committee, which consists of schoolteachers, retired professionals, community and religious leaders, the director of the district non-formal education centre, the non-formal education facilitator, and other community members (citation).

The Office of Non-formal and Informal Education in the Ministry of Education develop the guidelines and is responsible for making recommendations on non-formal and informal education policies, plans, strategies and standards.

In Viet Nam, the Commune People's Committee can propose a CLC establishment to the District People's Committee, which then decides on whether to go ahead. The Vietnamese Association for Learning Promotion, an association of retired professionals in the field of education and training, plays an important role; its members serve as deputy directors of the CLC leadership. Other government sectors and social groups representing health, farmers, women, youth, war veterans, and elderly are members in different committees that are part of the governance system.

4.2 Operational and financial resources

The majority of CLCs depend on support from outside to manage their activities. Each country has adopted different strategies for raising resources: co-financing mechanisms by national and local government, government support for initial setup and annual contribution (Viet Nam), competitive funding systems based on accountability (Indonesia), or resource

sharing through networks and with schools and international financial support (Bangladesh). Notable strategies of the countries are included here ranging from countries with high financial commitment by government to countries depending on external financial support.

In the Republic of Korea, the daily operations of LLCs are included in community-based lifelong learning projects that are co-financed by national and local governments; at the local level, plans are scrutinized by the Ministry of Education, NILE or sub-national institutes. Those selected receive funds towards the operations, staff and programmes.

> Upon receiving national assistance, the local governments are required to [additionally] invest a certain percentage of the amount they received. For the operation of the LLCs, the city/county/district offices are to invest 50% of the national assistance, while the metropolitan and provincial governments invest 10% or more of the national assistance. … The above method proved to have encouraged the local governments to earmark a bigger budget for lifelong learning .

In Viet Nam, the notion that CLCs are 'of the community, by the community and for the community' leads to the belief that 'CLCs have to mobilize resources to run their activities' . This may in turn contribute to the finding that about two-thirds of the CLC are either not active, small or lack quality. The Vietnamese Government realized this problematic situation and issued a circular that provides at least some seed money for each newly opened CLC: around US$1,500 for equipment and materials, and up to US$1,200 annually for their operations. It is questionable whether this is enough, even as seed money. It may not be sufficient to raise any other substantial resources.

In Indonesia, the Ministry of Education and Culture 'implements a competitive funding system.' At city, district and provincial level there are similar systems whereby 'all non-formal education institutions could propose to access some grant from the government. Only institutions with credible criteria could receive the grant'. Credibility means, for example, fulfilling all legal requirements, having recommendations from relevant authorities, conducting needs assessment, having an online ID, operating towards targets, and having specific partners.

The report from Thailand reveals a rich diversity of CLCs that have developed at the local level in communities sharing common governmental regulations on resources. These local CLCs follow the different conditions and contexts in which they were established while still working with other centres. Here, the national advisory mechanism suggests that:

> Networks [and] promotional coordination: the NFE facilitators should seek networks for sharing views, investment and participation. Coordination [is required] with the networks from government and NGOs as well local organizations, local elders, business operators and all forms of public relations for gaining good cooperation and support

Most Mongolian CLCs make use of the classrooms, training venues, equipment and technology of the formal education institutions that they are affiliated with. The direct financial provision for NFE from the state budget is small: just 0.31% of the total education expenditure. If LLCs are based at schools then these funds are mostly used for teachers' salaries and subsidies, hardly any for additional non-formal activities apart from equivalency courses. Additionally, several CLCs have access to external resources coming from international organizations and projects.

The case of Bangladesh is quite special. Government input is currently low: so far it is no more than a policy statement for the future without financial commitment; however, there is relatively high input from civil society. The country report suggests therefore that:

> BNFE (Bureau of Non-formal Education) has to develop a modality of cooperation and partnership with main actors (NGOs, communities, local government, government development agencies and private sector) as a facilitating, policy supporting, standard setting and monitoring organization, and develop its organizational structure and technical capacity for this purpose. … [And, in future,] Find ways to establish permanent CLCs and resource centres to back up the CLCs, thereby creating sustainable NFE structures at the grassroots with local government involvement, and public budgetary allocations complemented by other resources

4.3 Human resources

Different human resources are involved in the operation of a CLC, including teaching staff, managers and management committees. The level of continuing professional development ranges from national qualifications to be managers and teaching staff in CLCs to dependence on voluntary work.

Main actors for the NGO-owned and -run CLCs in Bangladesh are the facilitators, who act as 'multi-task operators: they teach, manage the library, organize life skills and other learning sessions, always in close cooperation with the community', and the CLC management committee. CLCs can act 'as a delivery platform and meeting place'. However, in light of government plans for the post-2015 era, the report states:

> Develop a long-term approach towards capacity development on NFE including that of Bureau of Non-Formal Education in the national government in order to effectively perform its multifaceted role of policy articulation, oversight and facilitation.

Indonesian CLCs have a variety of actors with different roles, tasks and responsibilities: a chairperson providing leadership, a secretary for administration, a treasurer, tutors or teachers, resource persons and heads of divisions according to functions. The local government education office provides supervisory services, including monitoring and evaluation, as well as training for tutors and trainers on non-formal education methods. Indonesian CLCs rely on the initiative of individuals, families or other members of the community. The selection of managers and other staff is done in two ways: informally, by contacting potentially interested people; or more formally through a meeting of the community, where leaders and other respected members are invited to share ideas on the location, facilities and resources of a prospective CLC.

The Korean system is quite explicit in defining the human resources needed for the LLCs. There must be an LLC manager who will play:

> different roles: provide counselling to the residents; conduct studies on the local learning demand; manage the LLC operation committee; set up and manage education programmes; support study circles; and build a collaborative network with the local institutions and organizations.

Before taking on the job, they 'must complete the LLC manager training course' that was developed by NILE and includes practical and theoretical aspects, and the provision of

operational guidebooks. The other staff members are called 'lifelong learning educators'. After successfully participating in credited lifelong learning courses at accredited institutions, they will receive the respective certificate.

In Mongolia, there are figures for 2015, some aggregated by gender. In 360 CLCs there are 569 staff working as directors, methodologists, social workers or teachers, out of which 520 are full-time. Of the 569 so-called operating staff, 432 are female, 137 male. As for facilitators and teachers, 76% are female and 24% male. The National Centre for Lifelong Education (NCLE) provides short courses to train teachers, who often perform their non-formal education activities on top of their normal duties; however, 'it appears that staff assigned to part-time NFE work in addition to their other responsibilities may not be able to do both jobs effectively'. Volunteer activists help with distributing information.

The report on Thailand is unequivocal in its opinion that the professionalization of CLCs, especially facilitators, needs fuller attention and better regulations instead of short-term contracts because 'if they find a good job, they move to the new position'. The report therefore suggests:

> improving the status and quality of non-formal education facilitators by reinforcing moral support, increasing their allowance, or offering the social or security welfare. [And, even more important to human resource development] developing the teaching-learning skills of non-formal education facilitators through e-learning, pre-service or in-service training programmes, self-study, distance learning, etc. (citation).

In Viet Nam, political leaders from the community serve as directors of CLCs. They are often already in powerful positions, so their other obligations may lead to the CLC not receiving the necessary attention. These directors are not professionals in the non-formal education field. The government therefore published a circular that the district level education authorities should assign a primary or secondary school teacher to the CLC; however, this is done nationwide in only 50% of centres and these teachers lack professional expertise in teaching adults and managing centres. More needs to be done to increase and enhance the quality of management of provision.

Overall, the levels of national government commitment and sharing of responsibilities between different government levels varies, as does the contribution of different non-governmental community partners. Government commitment ranges from constitutional-enacted requirement at one extreme to statements of goodwill, leaving community-led CLCs to find other resources. In terms of operational and financial resources, we noted that the strategies of the six countries vary significantly, ranging from countries with high financial commitment by government to countries depending on external financial support, as well as a varied mix of government and community contribution. We can see also that the approach to and the level of human resource provision and funding varies greatly. In some places, there are firm requirements about the conditions; elsewhere, the reliance is very much on voluntary effort. Where there are stronger links with the school system and its resources there are also questions about suitability for the different requirements of successful CLC work. These finds may prompt us to further investigate which models and levels of support lead to long-term sustainability, institutionalization and local community empowerment that supports all kinds of learning.

Table 5: No. of institutions and learners by country

Classification	Bangladesh	Indonesia	Mongolia[12]	Republic of Korea	Thailand	Viet Nam
Data year	2014	2015	2015	2015	2015	2014/15
No. of institutions supported by government / NGOs	NGO - Around 5,000[13]∗	Govt.: 409 NGO: 9,626 (p.16)	Govt.: 360 Private/NGO: n/a (p.3 & 21)	Govt.: 509 Lifelong learning halls: 888; community centres: 3,488; small libraries: 4,686 (p. 8)	8,764 Highland community learning centres in the mountainous areas: 760	Govt.: 10,994 Private/NGO: n/a (p.12)
No. of learners by sex	1.4 million participating in CLC run by 3 major NGOs and some smaller NGOs	Govt.: n/a NGO: 242,894 (total)	Govt.: 295,057 (total) Private/NGO: n/a (total)	Govt.: 58,082 (total)	1,203,581 (total): 673,571 (male). 530,010 (female)	Govt.: 19,100,087 (total) Private/NGO: n/a (p.12)
No. of teaching-learning courses	Varied mostly short courses	6 types	Govt.: 5,297 Private/NGO: n/a	Govt.: 2,855	33,917 (2016)	n/a
No. of operating staff by sex	4,450 staff in CLC run by 3 major NGOs	Govt.: n/a NGO: 15,240 teachers and 29,442 teaching personnel (p.16)	Govt.: 569 Private/NGO: n/a	Govt.: 893	13,066 (2016)	

5   Monitoring and evaluating: the achievements and benefits of CLCs

The six country reports identified many achievements by their community-based non-formal education institutions, mostly called CLCs. We did not start with the various other more traditional forms and arrangements for out-of-school learning practised in the region; these were carefully studied by UNESCO and partners in the early 1980s (UNESCO, 1982). Nor did we take the establishment of CLCs within UNESCO APPEAL (the Asia and Pacific

---

[12] Since 2012, CLCs are called lifelong learning centres (LLC) in Mongolia (p.2–3).
[13] A government project supported by donors had 7,000 centres, but the project came to an end in 2013 and most centres became non-operational.. (p.9)

Programme of Education for All) from the late 1990s as a starting point. From these broader perspectives, this sub-sector of education recorded in the country report is still in its infancy, especially compared with schools and universities in the formal education system. Noting how the governance and support framework are in respect of policy, legislation and finances compared to the formal system, many of the achievements appear rapid and substantial.

5.1 Monitoring and evaluation

Most of the country reports describe attempts to set up systems for the monitoring and regular evaluation of achievements. They differ in conditionality and responsibility, but not in the aspiration to improve the system and its services. It is well understood that professional expertise is needed to perform some processes that go beyond the capabilities of volunteers. The reports follow current thinking and debate on quality assurance matters, which aims to recognize, validate and accredit the learning outcomes of non-formal education in ways similar to those for the formal education sector.

It is mostly the national governments that see it as their right and duty to engage in the monitoring and evaluation of the CLCs. In Viet Nam, the Ministry of Education and Training has issued a circular 'on guidelines for evaluating the results and effectiveness of CLCs' in 2013. This details the responsibilities of provincial and district departments of education, and the concept and criteria to look at the achievements of CLC operations on levels like the centre itself, the participants, and social and community factors. In Thailand, standards are also set: the evaluation should measure against indicators that are related to management (building, budget and staff), learning activities and the cooperation of the community. In Bangladesh, the CLCs being run by NGOs, their monitoring falls under the monitoring and management information structure of the respective NGOs.

The Mongolian report is short and clear: to 'develop a monitoring and evaluation system and create financial levers that will lead to better implementation of lifelong education-related policy and legislation'. Here there is also a request for integration with the formal sector to 'introduce NFE elements into college and university curriculum for all teacher training and introduce a coherent system of preparation and in-service training with minimum course and credit-hour standards for LLC teachers'.

This could apply to any country that uses formal-system teachers to staff its CLCs: higher education could play an important role in all rapidly developing CLC systems, including in other areas of training and development for learning centres, in monitoring, evaluation, and teaching and administration, for example. The services of the higher education sector and its community engagement mission should also cover areas of research relevant to the improvement of the centres and the wider benefits of CLC learning, which in the long run will contribute to the quality of the lifelong learning system. The role of higher education is overlooked by the country reports overall; the idea of university engagement is perhaps less well established here than in other world regions.

5.2 Achievements and benefits

To have around 7,000 CLCs in Bangladesh under government auspices could be seen as a positive result, yet they disappeared with the cessation of donor aid. This raises questions about the efficacy of the CLCs, since neither the government nor the external donors continued to support them. Some 5,000 NGO-run centres have continued to operate for a

relatively long time without substantial external support, which suggests that they have been providing an in-demand service for their clientele. BRAC CLC members contribute annual fees; however, one should neither minimize nor exaggerate the important role such big NGOs can play, even and especially if they have substantial financial support from outside the country.

In Indonesia, the report reveals that, out of more than 10,000 CLCs, around 9,600 are led by private – often NGO-led – initiatives, with the rest by government. In the Republic of Korea, the variety and number of local education and community institutions is higher and may therefore need further analysis. Regardless of these issues, the growth of the specific form of LLCs from less than 100 to more than 500 in just two years leading up to 2015 is amazing. Similar success stories are available for the other three countries.

And yet despite these achievements, there is a need and much room for further development. In the words of one of the country report authors, a veteran authority on non-formal education:

> Bangladesh does not provide a good example yet or sustainable model of the community learning centre as the vehicle for effective lifelong learning. … One could, for instance, imagine a partnership between the government bureau of non-formal education and the NGOs with a track record and credibility to work together. The 7,000 donor-supported centres could have been used to develop a community-based sustainability model, also supported by government, NGOs and the private sector as well as community and the local government. As it stands now, without a strategic plan for government support to CLCs, NGOs are struggling to keep running the centres they had set up. Bangladesh could use several times the number of CLCs now in existence to bring more than 60,000 of the villages within the reach of a functioning CLC.

Further analysis of the different types of day-to-day activities – including literacy and other forms of basic education, vocational and income-generating activities, libraries and other community services, and the range of school equivalency programmes – would go beyond providing an overview only of the current range and variety. It would also be an opportunity to consider the potential diversity of provision on a supply-and-demand basis if professional and financial support were continuous and substantially increased, and monitoring systems improved. This implies examining what is monitored and counted, why and how.

A categorization of CLC activities by country showed that each country is making provision in all of the following categories:

- Literacy and post-literacy
- Non-formal basic education
- Vocational training, education and income generating-related programmes
- Childcare and education
- Elementary education accreditation
- Secondary education accreditation
- Leisure and the liberal arts
- Libraries
- Access to modern technologies
- Various community events

For a further category called 'other', the Republic of Korea and Mongolia made no entry. The other four countries added various activities aimed at a mix of target groups and subject areas,

such as women's empowerment; scholarships for Thai Hill Tribe children; environmental, health and cultural education; prisoners and their children; family life and education for parents.

The Indonesian report shows clearly that if and when CLCs are seen as valid instruments to provide access to non-formal equivalency training and thus serve in line with compulsory education, the staff involved as managers, administrators and teachers would have to follow and reach standards required for the formal education sector. There would be no difference in the academic qualifications requested by respective institutions. However, what is interesting in the Indonesian case is the clear conviction that CLCs can serve in quite different ways for the same participants or for additional clienteles.

> The success of CLCs also lies in their ability in contributing to collective impacts on individuals, families, neighbourhoods and communities around CLCs. The success is evident through the growth of small communities that are aware and act to improve family economic security and their quality of living. In a more specific example, CLCs have shown their role and impact in creating community dynamics in the society. They provide a space for people to gather and share thoughts, experiences and knowledge with each other in the context of lifelong learning. Therefore, they function not only as an education provider, but also as a learning centre for everybody, for free and forever.

Here, the contribution to community as well as individual development as a wider benefit of learning is explicit.

The Thailand report provides a detailed list of assumptions regarding the benefits afforded by activities provided by CLCs. If there is literacy education then 'people have a higher level of education and develop quality of life'. There are similar assumptions for vocational education, recreational and community activities. The analysis is not however explicitly related to 'wider' benefits. Community and civic empowerment may follow and this may indicate the orientation, especially as there are several notions that relate CLCs to the broader concept of lifelong learning.

Moving on to the overarching theme of the research, the aspect of 'wider benefits' may not have been investigated fully; however, it is clear that in the opinions of the authors, there are benefits for participants of CLCs. The Viet Nam report, in particular, is specific about this: it divides these benefits into economic and non-economic advantages, those for the individual, the family and the community, both short- and long-term. This is followed by a detailed list with literacy and the increase in knowledge at the beginning, followed by citizen rights, laws, health, educating children, environmental protection, then leading on to the opportunity to 'have more chances to communicate with others, be happier, be more confident' and 'enhancing mutual understanding and helping among community members; contributing to the preservation of cultural traditions and local/ethnic identities' . These achievements in Viet Nam are very much in line with the political vision of the prime minister towards building a learning society. This was taken up by the Viet Nam Association for Learning Promotion (VALP) in a country-wide project called 'Eager for Learning', which has found ways to implement this vision on three levels, with clans, families and communities. In the report, the impact of learning on health, income, participation and a better life in general features high.

The Korean study looks at diverse aspects relevant to assessing the achievements and benefits of lifelong learning through CLCs and of other projects, like the lifelong learning cities. The study differentiates between a variety of categories and approaches to the economy, ecology,

social capital and quality of life. The measurements cover qualitative terms (like 'satisfaction with learning and participation') and quantitative terms (like 'voting rate, employment rate') when analysing benefit:

> Thus the domain of benefit is wide and varied, from learning itself (more learning opportunities and better chance of participation in learning thanks to the Lifelong Learning Cities development project) to economic and ecological effects, social capital, quality of life, and local lifelong learning infrastructure.

However, for the moment there is an important qualifying note: 'Because LLCs have only started their operation in 2013, it is too early to discuss any long-term benefits.'

Overall, the country reports constitute an important mapping exercise covering the functions and progress of CLCs in the respective countries. They provide an overview of the diversity to be found in Asia and the Pacific regions, but is not covering all the sub-regions (see Recommendations in section 7 below on extending this work to other places).

6   Open discussion

Enter 'community learning centre' (CLC) into Google and you'll find that they are a widespread reality as far as institutional settings for community-based efforts for youth and adults in non-formal education go. A simple search yields 290 million results, with more focused terms still ranking in the hundreds of thousands. One issue raised by this report is whether CLCs amount to a distinct and by their nature local form of institutional innovation in Asia and globally, or whether they simply represent something that is found in other world regions under other names. In this section we look at several questions that the six country reviews raised for us, and not just about each country's version of CLCs, but about community-based education and learning opportunities for youth and adults in general.

Are CLCs different from previous learning-based initiatives or are they the same formula disguised under a different name?

The diversity of CLCs reflects the diversity of countries and regions, societies and cultures through their approaches to community-based continuing education opportunities in a perspective of lifelong learning (AED, 2010). The centres cover the three key fields of adult learning and education found in the new UNESCO Recommendation on Adult Learning and Education (2015); these are:

- Literacy and basic skills
- Continuing training and professional development
- Education and learning opportunities for active citizenship – variously known as community, popular or liberal education – that aim to empower people to engage with a wide range of social issues

Many other areas in-between are also addressed. The contexts in which CLCs were historically founded, and in which they are still grounded today, continue to matter in many respects. Often they are started and supported as community initiatives; at other times, they are initiated as part of government policies. There are many forms of organizational

representation dealing with extension and improvement of services and quality as well as networks for cooperation. The precise make-up of the local committees may determine the realities of decision-making and empowerment at this most local yet vital level.

Is it possible for community members to sustain broad community influence and even control over CLCs across very diverse contexts when they are monitored by central government as part of a national system?

The concept of wider benefits of learning originated in Europe well over a decade ago (AED, 2012; Motschilnig, 2012); it has since been further refined and linked to new non-economic indices of development such as a happiness index. It attempts to demonstrate advantages well beyond the narrow and familiar understanding of results in terms of education, schooling, credits and employment outcomes for individuals as lifelong and life-wide learners. It champions the idea of 'drawing out' (based on the Latin *educere*, the origin of the English word 'educate') an individual learner's attitudes and values, morals and ethics, and equipping people with the necessary capabilities to exercise and realise their rights and take control of their destinies. Some studies on the wider benefits of learning (WBL) recognize and value community and its learning, civic empowering and development – which takes us back to the visionary roots of the lifelong learning concept, as in the 1972 Faure report, that have been largely lost to subsequent economic policy priorities. As this report has shown, the ambitions for CLCs are wider than individual education and training, but recognition of the idea of 'wider benefits' appears to lag in national reports.

How and if monitoring by central government authorities affects CLCs' community roots and community influence depends on the relationship and mode of collaboration between government on the one hand and NGOs, civil society and communities on the other. It also depends on the purpose of central monitoring – i.e., is it being used to control or to promote and support objectives such as enhancing quality, relevance and equity in lifelong learning activities through CLCs?

Can Asian models of CLCs recapture the vision of the Faure report successors, and develop its rhetoric into open, long-term, sustainable community learning resources?

The pace of change including economic development has quickened in many Asian countries. Urgent needs for the lifelong learning of adults have emerged with more mobile populations, ever-bigger cities, rising longevity and a rising proportion of elderly and very old people often cut off from their families. Personal aspects of learning – the importance of decent work and lifestyle, the impact on health and happiness – clearly go beyond children and youth; instead, it affects the whole of one's lifecycle and the need for health and happiness as well as wealth. The wider view of the Faure report in 1972 and then Delors in 1995 repeats itself in the most recent related UNESCO review, *Rethinking Education: Towards a Common Global Good?* This 2015 reprise focuses on sustainable development, a humanistic approach, and rethinking citizenship and education as a common good. Vital global ecological sustainability issues now carry a new moral and social importance not visible in 1972. These matter for every individual and every local community. Target 7 of Sustainable Development Goal 4 –

Education 2030[14] addresses needs that are best served through non-formal and adult education via CLCs, and poses new challenges.

What do these six country reports tell us about defining the purpose, creating the support systems, and especially finding ways to measure the wider benefits of learning that do not leave out the most important, intangible and long-term parts?

More scholarly and practical understanding of the possible wider benefits of learning has generated interest in evidence-based research on such benefits, not only by providers and participants but also with governments and a variety of other stakeholders. There is a new focus on education for active citizenship, sometimes called community, popular or liberal education, through sustained activities and processes of acquiring, recognizing, exchanging, and adapting capabilities. Can robust data be generated to understand and measure the value of investments in lifelong learning for wider individual and social benefits – and to justify expenditure? A deeper analysis of the changes triggered by the findings of the BeLL (Benefits of Lifelong Learning) project might inform this overall CLC study, going beyond the synthesis of the six country papers (BeLL, 2014).

Have we access to the data and analytic tools to understand better how far CLCs deliver WBL in new and better ways?

Borrowing is a term frequently used in comparative studies. We have seen CLCs growing in many parts the world, and the concept of wider benefits of learning is spreading. How can we learn from the experiences of other societies with different cultures and histories without exporting and thus dominating others? Similar to the concept of CLCs is *kominkan* in Japan, which grew out of the devastation of the Second World War and were intended to support the construction of a democratic society. Government support was provided to create structures and institutions; over the decades, *kominkan* grew to provide services under the banner 'of, for, and by the people'. 'In 2010, 390,495 courses were held at *kominkan* nationwide, involving more than 10 million participants, of whom two-thirds were women'. It would be interesting to better understand how *kominkan* cope with all the economic, social, cultural and technological changes, and how they orient themselves to providing ALE as CLCs for the learning society. Sato concludes:

> Today's society calls for learning that is closely related to everyday life and conducted within that everyday life, as well as learning for children that can also be learning for adults and provide the foundation on which to nurture community ties as long-term projects. *Kominkan* today must return to their roots in considering the nature of *kominkan*-based learning and the role of *kominkan* in creating community ties and networks (Sato, 2016, p. 174).

The observation of one well-informed colleague is that active research by *kominkan* practitioners, researchers and university students is common practice, functioning as measures to introduce innovations in activities organized by/for *kominkan*. Several academic and practitioner associations at national and provincial level are also active in conducting qualitative research, and the ministry conducts further quantitative research on social

---

[14] By 2030, ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development.

education (including *kominkan*) every three years. The national Practical Social Education Research Centre's recent research covered the following topics: evaluation indicators for CLC management, trainers of *kominkan* staff, and partnership between government administration and volunteer associations.

A similar approach on a comparative basis elsewhere could enrich our understanding. We might, for example, analyse the longstanding, far-reaching and well-developed system of 'CLCs' serving up to 10 million youth and adults per year in one country: these are the 'folk' high schools (*Volkshochschulen* or VHS), which provide community adult education and learning centres in Germany. Historically rooted deep in the first democracy of Germany, *Volkshochschulen* started at the end of the First World War in 1918, with a clause in the constitution that governments at national and local levels should support adult education, especially the VHS. Adult education of that time was also closely associated to workers education as well as the extramural studies of universities. Today, a system of almost 1,000 VHS centres with 3,500 sub-centres reaches out to all cities and villages throughout Germany, with regional and national support associations providing the necessary professional services in research and training. This federal country system is backed by policies, legislation and financing. It is embedded into the local municipality structure, as non-governmental associations or as part of local government, depending on the different states. The system makes use of regular monitoring, using detailed and robust data on the institutions, programmes, courses and participants (disaggregated on gender and age for the last five decades), collected at local levels and aggregated and analysed by the states and federally. Deeper analysis of these two networks of 'CLCs for WBL' in Japan and Germany could provide a potential benchmark beyond Asia and Europe, and enrich global attempts to create lifelong learning opportunities for all.

The Competencies in Later Life project (CiLL) builds on the OECD Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), which extends the Programme for the International Students Assessments (PISA) into adult life. As people get older in all societies, lifelong learning must extend far beyond retirement age to deliver the wider benefits of learning to third-age learners. CiLL looks at both the competencies and the learning needs of those who are now sixty-six to eighty years old, with case studies and empirical results in four focus areas: for those still in income-related work, active in voluntary engagements, caring for relatives, or meeting the competency and learning needs of older migrants. We are prompted here to ask another question: *Is the rapid growth of CLCs a response to a new ageing demography? Can adopting this new term and approach help rejuvenate the identity and widen support for the lifelong learning of older adults generally?* The competencies and skills needed for such efforts and endeavours require new learning opportunities; CLC-type arrangements are one potentially vital kind of institution for this purpose.

Historically, CLC-type learning facilities have emerged in developed countries to serve needs such as personal fulfilment in leisure, cultural expressions and social interaction; however, in the least-developed countries, literacy and post-literacy have dominated the learning activities. In the more advanced developing countries, life and livelihood skills have been more prominent. It is therefore obvious that programmes, objectives and clientele affect the developmental context of individual CLCs; nonetheless, programmes and objectives must also evolve and be responsive to changing circumstances.

Can co-owned qualitative research and learning be used for assessments fit for different purposes?

Here, the elephant in the room may be the importance and elusiveness of qualitative assessment. There is also the indeterminate timeline needed to measure WBL impact and outcomes in terms of community and individual self-confidence and, for the purpose of this study, to progress towards global sustainable development at the most local CLC level. The compulsion of central governments to use large systems (big data) to gather and compare complex information drives us towards counting and measuring only what can be measured and counted, often annually.

Assessing and enhancing progress is central to good management; however, it relies on several strands: these include self-evaluation to adjust, work better and improve on the job; external monitoring that supports reflective practice and ongoing improved performance; external assessment or quality audit (QA) to acquit and account for funds and check value for money (VFM); and external quality enhancement (QE) to learn about and share success, problems, failures and to support improvement. For adults, as indeed for young people, the principles of participation are important if learner 'clients' are to share, own, learn from and use the results of audit analysis. Co-ownership is the key.

Can broader and more 'nuanced' means be developed to monitor CLCs in Asia?

Only with the acceptance that the wider benefits of this kind of learning are much less tangible, much longer term, and more entwined with a multitude of other variables than curriculum-bounded and conventionally examined classroom studies of individuals with easily measured evident target outcomes are. Many of the benefits would be seen as lying not within the education sector but in the remit of other ministries, and within 'learning communities'.

The dire need to have more and better institutions and programmes for education and learning beyond schools, colleges, universities and vocational training is of global concern. The need has changed over time and is now probably more urgent than ever before. The advent of new information technologies including social media has pushed it towards a variety of blended learning arrangements: online, face-to-face, and a multitude of constantly changing arrangements in-between. The interplay of formal, non-formal and informal education with lifelong, life-wide, and life-deep learning is already in part a reality; it may orient the future of education systems in learning societies. CLCs, with their basis of learning face-to-face in localities and in and for local 'natural' communities, may point to a way of extending the reach and achieving wider benefits of learning for all.

7   Some implications and proposals

Without question, these six Asian reports provide substantial insights into the contexts, creation, and practical operation of CLCs, including their management and resource bases. Several useful lessons can be learnt from the policy, practice and experiences for establishing guiding principles to enlarge the scope and number as well as the quality and performance of

CLCs for acting on the UNESCO Recommendation for Adult Learning and Education (2015).[15]

- **Of, by and for the community**. This principle is found in almost all the country reports as a basic characteristic of the CLC; the notion that they are not part of the formal system is quite often added. CLCs may thus be seen as outside the education system, which could be both an advantage or a problem. CLCs need to be seen as an important and highly valued part of a lifelong learning system.

- **Policy, legislation and financing**. The findings suggest that to create a system of CLCs adequate in quantity and quality throughout the country, support is needed similar to what is available through the formal education system to schools, universities and vocational training. The necessary policies and legislation related to CLCs must have a sound financial basis, in this sense no different from that for formal education.

- **Providers, programmes and participants**. In principle, the diversity in society as seen across economic, social, cultural and often religious and ethnic senses needs to be reflected in the diversity of providers who own or manage CLCs. They may be local government, civil society, religious or cultural institutions or the private sector. Programmes and activities should reflect as much as possible the diverse interests and needs of participants. These should also represent the full diversity of the community, and be the main source for defining their own learning needs.

- **Infrastructure, staff and facilities**. The reports show quality enhancement to be an important aspect of findings in cases where low participation or dropping out of CLC activities is a widespread reality. Buildings, equipment, teaching and learning materials, training and upgrading of full- and part-time staff should be strongly supported, and institutions created as general learning-support bases and service providers at national, provincial, township and district levels.

- It is less clear at this early stage how large **quality enhancement (QE)** looms, or how clearly it is conceived, at the local CLC level compared with adequate and reliable resources and other support like capable staff and a good study space. There may be an issue that monitoring and quality enhancement focuses too much on registered course performance and accreditation, thereby undervaluing the other truly informal drop-in idea of community learning spaces. There is also a danger that reporting and other paperwork required from above will draw off much of the available time of minimally staffed CLCs.

- **Assessments, monitoring and evaluation**. Learning and training assessments at local level should produce data relevant to the construction, planning and development of programmes, curricula and activities. These need to be guided by forms of continuous monitoring and regular participatory evaluation involving CLC learners and facilitators. All of this, including monitoring and evaluation, are professional support services to help local CLCs to improve. They should be performed by recognized and accredited institutions and be distinguishable from government control and audit

---

[15] http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=49354&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

related to financial and similar support. At the same time, they need to evolve their own methodology suited to diverse adults learning in diverse ways for different purposes, and not mimic classroom testing of cohorts of same-age same-stage young students.

- **Integration of formal and non-formal**. Most of the country reports are rather weak in describing and analysing structures of cooperation and bridges between the formal education sector and the CLCs as part of non-formal education. The exception is the important joint use of the buildings of the formal system. In addition, teaching staff may conduct CLC positions in some cases. Schoolteachers' lack of preparation for quite different roles in CLCs proves to be a problem in some places. The expertise of colleges and universities especially in applied, participatory and other research, and in basic and advance teacher training and development, should cover the whole education sector equally.

- **Voluntary versus professional**. Youth and adult education commonly relies on volunteer staff, including especially (a) community-focused provision, and (b) learning opportunities for older and retired adults such as the University of the Third Age. CLCs are no exception. There is the obvious advantage of saving payments to staff when money is scarce. For local communities, and especially those outside the mainstream of society, volunteers – local and well-known in particular – may cause less anxiety than paid staff, especially professional outsiders and those from government. On the other hand, this report shows the importance of having well-qualified experts for successful growth of CLCs. A balance must be struck between these two forms of facilitation; both can normally be successful. A key to the rapid growth of good CLCs may be the way local volunteer or minimally paid staff are supported by resource centres and staff from regional resource centres; this support may include the opportunity to discuss their work among professionals. This is a prime example of the importance of higher education as well as resource support centres for CLCs in each region.

- **A catch-22**. Adult educators have lobbied for adequate recognition, legislation and resources for adult learners for decades. It is essential for CLCs, like other forms of learning support, to be well recognized, valued and supported by governments as well as the local communities. This, however, could result in a catch-22: encouraged by the management practices of the most wealthy and modern nations, governments now seek value for money (VFM) and use enhanced human and especially technical resources to audit what they pay towards. With receipt of public funds, CLCs come under scrutiny and accountability, often with onerous required paperwork and data collection by standardized rules and measures. These apply irrespective of diverse local conditions. The more help you get, the more dependent and inflexible you may become. Our case studies gave some signals of this. Each national CLC system, and as far as in their power each local CLC, needs to be aware of this problem and do its best to strike a good balance.

- **Research useful for the development of CLCs**. This exploratory project is relevant and important for the development of lifelong learning in those previously discussed Asian countries, and for the Asian and the Pacific region (especially if it rolls out wider) and globally. To succeed, CLCs need to be reliable and sustainable. They are prospectively very important when it comes to responding to individuals' infinitely

diverse needs, and within and for sustainable development and contributing to the attainment of special community actions groups (SAGS) (Noguchi, Guevara & Yorozu, 2015). The style of research – participatory and empowering for and with the community – is also relevant and important. More collaborative and applied research by higher education and CLCs could play a pivotal role in how local people, and by aggregation whole nations, exacerbate or ameliorate global and local issues. Higher education also has an essential responsibility to share knowledge through academic and professional networks as well as government, media and civic bodies.

- **Extending the reach of this study**: There is a strong case for further refining and replicating this study in other places in Asia and the Pacific region in order to gain regional insights into the wider benefits of learning in CLCs. The community-based learning opportunities of the small island states, especially of the Pacific, are missing, as are the experience and approaches of the former Soviet Union countries of central Asia. Also missing are the approaches in different parts of the two very big countries – China and India – where a province or state is larger than many countries in terms of land size and population, and there is wide diversity within one country.

Other recommendations, including those implied in this and the previous chapter, include:

- In the next round of the research, include a questionnaire survey to 'raise specific issues related to women's empowerment and gender equality on the topic and present sex-disaggregated data and statistics when feasible'.
- Construct questionnaires for learners and facilitators in CLCs to help measure the important, less tangible, longer-term wider benefits of learning.
- Publish brief guidelines to assist the spread of best practice within CLCs and, where fitting, across cultural settings.
- Prepare a policy brief on CLCs similar to those drawn up by UIL on other key issues to inform the variety of stakeholders.
- Nurture higher education-led research and development learning circles between country systems to mentor and enhance quality across different Asia and Pacific sub-regions, as well as to gain comparative evidence from around the globe.
- Embed the use of CLCs into other learning programmes such as learning cities, and into other development programmes for sustainability in all sectors.
- Use and refine the happiness index used in Republic of Korea for different cultures and systems, especially across cultures and between nations from the different sub-regions of central, south, South-East and east Asia and the Pacific.
- Examine the particular strengths of and challenges for CLCs as key agents of education for sustainable development and citizenship.
- Explore the voluntary versus professional status of CLC personnel and appropriate roles for government to improve training, capacity building and staff development.
- Benchmark with other advanced CLC systems within the nation, region and globally.
- Look deeper into CLCs for the realization of the SDGs over time.
- Support service systems for non-formal education similarly to the way practices are carried out in the formal sector.

References

AED. 2010. Community Learning Centres. *Adult Education and Development 74*. Bonn, DVV International.

AED. 2012. Benefits of Adult Learning and Social Inclusion. *Adult Education and Development 78*. Bonn, DVV International.

BeLL. 2014. *Benefits of Lifelong Learning: Final Report*. Bonn, Education and Culture DG. Lifelong Learning Programme.

Delors, J. 1996. *Learning, the treasure within: Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century*. Paris, UNESCO.

Duke, C. and Hinzen, H. (eds.) 2014. *At the Sunset of MDG and EFA: Lifelong Learning, National Development and the Future*. Vientiane, DVV International.

Faure, E. 1972. *Learning to be; the world of education today and tomorrow*. Paris: UNESCO.

Literacy Watch Committee of Nepal. 1999. Bulletin No.9: Special Issue on Role of Community Learning Center for the Promotion of Literacy and Quality of Life. http://www.accu.or.jp/litdbase/literacy/nrc_nfe/eng_bul/BUL9.pdf (Accessed 7 September 2016)

Motschilnig, R. 2012. Wider Benefits of Adult Education – An Inventory of Existing Studies and Research. In: *Adult Education and Development 78,* p. 79-88.

Noguchi, F., Guevara, J. R. and Yorozu, R. 2015. *Communities in Action: Lifelong Learning for Sustainable Development*. Hamburg, UIL.

Sato, C. 2016. *Kominkan: Its Role in Education and Community-Building in Nonformal Education and Civil Society in Japan*. New York, Routledge Critical Studies in Asian Education, Routledge, pp. 159-178.

UN. 2015. Transforming Our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly on 25th. September 2015. http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1&Lang=E (Accessed 7 September 2016)

UNESCO. 1982. *Adult Education in Asia and the Pacific*. *Bulletin of the UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Asia and the Pacific: Special Issue*. Bangkok, UNESCO.

UNESCO. 1990. *World Declaration on Education for All*. Paris, UNESCO. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001275/127583e.pdf (Accessed 7 September 2016)

UNESCO. 1997. *Final Report: Fifth International Conference on Adult Learning*. Hamburg, UNESCO. http://www.unesco.org/education/uie/confintea/repeng.html (Accessed 7 September 2016.)

UNESCO. 1999. *Final Report of the Planning Meeting on Community Learning Centres*. Bangkok, UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Office for Education in Asia and the Pacific.

UNESCO. 2013. *Community Learning Centres: Asia-Pacific Regional Conference Report 2013*. Bangkok, UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Office for Education in Asia and the Pacific; Paris, UNESCO.

UNESCO. 2015a. *Recommendation on Adult Learning and Education.* http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002451/245179e.pdf (Accessed 7 September 2016.)

UNESCO. 2015. *Rethinking Education: Towards a Global Common Good?* Paris: UNESCO.

Yang, J. and Yorozu, R. 2015. *Building a Learning Society in Japan, the Republic of Korea and Singapore*. Hamburg, UIL.

UIL (UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning). 2010. *CONFINTEA VI Belem Framework for ACTION: Harnessing the Power and Potential for Adult Learning and Education for a Viable Future*. Hamburg, UIL.

UIL (UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning). 2013. *CONFINTEA VI Regional Follow-Meeting for Asia and Pacific.* http://www.uil.unesco.org/fileadmin/keydocuments/AdultEducation/en/Actionplan131129.pdf(Accessed 7 September 2016.)

World Education Forum. 2015. *Incheon Declaration, Education 2013: Towards Inclusive and Equitable Quality Education and Lifelong Leaning for All*. http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Documents/incheon-framework-for-action-en.pdf (Accessed 7 September 2016.)

Appendix

1 Terms of reference for synthesis report

Under the supervision of Rika Yorozu, UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning (UIL), the individual specialists shall:

Write a comprehensive and analytical 5-country synthesis report on the state of community learning centres. The report is commissioned in the framework of project 'Research on the Wider Benefits of Community Learning Centres', managed by the National Institute for Lifelong Education (Republic of Korea) in cooperation with UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning and UNESCO Bangkok from 2015 to 2017. The contractor shall carry out following tasks:

1.1 Write a conceptual introduction to the synthesis report, including conclusions from country reports and relevance of community learning centres in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Education 2030 Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action, and CONFINTEA VI Belém Framework for Action;

1.2 Provide feedback and synthesize the country reports submitted by national research partners in Bangladesh, Indonesia, Mongolia, Republic of Korea and Thailand (selection of country may change) – see indicative outline of country report in Annex;

1.3 Use secondary literature and other country reports and presentations about community learning centres available in UNESCO Bangkok and UIL webpages to complement information gaps in country reports and contact national researcher(s) for more information (if necessary);

1.4 In line with UNESCO gender equality guidelines for publications, raise specific issues related to women's empowerment and gender equality on the topic and present sex-disaggregated data and statistics when feasible;

1.5 Follow the UIL bibliographic style.

Deliverable: A manuscript (min. 8,000, max. 12,000 words)

Timeframe:

30 November 2015	UIL pays advance lump-sum to the individual specialist
Early December 2015	Feedback on draft country reports by individual specialist, NILE and UNESCO secretariat
	Draft country reports submitted by five country partners
15 December 2015	Final country reports submitted by country partners (realistic timeframe is 15 January 2015)
31 January 2016	Draft synthesis report submitted by individual specialist
12 February 2016	Feedback on draft synthesis report by NILE and UNESCO secretariat
29 February 2016	Revised manuscript submitted by individual specialist
Mid-March	Review by UIL publications board
31 March 2016	Revision of manuscript, if required by the publications board.

The Individual Specialists will do this work in the period between 1 December 2015 and 31 March 2016.

---

2 Terms of reference for country report

Organization: National Institute for Lifelong Education (NILE)

Unit: Office of Global Affairs for K-MOOC

Duration: 1 November – 15 December 2015

Project Background

This study on the wider benefits of community learning centres is based on the agreement made between the UNESCO Asia-Pacific member states at the Sixth International Conference on Adult Education (CONFINTEA VI) Regional Follow-up Meeting in Asia and the Pacific, which was held in the city of Jecheon, Republic of Korea, in October 2013.

The CONFINTEA VI Regional Follow-up Meeting for Asia and the Pacific resolved to carry out a study on the theme, "Wider Benefits of Community Learning Centres", aimed at concretely confirming and defining the role of CLCs in invigorating lifelong learning. This study will endeavour to identify what benefits participating in learning bestow upon learners at both the individual and societal levels. By surveying the learners who participate in CLCs in the Asia and the Pacific region, this study aims to identify how local citizens' participation in learning through CLCs brings beneficial changes not only to themselves but also to their own communities and to society as a whole.

Managed by the National Institute for Lifelong Education (NILE) of the Republic of Korea, this study is conducted in collaboration with UNESCO Bangkok and UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning (UIL). National experts from five countries in the Asia and the Pacific region (Bangladesh, Indonesia, Mongolia, Republic of Korea, and Thailand) will participate in the study.

Main Task

This study is planned to be administered over a three-year period from 2015 to 2017. The plan for the first year is to focus on the preliminary stages of developing the tools that can measure the benefits of CLCs.

A research team for each respective country has been set up after asking the experts at the research partner organization to recommend professional research institutes or experts who can assist with the conduct of research in the respective countries.

The tasks assigned to the respective research teams for the first year are as follows:
(Contracts are to be drafted for each year)

Classification	Tasks
First year (2015)	1. Review the feasibility and relevance of the questionnaire for CLC learners and managers 2. Prepare a country report on the status of CLC operations

An indicative outline of the country report is provided in Annex I.

This study is an explorative study that identifies the social impacts of positive changes that arise as a result of the learning opportunities that community learning centres (CLCs) in the Asia and the Pacific region provide to learners.

The results of this study will be used to demonstrate that the participation in learning through CLCs produces an impact on regional communities, regardless of the social, economic and regional diversity in the Asia and the Pacific region.

The specific tasks involved are as follows:
1. **Review and check the feasibility and relevance of the questionnaires for CLC learners and managers, and submit the results to NILE by 10 November 2015.**
2. **Prepare a comprehensive and analytical country report**. See Annex I for the indicative outline of the report. Analysis will be derived from a thorough examination of Chapters 2-4.
3. **Ensure that all data and information are valid, reliable and referenced (where appropriate).**
4. **Notify NILE in a timely manner of any questions regarding the completion of the country report.**
5. **Submit the first draft version of the country report to NILE by 30 November 2015.**
6. **Revise the draft country report in light of NILE's feedback by 15 December 2015.**

The Contractor will ensure the quality of the work produced under this contract. The Contractor shall liaise with the appropriate network of national experts and institutions to gather the updated data and information to the extent possible.

Expected Deliverables
- Review the questionnaire by **10 November 2015**.
- Draft country report by **30 November 2015**.
- Final country report by **15 December 2015**.

The Contractor will work intermittently between 1 November and 15 December 2015.

The work shall be completed by **15 December 2015** at the latest.

Annex : Indicative outline of regional country report

■   **Contents**

Chapter 1: Context

- What are the environmental factors in light of the social, economic, cultural and educational influences that affect the operation of community learning centres and the initiatives in this field in your country?

Chapter 2: CLC-Related Policy

- Definition of CLCs: what is your country's official term that describes a CLC? How does your country define the role of such centres? How is community defined in CLC? And in connection to this, does your country have specific administrative requirements for community?
- Legal or institutional foundation for CLCs: what legal or systemic bases does the country have to support the operation of CLCs?
- Objective of CLC-related policy and the targets of this policy: what goal does your country aim to achieve through CLC operations, and who are the intended beneficiaries of the policy?
- CLC-related projects: what projects your country has conducted at a national level to invigorate CLCs? Please explain.

Chapter 3: Status of CLC Operations

- CLC establishment authorities: Who are the decision-making authorities in establishing CLCs in your country? Is it the government or the local organisation being responsible for making related decisions?
- CLC operational system: who are the main actors in CLC operation? With which entities do you have partnerships to operate CLCs?
- CLC operational resources: who are the main entities entitled to support CLCs operations? How do CLCs secure the resources that are needed for their operations?
- Human resources for CLC operation: with regard to professional and volunteer staff members, how are the necessary human resource requirements to operate CLCs met?
- CLC operation status: please complete the table below using the most up-to-date data.

No. of Institutions and Learners (Year:)

Classification	Government-led	Private-led (NGO)	Total
No. of institutions			
No. of learners			
No. of teaching-learning courses			
No. of operating staff			

Type of CLC Operational Activities (Year:)

Classification	Yes / No
Literacy programme	
Post-literacy programme	
Non-formal basic educational programme	
Vocational training, education, income-creation-related programme	
Child care and educational programme	
Elementary education accreditation programme	
Secondary education accreditation programme	
Leisure and liberal arts programme	
Library	
Access to modern technologies	
Hosting of various community events	
Others	

Chapter 4: Analysis of CLC Achievements

- Concept and type of "benefit"
    - o Is there any concept that defines the benefit of participation in community learning (or non-formal education) through CLCs?
    - o How are the types of benefits classified?
    - o What are the specific examples of such benefits?
- Evaluation of the results of CLC operation
    - o Do you evaluate the results of CLC operation? Which organization is responsible for the evaluation? Who are the subjects of the evaluation? What is the objective of the evaluation?
    - o How do you define the achievements of CLC operations?
    - o What criteria do you have to assess their evaluation?

■ **Outline**
- Drafting of 23 pages from cover page to appendix.

Chapter	Volume (Recommended)
Cover page	
Chapter 1 The country in social, economic, cultural and educational terms	1 page
Chapter 2 CLC-related policy	4 pages
Chapter 3 CLC operation status	5 pages
Chapter 4 Achievements through CLC operation	5 pages
References	
Appendix	