



Pascal
International

PIMA Bulletin

No. 17, April 2018

CONTENTS

1. Editorial

By Chris Duke.

2. What is Happening to Democracy?

What Chances for Democracy. By Chris Brooks

3. What has Happened to Lifelong Learning?

The Curious Incident of the Disappearance of the Policy Discourse of Adult Education in England – Thoughts from a Foreigner. By Budd L. Hall

Looking Forward to a New Role for Adult Educators. By Martin Yarnit

Critical Adult Education Is Not Dead; Only Invisible. By Han SoongHee

Lifelong Learning: Reflections from Wurtzberg ASEM Lifelong Learning Hub meeting. By Mike Osborne

Further Comments. By Jim Saleeba and Steve Garlick

4. News and Views

Local Government, Local Democracy and Local Learning – Getting the Balance Right. By John Martin.

Developing an Action Plan for Older Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders. By Cindy Shannon

First UNESCO Chair in CBR and SRHE Face-to-Face Residency held in India. By UNESCO Chair in CBR and SRHE

5. New Members

Maurice Amutabi Vice Chancellor, Kenya

Dr Eunice Mareth Areola, Dean of Graduate Studies, Philippines

Dr Cameron Richards, Adjunct Professor, Chulalongkorn, UiTM, Southern Cross Universities.

6. PASCAL Business

Pascal 2018 Annual Conference

1. Editorial

By Chris Duke chris.duke@rmit.edu.au



Two recent meetings prompt the main theme of this issue of the Bulletin: a conference in Wolverhampton, England, reviewed the progress, or perhaps regress, in support and provision of UK lifelong learning over the past two decades; a regular Asia-European Meeting (ASEM) followed in Wurtzburg, Germany soon after. We have reflections from two participants in each, and additional thoughts about the condition of LLL from two senior reflective practitioners in Australia, where a national Lifelong Learning Policy Summit takes place this month. This is the kind of Out-of-the-Box (OTB) dialogue that PASCAL and PIMA wish to foster. Further contributions would be welcome for the Bulletin; or we might switch such discussion to the Website OTB and more immediate interactive mode.

The opening paper continues a Bulletin theme taken up from OTB under the heading *Crisis in Western Democracy* and the part that LLL might play. The post-school education service and system – enterprise or industry – can seem more preoccupied with its own functioning, competitions and rankings, divisions, financial and identity crises than with doing good in relation to a world in crisis outside. Much fine work is done at local level, as the Bulletin often features, in and by universities as well as local communities. But should we be more concerned about what is lacking than comfy over what is successful? How much can the historic ethical and civilising work of universities and institutional adult education be picked up by the new civil society agencies, and social and other media?

Participatory democracy and justice are severely deficient in many nations in the treatment of indigenous conquered and colonised peoples, as has been explored in recent Bulletins, mainly from dominant society viewpoints. We continue here with a note of efforts for older Australian Aborigines. The next (No.18) issue will I hope carry an ‘indigenous symposium’ like the LLL discussion here, as well as pressing on with the crisis in democracy. This indigenous strand indeed grew out from ‘letters from’ about general democratic crisis, in a two-part paper in Nos. 12 and 14 written by Hans Schuetze.

Local government is in principle a more accessible level for citizens to shape policy in action; but small-State ideology has tended to shift State responsibilities to more local levels while reducing the resources at their disposal. John Martin’s paper may lead into a discussion of how nation states reconcile demands for local-regional autonomy and the fear of break-up. Will democratic crisis and loss of faith in politics mutate into fiercer local identity nationalisms that cannot be reconciled with globalism and cultural plurality? Can indigenous knowledge and wisdom be woven back into the fabric of a shared more plural culture that is also accepting to newcomers?

LLL activists and public intellectuals, what are we doing to put shared learning to work here? A challenging ‘long read’ in the UK *Guardian* on 13 April 2018 written by Rana Dasgupta links the decay of democracy directly to the collapse of the nation state itself.



2. What is Happening to Democracy?

What Chances for Democracy? By Chris Brooks

Bad remembering

Few remember the immense brutality and the inhumanity of the systems which are part of our recent history. Few remember the terror and mass murder of the Stalin years. But President Vladimir Putin, massively reelected in Russia, has similar tactics and similar objectives to those of Joseph Stalin. First, Putin's strategy is to secure his own position in Russia by discrediting the democratic model in the West. In order to achieve his objectives he has set about supporting nationalist and illiberal politicians in the West. The election of Donald Trump and the 35 per cent score for Marine Le Pen in the French presidential election bear witness to the effectiveness of his strategy.

In Germany, home to one of the most brutal and abject periods of political totalitarianism of the twentieth century, the AFD is now the official opposition to Angela Merkel's coalition government. Sigmar Gabriel, the former German SPD leader, describes the AFD as Nazis. Austria, The Netherlands, Belgium, not to mention the UK, all show very worrying signs of a new wave of authoritarianism - a precursor of totalitarianism. Does this suggest that the West could go the way of Russia? I would like to think not; but recent opinion polls show that there is a marked rise in the growth of support for the idea of military rule in countries like the UK and Germany, and that this is especially strong amongst young voters. Incidentally it is also apparent in India, the world's largest democracy, from where I have just returned.

So why am I so worried?

My belief is that we are experiencing a new catastrophe - the failure of human memory to take into account its own collective failings of the recent past and their appalling consequences. All who have any interest or responsibility in education in its broadest sense must surely be concerned about our current collective amnesia. But there seems to be no debate. It should seem obvious to everybody that we are living through a resurgence of fundamentalism and that this seems to be occurring across the planet. Of course the nature differs from place to place; but the widespread nature of the phenomenon massively increases the risks. The parallels between Nazism and the old Soviet ideology, now readapted by Putin, have always been a taboo subject especially with the liberal intelligentsia. This also adds to the danger.

The Liberal Elite

Why do we not just ignore Russia? - it has always been a backward exception. We cannot do this because the democratic system in the United States is itself under threat. This is part of the global crisis in democracy witnessed by the growth of totalitarian governments. It would seem possible, perhaps probable, that American democracy will die unless the racial issues and economic

inequalities and injustices that led to the election of Donald Trump are resolved. As I argued in my previous article last October these are critical threats to liberal democracy.

One of the difficult problems we must confront is the nature of liberal democracy itself; and more importantly the character and intolerance of many of those who are its strongest advocates. The 'man in the street' is rarely listened to, and often a source of paternalist contempt to the liberal elite. The we-know-best attitude prevails strongly. In reality the liberal elite often have little time for democracy when it conflicts with their own liberal values. Class solidarity is fine as long as the working classes go along with us!

Here we have another major problem of education: not of the disadvantaged or the working class for which we hear so much discussion, but for the elite themselves. Why are they so out of touch? Why are they so sure of themselves? Why do they persist in their arrogance, when their undoubting commitment to open-ended internationalism is one of the causes of the new nationalism which is threatening democracy and risks to sink liberal and social democratic economic practices for good? The liberal elite has not moved seriously against the new capitalism of the West, and of China. Nor has it addressed the new culture of hedonistic individualism that it generates. Look at Facebook or Uber for two obvious examples of uncreative destruction that public policy has failed to address.

Educating the elite

So we must turn our attention to the education of the elite. A greater part of their education must involve practical learning and hands-on experience. Before any professional employment all graduates must be involved in active community service for a reasonably long period of time. All public servants and those involved in public policy should be encouraged to immerse themselves in everyday life. I once suggested that all international civil servants should be given the task of walking 3,000 miles on foot during one year and allowed only £5,000 pounds each to support themselves. Their diaries would be central to their recruitment in key jobs. We need a major discussion on how elite education can help create a sense of collective responsibility; we need to encourage a new sense of observing practical situations and behaviour. We need to find a route towards a new humanism which encourages mutual respect but which does not deny the individual.

The old media at risk

Journalism and the media have added to the anxiety which challenges faith in public institutions and political leaders. Journalists have an annoying tendency to perceive excitement and conflict where they often do not exist. All news services seem prone to the same problem. The community of professional journalists have not all served the 4th estate well in recent years. Rather than educate and explain they seek to provoke and excite. This is not helpful. Those responsible for the education of media and journalist professionals in our universities have a large responsibility to train the future generations of communications professionals in ways which help society to understand complexity rather than be made anxious by it.

In the end the excessive behaviour of journalists will probably result only in still less public interest in newspapers, radio and television. The statistics on the decline in reading and listening to the press as well as the financial crisis of the sector tend to indicate that this is already the case.

Stalin always insisted that ideological strength mattered more than military force. He often talked to his propaganda army about becoming engineers of human souls. The propaganda of the Soviet era

bears witness: an empire portrayed as a paradise whilst millions died in the concentration camps of Siberia. This should worry us as we get deeper into the world of manipulative technologies and computer-assisted propaganda. Internet is immensely powerful. We already see how it is being used by modern-day dictators, terrorists and corrupt States. The recent Cambridge Analytica scandal with Facebook looks like a modern-day chapter from Stalin era propaganda. It is not surprising that Russia and China have tried to close access to their information infrastructures against outside interests. They understand its value in the new world of information warfare which is sweeping the planet.

Can we recover civic education for a civil society?

It has never been easier to feed us lies and to manipulate our understanding and perception of issues and of others. This augurs badly for the future of democracy. Once again it poses major questions for all concerned with education. How do we educate our societies to doubt without being fearful; to be cautious without being paralysed; to enquire without being naïve. How do we create an education system which helps individuals to see their role as something larger than their direct or immediate interest, and to grasp that collective action and collective security is one of the keys to individual freedom and democracy?

3. What has Happened to Lifelong Learning?

The Curious Incident of the Disappearance of the Policy Discourse of Adult Education in England: Thoughts from a Foreigner **By Budd L. Hall**

Darlene Clover and I are returning to London on the train from Wolverhampton where we had the pleasure of attending a conference organised by the irresistible Sir Alan Tuckett on the subject of *The Learning Age 20 Years on*. The *Learning Age: A Renaissance for a New Britain* (1997) was a green paper brought out by New Labour under the political leadership of David (Lord) Blunkett, then Secretary of State for Education and Employment. It was seen to be a delicious cafeteria of ideas to promote lifelong learning as part of the New Labour agenda to tackle poverty and inequality. It was the latest in a series of English government reports, reports dating back to the famous 1919 Report and appearing in increasing rapidity in the last 30 years of the 20th Century. The Foreword to the report was seen as one of the most powerful statements linking the social and economic benefits of adult learning.



Let me say that if adult education has disappeared from the policy priorities of English government circles, it is not for a lack of intelligent, persistent and even passionate leadership of the generation of adult educators who have cared for the field over the past 40-50 years. The *Learning Age at 20* Conference was in many ways a 'Who's Who' of the English adult education world. Invited by the newly minted 'Sir' Alan Tuckett (slightly ironic for Alan to get his well-deserved recognition by a Government that has arguably lost interest in the field that he has loved), the Chancellor's Hall at Wolverhampton University was filled by a network that might have been mistaken for a NIACE old girls and boys gathering. Many of the best and the brightest whose names I have known over the years were there: John Field, Lorna Unwin, Andy Westwood, Jackie Dunne, Peter Lavender, Jan Eldred, Martin Yarnit, Joanna Cain, Leisha Fullick, Vicky Duckworth, Lyn Tett, Tom Schuller and more.

The conversations were deeper than those at a reunion of the faithful, although that aspect was no doubt a motivating factor in attendance. The conversations were about what had been gotten right by the *Learning Age report*, what was a bust, where do we stand now and what is the vision for the future. It would take someone like my friend Chris Duke with his depth of policy experience and more familiarity with those who were in the room to make more in-depth sense of what the day represented, but as someone who has followed English adult education at a distance for a number of years, I offer some thoughts. Let me remind readers that the 20th century discourse of adult education that spread around the world, during the last 30 years of the 20th Century by the International Council for Adult Education often in partnership with UNESCO, was strongly linked to the English roots and traditions. Certainly, for those of us in English-speaking Canada, the historic links with the Mechanics Institutes, the Workers Education Associations and the Women's Institutes (which originated in Canada) have been well noted.

Lord Blunkett, who was present via a video interview conducted by Alan Tuckett, reiterated his thoughts from the introduction to the Learning Age Report that 'social policy is fundamental to economic policy' and that 'lifelong learning is more needed now as we face a world of technological change and artificial intelligence than ever before'. John Field's opening included the question of whether the *Learning Age* report represented "too many bright ideas to make a difference". He noted that the recommendations of the Report were like a kind of lifelong learning confetti thrown into the social policy arena. In fact, few of the ideas ended up being funded and some of those that were funded ended up being distorted from what was originally intended (i.e. Individual Learning Accounts). Lorna Unwin noted that the report was framed in a 'deficit' assumption about the learning needs of 'others', seeing people 'needing' a kind of middle class education that they had missed somehow. She noted the 'wrecking ball' principle of government policy-making as each new government, or even each new Minister, feels the need to wreck the work of the previous government or Minister. Generally, the feeling from the opening panel was that the report concentrated too much on the supply side of the lifelong learning or adult education equation, to the neglect of the demand side. The report seemed to fall at the boundary of the idea of adult education as a broader, open, 'liberal' (English usage) provision and the emergence of the market-oriented and skills-focused lifelong learning. The report placed the responsibility for learning if not the benefits on individuals.

The day included a number of smaller group sessions led by veterans of the NIACE era with conversations about the strengths and weakness of Skills for Life, the challenges facing the Further Education sector and the continued existence of considerable new energy emerging from the Community Learning sector. It was pointed out that the emergence of a vigorous political right with its openly racist and xenophobic discourses has produced a new wave of young people organising oppositionally, often through social media platforms but also taking to the streets in many cities.

Several reflections came to mind during the day. First is the obvious point that the discourse of adult education in the mid-20th century English sense has disappeared in most political jurisdictions. Market, skills focussed and instrumentalized approaches to the learning of adults have become the focus of most of the government policy agendas around the world.

A second reflection is to query whether the success of adult education to institutionalise and professionalise itself as it did in England in the end undermined its dynamism and transformative

potential and as the very best minds were drawn into 50-60 years of dialogue with a series of successive governments. NIACE had many roles, but its leadership was engaged often brilliantly with scores of civil servants and politicians to ensure good funding for the professional field of adult education. Did the leadership in the movement become disengaged with the changing face of England? Did it continue to be part of the social movements that created the early adult education movement in England? Did the focus shift to provision, to professionalization to the exclusion of what working class, diverse, newly immigrant women and men were wanting?

Another thought is that the adult education field represented by the clever and decent people at the Wolverhampton gathering, including Darlene Clover and myself, is not the 'full' movement of adult education. Where are the radical movements of anti-racism, even those young people attracted to Momentum and the changing labour party, those calling for 'decolonization' of higher education, environmental activists and more? Where are the vibrant feminists' educators who are working with the arts and culture for deeply transformative purposes? And where are the popular educators' voices, those working to address the grinding inequality, the housing crisis in London and the big cities, and the deep divisions caused by years of austerity?

The day ended with a panel with Leisha Fullick, Tom Schuller and Alan Tuckett reflecting on whether the *Learning Age* agenda has any meaning today. The room still believed in the vision of the report or at least in the vision of the power and potential of adult education. But as Tom Schuller said, "who would own the vision"? What would a contemporary vision mean in a concrete way? What is the material base for a potential vision? At the end of the event I asked Alan Tuckett how he thought a new vision might be moved forward and by whom. He said, "it will take more meetings like these, but this time it will have to come from the bottom up".

Reference

Secretary of State for Education and the Economy (1997) London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office (available on line at <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00000654.htm>)

Looking Forward to a New Role for Adult Educators

By Martin Yarnit

Thirty years ago, I wrote an article bemoaning the state of adult and community learning (ACL) in the UK and calling for a Year of Adult Learning to raise its profile and a campaign for a new deal from government. The outcome was the creation of Adult Learners Week, a more modest but practicable initiative than the one I had envisaged, and eventually, a decade later, a commitment by a new government to a Learning Age.

A recent national conference at the University of Wolverhampton looked back to that moment and attempted a balance sheet of what had been achieved. Certainly, there were some advances, everyone was agreed, such as the adult literacy campaign, but more striking were the lost opportunities, particularly the failure to create a framework for lifelong learning. Some ministers maintained a vision of a learning society, but this took second place behind the government's overriding interest in schools and skills rather than providing a perspective that would underpin the drive towards better schools and vocational education.

The Wolverhampton conference reflected the primary, institutional focus of the organisers, speakers and many of the participants. This had two results. The first was a certain blindness towards developments outside the sphere of education narrowly defined. In some ways, the most important measures in the field of adult and community learning in the New Labour years (1997-2010) formed part of a major assault on urban inequality, the national strategy for neighbourhood renewal¹. Focused on the most deprived areas and social groups, this funded a significant programme of support for cradle to grave learning, encompassing pre-school children, school children, young people as well as adults. In a limited number of areas of the highest need investment was sharply focused and managed by local partnerships including representatives chosen by the local community.

Recent assessments of the impact of the neighbourhood renewal strategy point to improvements in schooling, an upturn in the take up of learning opportunities by adults in the most disadvantaged areas, and the value of involving parents in their children's learning.² Perhaps these outcomes have been less noticeable to some ACL practitioners because they resulted from a programme run by the Department for Communities and Local Government rather than the Department for Education.

A second result of the institutional focus of the conference was the tendency to view the future prospects for ACL in terms of its past. Although there was agreement at Wolverhampton that the hopes raised by New Labour's early commitment to a Learning Age had been comprehensively dashed by the governments that succeeded it in 2010, the clearest message from the conference was that the way forward was a re-commitment to publicly funded adult learning. Of course, that must be part of the solution but alone it is not sufficient, for two reasons: first because it fails to take account of the extent to which state-funded ACL has narrowed its focus at the expense of enlightenment and critical thinking, in the UK, the EU and countries such as Australia and Canada; and second, because it does not take account of major social and economic shifts that point away from the state as the primary support for ACL.

The rise of the internet and social media have unleashed a massive torrent of learning that is predominantly informal and virtual. People are learning alone or in networks rather than attending courses and preparing for examinations and qualifications. Adult learning professionals struggle to connect with this activity other than to offer courses in IT literacy. It is true that participation in part-time courses, especially by the most disadvantaged, has fallen off significantly in the UK, but it is unclear to what extent it has been displaced by an uptake of the learning opportunities offered by the internet. Does this mean that finally we are heading towards an informal framework of lifelong learning, involving people through the life cycle from childhood to adulthood? How should we respond to this development and how best to support it?

Alongside this and growing symbiotically is the learning promoted by the rise of new social and political movements, much of it face to face but much of it through smart phones and tablets. As we

¹ This was an English programme; similar approaches were tried in Wales and Scotland.

² See <http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/dps/case/spcc/WP06.pdf> See also https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/34798/12-p164-national-adult-learner-survey-2010.pdf Chart 2.2 suggests that adult learning participation in the most disadvantaged groups rose between 2001-2005 with a fall in 2010 that may reflect the impact of the recession.

know, these developments take forms that sometimes make us shudder with revulsion, dreaming perhaps of a golden age when the state determined a safer agenda of adult learning. But this points towards a new mission for adult educators, if not as the guarantors of social cohesion, certainly as intermediaries between contending forces, identifying common ground and pointing to the dangers of irresponsible polarization.

A civilized society should expect government to support cradle to grave learning, especially if its forms and content are locally determined rather than imposed from above. A democracy must also come to terms with the movements of women, young people, environmentalists and the educational initiatives they throw up. This is the agenda adult learning professionals must wrestle with while they resist the temptation to assume that a call for more of the measures that may have served us well in the past will do the same in the future.

Critical Adult Education Is Not Dead; Only Invisible

By Han, Soonghee (Professor, Seoul National University)

Budd Hall's note on 'The Curious Incident of the Disappearance of the Policy Discourse of Adult Education in England' revives the forgotten nature of adult education. It reminds the traditional memory of popular education, ranging from Latin America to Nordic countries, and workers education discourses in most of global contexts, especially in modern UK as well as contemporary Canada and Australia. The modern history of Korean politics cannot be told without telling the history of labor movement and civil society movements. Adult education in any case stood for the sake of those who were deprived, underprivileged, and oppressed. A month ago, on my way to Germany by airplane, I happened to write a fable on the identity of adult education. It goes like this:

After created the world, God realized he made a huge mistake. Adam and Eve were illiterates, barely remembering what they were ordered to obey. Concerned with the 'tree of knowledge' happening again, He decided to educate them.

In the beginning, God created education. The education was formless and empty. The first day, God said "Let there be letters", and there were letters. So the people were divided into the literates and the illiterates. The second day, God created Eden of education to be a holy place ceremonial by learning and teaching. God saw that it was good. The third day, God called the Eden 'school' and separated the form of learning into formal, non-formal, and informal. And it was so. The fourth day, God upgraded 'the tree of knowledge (of good and evil)' at the center of the Eden, to produce various fruits of knowledge. Now He call it 'university'. The fifth day, God so loved those who cannot read and write with compassion, so he sent his only begotten Son, 'adult education', to save them. The sixth day, God finally finished his work by making the whole world full of education, so He ordered "all life should live long in learning and education", which today we call it 'lifelong learning and lifelong education'. The seventh day, God rested.

This is what I made for a joke on the airplane heading to Wurzburg. I call it the 'book of genesis of education Chapter 1'.

We have an image of adult education as a savior of the oppressed, a social changer. Katarina Popovic, the Secretary-General of ICAE strongly argued at a keynote, the International Conference of Educational Researches, October 2017 in Seoul, that the newly adventing lifelong learning policies

deprived adult education of the main character of social changer. No more social movements with no more adult education as a game changer. Despite more talks about adults, mostly in terms of their human resources aspect, the “radical” part as emancipator is gone, as Budd Hall critically asserted. Adult education is no longer ‘the only begotten son’ nowadays, but ‘those who are waiting for mercy’ for funding. Lifelong learning has taken its seat on God’s right hand, while adult education was crucified to save the people.

The discourse of adult education has been invisible behind the light of lifelong learning. I believe, lifelong learning is not only a matter of enhancing inputs, opportunities, provisions, or funding. We lost the spirit and philosophy of learning inherited from old generation of adult education, a social changer. Budd Hall once said that adult education is a surfer who surfs against gusty winds and waves of social movements. Today’s wind is still gusty, of course in different ways: From labor movement to environmental or gender issues, for example. From massive visible collectivism to personalized invisible virtual voices of network like SNS or #metoo, which are still strong enough to change the society. From massive strikes to mindfulness in candles, yellow umbrellas, and so on. I like to find the trace of adult education in the new modes of lifelong learning agendas. Is adult education too old to catch up new trends? Or still lively to rise from the ashes?

Lifelong Learning: Reflections from Wurtzberg ASEM Lifelong Learning Hub meeting

By Mike Osborne

I have just had the pleasure of attending a conference organised by the University of Wurtzberg in collaboration with the Asia-Europe Lifelong Learning hub, entitled *Lifelong Learning Policies & Adult Education Professionals: Contextual and Cross-Contextual Comparisons between Europe and Asia*.

With keynote presentations from Arne Carlsen, formerly Head of UIL in Hamburg and the originator of ASEM LLL Hub, Han Soonghee from Korea, Maria Slowey from Ireland, Steffi Robak from Germany and Lesley Doyle from the UK as well as many excellent presentations from faculty members and postgraduates, there are grounds for optimism for the future of adult education.

As a member of a final panel asked to reflect on take-home messages from the conference, I proposed the following.

- Following on from Lesley Doyle’s reminder to us at the conference, we must not forget history. Without going too far into history, I can at European level point to EU and national reports, many of which have initiated or reflected policy in adult education over the last three decades, that are virtually unknown to a younger audience. In some cases they have been wiped from the internet, the source of preference for information in the modern world. Talking with UNESCO colleagues, we agreed that there is an urgent need to provide easy access to these materials so that we can inform current debates.
- There was much debate about research, particularly that which counters myths about adult learners, for example in relation to cognitive abilities and health, and the need in particular for research that informs policy. That is not to say that evidence necessary will inform policy, but at least if it is there, debate is better informed.
- The question of professionalism of the adult education sector (where it exists) was extensively discussed, though my reflection is that many who are concerned with the teaching of adults are likely not to view themselves as adult educators. This is particularly

the case in their work with the 16-30 year age group, the dominant target of much provision, certainly in Europe. Youth workers, community developers, ESOL (English as a Second Other Language) tutors (or the equivalent in other languages) they may be, but not self-defined adult educators. Does this matter? Maybe not as long as those working within various sub-sectors of education recognise and are informed by one another's work.

- More important though is collaborative working that cuts across traditional boundaries in the context of major global issues. In the UK, this is obvious given the two major strands of challenge-led research: the *Global Challenges Research Fund* (GCRF) and the *Industrial Challenges Fund* (ICF). The GCRF is a UK response to the Sustainable Development Goals and is a £1.5bn commitment to research in collaboration with partners in the global south to strengthen capacity. Industrial Challenges reflect how we will respond to the demands of future industries such as nanotechnology and to issues that pertain to automation, robotics, artificial intelligence, manufacturing of new medicines, production of clean energy and much more. What both sets of challenges have in common is an underpinning need for lifelong learning. This may in the south be the skills of community developers to translate technologies into local learning and actions which build sustainable villages, towns and cities. Whether it be capturing geo-thermal energy in Ethiopia or supporting maintenance of biodiversity in Uganda, Botswana and Nigeria (just two examples to be found under CR&DALL projects), the translational work of those experienced lifelong learning is likely to be vital. Similarly, at a UK national level (and the same applies in all countries) if we are to respond the skills needs of the changing nature of industry, and if we are to equip the population at large to cope with the everyday demands of new technologies, there is a learning imperative at all stages of the life-course.

I also heard many presentations from Asia and Europe some of which came as a complete surprise to me:

- The influence of John Dewey on Ataturk and the establishment of Village Learning Centres in Turkey
- A Thai colleague who uses the vehicle of improving the health of each family's goat in his village as the starting point for wider engagement in learning
- And more generally from our Asian colleagues an emphasis on the role of community learning.

Ultimately I left Wurtzburg feeling optimistic for the future of lifelong learning.

Further Comments

By Jim Saleeba

To conclude this section, two briefer comments from Australian PIMA members. Jim Saleeba is honorary CEO of the Australian Learning Communities Network LCN, where he keeps the focus of ACLN's 'Ripples' outside the 'Educators' box' and anchored in real-world issues, whereas the focus of narrow Adult Education and indeed LLL often narrows it down. [Ed.]

In his words "I just keep to my view of the concept of 'Learning communities'. Unfortunately it gets intertwined with lifelong learning which is generally associated with individual learning possibilities. As you are aware, I see learning communities as a collaborative community development process, identifying possibilities for cohesive and sustainable development in light of the constant speedy changes before us."

By Steve Garlick

And from recent correspondence, here is the perspective of Steve Garlick, for many years a consultant and volunteer work with OECD, PASCAL and now PIMA:

“I have never been comfortable with the concept of Lifelong Learning – even when I was on the Board of Pascal. As Chris knows I have always asked the question ‘learning for what purpose?’ and I have never really been comfortable with the answers I have received.

My experience with many university/ community reviews both with the OECD and then PASCAL has made me even more concerned that our various learning systems are framed within a neoliberal construct focusing on the individual and the benefits it can bring to that person and to the institution – but not communities in need. It’s a *good at* rather than a *good for*’ approach to learning predicated on student throughput, attracting finance, and recognition through individual awards and publication.

All the institutional reporting and consequent league tables are framed in this way. As I have written elsewhere (see: <https://ebooks.benthamscholarship.com/book/9781608057269/chapter/112458/> and in <http://manchester.universitypressscholarship.com/view/10.7228/manchester/9780719091629.001.0001/upso-9780719091629?rskey=GamA8z&result=1>) some of the biggest environmental disasters in the world today have been created by well- educated humans.

I am rather attracted to a by-line that says something like *learning for good*, which can have two related meanings, viz: (a) a temporal dimension that is about learning forever; and (b) an ethical dimension that has us reaching out to help others in ways that are good for those in need (and not only humans) through the learning we have.

I see in some institutions some elements of engagement that are for good purpose, but generally they are tiny and capture little institutional recognition. However, with social media there are now real opportunities to do much more and on a wider scale along the lines I have described. The issues stare us in the face every day (climate change, poverty, biodiversity loss, refugees, health access, etc) but institutional learning programs rarely incorporate on-the-ground application on such matters. I am still of the view that there is a gap to be filled here in having institutional learning programs engaging with need in innovative ways. Could we fill that void?”

4. News and Views

Last month the PASCAL Chair Josef Konvitz published on its Website PASCAL’s 12th Briefing Paper “The coming revolution in Public Services: What it means for Cities and Universities”. Here Australian PIMA Member John Martin takes a different look at the functioning of democracy and learning at a local government level.

Local Government, local democracy and local learning: Getting the balance right

By John Martin

In the 1980s in Australia and other Western nations a sea-change change occurred in public administration and management. With the introduction of New Public Management, public service providers ‘went to the market’ calling for tenders under the belief that competition, as opposed to

having in-house workforces to deliver services, would provide greater value for money. The assumption was that private companies competing for government work would provide greater value for money than the existing system of permanent government workforces delivering services.

Over the last three decades local government systems in all Australian states and territories have been reformed to reflect this new way of providing services. Commensurate with this fundamental change were many other changes which complemented going to the market for the provision of services. These included senior managers employed on three to five-year contracts, amalgamation of councils into larger geographic areas ostensibly to realise the economic benefits of scale, and an accounting system based on private sector depreciation principles.

Going to the market as it is commonly called - seeking tenders for government work - has brought with it many other unforeseen situations, which might or might not have occurred under the old system of public administration. For example, the concept of pecuniary interest is now front and centre in council decision-making about who wins the contract to provide services, and the relationship they have with those who decide.

In New South Wales, for example, the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) now has an extensive library of cases where local authorities, and state government departments, have breached the principles of pecuniary interest, and other offences, and been referred to the courts for prosecution, in some cases resulting in jail time for offenders. In Queensland the establishment of the Crime and Misconduct Commission, now the Crime and Corruption Commission (CCC), with extensive powers of investigation, like its ICAC counterpart, has revealed that in many councils decision-makers have engaged in practices which result in them being referred to the courts. The CCC's recent Belcarra Inquiry report into election practices in four councils at the last election has made such recommendations to the Director of Public Prosecutions www.ccc.qld.gov.au/corruption/operation-belcarra-public-hearing/operation-belcarra-public-hearings.

In a recent high-profile case in one of these councils, the Chief Executive Officer was terminated one week before the end of her six-month probationary period. It was not reported why her appointment was terminated. She was interviewed on state-wide television and was unable to say why, as reasons were not given by the mayor and councillors. In her role as Chief Executive Officer she was vicariously responsible for reporting to the CCC instances where councillors may have contravened the rules relating to pecuniary interest and transparency in decision-making. This is a requirement of all Queensland Local Government CEOs. If they do not report behaviour of councillors that they suspect may be acting inappropriately they the CEO can be prosecuted.

In the last four-year term of the Queensland Local Government (2013 to 2016) some 73 CEOs of the 77 councils in Queensland left employment with their council before the end of their contract period. While some of these (about ten) retired the great proportion were terminated before the end of their contract period. We don't know why this happened because the councils are not required to publish reasons for terminating the CEO's contract. In many of these cases the CEOs fulfil their responsibility of reporting to the CCC matters of concern relating to council decision-making. Could it be that the elected members terminate their employment and pay out an amount estimated to be around \$20-30 million over this four-year period across all councils, rather than face being reported to the CCC?

Anecdotal reports from local government in other Australian states suggest that this dilemma is widespread. Local government decision-making evolves over time and requires analysis and consideration by staff and elected members together. In many cases this consideration also includes the community impacted by decisions. How and when they are engaged for consideration is an important strategic question.

If we consider that local government is local democracy then the process of consideration is one of collective learning by all involved. The assumption is that if an appropriate process is followed all parties to the decision are made learn about a wider range of options, develop more innovative solutions and come to a conclusion that no one had thought of at the outset. While this may be an ideal there are also many examples across Australian local government where this is in fact what has happened, and community sustainability and resilience has grown as an outcome of such good local governance.

To give one relatively straightforward example, two decades ago a small rural council in central New South Wales won a national award for an ecotourism project identifying bird routes along old stock routes. The initiative was a community effort driven by a passionate local birdwatcher and the council. Today this is one of 23 bird routes in central New South Wales attracting birdwatchers world-wide. The bird count, in large part done in partnership with local landholders, constitutes the council's periodic state-of-the-environment report. When we look back to innovation award winners and ask *what is the legacy of this innovation?* we find that the decision is one made and enacted by the community over time.

The current concerns with due process in local government decision-making in Australia have led to a situation where administrative staff can become polarised from their elected members because of the reporting requirements imposed on them by state government legislation. For local learning to be realised through local democracy, how to strike a balance in these reporting requirements, such that local governments have the capacity to innovate while being accountable to their local community and the state government through appropriate processes of scrutiny, is a question that needs to be addressed.

Developing an action plan for older Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders

By Cindy Shannon

In a note dated 7 February 2018 the Victorian Council for the Ageing COTA announced that the Institute for Urban Indigenous Health (IUIH) is leading the formation of an Action Plan for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders as part of the Commonwealth Government's development of an Aged Care Diversity Strategy Framework. IUIH will conduct the action plan research and actions in collaboration with the Victorian Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Organisation. IUIH said Australia's aged care system is changing, and that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders Australians display the same diversity of characteristics and life experiences as the broader population.

As part of the development of the Aged Care Diversity Strategy Framework, implementation action plans will also be developed for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse communities, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans and/or Intersex communities.

The Institute said that with the aged care system evolving to offer increased choice and control for consumers, and the transition to person-centred care there was a need to hear specifically from communities such as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders Australians. UIH wished to hear specifically from consumers of aged care services or their family members, carer or representative; aged care providers and peak representative groups.

They aim for three significant outcomes:

- a proposed Action Plan for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Aged Care that will be an integral part of the national Aged Care Diversity Framework
- a detailed consultation report that will inform local issues as well as national priorities and the development of the action plan
- identified evidence-based best practice for aged care service delivery to Indigenous communities based on a comprehensive literature review

For more information contact Project Lead Dr Cindy Shannon at: cindy.shannon@iuih.org.au

First UNESCO Chair in CBR & SRHE Face-to-Face Residency held in India, March 11-23 2018

By Budd Hall and Rajesh Tandon

The UNESCO Chair in Community Based Research & Social Responsibility in Higher Education launched the first cohort in the Mentor Training Programme for our K4C consortium in January with the on-line component. It was held in India with 19 mentors from seven countries. The report from the workshop can give you a flavour for what we are doing. Our overall sense is that things are going well. The hubs will require more support than we might have imagined, but the commitment to creating permanent sustainable CBPR training structure not dependent on outside funding appears to be working out.

The K4C Global Consortium is a project of the UNESCO Chair in Community Based Research and Social Responsibility in Higher Education. It is supported by an MoU between the University of Victoria (UVic) in Canada and the Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA) in India. The objectives of K4C are to support the creation of CBR training hubs in countries of the global South and the excluded North where student and community workers can learn the theory and practice of Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR).

K4C is a social innovation linking universities, community organisations, local governments and funding bodies to train a future generation of youth to be able to create participatory knowledge which can contribute to solutions for local challenges and also relate to the 17 goals of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UN SDGs). Mentors nominated by the hubs take part in a 21-week on-line, field-based and face to face course. These mentors will be responsible for organising the local training courses that will take place in each of the hubs. This report is from the first ever face to face residency that was hosted at PRIA in New Delhi and O.P. Jindal Global University in Haryana, India.

Mentors from seven countries gathered in India, meeting each other face to face for the first time. They knew quite about each other from the discussions in the on-line course that they began during the third week of January, 2018. Mentors for this inaugural Mentor Training Program (MTP) came from *Sardinia, Italy, Durban, South Africa, Bogota, Colombia, Surabaya, Indonesia, Toronto, Canada, Haryana, India, Jaipur, India and Raipur, India*. Dr Rajesh Tandon and Dr Budd Hall facilitated the two

week residency. Invited guest lecturers were Dr. Darlene Clover of the University of Victoria in Canada on 'Modes of Inquiry' and 'Arts-based research methods' and Prof. Wangoola Wangoola Ndawula of the Mpambo African Multiversity in Uganda.

Objectives of the residency included providing a participatory learning environment, a model of which they could learn from, for their own teaching when they begin their work in the hubs. The residency allowed for hub teams to work on the draft plans for their local training programmes, for individual plans for their field work to receive feedback, to learn about arts-based and other participatory research methods that they can teach and use, to have an introduction to knowledge democracy and thinking about Indigenous knowledge, to visit sites of local CBPR work, to learn about ancient history in the region and to deepen their knowledge of both the theory and practice of CBPR.

Feedback was provided at various times both to groups and to individuals. Video recordings were made of the practice teaching sessions so that mentors could discuss their performance with one of the facilitators. Individual conversations were held with each mentor based on the self-assessment of CBPR competencies that they had completed.



5. New Members

As President of PIMA, Dorothy Lucardie has welcomed three new members, **Maurice Nyamanga Amutabi** from Kenya, Eunice **Mareth Querol-Areola** from the Philippines, and **Cameron Richards** from Australia and peripatetic also from South-East Asia. Each brings great experience as well as passion to PIMA and we look forward to their participation.

Prof. Maurice Nyamanga Amutabi

Amutabi@yahoo.com or amutabi@gmail.com

Maurice Amutabi is the Vice-Chancellor of Lukenya University, Kenya. He is a former Fulbright Scholar who previously worked as Deputy Vice-Chancellor at Kisii University, and also Director of Research and Professor in Peace and Strategic Studies at the Catholic University of Eastern Africa (CUEA) from 2010 to 2013. He previously taught in the African Studies Programme at Central Washington University, USA (2005-2010) and in Moi University (1992-2000) in the Department of Development Studies, as well as other public universities in Kenya.

Prof. Amutabi holds a PhD from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA in History and African Studies. He received his B.A (Hons) in 1989 in Political Science and History and M.A in 1991 from the University of Nairobi, Kenya. He has written 26 books on various themes, ranging from peace and security issues through politics and development. His articles have appeared in journals such as *African Studies Review*, *African Contemporary Cultural Studies*, *Canadian Journal of African Studies*, *International Journal of Educational Development*; and *Jenda: A Journal of Culture and African Women Studies*. He has made presentations at over one hundred and fifty national and international conferences.

He is the Vice-President of the Kenya Studies and Scholars' Association (KESSA), Kenya's premier research and academic organization. He served as Editor-in-Chief of *Kenya Studies Review* for five years and *Eastern Africa Journal of Humanities and Sciences*. He is currently the Editor-in-Chief of the *Journal of Popular Education in Africa (JOPEA)* and *Journal of African Interdisciplinary Studies (JAIS)*, and serves on advisory boards of many journals.

He has conducted extensive research on issues of security and development, and taught courses on peace and conflict, and gender and development. He has taught in PhD and Masters Programmes at several universities. He is someone who loves networks, so for him PIMA provides a special opportunity to share experiences with its global audience and reach. He looks forward to benefiting from and also enriching the network.

Professor Eunice Mareth Querol-Areola

euniceareola@gmail.com

Professor Eunice Mareth Querol-Areola is Dean of the Graduate School at Miriam College, Quezon City. She has a prominent record as an international champion of sustainability. She was one of the signatories of the COP21 Open Letter of the Academics to the world leaders of the 2015 UN Climate Change Conference in Paris and recently a founding endorser of the Environmental Association of Universities and Colleges based in the United Kingdom. The *Minervas*, an international women's group based in Florida, USA recognised her as *Woman Prime Mover*.

Dr Areola's interest in PIMA derived from hearing about it from SIG Later Life Learning Coordinator Thomas Kuan. She likes and supports PIMA's basic principles and aspirations and applied to join. Her national accolades include recognition as *Diplomate in Business Education*, the highest recognition given by the Philippine Academy of Professionals in Business Education; as *Outstanding Educator in Management* by the Philippine Council of Deans and Educators in Business and the Philippine Commission on Higher Education; and the *Outstanding Entrepreneurship Educator Award* by the Entrepreneurship Educators Association of the Philippines, Inc

She is an international author, a global speaker, a cross-cultural researcher, an innovation coach, a sustainability mentor, a life-long education advocate and a consultancy entrepreneur, wife to a Finance Executive and mother to four young adults. She earned her PhD in Management from the University of St. Gallen, Switzerland (PhD HSG), become Dean of a Graduate School in The Philippines.

Eunice maintains that it is an academic's desire to continuously make a difference in her field in the company of similarly-grounded, dynamic and inspiring people. It is always a pleasure and an opportunity to meet and work with people from other disciplines that cut across the universal value of education. The possibility of expanding her reach in lifelong learning initiatives, in research and in community involvement through any possible and available platform anchors her interest to be part of PIMA of which she hopes to be a valuable and relevant member of this movement.

Dr. Cameron Richards

cameronrichards@gmail.com

Dr. Cameron Richards is an Australian Professor of Interdisciplinary Studies, semi-retired, with extensive experience in the Asia-Pacific region. This includes work at Queensland University of Technology Australia, Nanyang University Singapore, Hong Kong Institute of Education, University of Western Australia, and UTM in Malaysia. He is an Adjunct Professor at Chulalongkorn University in Thailand as well as at UiTM, and Southern Cross University in Australia.

Cameron has a multi-disciplinary background for a current-and-future focus on sustainability studies, policy research, academic research and writing methodology, leadership and organizational learning, educational technologies, intercultural communication, curriculum innovation, and new literacies. He continues to collaborate with NGOs and other agencies, recently including the Indonesian Rainforest Foundation, Arbonaut, and Worldview, on 'sustainable policy' projects and proposals in South-East Asia, focused on the global and local challenges of better reconciling economic, social and environmental sustainability.

He continues: (a) to assist with the academic capacity and policy studies professional development of colleagues and PhD students in higher education institutions within the region, and (b) to further explore how future academics and universities can work better with governments, industries and business, and local community contexts of and for future sustainability – for example in terms of the complex problem-solving applications of interdisciplinary frameworks.

6. PACSAL Business

PASCAL 2018 Annual Conference



PASCAL Observatory is pleased to announce the first Call for Contributions and Preliminary Programme for the 15th PASCAL International Conference to be co-organised and hosted by the [Gyeonggi Do Provincial Institute for Lifelong Learning \(GILL\)](#) and [Ajou University](#) from 30 August - 1 September at Suwon City, Republic of Korea. The main theme of the Conference is “**Learning Cities, Learning Societies and the Sustainable Development Goals: Connecting Research, Policy and Practice**”.

This conference revisits the concept of learning cities and learning societies within the perspective of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), while keeping in focus the critical dimensions that are shaping, and are shaped by, our cities today. The SDGs provide a global

framework that can guide learning, because these goals are a universal call to action - to end poverty, care for the planet, and ensure peace and equitable development, not just for the few, but committed to 'no one left behind'.

Shirley Walters (South Africa) will speak on the main theme **Learning Cities and Societies** and the SDGs: Connecting Research, Policy and Practice drawing on her extensive experience in popular education and learning cities.

Jose Roberto Guevara (Australia/Philippines) will deliver the closing keynote weaving the different conference contributions and experiences in "**Glocalized**" **Learning: Weaving Research, Policy and Practice**.

The PASCAL Observatory, the Gyeonggi Do Provincial Institute for Lifelong Learning (GILL) and Ajou University invite scholars, local government officials, advocates and researchers who are actively engaged in the ideas, policies and practice to attend the conference. Because of the great generosity of our hosts, there will be no conference fee, although delegates will have to pay for accommodation and their travel to the event.

Four sub-themes and respective leaders have been identified to help facilitate the conversations and field visits as they relate to the overall theme.

The sub theme leaders and their respective themes are...

- *Roberta Piazza (Italy) on A: Sustaining Learning City Networks*
- *Dorothy Lucardie (Australia) on B: Lifelong Learning as the key to solving community problems*
- *Michael Osborne (UK) on C: Building collective intelligence: Big Data and Public Participation*
- *Peter Kearns (Australia) on D: Learning in Later Life*

The conference aims to create a platform where dialogue between students, researchers, advocates and local government officials, together with representatives from civil society organisations, the academe, and the private sector can occur to advance our knowledge of how policies and practices associated with learning cities can better respond to these urgent local realities. Together we will examine research, policy and practice in the light of shared global problems and prospective solutions, not only for the individual but also for institutional and organisational learning.

You are encouraged to monitor the PASCAL Observatory Website

Contributions Responses to news items and opinion pieces, other feedback and material for publication are always welcome. Please send contributions to Chris Duke at: chris.duke@rmit.edu.au