

**Feasibility Study Report on the Proposed Establishment of the
Institute for Educational Planning and Administration (IEPA)
in Cape Coast, Ghana
as a UNESCO Category 2 Centre**

Richard Sack, Ph.D.
external consultant

Table of Contents

Abbreviations, acronyms	iii
Introduction	1
Criterion 1: Programmatic linkage with UNESCO’s program on education policy and planning.....	1
Criterion 2: Scope of IEPA’s activities and its capacity to meet its objectives.....	3
Criterion 3: Global, regional, sub-regional relevance and potential impact and potential contribution to policy advice and capacity development	4
Criterion 4: Complementarity or redundancy with other Category 2 entities or similar UN institutions	5
Criterion 5: Cooperation IEPA aims to maintain with UNESCO entities.....	5
Criterion 6: IEPA governance and financial sustainability and its alignment to UNESCO’s Integrated Comprehensive Strategy for Category 2 Institutes and Centres	6
Criterion 7: Steps to be taken by IEPA to establish itself as a Category 2 Centre and its readiness for the process	8
Conclusions	9
Annex 1. Persons met.....	11
Annex 2. Overview of the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration.....	12
IEPA degree and course offerings.....	12
IEPA’s faculty	15
Research	15
Outreach	16
International presence.....	16
Comment on “planning” and “leadership”	16
Financial aspects.....	17
Governance and organization.....	18
Annex 3. IEPA’s proposed organizational structure as Category 2 Institute	20
Annex 4. Documentation provided by IEPA.....	21

Tables and Figures

Table 1. Admissions into IEPA degree programs	14
Table 2 . Graduation statistics from January 2014 to September 2018.....	14
Table 3. IEPA income and expenditures: 2014-2018	18
Figure 1. Snapshot of IEPA’s academic programs	13

Abbreviations, acronyms

AERA	American Educational Research Association
AIMS	African Institute for Mathematical Sciences
APCEIU	Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding
BAAL	British Association of Applied Linguistics
BELMAS	British Educational Leadership, Management and Administration Society
BSRLM	British Society for Research into Learning Mathematics
CEFWA	Collaboration of Education Faculties of West Africa
CET	Commonwealth Education Trust
CoDE	Centre of Distance Education
DfID	Department for International Development
EMASA	Educational Management Association of South Africa
GB	Governing Board
GES	Ghana Education Service
ICET	International Council on Education for Teaching
ICP	International Convention of Principals
ICT	Information and communication technologies
IEPA	Institute for Educational Planning and Administration
IICBA	International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa
IIEP	International Institute for Educational Planning
ISSN	International Standard Serial Number
JEM	Journal of Educational Management
MO	Modus operandi
MoE	Ministry of Education
Para.	Paragraph number
SAMES	Sectoral Analysis and Management of the Education System
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
TVET	Technical and vocational education and training
UCC	University of Cape Coast
UKFIET	United Kingdom Forum for International Education and Training
VC	Vice Chancellor

Introduction

IEPA¹ submitted its proposal to be established as a Category 2 Institute under the auspices of UNESCO in April 2018 with the vision of becoming a “strategic Centre of Excellence in educational research and training of educational leadership – administrators, managers and planners in the West Africa Sub-region.” For this, IEPA’s main objectives as a Category 2 Institute are to:

- (i) “Undertake collaborative research in educational administration, management and planning across the West Africa Sub-region;
- (ii) Lead the training and facilitation of continuous professional development in educational leadership to improve the competencies of educational administrators, managers and planners in the West Africa Sub-region;
- (iii) Provide technical assistance through policy advice to governments and its agencies on matters relating to educational leadership.
- (iv) Promote professional standards in education sector administration, management and planning through advocacy and experiential sharing with professional bodies and International Organizations such as the UNESCO Teacher Task Force (TTF) and similar institutions within the UN System.”

This feasibility study is based on information from the following sources : (i) a review of pertinent UNESCO documentation (C/4 and C/5 documents; “Revision of the Integrated Comprehensive Strategy for Category 2 Institutes and Centres under the Auspices of UNESCO”), including from the IIEP and IICBA; (ii) a review of IEPA documentation (see Annex 4); (iii) a three-day visit to IEPA by a four-member team (one UNESCO Headquarters staff; two from the IIEP, including its Pole de Dakar, plus the external, independent consultant, author of this report) that included meetings and interviews with IEPA staff, UCC leadership, and a visit to relevant parts of the UCC campus (library, distance learning center, ICT network center); and (iv) a day in Accra with meetings at the Ministry of Education, the Ghana Education Services and the UNESCO office.

This assessment of the IEPA proposal is organized around the seven criteria proposed by UNESCO for accession to Category 2 status. The following sections treat each criterion separately. A list of persons met is in Annex 1; Annex 2 provides an overview of IEPA that covers its academic, financial and governance characteristics; Annex 3 contains IEPA’s proposed governance structure as a Category 2 institute; and Annex 4 shows the documentation provided by IEPA to the feasibility study team.

Criterion 1: Programmatic linkage with UNESCO’s program on education policy and planning

UNESCO’s programs on education policy and planning are broadly stated in its “39 C/5” document and include, inter alia: equitable access; the delivery of quality learning opportunities; a focus on the supply of and support to qualified teachers; the elimination of gender disparities. Within UNESCO, the IIEP is mainly concerned with training, capacity development, the production of applied research, and knowledge sharing in educational policy, planning and management. IICBA (also a UNESCO institute), which is in Addis Ababa, focuses on strengthening teacher development in Africa.

¹ See Annex 2 for an overview of IEPA’s activities, structure, degree and course offerings, enrollments, faculty, governance, research, and financing.

Although IEPA does not have any ongoing programs with UNESCO, currently there is a reasonable level of complementarity² and, most importantly, there is strong potential for productive linkages in the following areas:

- Implementation (expected result 1 of the 39 C/5 UNESCO Education programme). Applied research on how and why well-planned policies often falter and stumble when they arrive at the multiple points of implementation is increasingly needed. This is a major current issue that requires strong links to, both, the points of (i) policy-making and central planning, and (ii) the local levels of implementation. IEPA is well-placed to work with the IIEP, for example, on these issues, given IEPA's extensive experience in training for leadership and management at the sub-national levels (regions, districts, schools), in addition to training staff for the GES at the central level. An analysis of the CVs of IEPA's academic staff reveals a clear interest in implementation, along with documented experience in tackling implementation-related issues³ Indeed, implementation is increasingly recognized as the new frontier of planning and policy analysis.⁴ In the past, IEPA has worked with IIEP (i) in the implementation of a regional training program on education sector planning for planners and managers in Ghana, and (ii) a sector analysis for Ghana led by the Pole de Dakar.
- Quality. Concern for "quality" in its various forms and meanings is also prominent in the work of the IEPA and its faculty members.⁵ This is an area where UNESCO is active and the potential for programmatic linkages is significant.
- Teacher development (expected result 5 of the 39 C/5 UNESCO Education programme), is also an area where IEPA is active.⁶ It should be noted that most IEPA students had been teachers before entering the Institute and many work with and/or manage teachers upon completing their studies there. This suggests that IEPA is well-placed to develop linkages with UNESCO in this thematic priority. The potential contribution to the work of IICBA, focusing on the development of teachers in Africa, could be explored. Furthermore, IEPA also intends to work with the UNESCO Teacher Task Force.
- Higher education (expected result 4 of the 39 C/5 UNESCO Education programme). Several IEPA staff have done research related to higher education. This suggests potential linkages with UNESCO's work in higher education.

In order to transform this potential into practice it would be necessary for IEPA reach out to the relevant UNESCO program units/institutes with (at least) clear outlines on how it foresees programmatic contributions at the sub-regional level to UNESCO's expected results. Access to Category 2 status could facilitate this. In its proposal to become a

² For example, many of the required and suggested reading materials for IEPA courses are published by UNESCO and IIEP.

³ A word search of the CVs finds 33 occurrences of the word "implementation", found in the titles of 15 journal articles published by IEPA faculty members, and the titles of various meetings attended and committees concerned with implementation where they have served.

⁴ See, for example, Bashir, S., Lockheed, M. E., & Tan, J.-P. (2018). *Facing Forward: Schooling for Learning in Africa*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

⁵ The word search of CVs finds 83 occurrences of the word "quality", which appears in a variety of contexts: quality assurance mechanisms; a review of the concept of quality; quality teaching; language of instruction; quality indicators; etc. The word appears in both the titles of publications and the titles of conferences attended.

⁶ The word "teacher" appears 218 times in the CVs, often in an institutional context (as in the name of a meeting or association), and the word "teaching" appears 120 times.

Category 2 Institute, IEPA explicitly establishes the programmatic linkages between its key activities and UNESCO’s main lines of action numbers 1 and 2 in its 39 C/5, which concern strengthening the capacities of education managers for the realization of the SDG4 targets.

A first, and very useful, step by IEPA would be to document its experiences in the areas of implementation, quality, teacher development, and higher education that synthesize its accumulated knowledge and lessons learned in these areas, along with statements on how this can be useful in complementing the work of UNESCO at the sub-regional level.

IEPA’s 2020-2025 Strategic Plan suggests several areas of programmatic linkages with UNESCO. In particular, this is seen in the four “thrusts” of this plan; each thrust has several key tasks which, in turn, have several key activities. The matrix below lists these thrusts along with comments on how the UNESCO feasibility mission views the readiness of IEPA to carry them out.

Thrust

Comments regarding feasibility

1: Building and strengthening capacity of educational planners, administrators and leaders in the West African sub-region.

- Includes 3 objectives, 10 key tasks, 14 key activities and 24 key activities.
- Although this will involve a fair amount of internal reform, it is consistent with IEPA’s current set-up and experience.

2: Supporting education ministries within the sub-region to undertake sector-wide planning, policy development and implementation.

- Includes 3 objectives, 8 key tasks and 15 key activities..
- Many of the proposed activities focus on the development of training materials and guidelines.
- Staff do not appear to have much experience in sector-wide planning.
- IEPA may wish to partner with IIEP/Pole de Dakar in order to develop this thrust.

3: Undertaking cutting-edge research and consultancy, and promoting innovation in education service delivery towards the attainment of the Education 2030 Agenda.

- Includes 4 objectives, 9 key tasks and 33 key activities..
- Focus on research is welcome, it is much needed in order to promote realistic, implementable sector policies; plus this plays to IEPA’s strengths.
- Define broad research priorities.
- The ability to deliver consultancy services could benefit from the development of partnerships with international and regional education research centers.

4: Creating a platform for, and mobilising education experts in the sub-region to interrogate educational issues and provide policy advice to Ministries of Education of Member States.

- Includes 1 objective, 1 key task, and 5 key activities.
- A potentially valuable exercise that would promote IEPA’s outreach through the development of networking capabilities.

Criterion 2: Scope of IEPA’s activities and its capacity to meet its objectives

As shown in Annex 2, IEPA has a considerable track record in the pursuit of its objectives in the areas of training, research and outreach (mainly within Ghana). As a Category 2 institute, IEPA aims “to become a strategic centre of excellence in educational research, outreach and training of educational leadership in the West Africa sub region and beyond.”⁷ For this, IEPA has a assets that include: a fourteen member faculty team, all with Ph.D.s; a

⁷ According to its document “Expansion into the West Africa Sub-region as Category II Institute.”

solid track record in teaching, research and outreach (mostly within Ghana); a level of autonomy that enables it to be responsive to changing environments and demand, as well as the ability to receive payment for services rendered and manage expenditures accordingly; access to a larger university that can supply cross-disciplinary academic perspectives and infrastructure (ICT, library, immigration services).

A potential capacity vector for IEPA is the Journal of Educational Management (JEM) which it has been editing and publishing for nine years (see the section on research in Annex 2). Although we do not have an in-depth assessment of how well known the journal is outside of Ghana, its sustained publication could be a major factor in its capacity to attract attention from the sub-region and beyond.

In other words, the capacity is clearly there. However, what is not clear is the nature of the demand from other (mainly Anglophone) West African countries. The presence at IEPA of other West Africans is currently quite limited (only 11 non-Ghanaian West African students in the past five years, plus 3 from India).

The scope of IEPA's core activities—teaching, training, research—are, clearly pertinent to issues of education faced by most countries in the world. . However, they need to be better known outside of Ghana in order for IEPA to meet its own objectives as a Category 2 institute. For this, IEPA might need to clarify its message and undertake some advocacy initiatives , especially in the West African subregion. A first step in this direction could be to produce a synthesis of its vision, expertise and experience in the areas of training and research for leadership, management and planning. Such a document should emphasize the findings and policy related aspects of IEPA's work. IEPA may also wish to explore upcoming sub-regional events in collaboration with the National Commission.

Criterion 3: Global, regional, sub-regional relevance and potential impact and potential contribution to policy advice and capacity development

The potential global relevance and impact of becoming a UNESCO Category 2 institute would be double: (i) IEPA could help to provide greater focus on and access to issues related to implementation; and (ii) IEPA's extensive work in teaching and research on and around the concept of "leadership" could help to bring that concept more into the mainstream, where "planning" and "management" dominate. Put differently, by bringing its knowledge and experience in the areas of implementation and leadership to the table of international discourse, IEPA could contribute to a needed conceptual broadening of the more common concepts of planning and management found in the international discourse and that are usually applied to activities more centrally located.

There is every reason to believe that there is a need, and a strong potential demand for the capacities of IEPA in the West African subregion. This is especially the case given the role that leadership and implementation play in IEPA's work.

However, as stated above (under Criterion 2), IEPA would need to demonstrate the relevance and potential utility of its work and approaches to other countries. Based on IEPA's substantial track record, this demonstration should seek to show how IEPA's work in training and research could be useful elsewhere. One approach would be to test the hypothesis that IEPA training for leadership is associated with improved implementation at the appropriate levels (such as the implementation of national, regional and school plans, or improved training of teachers and headmasters, etc.).

Criterion 4: Complementarity or redundancy with other Category 2 entities or similar UN institutions

There are no other Category 2 entities in related fields in Africa. The African Institute for Mathematical Sciences (AIMS; <https://aims.edu.gh/>) is a Category 2 center located in Biriwa (not far from Cape Coast).⁸ From all accounts, AIMS is operating successfully. However, IEPA is very much complementary with two UNESCO Category I institutes: IIEP and IICBA (see Criterion 1), as well as with UNESCO's Teacher' Development section, which houses the Secretariat of the International Task Force on Teachers.

With regard to IIEP, with headquarters in Paris and a branch in Dakar (Pole de Dakar), the nature of the complementarity is most interesting in that each one (IEPA and IIEP) addresses similar issues but at different levels and from different perspectives, which are clearly complementary. IIEP is largely, but not exclusively, concerned with planning at the more central levels. Its Pole de Dakar, in particular, focuses analyses of system-wide sector analysis using mostly quantitative methods and tools. The Pole de Dakar also has its SAMES (Sectoral Analysis and Management of the Education System) training program which is based on these quantitative methods and tools and which combines a residential and distance approach that is organized over a period 14 months.⁹ IEPA may be interested in exploring a partnership with the IIEP/Pole de Dakar, which could be interested in developing partnerships with other African academic institutions for the delivery of this course.

The UNESCO International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa (IICBA), based in Addis Ababa, focuses on strengthening capacities in the areas of teacher policy and development. IEPA has extensive experience in training for operational and leadership positions that are, largely, outside of the central offices of the MoE and GES.¹⁰ Also, much of IEPA's research revolves around case studies at relatively local levels (see the section on research in Annex 2). This implies that there is potential for cooperation between IEPA and IICBA in area of evidence-based teacher management and development.

Criterion 5: Cooperation IEPA aims to maintain with UNESCO entities

One reason for which IEPA is eager to accede to Category 2 status is to develop more sustained relations with UNESCO entities, in particular with IIEP. Six IEPA faculty members are IIEP alumni: two have IIEP masters' degrees and four others have participated in IIEP blended courses on education sector planning and in other training activities.¹¹ Also, IEPA expects that closer cooperation with UNESCO entities will strengthen its own capacities in support of its programs throughout Africa, and in West Africa, in particular.¹²

⁸ According to its web site, AIMS is a "pan-African centre of excellence in education and research" that recruits "talented students from all over Africa and prepares them for careers in Mathematical Sciences. Operating as a partnership between African and international universities, AIMS Ghana provides an innovative and relevant curriculum within a unique 24-hour learning environment."

⁹ SAMES is organized in partnership with the University of Gambia. The francophone version of this course is co-organized with education faculty of the Université Cheikh Anta Diop in Dakar

¹⁰ According to the tracer study by Nudzor et al. (2018), 55% of the IEPA graduates surveyed were working in middle management or operational positions.

¹¹ Based on information in the CVs provided by IEPA.

¹² According to the IEPA document "Expansion into the West Africa Sub-region as Category II Institute."

The IEPA proposal to become a UNESCO Category 2 Institute, makes the following points concerning cooperation with UNESCO:

- IEPA's capacity building role could "augment the already existing initiative of development partners, including UNESCO's own interventions and efforts in the sub-region". This could include addressing the teacher question in the SDG 4.c¹³; and "supporting the global effort to scale-up and monitor the acquisition of fundamental skills and lifelong learning through ICTs";
- Given its operational mandate and key activities, IEPA claims that "the programmatic linkage with UNESCO's priority objectives ... are evident." IEPA would "utilize these linkages through multi-stakeholder approaches to scale up support for UNESCO's programme priorities";
- As a Category 2 institute, IEPA sees itself as a rallying point for expertise from throughout West Africa that would "serve to complement the efforts and capacity building role" of IICBA and IIEP (Paris and Pole de Dakar);
- IEPA's emphasis on gender responsiveness and inclusivity in education already underway supports UNESCO's Priority Gender Equality programming; and
- IEPA has collaborated with the Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding (APCEIU, in South Korea) which is a UNESCO Category 2 centre, in conducting capacity building activities for global citizenship education.

Criterion 6: IEPA governance and financial sustainability and its alignment to UNESCO's Integrated Comprehensive Strategy for Category 2 Institutes and Centres

Governance. As pointed out in Annex 2, IEPA has always had its own Governing Board and a large degree of functional autonomy. It has recently been incorporated under the Ghana Companies Act, which gives IEPA the required independent legal status to perform as a category 2 center. IEPA director and staff are appointed formally by the university vice-chancellor. In practice, the recommendations of the IEPA Governing Board are retained by the vice-chancellor.

As described in Annex 2, IEPA's Governing Board plays an active role in all areas of the life of the Institute. In addition to approving the Institute's academic program, budget and staff appointments, the GB provides critical input and feedback in areas such as international cooperation.

The proposed governance structure as a Category 2 Institute is shown in Annex 3. Under this structure, the IEPA director would be directly accountable to the GB, with some level of oversight by an external auditor and by the Vice Chancellor.

For financial matters, IEPA has its own bank account for income and expenditures (all the lines in Table 3 of Annex 2 except for Subvention and Compensation which are received and paid, respectively, by the University for IEPA staff salaries). This account is regularly audited. In terms of functional autonomy, this means that IEPA has the juridical and administrative capacities to receive income and make expenditures according to its budget estimates which are approved by the GB.

¹³ "Provide a dynamic platform for regular dialogue and for stocktaking and agenda-setting to advance sustainable development." See <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/hlpf>

Financial sustainability. Upon attaining Category 2 status, the Government of Ghana is committed to funding mobilization initiatives that would, in particular, include enhanced subventions through the Government’s regular budget. In addition, IEPA would continue to raise income from a variety of sources, including: admission, registration and tuition fees; facility user fees; outreach activities, support from alumni; short courses and consultancy services; online learning; and a sub-regional fellowship scheme. In this context, IEPA considers that accession to Category 2 status would improve its attractivity in all areas with potential for income generation.

It is also worth noting that IEPA has consistently demonstrated a capacity for prudent financial management. This is attested to by the last line of Table 3 of Annex 2 which shows that over the past five years IEPA expenditures have varied between 83% and 90% of income.

Alignment to UNESCO’s Integrated Comprehensive Strategy for Category 2 Institutes and Centers. The matrix below summarizes the pertinent requirements of UNESCO’s Integrated Comprehensive Strategy¹⁴ and this feasibility study’s assessment of IEPA “responses”, which either can be seen in its current structure and modus operandi (MO) or could be incorporated into its future structure and MO. The matrix shows a fairly high degree of alignment between IEPA’s governance structures, its activities and its stated intentions, on the one hand, and UNESCO’s requirements as per its Integrated Comprehensive Strategy for Category 2 institutes, on the other hand.

UNESCO’s strategy requirements	IEPA’s “responses” (see Annex 2)
The activities of category 2 institutes and centres must be global, regional, subregional or interregional in scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEPA has had some activities outside of Ghana, which it expects to revitalize and expand with Category 2 status.¹⁵ • There are several students from the subregion and beyond; with Category 2 status this is expected to expand. • The university has a variety of administrative and physical facilities to accommodate foreign students and staff.
Contribute to the achievement of UNESCO’s strategic programme objectives and global priorities, as well as and sectoral or intersectoral programme priorities and themes	IEPA’s programme objectives and priorities are in line with those of UNESCO’s education sector (in particular, expected results 1, 4, & 5 of the Education Sector’s 39 C/5)
The type, scope and nature of the contribution must be articulated in the original request for creation/association	This is the case. Further details were obtained by the feasibility study mission.
Each category 2 institute and centre must be independent of UNESCO and have the legal capacity necessary for the exercise for its function under the laws of the country in which it is located.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEPA is, and will be, independent of UNESCO. • Legal status: IEPA has its own legal personality, which allows for sufficient functional autonomy
Each category 2 institute and centre must have	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEPA’s Governing Board meets twice a year

¹⁴ According to UNESCO document 37 C/18 Part I (5 November 2013), “Revision of the Integrated Comprehensive Strategy for Category 2 Institutes and Centres Under the Auspices of UNESCO.”

¹⁵ See the section on “International presence” in Annex 2.

UNESCO's strategy requirements

a governing body or a similar supervisory and decision-making mechanism, which shall meet annually. Such body shall appoint the director and approve the budget and the programme of activities

UNESCO must be represented as a full member in the governing body of each category 2 institute or centre

UNESCO shall have no financial obligations or accountability for the operations, management and accounting by any category 2 institute or centre and shall not provide financial support for administrative or institutional purposes.

Category 2 institutes and centres are encouraged to deliver high-quality work with a view to contributing to the objectives of UNESCO and promoting its impact, relevance and visibility in the field

IEPA's "responses" (see Annex 2)

- IEPA director is appointed by University VC upon recommendation by GB
- The GB approves the budget and the programme activities

- This should be possible.
- A senior member of the Ghana National Commission for UNESCO has been a member of the GB since 2012.

There are no expectations regarding direct financial, operational or management support

- All IEPA faculty members have PhDs; all but one from universities in Europe, Australia or USA
- IEPA faculty members publish in refereed journals
- IEPA's training and research activities are in line with the objectives of UNESCO's education sector
- Reason for aspiring to Category 2 status is to be better positioned to contribute to the objectives of UNESCO and to gain greater visibility

Criterion 7: Steps to be taken by IEPA to establish itself as a Category 2 Centre and its readiness for the process

Legal status. On 28 March 2019 IEPA was incorporated under the Companies Act, 1963 (Act 179). As such, IEPA has a distinct legal personality.

Governing Board.

- (i) A representative of UNESCO should be appointed to the GB
- (ii) In addition, non-Ghanaian members should be appointed: one from the West African subregion; another from the international professional community of applied researchers in the areas of educational planning, leadership, management and administration; and one from an African regional organization, such as the AU, ADEA, AfDB, FAWE, etc. Also, as is the case with many a governing board or board of directors, IEPA may wish to think of its GB as outreach to potential external financing and seek members accordingly.
- (iii) The Governing Board should strive for improved gender balance.

Financial sustainability. An official statement from the Government of Ghana concerning its financial commitment to IEPA should be sought. Related to this, IEPA should prepare a

costed development plan for its operations as a Category 2 Institute which is organized by program objectives and expected results.

Developing linkages. IEPA should reach out to the relevant UNESCO program units/institutes with clear and operationally detailed outlines on how it foresees programmatic linkages with them.

In order to strengthen its capacity to develop such linkages, IEPA should produce a detailed synthesis of its vision, expertise and experience in the areas of training and research for leadership, management and planning. Such a document should emphasize the findings and policy related aspects of IEPA's work; it should go beyond the general and get into the details of IEPA's accomplishments and how they could serve as a basis for the linkages it seeks to establish, and how it plans to establish them. Based on IEPA's substantial track record, this demonstration should show how IEPA's work in training and research could be useful elsewhere. If possible, one aspect of this demonstration would be to test the hypothesis that IEPA training for leadership is associated with improved implementation within Ghana. In other words, IEPA should devote some resources towards "capitalization" of its experience and acquired knowledge and know-how so that potential partners would clearly see the nature and extent of (i) what IEPA has to offer, and (ii) how the establishment of linkages with IEPA could be of benefit.

Conclusions

The major conclusion of this feasibility study is that accession to Category 2 status would be mutually beneficial to both IEPA and UNESCO and that the relationship between the two could be asymmetrically symbiotic. Symbiotic, because each has resources that are valuable to the other's development and capacities to pursue their respective mandates. Asymmetric, because each one's resources are of a different nature, both qualitatively and quantitatively.

UNESCO Category 2 status would be beneficial to IEPA in terms of:

- IEPA's reputational capital and networking opportunities within and beyond UNESCO. IEPA firmly believes that its identification as a UNESCO Category 2 institute will enhance its capacities to network, and facilitate partnerships and linkages with other institutions (education ministries, universities, education research centres) in Africa and throughout the world. Attracting more international students is a major IEPA objective, as is developing new avenues for research and outreach outside of Ghana.
- Its technical capacities, especially those of the IIEP and its Pole de Dakar, as well as those associated with UNESCO's Teacher Task Force.
- Facilitated access to a broad range of international actors in the field of educational development, such as UNESCO Category 1 institutions, and networking opportunities through access to UNESCO meetings.

What IEPA could bring to UNESCO includes:

- Access to a broad range of field-level experience and activities that are close to the points of implementation, which is where the delivery of educational resources happens and, therefore, where SDG 4 will eventually succeed or fail.
- Through this, there is a potential for improved understandings of the mechanics of achieving SDG 4 in general, and implementation in particular. , This would be of interest to the work of IIEP, IICBA and the Teacher Task Force in terms of feedback

between research, training and implementation. Together, this nexus of activities could contribute to improving UNESCO's voice within the concert of development partners concerned with education for all.

Of course, such complementarity would require the active care and reaching-out from both sides. IEPA would need to have invested in the "capitalization" of its experience, knowledge and know-how in such a way that is aligned to UNESCO's work and communicable to both UNESCO and other partners; it would also need to become more actively involved in all aspects of outreach. UNESCO, on the other hand, would need to buy into this vision of a mutually advantageous relationship.

On the whole, the feasibility study mission noted a number of positive points: the level of commitment by Government, the UNESCO National Commission for Ghana, UCC and, of course, IEPA; all members of IEPA's faculty all have PhDs; the fact that IEPA regularly publishes the JEM; the level of benefits available to IEPA related to the economies of scale of being part of a full-service university with common facilities (ICT, immigration services, maintenance, etc.); IEPA's long experience with functional autonomy; and the active participation of the Governing Board in all aspects of IEPA's work.

Risks. However, such a vision is not without risks. IEPA recognizes four risks in its strategy:¹⁶

- The Government of Ghana could renege "on its commitment to support IEPA as a category 2 institute."
- There could be "unforeseen travel and bureaucratic protocols restricting the running of programmes in other countries."
- There could be "a shift in the policy focus by governments in the sub-region for educational leadership development."
- There could be issues caused by "incompatible ICT software settings and internet connectivity."

In addition to this, the feasibility study mission noted other potential risks:

- Enrolments in the regular course programs has declined significantly for reasons that are not clear, but may be related to competition and declining attractiveness.
- IEPA's objectives are ambitious and may require greater focus and a clearer definition of its "core business" and specific comparative advantages.

¹⁶ These are not articulated in its proposal submission but, rather, in the IEPA document "Expansion into the West Africa Sub-region as Category II Institute".

Annex 1. Persons met

Dr. Matthew Opoku Prempeh	Minister of Education
Mr. Enoch H. Cobbinah	Chief Director, Ministry of Education
Prof. Kwasi Opoku-Amankwa	Director-General, Ghana Education Services
Ms. Ama Serwah Nerquaye-Tetteh	Secretary General, Ghana National Commission for UNESCO
Mr. Rich-Mike Wellington	Chief Programme Officer, Ghana National Commission for UNESCO
Mr. Abdourahamane Diallo	Head of the UNESCO office, Accra

University of Cape Coast

Prof. Joseph Ghartey Ampiah,	Vice-Chancellor
Dr. Regina Gyampo-Vidogah	Director, ICT
Ms. Paulina Attul-Author	Deputy Librarian
Mr. Solomon Faakye	Head of Legal Section
Dr. Michael Amakyi	Director, IEPA
Prof. Joseph Ghartey Ampiah	IEPA
Prof. Samuel Annim	IEPA
Prof. Ernest L. Okorley	IEPA
Prof. George T. K. Oduro	IEPA
Prof. Yaw Afari Ankomah	Professor, IEPA
Prof. Rosemary S. Bosu	Associate Professor, IEPA
Dr. Alfred Ampah-Mensah	Senior Research Fellow, IEPA
Dr. Nudzor Hope Pius	Senior Research Fellow, IEPA
Dr. Wisdom Kwaku Agbevanu	Research Fellow, IEPA
Dr. Might Kojo Abreh	Research fellow, IEPA

Annex 2. Overview of the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration

The IEPA is an institute within the University of Cape Coast (UCC), Ghana. (147 kilometres from Accra) with a focus on educational planning, leadership, management and administration. It was established in 1975 as an autonomous entity, based on a joint UNESCO/UNDP and Government of Ghana agreement under which the UNDP provided the initial funding. Its functions and structure are similar to a graduate-school/faculty of education in an Anglo-Saxon university, albeit with greater autonomy than many given that it has a dedicated governing board. The Institute's operations include: teaching and training; research; outreach programs and in-service training; and documentation (mainly, publication of a research journal).

UCC offers undergraduate and graduate programs that cover a broad spectrum of the hard sciences, medicine, the social sciences, management, education, agriculture, and the humanities (see <https://ucc.edu.gh/>). It also has a Centre of Distance Education (CoDE) which, till now, mainly runs print-based with 69 learning centres across the country. It will soon be offering web-based delivery modes through an online learning platform (Moodle). CoDE focus on programs in education and business, leading to undergraduate and master's degrees. Currently, there are about 50,000 students enrolled in CoDE programs. Within UCC there also is an Institute of Education which trains future teachers and delivers a B.Ed. degree after four years of study.

UCC is situated on an expansive campus, whose modern facilities include a central library, a powerful data centre (lodged in CoDE), WiFi throughout the campus, student and faculty housing, and buildings that (from the outside) appear to be reasonably well maintained. Ongoing construction suggests continued investment in, and expansion of the university. The university has a number of common services that are available to all of its constituent parts (faculties, institutes, etc).. They include: the central library; access to the internet and other ICT services; immigration services for foreign students and staff.

IEPA degree and course offerings

IEPA grants only advanced degrees:

- PhD in Qualitative Research
- M.Phil (Educational Planning)
- M.Phil (Educational Administration)
- M.Phil (Administration in Higher Education)
- M.Ed Top-Up leading to M.Phil (Administration in Higher Education)
- M.Ed (Educational Administration) (Sandwich, in-service)

In addition, IEPA offers two distance programs on Administration in Higher Education (MA and M.Ed.) in cooperation with the UCC College of Distance Education, and short professional development courses organized on demand for different institutions.

Course offerings in pursuit of these degrees cover the gamut of planning, administration and management issues and include: research methodology (mostly qualitative, some quantitative; data collection); economics of education; demographic aspects of planning; academic, institutional and facilities planning; school mapping; statistics; principles of administration; institutional and human resource management; foundations of education; financial administration and accounting; evaluation; policy analysis; computer applications;

curriculum development; law and politics in education. Figure 1 provides a “snapshot” of IEPA’s teaching/training programs.

Figure 1. Snapshot of IEPA’s academic programs

PROGRAMS	OPTIONS	DURATION	CERTIFICATION
REGULAR PROGRAM	M.Phil Educational Administration Educational Planning Administration in Higher Education	2 YEARS - 4 SEMESTERS	University Degree
	PhD Qualitative research	4 YEARS	University Degree
SANDWICH PROGRAM	M.Ed Educational Administration	2 Sandwich semesters	University Degree
	Top Up /M. Phil Administration in Higher Education	1 YEAR	University Degree
DISTANCE	MA Administration in Higher Education	3 distance semesters	University Degree
	M.Ed Administration in Higher Education	3 distance semesters	University Degree
Professional Development	On request Various areas/topics	Various (days to weeks)	Certificate of participation
	Response to research Various areas/topics	Various (days to weeks)	Certificate of participation

Two new programs leading to MA/MPhil and PhD degrees have recently been submitted for accreditation to the National Accreditation Board: one in educational planning; and another in quality assurance in tertiary education.

The demand for these programs has varied over the years which, of course, has influenced the production of graduates. Table 1 shows the numbers of students admitted into IEPA programs between 2013 and 2018 and Table 2 provides information on graduates by program and year. These tables show that educational administration is, by far, the program where demand is the greatest, whereas demand is weak (almost nil) for planning. The M.Phil. in higher education administration is the only program where the number of graduates has increased over the past five years. This is attributed to the significant increase in the number private institutions of higher education and the resulting demand for administrators for these institutions which must be accredited in order to operate.

Table 1. Admissions into IEPA degree programs

	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
M. Phil Administration in Higher Education	16	11	27	19	4	11
M. Phil Educational Administration	18	19	9	10	5	5
M. Phil Educational Planning	3	4	3	3	1	1
M. Ed Educational Administration	210	231	157	121	99	165
M. Phil Administration in Higher Education (Top Up)	18	17	16	15	12	13
Total	265	282	212	168	121	195
% Female	47%	44%	53%	64%	42%	44%

Source: IEPA

Table 2 . Graduation statistics from January 2014 to September 2018

	January 2014	January 2015	February 2016	March + October 2017	September 2018
Ph.D. Qualitative research	0	0	1	0	2
M.Phil. Administration in Higher Education	14	10	8	16	21
M.Phil. Educational Planning	7	4	4	4	0
M.Phil. Educational Administration	21	13	6	20	10
M.Ed Administration in Higher Education	3	1	0	0	0
M.Ed Educational Planning	4	1	0	2	1
M.Ed Educational Administration	491	413	248	283	99
M.A. Educational Administration	0	4	0	0	0
M.A. Administration in Higher Education	0	0	0	5	0
TOTAL	540	446	267	330	133

Source: IEPA

Two reasons are given for the decline in the demand for the program in planning: (i) increasing numbers are studying planning through CoDE (for which we do not have data); and (ii) competition from other universities. In addition, it appears (from data provided) that degree completion rates are rather low: 15 of the 28 students admitted into M.Phil. programs in 2014 have yet to complete their degree and 63% of those admitted in 2015 have yet to complete.

A tracer recent study of IEPA graduates¹ found that, overall, IEPA and its graduates “have contributed, and still continues to contribute to the training of the country’s human resources to take up useful roles in the education sector as well as other productive sectors of the Ghanaian economy.” More specifically, the study found that:

- 94% of IEPA graduates were “employed in education and related establishment across all levels of the Ghanaian educational sector”;²
- “degree specialisation; educational preparation and training; and experience of employees respectively were the first three factors that employers of IEPA graduates

¹ H. P. Nudzor et al. Placement and Utilisation of ‘IEPA’ Graduates In Sectors of the Ghanaian Economy. IEPA. March 2018.

² GES is the largest single employer of graduates, employing 74% of those interviewed. Other employers included technical universities (3%), colleges of education (2%) and traditional universities (12%). The remainder of those interviewed were working in private basic schools, private universities and MoE headquarters. When questioned about tasks they perform most in their current position (several tasks allowed), 57% of the IEPA graduates in the study claim to doing leadership tasks, 51% doing management tasks, 50% doing administrative tasks, 35% doing planning tasks, 17% doing research and analytical tasks, and 11% doing secretarial tasks.

gave considerations to in determining the selection and placement of their employees;”

- “employers utilised IEPA graduate employees in ways and/or schedules that were generally consistent with the professional training, degree specialisation and/or qualification they had attained from IEPA;” Nonetheless, many graduates were performing other “supplementary” roles/tasks for which they were not trained and received on-the-job training in order to function effectively;
- IEPA graduates thought of themselves as being efficient and effective in their work;
- Most employers³ were satisfied with the efficiency and effectiveness of the graduates whereas another group argued that they were not fit-for-purpose;
- The “three best ways to improve IEPA’s curricula and general modes of training and delivery were by: introduction of new and relevant courses; improving IEPA’s facilities and equipment; and formation of a professional body for educational planners and administrators to help address the teething challenges they faced at their respective job places.”

IEPA’s faculty

In the current academic year (2018/19), IEPA has 14 faculty members (up from 12 in 2014/15), 3 research assistants and one adjunct faculty member, one-third of whom are women. All faculty members and the adjunct possess the Ph.D. degree which they earned from a variety of universities in the United States (n=5), the United Kingdom (n=4), Australia (n=1), the Netherlands (n=2), and Ghana (n=1).⁴

Research

Several important indicators attest to the fact that research is a major aspect of IEPA’s institutional culture: regular publication of a research journal with international aspirations; faculty publishing activities; and faculty participation in research conferences.

IEPA publishes the Journal of Educational Management (JEM: expected to come online in the near future). JEM (ISSN 0855-3343) has published nine volumes, with 1-2 issues per year. The date of the most recent issue is April 2018. Judging from the titles of articles in three issues (April 2016, April 2017, April 2018), the research published covers the broad range of topics that constitute the various dimensions (pedagogical, strategic, administrative, sociological, economics) of educational management . Most articles appear to focus on case studies within individual educational institutions or districts/regions. Several articles concern system-wide issues, such as: language policy implementation in Ghana; cohort analysis of junior high school students in Ghana; and the importance of leadership for education management in Nigeria. About 25% of the authors in these three issues are IEPA faculty members.

Since 2014, the current fourteen members of the IEPA faculty account for 97 journal publications, 43 of which are in international refereed journals. In addition to publishing journal articles, faculty have contributed chapters to books published in Ghana and in Europe and have made numerous presentations at professional meetings, mostly in Ghana.

³ 14 of the 16 interviewed

⁴ The CV for one faculty member (research fellow) is missing.

Outreach

IEPA identifies four categories of beneficiaries for its outreach capacity development programs: district-based educational structures; heads of senior high schools; circuit supervisors; and heads of basic schools. Outreach includes contributions to in-service training programs as well as the provision of advisory services outside of the university. GES—which is the implementation arm of MoE—is a major beneficiary of in-service training and other services provided by IEPA. According to the director-general of GES, the training provided to head teachers and people in other leadership positions throughout the school system is essential: leaders at all levels—all the way “down” to head teachers—require training that will enable them to identify issues and have a clear vision on “how to get from here to there.”

International presence

Although the vast majority of IEPA’s activities are within Ghana, faculty members—all but one of whom did their graduate training overseas—maintain professional activities with international organizations such as UNESCO, IIEP and UNICEF, and attend professional conferences organized by a variety of structures (UKFIET, CEFWA, ICET, CET, ICP, BELMAS, EMASA, British Council, BSRLM, BAAL). All IEPA faculty members have attended and made presentations at international meetings in Africa, Europe, Asia and North America.⁵ Examples participation and/or collaboration with entities outside of Ghana include:

- An invitation by the British Council to co-facilitate a three-week leadership and management training program for senior managers in Sudan’s Ministry of General Education, plus training for headteachers and supervisors in three Sudanese states.
- Participation in a MoE delegation to Tanzania organized by the Agency for Development of Educational Management.
- Participation on a team organized by GES to an inter-ministerial conference in Rwanda to look at Education Sector Planning.
- Participation on a team to Senegal on Education Sector Planning.
- Participation on a team organized by the MoE and the British Council to Kenya on Connecting Classrooms regional workshops for sub-Saharan Africa.
- Participation in an “EdQual” project on implementing education quality in low income countries. This was funded by DfID with a number of collaborating partners such as Witwatersrand University, the Kigali Institute of Education, the Aga Khan University and the Universidad de La Frontera in Chile.
- Contacts with India’s National University for Educational Planning and Administration in view of collaboration.

Foreign students. Over the past five years, there have been 6 students from Nigeria, 3 from Liberia, 2 from Togo and 3 from India. Although few in number, this does attest to IEPA’s vision as an institute whose pertinence goes beyond the borders of Ghana.

Comment on “planning” and “leadership”

Various aspects of “planning” are in the title of ten courses offered by IEPA. The research produced by IEPA faculty members, on the other hand, appears to be more focused on

⁵ Based on information contained in the curricula vitae of IEPA faculty members.

“leadership” than on “planning.”⁶ It appears that the demand for the degree program in planning has declined seriously. “Leadership”, on the other hand, appears with increasing frequency in the scholarship and the outreach activities of IEPA staff. This may be a sign of the times, a reflection of the demand coming from the field for improvements in the delivery of education services, which is more a matter of the management of implementation at the more local levels than of more centralized planning. In this context, it is necessary to distinguish between:

- (i) sector-wide planning that provides the basis for the production of the national plans/policies that are required to obtain international financing. For any given country, these plans/policies are produced every five years, more or less; and
- (ii) the more ongoing, continuous micro planning that occurs at levels much closer to real-life implementation (school and district levels).

It is in this second area where the term and concept of “leadership” should be understood. At least two factors, most likely, contribute to this:

- A strong body of research points to the quality of school leadership and management as a determining factor in the quality of educational outcomes.
- “Leadership” is much more common in the academic culture (research topics, courses, department names) in graduate schools of education in North America and Great Britain (where a sizeable proportion of IEPA faculty members obtained their Ph.D.s) than “planning.” For example, IEPA has worked with the University of Cambridge’s Faculty of Education and its network focused on leadership for learning.⁷

Furthermore, it is worth noting that concerns for implementation are increasingly found both in the development literature⁸ and observations from the field where, all too often, well-planned policies falter for lack of effective implementation. It could be useful to give thought to the relative meanings and impacts of “planning”, “management” and “leadership”.

Financial aspects

Table 3 provides an overview of IEPA’s income and expenditures that indicates a rather stable and healthy situation. The following are the most salient points that emerge from this table:

- Income regularly surpasses expenditures. This suggests prudent financial management;
- The Government subvention covers staff costs (compensation) and this has increased over the past five years, in absolute and in relative terms. This suggests sustained Government commitment to IEPA;
- Staff compensation has increased from 54% to 79% of expenditures since 2014. This reflects the declining share of non-government income;
- IEPA has a history of generating income from a variety of sources. However, the share of this income in IEPA’s overall financial resource picture has decreased in the

⁶ The word “planning” does not appear in the titles of any articles in JEM issues between 2016 and 2018, whereas “leadership” appears in the titles of two articles. More emphatically, a word count of the curricula vitae of IEPA faculty members shows that “planning” appears 163 times and “leadership” 300 times. Many, if not most, occurrences of “planning” are institutional references (as in IEPA, courses taught), whereas occurrences of “leadership” are found mainly in the titles of research activities, papers, conferences and outreach activities.

⁷ See <http://www.educ.cam.ac.uk/networks/lfl/>.

⁸ For example, in Bashir, Sajitha, Marlaine Lockheed, Elizabeth Ninan, and Jee-Peng Tan. 2018. *Facing Forward: Schooling for Learning in Africa*. Africa Development Forum series. Washington, DC: World Bank.

past five years, going from 55% in 2014 to 30% in 2018. This suggests that IEPA needs to revitalize its non-governmental sources of income sources and compensate for the loss of income from sandwich courses and admission/registration fees.

Table 3. IEPA income and expenditures: 2014-2018

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
INCOME	GH¢	GH¢	GH¢	GH¢	GH¢
Overhead Charges	49,773	81,068	45,075	66,422	66,442
Bus Service	24,350	11,350	2,950	18,625	7,300
Subvention	1,144,019	1,551,878	1,674,570	1,838,254	2,047,370
Miscellaneous Earnings	2,460	115	2,295	1,829	30
Sandwich Income	1,159,562	1,023,603	902,030	777,550	615,660
Chalet Income			10,700	10,736	11,856
Admission & Registration Fees	135,100	27,778	50,462	75,771	7,360
Interest on Fixed Deposit	14,738	55,786	191,055	187,588	185,103
<i>Sub-totals</i>	<i>2,530,001</i>	<i>2,751,578</i>	<i>2,879,137</i>	<i>2,976,775</i>	<i>2,941,121</i>
Government subvention as % total income	45%	56%	58%	62%	70%
EXPENDITURE					
Academic and Admin. Expenses	313,626	224,064	249,742	303,905	337,656
Sandwich Expenses	637,026	566,073	653,975	516,864	181,450
Municipal Expenses	2,007	15,443	16,581	11,577	22,983
Compensation	1,144,019	1,551,878	1,674,570	1,838,254	2,047,370
Miscellaneous Expenses	2,710	24,153	3,791	2,758	2,980
UCC Contingency Fund Contribution		50,000			
<i>Sub-totals</i>	<i>2,099,387</i>	<i>2,431,612</i>	<i>2,598,659</i>	<i>2,673,358</i>	<i>2,592,439</i>
Staff compensation as % total expenditures	54%	64%	64%	69%	79%
Excess of Income Over Expenditure	430,613	319,966	280,478	303,417	348,682
Expenditures as % of income	83%	88%	90%	90%	88%

Source: IEPA

Governance and organization

IEPA has its own Governing Board and a high degree of functional autonomy; it has recently been incorporated under the Companies Act of 1963, which means that it has the necessary autonomy for a category 2 centre.

The Governing Board, which meets twice a year, consists of: the Vice-Chancellor of UCC, who chairs the Board, along with the UCC provost for the College of Education Studies; the director of IEPA; representatives of the ministries of education, and finance and economic planning; the director-general of GES; a representative of the Ghana National Association of Teachers and of the Ghana National Commission for UNESCO; and the executive secretary of the National Council for Tertiary Education.

The GB's functions include:

- Approving IEPA's program of activities;
- Receiving reports on the Institute's course offerings;
- Reviewing candidacies for staff positions; and
- Ensuring that the Institute's objectives are fulfilled within the context of its overall policies.

Reading the GB minutes of the past six years reveals that the GB plays an active and dynamic role in all areas of the life of the Institute: it provides advice and provides critical feedback; it suggests areas for future development (such as becoming a UNESCO Category 2 center, making JEM available online; and greater cooperation with India's National

University for Educational Planning and Administration and with other West African institutions); and it apprised of all aspects of the Institute's activities.

Annex 3. IEPA's proposed organizational structure as Category 2 Institute



Annex 4. Documentation provided by IEPA

“Government of Ghana Proposal for a Category II Institute under the Auspices of UNESCO.”
April 4, 2018.

IEPA Brochure

IEPA Capacity Building Programmes

IEPA five year financial statements

IEPA, “Expansion into the West Africa Sub-region as Category II Institute.”

IEPA, Curricula Vitae of IEPA faculty members

IEPA Governing Board Minutes (meetings of 20th November 2018, 24th April 2018, 28th November 2017, 7th November 2016, 3rd May 2016, 25th February 2014, 4th April 2012, 27th November 2012, April 2011, 7th April 2010)

IEP, “Strategic Plan for the Proposed Category Ii Institute under the Auspices of UNESCO, 2020 – 2025.” February 2019.

Journal of Educational Management (issues dated 4/2016; 4/2017; 4/2018)

Nudzor, Hope Pius et al. (2018) “Placement and Utilisation of ‘IEPA’ Graduates in Sectors of the Ghanaian Economy”.