20 Ubuntu-inspired tools and models to decolonise social work practice

Rugare Mugumbate

Introduction

Reading, writing and analysing without action will not decolonise and indigenise social work practice. The reason for indigenising is to come up with sustainable solutions for poverty eradication and development. Africa has been colonised for over 500 years, and development has not happened, in fact, urban-focused 'modernisation' has multiplied Africa's social and economic problems. Decolonising social work practice is a process. In Africa, social workers, schools of social work and agencies employing or regulating social workers are at different stages of the process. Others have yet to start the process, and yet more others are on the first steps or are moving towards the middle steps. This chapter starts with a discussion of the uncolonised-colonised-decolonised continuum followed by tools for decolonising social work education and practice and concludes with the stages of decolonising practice.

From uncolonised to colonised and decolonised

All of Africa was uncolonised at some time. Different groups of Black people lived in different parts of the continent, and the largest group travelled from North Africa to settle at Mambilla region which is between Nigeria and Cameroon (Katanekwa, 2021). From about 4,000 years ago, some of them spread, some reaching the bottom ocean of Africa in South Africa about 2,000 years ago (Koile et al, 2022). This is the stage of uncolonisation, which for many Africans ended about 800 years ago, when *zungu* people missionaries came to colonise African religion (Mbiti, 1969; Samkange and Samkange, 1980). These people included Abrahamaic religious colonisers (that is Christian 'missionaries' and Islamic *dawa*), anthropologists, imperialists, traders and explorers. They all had a wrong belief that Africa was 'philosophyless' (yet we have Ubuntu as our philosophy), 'religiousless' or Godless (yet Africa has its own religion), 'humanless' or simply animals and 'intellectualless' (yet we innovated throughout history).

The colonisation process had four major older tactics and one newer one: (1) philosophical, scientific and mental or intellectual colonisation that was started by anthropologists and voyagers (Diop, 1974; Chilisa, 2020; Ndlovu-Gatsheni,

DOI: 10.4324/9781003330370-26

2020); (2) religious and artistic colonisation that started with Christian and Islamic missionaries (Mbiti, 1969); (3) uprooting and enslavement, commonly known as slavery (colonially called slave trade to blame Africans for 'trading themselves') (Asante, 1998); (4) land, economic and political colonisation which peaked with the partition of Africa in German in 1884 (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2020); (5) the stage of hidden or masked colonisation, what others have termed neo-colonisation which exists in aid, international relations, trade and international organisations (Moyo, 2009). In academia, including social work, it (neo-colonisation) exists in so-called global standards, global education, publishing, funding, brain-drain and global rankings.

Decolonisation means resisting the intentions, tactics and effects of colonisation and undoing philosophical, religious and mental or intellectual colonisation. It involves having functional and developmental education. This is education that contributes to growth of the local economy (Baguma and Aheisibwe, 2011). In the training of social workers for example, Mupedziswa and Sinkamba (2014) argued for education that allows social workers to contribute to socio-economic development and not social welfare only. As Nziramasanga (1999: 24) said, African education should 'be based on the peoples' belief in *Unhu*/Ubuntu', starting at pre-school level and incorporating diverse cultures for national identity' and should be 'embedded in *Unhu*/Ubuntu which has withstood the corrosion of time and the tempests of history.'

Provision of social support and services existed in Africa before colonisation, however, social work as an academic-based profession was formed during colonisation through import of social welfare workers and policies from colonising countries or training social workers at schools initiated by white people in Africa. The time and environment in which academic-based professional social work was formed impacted the three areas of social work: education, practice (the focus of this chapter) and research. To understand what practice is, we can analyse who the social work practitioners are (Table 20.1) or the fields of practice (Table 20.2).

Current social work practice in Africa: *Types of practitioners and fields of practice*

There are also non-practising social workers. These include those unemployed, suspended, retired and those working in non-social work fields. In some countries, this group can be quite huge (Mabvurira, 2018), and in some African countries, they outnumber those who are practising because of high unemployment rates. For example, in 2022 South Africa, which together with Nigeria are the top economies in Africa, had about 9,000 social workers who were unemployed and this translates to about 16 per cent (Gray and Lombard, 2022). Countries such as Zimbabwe will have unemployment rates of social workers higher than 70 per cent.

Some social workers work as regulators. This involves ensuring compliance of other social workers, employers and organisations of social work including training institutions. They set and monitor application of code of ethics, training standards and practice standards. They register and monitor training

Table 20.1 The eight types of social work practitioners

Category	*Description*
1. Academics, trainers and trainees	This includes designing curricula, teaching and assessing social work learning. The practitioners in this category include principals, lecturers, tutors and fieldwork facilitators,. This category includes social workers providing continuous professional development.
	Fieldwork or practicum - This is social work practice, placement or observation for learning or professional growth. This is the category of student practitioners.
3. Administrators	This involves forming, managing and evaluating social work services in public or private organisations. This is work done by social work leaders, mainly directors and managers.
4. Service providers	This involves meeting and communicating with clients to assess their needs, provide services, monitor and report. These practitioners include social development or welfare workers, community workers, housing workers, medical social workers, disability social workers, rural development workers, gender workers, child protection workers and others.
5. Community organisers	This involves mobilising the community and work with them to conceptualise, plan, implement, monitor and implement social and development projects.
6. Researchers and evaluators	This involves identifying research gaps, creating questions and methods and implementing them and disseminating findings. This also includes monitoring and evaluation research. Research can be done or contracted by local or international organisation by its employees or consultants or by academics in institutes, universities or colleges.
7. Policy workers, politicians, trade unionists and advocates	This deals with laws, procedures and policies used by social workers and those that impact the work they do and the people they work with.
8. International practitioners	This includes social workers working outside the country in academia or direct practice and those who have come to work in the country. This also includes students who are being trained outside the country.
9. Creative practitioners	These practitioners provide social work services using art: music, film or blogging, usually as individual efforts.

schools and practitioners. The practitioners in this category work for social work associations, independent or public regulation boards and tertiary education qualifications and quality control authorities.

Social workers are employed by government, non-government organisations, private businesses, schools and others are self-employed. In Uganda and Kenya, most social workers are employed by non-government organisations, mostly working in community work, education and health (Twikirize, 2017). This could be the case in most African countries.

Table 20.2 The seven social work fields of practice in Africa

Field	*Description*
1. Development	Working that contributes to income building, poverty eradication and prevention for individuals, families, communities.
2. Community	Working with the community, in the community.
3. Policy	Working in political parties, parliament or community or advocacy groups.
4. Academia	This includes working in social work educational institutions.
5. Research and evaluation	Working in research, for a research organisation or as an independent researcher.
6. Welfare	Work of providing aid, relief and grants to individuals, families, communities.
7. International practice	Working across borders or with service users from another country. Working with regional, continental and global organisations.

Decolonising of social work practice refers to decolonisation of all these seven types. All social workers pass through category one (academia) and two (fieldwork or practicum), therefore, it is important that decolonisation of practice focuses on these two levels.

What is colonial about current practice?

The decolonised and colonised practice may overlap, making it difficult to differentiate. However, there are some major signposts for both. These are shown in Table 20.3.

Table 20.3 Colonised versus decolonised practice

Colonised practice	*Decolonised practice*
1. Focuses on the individual (for example, casework and individual counselling)	Focuses on the family, village, community and society
2. Focuses on welfare, for example, government grants or aid	Focuses on bottom-up development, for example community development
3. Focuses on treatment and therapy (it is remedial and curative)	Focuses on prevention
4. Focuses on white, urban and educated populations (it is elitist), who make up only about 30 per cent of the population	Focuses on the poor who make up about 70 per cent of the population Focuses on redistribution
5. Focuses on and is grounded in Western knowledge (philosophy, theories, research and case studies)	Focuses on indigenous knowledge
6. Focuses on markets (capitalistic, free markets and neoliberalism)	Focuses on production and income generation for all
7. Focuses on deficits	Focuses on strengths

Early practice in Africa was focused on a modernisation theory which was an appendix of industrialisation (Kaseke, 2001). Modernisation theory was premised on the mistaken belief that the Global South including Africa was 'traditional' and this impacted development. The solution to have modern villages (e.g. towns), industrialising and having Western lifestyles, including adopting Western culture. The theory assumed that the proceeds of industry would eventually reach everyone in society. In this utopian modern economy, everyone would get a job to look after their families and to purchase social services, and only a few who fail would get social assistance. This proved unhelpful because as a top-down approach, it required a 'trickle down' effect to income and the new lifestyles were problematic (2001) and social problems actually increased. The hope that modernisation was the answer faded and (2001). In urban areas for example, new social issues emerged, including homelessness (which was never an issue), youth deviance and crime. There was a move towards social development theory which simply means twining social and economic development, or looking at them as equals (2001). According to this theory, social and economic development would move at the same time in what was termed development with a human face (2001). This proved difficult and developmentalist, developmental social work theory or simply development theory became the focus, propelled by academics in the Global South, mainly Africa. With this theory, the focus is on ensuring that resources are justly distributed or redistributed, that practice is decolonised and indigenous approaches to practice are valued (Kaseke, 2001; Midgley, 2010). This is the current theory being promoted in Africa and has been explained by many African authors, among them Mupedziswa (2001); Patel and Hochfeld (2013), Mupedziswa and Sinkamba (2014), Lombard and Twikirize (2014), Kaseke (2017), Gray, Agllias, Mupedziswa, & Mugumbate (2018) and Kurevakwesu et al. (2022). That developmental social work has been theorised by academics has not translated to its use on the ground – social work in Africa remains largely welfaristic, remedial and an appendix of economic development. Developmental social work is further in the next section.

Developmental social work practice

When social started, it was thought that the roles of social workers were to help people who were already facing social problems. As already pointed out, it was thought people needed to be 'modernised' or Europeanised in order for social problems to go away, but problems have increased with growth of urban areas and adoption of Western lifestyles and religions (Midgley, 1995; Kaseke, 2001). Others, including the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, then thought the best way was for governments to liberalise their systems, for example, through Western-engineered economic structural adjustment programmes that failed dismally (Kaseke, 2001). This was followed by a call for social development, which meant more government expenditure on social

services and institutions (Midgley, 1995; Kaseke, 2001).While this helps to reduce poverty, it does not end it (Kaseke, 2001). African academics then proposed developmental social work which focuses in income, production and justice for everyone, as a solution (Mupedziswa, 2001; Patel & Hochfeld, 2013; Kaseke, 2017). To get enough income, everyone has to be involved productively, and the role of government and social workers is to ensure that everyone is productive and that laws, infrastructure and markets are available (Mupedziswa & Sinkamba, 2014; Lombard & Twikirize, 2014). The framework (Table 20.4) measures practice as developmental or not.

Table 20.4 A framework for evaluating developmental practice

Aspects of developmental social work	*Description*	*Rating out 10*
Preventive	Prevention of social problems and poverty instead of curing them through welfare and aid.	
Productive	Production of goods and services from agriculture, mining, fishing, trading, processing and others.	
Economic	Generation and protection of income, savings, assets and infrastructure (roads, bridges, clinics, markets and schools), off-farm income generating projects, self-employment and enterprises.	
Asset	Land is owned as the main asset in both rural and urban areas. Access to the environment guaranteed.	
Justice	Resources are distributed or redistributed fairly and historical injustices are addressed.	
Indigenous or decolonial	Strengths of the community is recognised and valued.	
Political	Creates, advocates and supports policies that support people to realise their full potential.	
Rationally planned in a participatory and inclusive way	Development is planned rationally from the village to the continental level.	
Sustainable	The environment is protected.	
Other important aspect	For example, spirituality or culture.	
Total		%

Scale: 0–49 = Remedial or welfaristic; 50–74 Transitioning to Developmental; 75 = Advanced developmental; 90 = Developmental

Decolonising social work practice: tools and models

As was indicated in the introduction, decolonisation has stages. At each stage, there are tools or models that could be used to decolonise. These help with understanding stages, assessing or evaluating decolonisation, planning to decolonise and implementing planned strategies. It is acknowledged that assessing or evaluating phenomena as decolonisation or indigenisation has some challenges and limitations, however, these tools offer a starting point and a framework to use for reflection or thinking deeply about them. Some of the important tools are discussed in this section.

Tools to help to reflect on and assess colonisation and indigenisation

Three tools to use to reflect on and assess decolonisation are provided, Tables 20.5 and 20.6. These include the decolonisation stages framework (also known as the Chilisa framework), decolonisation matrix and the decolonisation calculator (DECA). The simplest way to assess decolonisation is to use the matrix in Table 20.1. To use the matrix, think about each category of practice and tick the stages it is at the moment. The more points you get, the more you are indigenising. The maximum is 48 points, the least is 0, and the average is 24. The matrix gives you a quick idea about where you are lacking and where you are doing well.

Writing about decolonising global South research (Chilisa, 2020) and African research (Africa Social Work Network, 2022) provided four and six stage frameworks respectively. These frameworks have been adapted to fit decolonisation of practice as follows:

Table 20.5 The decolonisation stages framework (also known as Chilisa framework)

Level of decolonisation	*Meaning*	*Description*
Level 0	Colonial practice	Where African approaches are not included, not recognised, they are devalued or practitioners have received too much colonial education that they are unable to challenge it or unwilling to change their practice.
Level 1	Least indigenised practice	Where there is paternalistic recognition of African practice approaches, pretence, false recognition
Level 2	Transitional practice	Where both African and Western practice approaches are used with a conscious decision about the role of indigenous practice
Level 3	Predominantly indigenous practice	
Level 4	Totally indigenous practice	

This framework is easy to use. You simply think about your practice more broadly and rate it between 0 and 4, as shown in the table. Levels 0 and 1 are not desirable, and Africa should move quickly towards the middle level. The desired levels are 3 and 4. If you want more nuanced methods, then use the next two.

The total points obtainable is 40 which is most indigenous and the least is 0. A more advanced way to measure where you are on the colonisation-decolonisation continuum, is to use the DECA, the most notable one being the one developed by the Africa Social Network and has been validated. There are several DECAs, the one appropriate for measuring practice is the one for social work and development education institutions (DECA-SWDEI, Version 1.01 2022) shown in Table 20.3. A digital calculator is available at https://africasocialwork.net/decolonisation-calculator. As has already been pointed out, all social work practitioners pass through the education and training system as students

Table 20.6 The matrix to measure colonisation and indigenisation

Stages *Type of practitioner*	*Colonial* *0*	*Least* *1*	*Transition* *2*	*Predominantly indigenous* *3*	*Totally indigenous* *4*
1. Academics, trainers and trainees					
2. Fieldwork or practicum					
3. Administrators					
4. Service providers					
5. Community organisers					
6. Researchers and evaluators					
7. Policy workers, politicians, trade unionists and advocates					
8. International practitioners					
9. Creative practitioners					
10. Regulating					
	Colonial *0*	*Least* *1*	*Transition* *2*	*Predominantly Indigenous 3*	*Totally indigenous* *4*

Table 20.7 Decolonisation calculator (DECA) social work and development education institutions

Question	*Rating*									
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*
1) Literature - out of every 10 books you have in your libraries (includes online library), how many are written and published locally? Locally means your country and continent.										
2) Staff - out every 10 staff you have, how many are local?										
3) Philosophy - out of every 10 students, how many use local philosophy. For example, in the philosophy is Ubuntu.										
4) Theories - out of 10 theories used by your staff and students, how many are local or developed locally?										
5) Fieldwork - out of 10 fieldwork placements, how many are developmental (focused on preventing poverty, building income and production)?										
6) Research - out of every 10 researches done by staff and students, how many use local research methods?										
7) Continuous Professional Development (CPD) – out of every ten CPD programmes in your country, how many have decolonial objectives and outcomes?										
8) Indigenous – on a scale of 0–10, how would you rate the indigenous nature of social work and development in your country? This includes using local languages, orature and involving the community.										
9) Indigenous – on a scale of 0–10, how would you rate the indigenous nature of social work and development in your country? This includes using local languages, orature and involving the community.										
10) Future – when you think about the future of social work and development training and practice in the next ten years, how likely is it to be decolonial, developmental and indigenous?										
Totals										
Total										

Scale: 0–49 = Colonial; 50–74 Transitioning to Decolonial; 75 = Decolonial; 90 = Indigenous

or for continuous professional developmentCPD. It is therefore the most important category of practice to measure decolonisation.

Peer mechanism

The limitation of stage-based and rating-based tools is that they seek to measure in a quantitative way. Measuring can be very helpful and offers a starting point for people to think deeply about where they are with decolonisation, however, it can create a false sense of achievement or lack of it. Measuring can be biased, especially when people simply tick boxes. An alternative approach, which is qualitative, is to use a peer review mechanism. This borrows from the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) used by the African Union. The Afrian Union (2002, para. 2) describes APRM is a 'tool for sharing experiences, reinforcing best practices, identifying deficiencies and assessing capacity-building needs to foster policies, standards and practices that lead to political stability, high economic growth, sustainable development and accelerated sub-regional and continental economic integration'. The APRM has five types of reviews (African Union, 2022), and these are:

1 Base review – carried out immediately after a country becomes a member of the APRM.
2 Periodic review every four years.
3 Targeted review – requested by the member country itself outside the framework of mandated reviews.
4 A review commissioned when there are early signs of pending political and economic crisis.

The process of the APRM (African Union, 2022) is as follows:

1 Consultation – at this stage there is consultation between those involved in the review and the country to be reviewed, resulting in a memorandum being agreed. The country being reviewed does a self-assessment.
2 Country visit – the review team visits the country and does consultations that are broad.
3 Reporting – a report is prepared with recommendations and presented to the APR forum
4 Peer review – the forum discusses recommendations with the country's leadership.
5 Sharing report – the report is shared with Pan-African Parliament, African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, AU Peace and Security Council, Economic, Social and Cultural Council of the African Union before being shared with the public.

A recommended peer review mechanism for decolonisation or indigenisation in social work institutions is as follows:

1 Consultation – the institution wanting a peer reviewer does self-assessment and shares it with two other institutions.
2 Institutional visit – the reviewers visits the institution and does consultations with leaders, regulators, students, practitioners, librarians, employers and other important stakeholders.
3 Reporting – a report is prepared with recommendations and shared with the institution and stakeholders.
4 Peer review – the recommendations are discussed and the institution develops a plan for the next period of the review.

Such reviews could be periodic and voluntary, or they could be administered by a national or regional organisation to which institutions are affiliated.

Decolonisation planning tool

Decolonisation will not happen on its own and the coloniser will not decolonise willingly. It has to be planned, and the plans have to be implemented. By the same reason, measuring decolonisation is not enough. Below is an example of a decolonisation plan based on the six Ls model.

The six Ls mind map of decolonisation planning

The six Ls is a simple model that looks at the targets of decolonisation which are leaders, libraries, literature, lecturers, learners and laws. It gives a mind map of what to decolonise. Those planning or doing decolonisation can set action plans for each L and do the same when evaluating. An example of an indigenisation or decolonisation action plan is shown in Table 20.8.

Indigenisation and decolonisation are related but different (Tusasiirwe, 2022). The processes of decolonisation and indigenisation may be intertwined and difficult to separate. At times, decolonisation is achieved through indigenisation, and the reverse is also true. For example, removing colonial literature is to decolonise, and replacing it with indigenous literature is to indigenise. In Table 20.8, indigenisation and decolonisation may be taken to mean the same thing.

An example of an indigenisation or decolonisation action plan

Indigenisation or Decolonisation Action Plan of …….
(Put name Social Work Educational Institution or organisation)

Indigenisation or Decolonisation Co-ordinator, Officer or Committee: …….
(Put their names)

Aim: This document provides the specific actions that we will take to decolonise or indigenise our practice.

Table 20.8 An example of an indigenisation or decolonisation action plan

Focus area	*Actions and participants*	*Timeframe*
Leadership		
Library/libraries		
Literature		
Lecturers		
Learners		
Laws		

Date of review.....

A model for decolonising fieldwork

As with classroom learning, the philosophy of fieldwork training needs to be appropriately situated (Dhemba, 2012; Amadasun, 2020), for example, making it more developmental (Gray et al, 2018). The African theory of education (ATE) and African philosophy of education (APE) all came from ubuntu philosophy, and they are useful starting points for those planning and administering fieldwork (Bangura, 2005, 2012). ATE teaches us that education should not only be academic, it must serve a relevant purpose and must be relevant and useful to our communities while APE teaches us that our communities have a role to play in education, in fact, before modern day education, learning was happening in our communities, especially experiential learning. Both ATE and APE emphasise Ubuntu, that is, education is not only about the learner, but their interaction and interdependence with their family, community and society at large. The Conventional Community Developmental and Creative model is useful in ensuring fieldwork is decolonised. The argument of the model is that, since 80 per cent of Africans are struggling to get enough income and resources for their living, 75 per cent of fieldwork must be developmental. This means that 75 per cent of students must be placed in developmental placements.

It is important for students to have experience from at least two types of placements. Categories 2 & 3 work very well in Africa where there is shortage of supervisors, by involving communities and other professionals there will be checks and balances. After the placement, the student writes a comprehensive report that includes potential roles of social work in the community of placement.

Other models

Longwe's Empowerment Framework

The framework applies to development work, social work, community work, welfare work and gender work. Developed by Sara Hlupekile Longwe of

Table 20.9 The Conventional Community Developmental and Creative model to distribute student placements

Category of placement	*Description*	*What % should this have?*
1) Conventional social work placements	• Include placements in clinical social work, welfare and charity settings, usually urban-focused, non-preventive and individually focused • Can include classroom or laboratory based simulations • Work well where there are enough experienced social workers and adequate resources to support students on placement, not usually the case in Africa	10%
2) Community and developmental social work placements	• Involve communities, villages, remote and rural areas – these are community-focused or bottom up placements • Student can be placed in an agency that has no social workers or placed within a community instead of an agency • Work in communities that have no access to agencies, social workers or are remote • Promotes equitable development because without their involvement, the communities will never benefit from social work • The focus is to reduce poverty, empowerment and prevention of social challenges • More than 75 per cent of people in Africa are poor, with no access to social workers, social work agencies or training institutions making these placements relevant	75%
3) Creative social work placements	• This model views social work students as innovators, contributors, creators, curators, activists or advocates. • Social work as an art, using individual talents and strengths to solve social challenges. • Working with other disciplines or communities where there are no social work supervisors or where social work is not usually there	15%

LEVEL	DESCRIPTION
1. WELFARE	Access to resources such as food supply, income and medical care.
2. ACCESS	Access to production: land, labour, credit, training, markets and all public services.
3. CONSCIENTISATION	Conscious understanding of inequality & its cultural, economic, political & social causes
4. PARTICIPATION	Equal participation in decision-making, policy-making, planning, and administration
5. CONTROL	Equality of control at each level (1-4), control of resources and production.

Figure 20.1 Longwe's Empowerment Framework
Source: Longwe (1995)

Zambia in 1995, this is one of the world's most persuasive empowerment theories. The framework is used to teach, plan, evaluate, learn and research gender issues globally (Longwe, 1995).

The model teaches that programmes that are focused on welfare, for example most aid programmes, have less impact, they contribute to. Disempowerment, mainly because they promote dependency. Programmes that enable people to control resources and production equally, are the most empowering.

Green Belt Movement Model

The Green Belt Movement is one of the most effective and empowering indigenous grassroots organisations globally. It was started by Wangarĩ Muta Maathai in Kenya in 1977. Their mission is to mobilise community consciousness for self-determination, justice, equity, reduction of poverty and environmental conservation, using trees as the entry point (Maathai, 1995).

Their model, as derived from their five principal areas of work or core programmes and four areas of activity, is as follows:

1 Pan African identity (training workshops, protection of culture and economy)
2 Civic education and advocacy (human rights, land rights, environmental justice)
3 Environment/natural resources and ecosystems (education, conservation, protection, restoration e.g. tree planting and maximum use e.g. water harvesting and eco-tourism e.g. Green Belt Safaris
4 Gender and development (improving livelihoods and advocacy)

Aspect of development	Description
1. Pan African identity	Training workshops, protection of culture and economy
2. Civic education and advocacy	Human rights, land rights and environmental justice
3. Environment/natural resources and ecosystems	Education, conservation, protection, restoration e.g. tree planting and maximum use e.g. water harvesting and eco-tourism e.g. Green Belt Safaris (GBS)
4. Gender and development	Improving livelihoods and advocacy

Figure 20.2 Green Belt Movement Model
Source: Maathai (1995)

Made in Africa Evaluation approach

Developed by the Africa Evaluation Association (AFreA), the Made in Africa Evaluation (MAE) is a uniquely African approach to evaluation which emphasises that context, culture, history and beliefs shape the nature of evaluations, specifically in the diverse, often complex African reality (Chilisa, 2015; Frehiwot, 2019; Mbava, 2019). The MAE is used globally. The main aspects of this approach are:

1 Decolonisation of evaluation and evaluators, which means the transformation of evaluation knowledge and practices from global North dominance.
2 Indigenisation, which means to make it African-focused.
3 Participation and evaluation based on mutual respect.
4 Use of local knowledge, philosophy of Ubuntu, theories, etc.
5 Contextuality which means relevance to local situation, aspirations and priorities.
6 Internationalisation of MAE.

Frehiwot had this to say about the approach "The use of the ubuntu philosophy to situate Made in Africa evaluation will respond to the following critical question: "Whose philosophy and ideology will underpin the evaluation process and tools? It is through the notion of African personhood that the evaluator and the evaluating agency would view themselves as a mere extension of the community or project being evaluated. This humanistic approach to

understanding Africa through African philosophy can ensure that African made evaluation can move beyond a rubber stamp. Ubuntu is not the only philosophy or evaluation tool that can be researched; it is an example of how the use of African philosophy, systems and institutions can strengthen the question for Made in Africa evaluation" (Frehiwot, 2019: 20).

Summary of desirable actions for decolonising social work in Africa

The actions that are needed to decolonise are (1) continuously reflect on, assess or review decolonisation and indigenisation using tools and models that are African-centred and Ubuntu-inspired; (2) develop a decolonisation and indigenisation plan; (3) remove and don't use colonial literature; (4) use no less than 80 per cent local literature in course outlines, references, journal articles, reports, manuals, book chapters or books to create a CPD course on decolonisation; (5) revise syllabus and fieldwork placements so that they focus on developmental practice; (6) bring your communities to the classroom or university; (7) revise codes of ethics and standards in training and practice; (8) create, promote, or support local publishing houses and printing presses and support publications in local languages; (9) revise entry requirements so that they are not academic and theoretical but promote justice and equality; (10) lobby and advocate for decolonisation of all education from early childhood education to university; (11) name and define social work and other key concepts in local languages; and (12) promote teaching and learning in local languages.

References

African Social Work Network. (2022). Decolonisation Calculator. https://africasocialwork.net/decolonisation-calculator.

African Union. (2002) African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) – Africa's Self-Assessment for Good Governance. https://au.int/en/organs/aprm.

African Union. (2022) About African Peer Review Mechanism. www.aprm-au.org/page-about.

Amadasun, S. (2020). Is the signature pedagogy still worthwhile? An empirical study of field practice experience among social work students in Nigeria, *Social Work Education*, doi:10.1080/02615479.2020.1771300.

Asante, M.K. (1998). The African American as African. *Diogenes*, 46(184), 39–50. doi:10.1177/039219219804618405.

Baguma, P. & Aheisibwe, I. (2011). Issues in African Education. In B.A. Nsamenang & T.M.S. Tchombe (Eds), *Handbook of African Educational Theories and Practices A Generative Teacher Education Curriculum*, pp. 21–34. Yaoundé: Human Development Resource Centre.

Bangura, A. K. (2005). 'Ubuntugogy': An African educational paradigm that transcends pedagogy, andragogy, ergonagy and heutagogy. *Journal of Third World Studies*, 22(2), 13–53.

Bangura, A.K. (2012). From Diop to Asante: Conceptualizing and Contextualizing the Afrocentric Paradigm. *The Journal of Pan African Studies*, 5(1), 103–125. www.jpanafrican.org/docs/vol5no1/5.1FromDiop.pdf.

Chilisa, B. (2015). A synthesis paper on the Made in Africa evaluation concept. Accra: African Evaluation Association.

Chilisa, B. (2020). *Indigenous research methodologies*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Dhemba, J. (2012). Fieldwork in Social Work Education and Training: Issues and Challenges in the Case of Eastern and Southern Africa. *Social Work and Society*, 10(1).

Diop, C.A. (1974). *The African Origin of Civilisation: Myth and Reality*. Chicago, IL: Lawrence Hill Books.

Frehiwot, M. (2019). Made in Africa Evaluation: Decolonializing Evaluation in Africa. *eVALUation Matters*, Third Quarter, 23–31.

Gray, M. & Lombard, A. (2022). Progress of the social service professions in South Africa's developmental social welfare system: Social work, and child and youth care work. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 1–13. doi:10.1111/ijsw.12562.

Gray, M., Agllias, K., Mupedziswa, R. & Mugumbate, J. (2018). The expansion of developmental social work in Southern and East Africa: Opportunities and challenges for social work field programmes. *International Social Work*, 61(6), 974–987. doi:10.1177/0020872817695399.

Kaseke, E. (2001). Social development as a model of social work practice: the experience of Zimbabwe. School of Social Work Staff Papers. Harare, School of Social Work.

Kaseke, E. (2017). Repositioning social workers in South Africa for a developmental state. *International Social Work*, 60(2), 470–478. doi:10.1177/0020872815594216.

Katanekwa, M.N. (2021). *Bantu People of Africa: Language Groups, Origins and Migrations, 3000 before present time to 1840*. Independently published.

Koile, E., Greenhill, S.J., Blasi, D.E., Bouckaert, R. & Gray, R.D. (2022). Phylogeographic analysis of the Bantu language expansion supports a rainforest route. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(32), e2112853119.

Kurevakwesu, W. et al. (2022). Towards the creation of a developmental welfare state in Zimbabwe: an inside perspective on the department of social development. *Social Work*, 58(2), 115–130. doi:10.15270/58-2-1037.

Lombard, A. & Twikirize, J.M. (2014). Promoting social and economic equality: Social workers' contribution to social justice and social development in South Africa and Uganda. *International Social Work*, 57(4), 313–325. doi:10.1177/0020872814525813.

Longwe, H.S. (1995). *Women's Empowerment Tool*. Lusaka.

Maathai, W.M. (1995). Bottlenecks to Development in Africa. (Speech).

Mabvurira, V. (2018). Making sense of African thought in social work practice in Zimbabwe: Towards professional decolonisation. *International Social Work*, 63, 419–430.

Mbava, N.P. (2019). Shifting the Status Quo: Africa Influencing Global Evaluation Practice. *eVALUation Matters*, Third Quarter, 13–21.

Mbiti, J.S. (1969). *African religions and philosophy*. Johannesburg: Heinemann.

Midgley, J. (1995). *Social development the developmental perspective in social welfare*. London: Sage Publications.

Midgley, J. (2010). 'The Theory and Practice of Developmental Social Work', in J. Midgley, and A. Conley (Eds), *Social Work and Social Development: Theories and Skills for Developmental Social Work*. New York: Oxford Academic.

Moyo, D. (2009). *Dead aid: why aid is not working and how there is a better way for Africa*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Mupedziswa, R. (2001). The quest for relevance: Towards a conceptual model of developmental social work education and training in Africa. *International Social Work*, 44 (3), 285–300. doi:10.1177/002087280104400302.

Mupedziswa, R. & Kubanga, K. (2016). Developing social work education in Africa: Challenges and prospects. In I. Taylor, M. Bogo, M. Lefevre & B. Teater (Eds), *Routledge international handbook of social work education*, pp. 119–130). London: Routledge.

Mupedziswa, R. & Sinkamba, R. (2014). Social work education and training in Southern and East Africa: Yesterday, today and tomorrow. In H.S.C. Noble & B. Littlechild (Eds), *Global social work: Crossing borders, blurring boundaries*, pp. 141–154. Sydney: Sydney University Press.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S.J. (2020). *Decolonization, Development and Knowledge in Africa: Turning over a New Leaf*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Nziramasanga, C.T. (1999). *Report into the Presidential Commission of Inquiry into Education and Training*. Harare: Government of Zimbabwe.

Patel, L. & Hochfeld, T. (2013). Developmental social work in South Africa: Translating policy into practice. *International Social Work*, 56(5), 690–704. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020872812444481.

Samkange, S.J.W.T. & Samkange, S. (1980). *Hunhuism or Ubuntuism: A Zimbabwe indegenous political philosophy*. Harare: Graham.

Tusasiirwe, S. (2022). Is it indigenisation or decolonisation of social work in Africa? A focus on Uganda. *African Journal of Social Work*, 12(1), 1–11.

Twikirize, J.M. (2017). Social work practice in the NGO sector in Uganda and kenya – opportunities and challenges. In M. Gray (Ed.), *The Handbook of Social Work and Social Development in Africa*. London: Routledge.