

## 18. Study on Formulation and Assessment of Local Government Social Education Plans

Leader: BABA Yujiro, Director, Practical Social Education Research Center

### (1) Purpose and Aim of Study

With the revision of the Basic Act on Education and the inclusion of provisions stipulating a Basic Plan for the Promotion of Education, revision of social education plans and appropriate evaluation of such plans will become issues for local governments when they are determining basic plans relating to measures for the promotion of education. Consequently, based on analysis of examples of current local government social education plans, this study develops a range of planning tools for the promotion of social education, including planning perspectives, plan formulation methods, suggestions for structure and content, implementation goals, result indicators, and assessment methods.

### (2) Outline of Research Results

- Survey on formulation of lifelong learning promotion plans, social education plans, etc.

(As of September 1, 2007: schemes and plans during planning period)

#### 1. Lifelong learning promotion plans

- (a) Long-term schemes/plans: 32 schemes/plans in 29 prefectures, 13 schemes/plans in 13 cities
- (b) Medium-term plans: 2 plans in 2 prefectures, 7 plans in 7 cities
- (c) Implementation plans: 3 plans in 3 prefectures

#### 2. Overall education plans

- (a) Long-term schemes/plans: 31 schemes/plans in 21 prefectures, 5 schemes/plans in 5 cities
- (b) Medium-term plans: 5 plans in 5 prefectures
- (c) Implementation plans: 4 plans in 4 prefectures, 4 plans in 3 cities

#### 3. Social Education Plans

- (a) No prefectures or designated cities have formulated long-term plans/schemes
- (b) No prefectures or designated cities have formulated medium-term plans

(c) No prefectures or designated cities have formulated implementation plans

4. Overall local government plans

(a) Long-term schemes/plans: 54 schemes/plans in 41 prefectures, 23 schemes/plans in 16 cities

(b) Medium-term plans: 13 plans in 11 prefectures, 5 plans in 5 cities

(c) Implementation plans: 15 plans in 14 prefectures, 13 plans in 13 cities

Reasons for formulating and assessing social education plans

- Social education plans set out policy issues and priorities for a certain period so that social education objectives can be achieved. Where goals have been set for addressing issues, plans provide a structure for the measures needed to attain those goals.
- In the past social education plans were formulated on an ongoing basis in all prefectures, but as this survey revealed, there are now no stand-alone social education plans, and social education goals are stipulated in general plans such as those for lifelong learning, overall education, or local government activities as a whole.
- Social education plans need to set out finite and explicit goals for the medium to long term, and need to be formulated so that results can be evaluated.
- In setting goals, it is necessary to show desired outcomes.
- Indicators for evaluation must measure the extent to which goals have been achieved. Depending on goal-setting, a single indicator may not be sufficient. A combination of diverse indicators is more effective.
- Just as goals are expressed in the form of outcomes, indicators for evaluation also need to be outcomes. However, in cases where it is difficult to set indicators due to the nature of the topic, it may be possible to substitute qualitative evaluation or description.