



Foreword

Emerging Landscape of Ideas around GRA: Notes on Going Forward

Introduction

This is the third and final version of the set of thematic papers on the Global and Regional Activities (GRA) program led by the Global Partnership for Education's (GPE) Secretariat's Global Good Practice Team (GGP), resulting from the first and second rounds of consultations in June-August of 2011. It summarizes the results of those two rounds, the state of the discussion, and also provides some background history on the GRA that seems to have been missing from the perceptions of some commentators, and how the activities are integrated with each other and with the other priorities of the GPE Secretariat as endorsed by its Board of Directors.

Background on the GRA

The GRA program was approved in November of 2010 by the GPE Board of Directors, as a partial successor to the EPDF (certain aspects of EPDF activities, such as direct support to overall ESP development, are not included in GRA, but are included in GPE plans and can be funded). According to the approval document, the program will function under the unified Education for All Fund. The GRA program will provide support for initiatives and programs that address the three thematic areas and demonstrate their ability to enhance the capacity of country and international/regional level institutions to support GPE country partners to meet their education goals.

Global and regional initiatives are intended to address the following development objectives:

- Strengthen capacity of country and regional level entities to develop, implement, and/or monitor specific technical aspects in sustainable national education sector programs.
- Enhance understanding of key priorities through research and practice and increase the impact of investments in education, drawing on innovations, evidence, and global good practices in these areas.
- Improve knowledge sharing between and among GPE partners through the systematic provision of services and products that enlighten, engage and energize partners to apply new knowledge and evidence-based good practices to resolve education challenges.
- Improve Partnership accountability by strengthening availability and quality of data.
- Strengthen South-South networks and partnerships.

The three thematic areas set out in the Board approval document for the GRA program cycle 1 (2011-2013) are:

- Learning outcomes
- Out-of-school children
- Education financing

According to the approval document, eligible activities to be funded by the program are:

- Research and dissemination
- Technical workshops
- Development of innovative partnerships and networks
- Technical assistance
- Study tours
- Interventions to inform scale up

Summary of Thematic Papers and the Role of GPE Partners

Out of School. This paper concerned itself with gaps in Data, Policy, and Management (or Implementation) in terms of identifying and counting children, assessing the reasons for non-enrolment and non-attendance, addressing out of school issues via improved policy-making and sector planning, and, finally, by developing more effective models of implementation to address issues related to getting children into school and keeping them there. The overall aim is to provide improved tools and guidance as well as documented examples of good practices in all these issues.

Quality and Learning Outcomes. This paper noted the need for an entry point into quality, and argued that early literacy (soon followed by mathematics) represents a good entry point for two reasons: a) because it is chronologically and pedagogically fundamental to accessing all other forms of knowledge at later points in the school system, and b) because in improving learning in these areas one can provide entry points or object lessons in how to improve other subjects, later in the system. The paper called for small amounts of knowledge compilation, and larger amounts of knowledge dissemination based on existing knowledge and experimentation.

Finance. This paper called for work in a) improved reporting and monitoring of finance flows, including analysis of efficiency and equity issues, b) tools for assessing fiduciary risk in the sector, particularly in view of sector and general budget support and other modalities deemed to be more effective than projects managed by donors and NGOs, c) experiences with types of financing that can more directly stimulate or support results, d) development of integrated funding approaches for equity in education, and e) innovative financing sources.

The three thematic papers have been revised through a consultative process with GPE partners, seeking to enrich the understanding of the thematic areas and to determine an agreed way for the GRA program to help move the out-of-school, education financing, and quality agendas forward.

The papers provide a framework for activities to be developed with members of the GPE partnership, and do not attempt to catalogue the out-of-school, education financing, and quality issues. Elements of the discussions may remain unaddressed, since these thematic papers are only meant to create an overall framework for action, but this does not mean that any specialized considerations cannot be integrated in the activity proposals by partners (or handled later). In fact we hope they will be, as proposals are elaborated in the coming period.

GPE and Implementation

Given the vastness of the issues, the mandate of the GPE Secretariat, and the requirements of specialization, it is clear that the GPE Secretariat cannot “implement” solutions to these issues. There are plenty of partners, including developing country partners, who are already doing a great deal of work in these areas. The GPE Secretariat, through the GRA activities, hopes to create an opportunity for all partners to take systematic re-look at how these issues relate to each other, and expand the dissemination of knowledge and experiences that can further achievement in these areas.

At the same time, it should be clear that even in partnership, GRA is not meant to directly finance implementation activities. There are other aspects or windows of the Education for All Fund that are aimed at supporting actual implementation, ESP development, the operation of LEGs, etc. Whenever, acting in concert with particular partners, the GPE Secretariat itself can give a short-term boost to a particular area that has gone un-attended, we believe someone has to step in and provide that boost. In most cases the GPE Secretariat will stimulate others; in a limited number of cases we will kick-start a relatively specialized or small area, in the hope of turning it over to others as soon as possible.

Thus, most (90% to 95%, probably more) of the implementation of this work is expected to take place through transfer agreements from the GPE Secretariat to various Supervising Entities who have the fiduciary controls needed to supervise funding usage. At the same time, actual implementers may be countries, NGOs, the Supervising Entities themselves, etc. The Secretariat expects that there may be some “orphaned” areas (areas that no partner has expressed an interest in actually working on, though partners have said the area is important) that will need singling out in a more direct way by the Secretariat itself, perhaps through small consultancies. It may well be that this can be done through sources of funding complimentary but not part of the GRA window.

While the GPE Secretariat hopes to stimulate others in certain areas, and also to encourage clear agreements as to what results are expected, similarly GPE does not intend to issue competitive requests for proposals (RFPs), nor does it see itself as a “client” with “suppliers.” It seems that the term “RFP” used in round 1 of consultations had sent the wrong message, so as of round 2 we use the term Requests for Results Partnerships (RRPs) for the documents with which we hope to elicit proposals for partnerships around key results. Formal relationships with the Supervising Entities will still need to exist, of course.

Selected Comments from Stakeholder Consultations 1 and 2

During the first phase of the consultation process, two aspects of the whole process have become increasingly clear: a) areas that were missing in the original formulation, which partners have pointed out and b) partners pointing out their history and ongoing willingness to address some of these areas as well as pointing to other experiences. This section summarizes those reactions. Only main lines of discussion, common to several commentators, are summarized here. More specific comments were too numerous to summarize succinctly, but have influenced the overall tenor of the GPE Secretariat response. These have found their way to the concept notes for round 2 of consultations, and into these final papers, most often in the language used throughout. We created new activities or sub-activities in cases where there were comments in common to many partners, especially if the comments clearly implied a “proposition” with regard to a concrete activity that could be said to be missing from the GRA.

In round 1, missing areas or general comments noted by various commentators included the following, in no particular order. Some are oriented at substance, others at process. Some of these areas were indeed noted in the Concept Notes, but perhaps in too muted a fashion, so they are re-stated here as comments.

1. Naïveté with regard to the political economy and institutional aspects of change or lack of change (e.g., in why certain OOS issues are not addressed in countries’ plans, why learning outcomes are so hard to improve, etc.). As well as reform implementation. This was mentioned by many partners and in regard to a variety of areas. This was perhaps one of the most remarked-upon issues.
2. Lack of tie-in to curricular definition of early literacy in countries, in a practical manner, and with possible “hooks” to assessment and learning materials, in an integrated fashion, in the quality area.
3. Need to further emphasize and support country-based planning processes, and to work within the context of country plans and policy dialogue as much as possible. In all areas.
4. The need for both systemic frameworks for quality and broader sense of quality. Focus of learning outcomes on early literacy is too tight. Mostly in quality area.
5. In quality, the whole issue of attitudes, value and culture as motivators of behavior and determinants of quality, especially when it comes to teacher motivation.
6. Promotion of single approach as a solution to key problems, particularly in early literacy, is not sufficiently cognizant of others’ efforts and the variety of approaches others have tried. Similarly, it has been noted that collaboration amongst agencies proposing solutions ought to be encouraged, to the degree possible, as opposed to dependence on a single organization for all of one area.
7. More emphasis on the local (school or village), especially on the use of data for localized management and accountability, not just policy-setting. Mentioned mostly in the context of OOS. Could tie into concept of political economy, already noted.
8. With regard to some of the concept notes and reviewers who reviewed only one, some of their concerns are actually noted in other concept notes that they may not have reviewed (e.g., the issue of pro-poor financing as a way to deal with OOS or Learning Outcomes is dealt with in the Finances concept note; it was dealt with already, but it has now been made more explicit).
9. Limited recognition of and/or linkage to on-going efforts and initiatives by partners already addressing the identified gaps. Here it is important to note that the GRA does not intend to

duplicate but to support the efforts of members of the GPE partnership, while contributing to linking together various efforts for a more comprehensive global approach. The concept notes generally aim to fill gaps in knowledge and practice, but not to be a catalogue of good practices. That will come later, as part of the work itself. For now, however, if a partner feels a set of available knowledge products or practices are so well-evaluated and definitive that further work is not at all necessary, then this would be an important thing to note.

In the *second* round a whole set of additional comments were submitted. We have taken careful note of as many of these as possible and have made many changes in the papers. Many of the comments were very detailed or specific, and generated specific but relatively minor changes. Here we summarize some major comments, which have also been addressed in the main text of the paper, but which are worth highlighting. Furthermore, the set of issues brought up in the 2nd round of consultations, appropriate as they all are, was so vast that it is simply practically impossible to include them all in what is, after all, a general thematic paper pertaining to the issue of quality and learning outcomes. To include them all would probably double the length of what are already long papers. Furthermore, many commentators have also noted that the task already seems daunting and too long (while, often, at the same time, asking that their particular issues be considered). *The only solution to this problem, it seems to us, is to keep things relatively general at the level of the thematic papers, and then to negotiate or discuss the specifics when we proceed to developing agreements with particular partners.* That said, the following general points were made by more than one commentator, that is, they seemed to be “common cause” rather than the concern of one particular commentator.

1. More attention should be devoted to country-to-country (South-South) and, in general, peer-to-peer exchanges, particularly for matters where practical knowledge matters most, and where the issue is scale-up of experiences that already have been largely proven. In other cases there is more of a need to distil lessons of experience and pilots, and disseminate them. Thus in workshops and other learning events there is both a need to exchange lessons and a need to share good practices derived from analysis of experiences across a variety of countries and from recent research.
2. It is important to encourage collaboration amongst partners rather than competition, and (to the degree reasonably feasible) not to create the impression that any one partner has a lock on the key knowledge about a particular issue, while acknowledging that in certain specialized areas there is indeed a preponderance of ability in some particular partners, and also that there are existing international mandates for that partner to be the lead agency in certain technical areas.
3. Time frame too short for certain activities. This is acknowledged but is a management issue rather than a technical issue, and will be explored. The possibility of conceptualizing the activity as lasting 4 years, but with a proviso that their actual funding would take place only if there is successful replenishment after 2011, was mentioned.
4. Re-emphasize need for country-led or demand-led interest, not supply-led interest. The plan is that the review of the proposed results agreements between various partners and GPE will contain specific requirement of “proof of country interest.”
5. Some commentators, particularly those with an interesting in a cross-cutting theme such as management, have asked that their theme be included in every “technical” sub-theme. This is something easier done in practice than in theory. If we tried to do this for every possible cross-cutting theme, when the papers are organized around technical areas (or for every technical

area if the paper were organized around cross-cutting themes) then the papers (particularly the quality paper) would become impractically long and also very repetitive and even more tedious than it already perhaps is. We think this is best dealt with in practice, as partners work through these ideas in concrete situations.

6. Some commentators have shared a deep and at the same time extremely varied set of projects and experiences they have carried out. We have read all of these comments and descriptions, but it is not always easy to think of ways to further support such hugely varied experiences through a mechanism such as the GRA. Instead, it seems to us that GRA can support multilateral agencies who are compiling general quality frameworks to make sure that the practical experiences of many bilateral and multilateral projects find their way into these general frameworks. GRA could make the resources available to do this, to the degree possible, and to the degree that resources can make a difference.
7. Commentators (on the quality paper) have emphasized the fact that learning outcomes are affected by environmental conditions and also the supply resources, not just by pedagogical and management practice, teaching skills, etc., and that in that sense the approach implied by this GRA activity was overly focused on the pedagogical. At the same time, many noted that quality is not just about learning outcomes. On the other hand, it is important to note that if the idea is to create a speedy response that can create a sense of emerging optimism, it is logical to start with something clearly doable. We are convinced that the most urgent and remediable issues, with most promise of both fast and lasting impact, are indeed the ones related to classroom practice and learning materials, and that GPE needs to *start* with an impact here, and with some emphasis on these issues. Nonetheless, the critique is valid and therefore must be responded to. There are two issues: equity and appropriateness of funding/resourcing, and non-pedagogical or non-school factors. The issue of equity in funding and resourcing is dealt with in the Education Financing paper. Certain supply-side issues are also dealt with in the Out of School thematic paper. Other than that, it is difficult to know what to do with this topic. In certain cases, to the degree that the impacts are well-known, and to the extent that GRA cannot pay for implementation in any case, then the main thing one can do is encourage advocacy and accountability pressure so that governments and donors pay appropriate attention to these concerns. Since advocacy, accountability, and political economy issues were included as a specialized area of activity, then, by definition, advocacy around non-pedagogical issues was already considered. However, to acknowledge the importance of this entire area, and to handle the broad issue of non-pedagogical impacts on quality or learning, we have added a new activity, in which partners could focus on non-pedagogical factors related to school environment.

Partner Interest

Partner interests have been expressed in various aspects of the GRA agenda, based on the various partners' work histories and comparative advantage. These are presented in tabular format. In discussion with individual partners, we hope to further refine these interests. The table is presented in alphabetical order. Some agency commentators made extremely diverse, in depth, and very engaged comments. However, they did not always express ways in which they themselves could proactively engage in a follow-up. We have read the intensity and engagement of comments as suggesting some institutional interest in follow-up (e.g., in being a Supervising Entity in at least some aspects of their comments) but that is, in some cases, only an assumption on our part. In other cases, partners were

quite “propositional” and therefore their interest was more likely to be digestible and presentable in tabular form. In general, our summaries below are very telegraphic statements of groups’ interests, as we cannot reproduce the richness of everyone’s comments in a table. All comments are posted on the webpage as noted, and, also, each thematic paper now reflects commentators points more completely, particularly when commentators were “propositional.” This table thus does not summarize partners’ technical or intellectual comments; it looks only at partners’ “propositional” comments.

It is important to note, in reading the table below, that according to the terms of the paper approved by the Board in 2010 and the governance documents for the Education for All Fund, only institutions that are official development agencies *and* are represented on the Board of GPE are able to directly access GRA funds: “‘Supervising Entity’ means any GPE Multilateral Agency Partner or any GPE Donor Country Partner designated to receive Transferred Funds and supervise an Activity, as approved by the GPE Board of Directors” (governance document for Education for All Fund). Thus, CSOs looking to partner with GPE in carrying out these activities need to come under the umbrella of an SE. However, these partnerships between CSOs and SEs would have to emerge out of discussions between the CSOs and SEs, as GPE is not in a position to induce, nor does it have the power to mandate or require these sorts of relationships.

All activities and interest listed below are provisional, as it is not always clear exactly how keenly each actor prioritizes the ideas submitted. This will be sorted out in conversations between GPE Secretariat and the actors. However, it is important for actors who are interested in the same topic to think, already, about their possible collaboration. This need not imply that one is a “prime” SE. Both could be SEs. The important thing is that they coordinate their actions. GPE will play a facilitative role in that, by, for instance, providing this matrix. *But it is important for the actors to be talking to each other, as is indeed already happening in a variety of these areas.*

Countries	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Ghana, the School Performance appraisal Meeting (SPAM) is a multi-stakeholder forum used to promote the use of data for managing enrolment and attendance. Moreover, the Ministry of Education has developed a draft complementary basic education policy (emphasizing State-Civil Society joint implementation) to address OOS children. However, implementation faces budget and cost-efficiency challenges. 2. Honduras will be experimenting with results-based financing as part of its own policies and would welcome support and collaboration with GPE-S. 3. Mozambique suggests the possibility of making better use of both exams and assessment systems and appreciates help in this area. Calls for common benchmarks in public exams. In general the use of public exams for quality assurance, not just filtering, is under-explored. Also express interest in measurement of more basic skills and in mother tongue and in effective remediation approaches (already included in the note on Learning Outcomes) for children falling behind and under difficult conditions.
IBE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Interest in helping with curricular agenda as it pertains to early literacy, and tie-in between curricular agenda and assessment and learning materials. Can bring in important academic actors.
IIEP	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. OOS. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.2 In training and support on ESPs, ensure aspects of inclusion (may be

	<p>implemented through Education for All Fund windows other than GRA).</p> <p>1.3 Possible role convening work on written assessment in early grades, networking PASEC, SACMEQ, LLECE, other efforts.</p> <p>1.4 Causes of gender inequality in learning outcomes particularly in poorest countries</p> <p>2. Finance. Interest in finance agenda, capacity-building around finance, fiduciary risk assessment, integrated approaches to funding equity, and innovative finance (with French Ministry of Foreign Affairs). Interest in collaboration with Pole de Dakar, and UIS. Irish Aid suggested possibility of collaboration with IIEP on Finance.</p>
ILO, ILO-IPEC	<p>1. OOS and Quality.</p> <p>a. Interest in helping with linkages between child labor knowledge base and education (OOS) through ILO IPEC program/better connection between analysis of child labor data and education planning.</p> <p>b. Contribute to improved coherence between data collection activities of member agencies to ensure mainstreaming of the child labor issue in ESPs, upscale of existing methodologies for including more children, and to identify vital interventions to address the reasons why children work instead of going to school or why they drop out to work.</p> <p>c. Particular interest in schooling (OOS and quality) outcomes of migrant children.</p> <p>d. Contribute to the development of an operational definition of OOS and related indicators for statistical measurement purposes. Model questionnaires. In this regard, collaboration with WB, UNICEF, UNESCO and UCW could be envisaged.</p>
UIS	<p>1. OOS.</p> <p>a. Work on data issues particularly as they pertain to OOS. Indicator definition. Particular attention to issues of absenteeism, in-and-out-of-school phenomena. Analysis of administrative data and HH surveys, linking the two if possible.</p> <p>b. Carrying on ongoing work as part of OOSCI initiative.</p> <p>2. Quality.</p> <p>a. Work on oral assessment based on existing technical experience. (Convening experts to set standards, compare experiences, etc.). Possibly other aspects of networking learning outcomes. (See UNESCO.) Repository of information on learning outcomes.</p> <p>3. Finance.</p> <p>a. Development of methodologies to improve national reporting systems on finance flows. Collaborate with WB, also National Education Account efforts?</p>
UNESCO	<p>1. Quality.</p> <p>a. Mutual mandate-setting through common commitment, and agreement generation amongst technical leaders and countries around GPE goal 6, as a starting point.</p> <p>b. Quality frameworks and agreements to try, use, document.</p> <p>c. Institutionalizing support to quality enhancement via local knowledge providers (universities and think tanks within countries).</p> <p>d. Consolidating lessons learned across a variety of assessments. (See UIS.)</p> <p>2. OOS and Quality. Non-formal education: analysis, knowledge-sharing, pilot. Strengthening non-formal pathways for expanding basic education opportunities for out-of-school children – integrating NFE in clear policy</p>

	<p>framework; partnership with NGOs, CSOs and local communities to strengthen and expand quality NFE; assess and document on-going NFE initiatives; support capacity development and training for NFE personnel (if policy level, this should be integrated with the overall activity on analysis of sector plans, and it is therefore suggested as a ‘supporting’ activity, if pilot activities also need to be integrated with ESPs, locally-owned).</p> <p>3. Finance.</p> <p>a. UNESCO with UIS expressed its interest to carry out the development of a methodology to improve national reporting systems on financial flows.</p>
UNICEF	<p>1. OOS.</p> <p>1.2 Interest in various aspects of data, policy, and management of OOS agenda, including measurement of causes, management of enrollment and attendance, experiences and dissemination of practical approaches to OOS. Ongoing history of OOS work with UIS under OOSCI initiative. Experience in household surveys that can identify causes. Thus, build on the efforts of OOSCI. In response to increasing demand from countries, UNICEF is developing a strategy in collaboration with its regional offices to roll out OOSCI in more countries. This will need to be done in close collaboration with the GPE in order to ensure systematic embedding of the approach in to country planning, reform and implementation process (including Joint Sector Reviews). Development of guide on OOSC. Expand practical work to more countries.</p> <p>1.3 Collaborate with the GPE and other partners in the development of the guide on OOSC in order to ensure the input of solid expertise. Develop a strategy for a more systematic use of the guide in country planning processes and joint sector reviews.</p> <p>2. Quality.</p> <p>2.2 Interest in scale-up of use of Child-Friendly Schools framework as a quality assurance framework.</p> <p>2.3 Interests and comments expressed in mother tongue, multi-grade teaching, production of texts in mother tongue, PPPs in textbooks, and a great variety of topics that would need to be provided in integral form. This suggests roles in piloting of integrated approaches or very country-based partnerships.</p> <p>3. OOS and Quality: Developing approaches and policy development for the inclusion of children with disabilities. Collaborate on MICS disability module. Inclusion of disability issues in ESPs, JSRs.</p> <p>4. Finance. Development of integrated funding approaches for equity in education: school fees.</p>
Various bilateral agencies	<p>1. Interest in GPE Secretariat’s technical recommendations on key issues such as norms around learning outcomes (e.g., Dfid, USAID).</p> <p>2. Interested in commenting on and supporting GPE via their own work in countries, convening regional efforts (e.g., AFD around PASEC and learning outcomes, as PASEC one of few experiences in early learning assessment in writing).</p> <p>3. GIZ has expressed particular interest in collaborating on dissemination and knowledge-sharing of particular products, particularly in quality area and more specifically in teaching and early skills, mother tongue, ECD, teacher training and supervision, and learner assessment (in collaboration with IIEP?). Experience of former InWent is mentioned.</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. JICA has made available extensive list of good practices, learned from specific pilot projects, which can be shared in any of the three areas. Possible special interest in school grants in connection with Finance activity on Development of integrated funding approaches for equity in education. More discussion with JICA on specific types of activities (workshops, scale up of pilots, as ways of further mainstreaming the project experience?) will likely be convenient. 5. Irish Aid, similarly to JICA, cited a background of country experience and willingness to work in various GRA activities. Collaboration with IIEP specifically on Finance issues was mentioned. (See IIEP section.) 6. DfID has noted an interest in focused approaches in early learning including assessment of early skills. 7. USAID. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Quality. Already modeling various bilateral projects with explicit literacy aim. Welcomes technical collaboration with GPE, DfID, AusAID, etc. Is already modeling many of the Learning Outcomes approaches noted here, often in rigorously evaluated contexts, and their experiences will inform work going forward. GPE will find ways to support these processes particularly if/as USAID links with other donors with a very close interest such as DfID or AusAID. b. Finance. Possible interest in modeling of explicit mechanisms for incentivizing outcomes. 8. French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Finance. Innovative-finance aspects of finance theme paper, possibly in collaboration with IIEP. 9. AFD interests in: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. OOS and quality. Health factors. Eyesight, nutrition, etc. Possible research area. b. Quality. Assessment systems. Collaborate in improving and sharing lessons learnt across regional assessments with focus on PASEC. In particular plans and interaction on early-grade methodologies might be of most interest to other assessments and thus collaboration in that area. c. Quality. Multilingual / mother tongue. Collaboration with GPE but also other partners (GIZ, ADEA, etc.), sharing of lessons, technical support and exchanges. d. Quality. Teacher practices/attitudes/behaviors. Improve dissemination of understanding of current weak impact of TT. e. Finance. Development of a methodology to improve national reporting systems on finance flows through Pole de Dakar (and perhaps broader issues on finance themes). Broader “sector analysis” issues. 10. AusAID. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. All areas, including OOS, Learning, Finance, as they relate to advocacy and watchfulness, in relation to civil society, possibly in partnership with CGE. b. Quality. AusAID interest in learning outcome targets and coordinating effort with other donors on this topic. 11. Similarly AusAID and CIDA seem to have particular interest in various areas and submitted many comments but it is unclear how they themselves are proceeding in ways that can link with some of these initiatives or possible role as SE partners. 12. Finland. Interest in both OOS and Quality aspects of disability and inclusion. Collaboration also via UNICEF. Possible collaboration with
--	---

	Leonard Cheshire Disability. (Extension of ongoing innovations in collaboration with these various bodies.)
Various civil society organizations, "other"	<p><i>Note that under the terms of the Education for All governance documentation, as well as the GRA definition document approved by the Board, CSOs would have to work under a SE.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CGE has signaled willingness to work on political economic and accountability issues with respect to access, learning outcomes, and finance. May need a Supervising Entity. 2. The Brookings Institution has issued a Global Compact on Learning which itself encompasses key GPE partners (DfID, CIDA, USAID, elements of civil society constituencies, for instance), and which addresses itself at the Learning Outcomes / Quality agenda including but not limited to early literacy. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. In collaboration with others, possible work on finance agenda including National Education Accounts. 3. Various NGOs such as Save-the-Children with its Literacy Boost approach, Pratham in India, IEP in Mali (and others), have already been demonstrating approaches that tie in to the efforts noted in the Learning Outcomes concept note. 4. Similarly various service-provision CSOs and NGOs would be interested in working in Fragile States situations to further develop experiences, leading to knowledge sharing, on improved ways to work in these cases. 5. Education International signaled its willingness to work on the definition of out-of-school children and conceptualizing of the meaning of enrolment; development of techniques to measure out of school children. Also to play role in collaborating with ESPs at local level to ensure GPE goals addressed. 6. Global March showed interest in improved coherence between data collection activities of member agencies and to identify child-labor issues related to OOS. Possible collaboration with UIS or ILO. Also collaborating on CSO advocacy capacity building on GPE goals. 7. CONFEMEN signaled interest in assessment through PASEC, and uses of assessment in improving. More interest in focus on end-of-cycle. (See AFD entry, IIEP, UIS and UNESCO entries.)
World Bank	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. OOS. Linking data gap activity led by two SEs (UIS, UNICEF) with SABER which has a planned domain in inclusion and equity, but mostly focuses on benchmarking systems for monitoring inclusion, while UIS, UNICEF efforts are aimed at data and policy and management. Model of exclusion as basis for data and management. Assess applicability of various SABER tools to fragile states. 2. OOS and Quality. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ongoing work on impact evaluation of various kinds of interventions across all areas of GRA. Note relationship to recommendations of mid-term GPE evaluation and subsequent M&E consultants regarding need for impact evaluation of GPE initiatives. (Refer to GPE M&E policy definition process during 2011.) b. The role of health and nutrition factors in both OOS and Learning Outcomes. Indicators of school health outcomes. Possible specific example starting evaluation of eye-glasses provision as cost-effective quality-enhancing move. De-worming and similar initiatives. Could collaborate with WHO. Sustainable models of integrated school health. 3. Quality. Apply SABER work in more GPE countries in particular areas such

	<p>as teacher policy, learner assessment. Assess applicability of various SABER tools to fragile states. Interest in ECD approaches. Improving on use of assessment tools for affecting instruction.</p> <p>4. Quality. Life and literacy skills assessment for youth. Highest-order goal of GPE is youth literacy yet there are no real tools for measuring it. WB has an initiative in this area, which could make original methodological contributions.</p> <p>5. Finance.</p> <p>a. Development of a methodology to improve national reporting systems on finance flows (SABER).</p> <p>b. Work on improved financial analysis and reporting (e.g., ongoing work on Country Status Reports).</p> <p>c. Fiduciary risk (PEFA).</p> <p>d. Development of integrated funding approaches for equity in education (SABER).</p> <p>e. Marginal Budgeting for Bottlenecks. (This could be linked to the Finance thematic paper or also the accountability section of the quality paper.)</p>
--	--

Partners listed by interest in specific Out of School Activities

The table above shows partners interests sorted by partner. The one below, which should be read in conjunction with the one above, groups all the partners by area of interest. By focusing on the various partners interested in particular aspects of each activity, it is intended to help sort out areas of mutual interest and either stimulate discussion amongst partners or explain why GPE might single out particular partners for particular issues.

SE or interested partner	Activity: OOS DATA GAP
<i>Potential SEs include UIS and the World Bank with interest for linkage expressed by the World Bank. A discussion between these partners will be organized to seek agreement on how to proceed – potentially with a joint proposal.</i>	
UIS (suggested SE)	Contributions to indicator definitions, analysis of administrative and survey data, and survey design – linking in to the Interagency Group on Education Data from Household Surveys.
World Bank (potential SE in collaboration with WHO, WFP, UNICEF and others)	Development of a database for country, regional, global school health indicators.
Other interested partners	<i>In addition to the SE partner's own activities, the following partners could be considered by SEs as participating/ implementing partners for components of the activities</i>
ILO / ILO-IPEC (suggested SE)	Ensure mainstreaming of the child labor issue and identify vital interventions to address the reasons why children work instead of going to school or why they drop out to work.

	<p>Contribute to the development of an operational definition of OOS and related indicators for statistical measurement purposes.</p> <p>Development of a model questionnaire to collect data on OOS and other relevant statistics through SIMPOC household based surveys, and a manual for supervisors and interviewers.</p>
UNICEF	<p>Build on the OOSCI.</p> <p>MICS/disability module development.</p>
World Bank	<p>Linking the data gap activity led by the two SEs with SABER – which has a planned domain in inclusion and equity – e.g. in benchmarking whether countries’ systems do a good job of inclusion measurement.</p>
Education International	<p>Interest in participating in debate on definition of out-of-school children and conceptualizing of the meaning of enrolment; as well as in the development of techniques to measure out of school children.</p>
Global March	<p>Interested in contributing to improved coherence between data collection activities of member agencies and to identify vital interventions to address the reasons why children work instead of going to school or why they drop out to enter the labor market (interested in working with both UIS and ILO).</p>

SE or interested partner	Activity: OOS Policy Gaps
<p><i>Potential SEs include UNICEF, UNESCO/IIEP and the World Bank. Discussion between these partners will be organized to seek agreement on how to proceed – potentially with a joint proposal but it could also be with separate complementary products. The second group of partners could be involved not as SEs but as supporting/implementing partners. Potential configurations have to be discussed and agreed.</i></p>	
UNICEF (potential SE)	<p>UNICEF is developing a strategy to roll out OOSCI in more countries. Systematic embedding of the approach into country planning, reform and implementation processes.</p> <p>Development of guide on OOSC. Develop a strategy for a more systematic use of the guide in country planning processes and joint sector reviews.</p> <p>Inclusion of children with disabilities in ESPs.</p>
IIEP – (preferably in collaboration with UNICEF)	<p>Undertake a program aimed at supporting selected GPE partner countries with the formulation of an effective policy to educate out of school children.</p>
UNESCO – Division for Basic to Higher Education and Learning (BHL) –	<p>Strengthening non-formal pathways for expanding basic education opportunities for out-of-school children – integrating NFE in clear policy</p>

suggested supporting partner	framework; partnership with NGOs, CSOs and local communities to strengthen and expand quality NFE; assess and document ongoing NFE initiatives; support capacity development and training for NFE personnel (this should be integrated with the overall activity on analysis of sector plans, and it is therefore suggested as a 'supporting' activity).
World Bank (potential SE in collaboration with WHO, WFP and others)	Potential activity on health and nutrition factors linked to out-of-school problems. Development of an operational model for distribution of eye glasses as part of dropout prevention program/school health/screening.
Other interested partners	<i>In addition to the SE partner's own activities, the following partners could be considered by SEs as implementing partners</i>
ILO	Research determining to what extent migrant children go to school in countries that face significant internal and/or cross border migration and identifying the main impediments to education and what are enabling factors.
Finnish Department for International Development with Leonard Cheshire International	Development and scaling up of effective strategies to include children with disabilities in EFA programs in ESPs (jointly with UNICEF).
Education International	Assessment of ESPs; training/support for government officials and LEGS to develop effective strategies for out of school children; identification and documentation of policies; assessment of causes for lack of policies.
Global March	Capacity building of civil society actors to ensure their full and meaningful participation in the activities included - facilitating technical workshops and knowledge dissemination for civil society partners in identified countries. Reinforce policy coherence in the identified 3-5 countries to ensure the capacity of ESPs to address out of school issues, particularly where these include the incidence of child labor. Document and disseminate good practices and designing and facilitating relevant workshops.

SE or interested partner	Activity 3 – management gaps
UNICEF (SE)	Build on the efforts of OOSCI, strengthen ongoing work in and support the roll-out to more Global Partnership for Education countries. (Expansion of OOSCI to more fragile states is encouraged!)
World Bank (potential SE in collaboration with WHO, WFP and others)	Developing a model for the sustainable management of school-based

others)	health services at country level.
Other interested partners	<i>In addition to the SE partner's own activities, the following partners could be considered by SEs as implementing partners</i>
ILO	With a view to seeing how linkages can be made between action to address child labor and education sector plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing of good practice approaches on child labor and education; • Pilot programs in 2 countries to see how education sector plans can upscale approaches used by ILO-IPEC partners to provide education services to out of school children.
Education International	Identification and sharing of best practices; engaging government/stakeholders in reviewing the implementation of their current policies.
Global March	Support identification and sharing of good practices; and efforts to address management gaps through partnership activities between government and civil society.

Way Forward

The Secretariat will provide the Board a priority list of the thematic activities, list of potential SEs, and estimates for the funding requests. At the November meeting, the Board will be requested to approve a funding envelope for the GRA based on the success of the replenishment. If a decision on the priority list (within the envelope) cannot also be decided at that time, then a special virtual decision meeting will be held pending EQRs of the RRP.

Based on the expressions of interest and ongoing conversations, the Secretariat will proceed to issue Requests for Results Partnerships (RRPs). Once the RRP are issued, the Secretariat will schedule EQRs for each of the proposals received to ensure they are results-oriented and will identify the specific outputs and outcomes that the consultations indicate the Global Partnership for Education should support. Expert panels will be commissioned to undertake the reviews and provide concrete ratings and recommendations on which RRP to support and to what extent. When the EQR process is completed, the Secretariat will review the comments from the EQR expert panels, request clarifications and/or adjustments in the proposals, as appropriate, and then proceed to issue Transfer Agreements.



Global and Regional Activities Program Thematic Area: Out of School Children

VERSION 3: FINAL

SEPTEMBER 2011

Table of Contents

1. Background	1
2. Proposed Activities	2
2.1 Data Gaps	2
2.1.1 Gaps in defining and conceptualizing out-of-school categories	2
2.1.2 Gaps in data resources	3
2.1.3 Gaps in use of data	4
2.1.4 Suggested actions	5
2.2 Gaps in Evidence-Based Policy Development	7
2.2.1 Gaps in knowledge about the determinants of out-of-school status	7
2.2.2 Gaps in the application of knowledge	8
2.2.3 Suggested actions	10
2.3 Management and Implementation Gaps	12
2.3.1 Gaps in the management of enrollment and attendance	12
2.3.2 Gaps in managing the provision of education in puts	13
2.3.3 Gaps in the management of interventions targeting children out of school	13
2.3.4 Suggested activities	13
3. Summary	15

1. BACKGROUND

Despite notable progress in the number of children enrolled in school over the past decade, an estimated 67 million children remain out of school worldwide according to the 2011 Global Monitoring Report. This includes 36 million girls, and 38 million children in Africa alone. Over 40 percent of children out of school live in fragile states.

The EFA FTI partnership's primary focus is on accelerating progress towards the core EFA goal of universal primary education by 2015. As 2015 draws closer, the partnership is therefore increasingly concerned with the high number of children who remain excluded from schools.

Children are out of school for a variety of reasons, related to inadequacies in the educational offer (with value-for-money a major issue for families), as well as difficulties posed by personal/family situations and socio-economic, cultural and political contexts. Out-of-school children include those who do not have access to a school in their community, children who do not enroll despite the availability of a school, children who enroll but who do not attend school, and children who drop out. Some groups are not in school because education systems are structured in ways that exclude them or are not relevant to their situations and learning needs —such as children with disabilities, children in nomadic communities and children who are part of linguistic or ethnic minorities. Millions of hard-to-reach children are left out of education sector plans due to faulty data collection and a lack of knowledge on how to include them in Education for All (EFA) planning and implementation. Their exclusion is also a result of lack of political engagement to adjust strategies and allocate resources more equitably—both nationally and globally.

Barriers to children's education include poverty, disability, poor health and nutrition, HIV AIDS orphanhood, child labor (including its more abusive sub-categories), migration, geographical disadvantages, cultural factors and situations of fragility and conflict. They also include limitations in the education offer such as lack of qualified teachers, poor teacher attendance, teaching methods and content inappropriate to children's background and needs, poor and insufficient school infrastructures, violence in and outside the school and lack of gender responsiveness. These school-level issues are in turn linked to overall capacity gaps in educational planning, resourcing and management, which play out differently in different contexts.

Activities targeting out-of-school children are dispersed, and significant gaps remain in terms of provision. Strategies that are effective at the local level are not always supported and scaled up through national policies and budgets. To accelerate global progress to reach out-of-school children, there is a need for concerted efforts to build and consolidate knowledge, and to improve the capacity of education systems to address the needs of children who have so far been excluded.

The mandate to accelerate progress towards education for all means that the EFA FTI partnership has a key role to play in driving efforts and supporting countries to build a stronger knowledge base and develop effective strategies to bring excluded children into schools. The partnership will therefore step

up its efforts to ensure that barriers for out-of-school children are lifted, so that every child has an opportunity to enroll and succeed in school.

2. PROPOSED ACTIVITIES

We see three areas of activity to address three key gaps: knowledge/data, policy, and implementation management. While the three activity areas have been separated for conceptual purposes, proposals that combine and interlink them will also be considered, as long as they address gaps and contribute to the objectives of the Out of School GRA. There are methodological advantages, however, in having a partner look at certain specialized issues. For instance, the issue of improving data collection is quite specialized, and meaningful knowledge can be created and disseminated by focusing on that one aspect.

It should be noted that the overall purpose is to build knowledge for the GPE partnership that in turn can be applied in countries through ESPs that are better equipped to bring out-of-school children into schools. It is understood that the activities need deep involvement from developing country partners, but the GRA also has to be understood separately from activities that are purely country-level capacity building and ESP implementation activities, since there are other Global Partnership for Education 'windows' for these. A GRA activity should have implications for regional/global knowledge that helps the partnership gain experience and spread it amongst partners.

2.1 Data Gaps

The data gap is a challenge that will have to be addressed for education systems to plan for and implement the expansion of education provision to all children. Despite efforts, most notably by UIS, there are still knowledge gaps concerning the size and nature of out-of-school populations.

The UNICEF/UIS' Global Initiative on Out of School Children works to address the data gap in 25 countries, using a five-dimensional model of exclusion. The outcome of this initiative will help determine how to further build on and strengthen efforts to define, measure, and monitor out-of-school populations. Furthermore, ILO IPEC has helped develop linkage between the knowledge base on child labor and education. This could also contribute to close the data gap, as could better linkage with Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS). An important task will be to examine the content and quality of different surveys used to identify and count categories of out-of-school children. The GRA is intended to reinforce the UIS and other partners in closing the out-of-school data gap through strengthened partnership, consolidated efforts and additional resources for more reliable and comprehensive data.

2.1.1 Gaps in defining and conceptualizing out-of-school categories

Out-of-school children are defined as children of primary school age who are not in either primary or secondary school. These include children who have not entered school as well as children who entered school but have dropped out. While it is conceptually unproblematic to determine which children have never been in school, clarity on who has dropped out and who has not is more difficult to achieve, because it is difficult to estimate which children will definitively not return to school using simple mechanisms. Even household surveys often do not delve sufficiently into whether children have abandoned school definitively, are simply taking a break, or would go back under the right

circumstances. Moreover, there is insufficient consensus that the definitions of dropout in use are what is actually measured when dropouts are measured with traditional means based on administrative or survey data.

Surveys often accept as effectively attending any child who attended school at any time of the year. There is a need to capture and measure more evasive phenomena, however, such as non-attendance after enrollment, desultory attendance, and in-and-out of school. It may well be that the issue of poor attendance is nearly as pressing as the issue of being completely out of school. One could argue that there is an inappropriate generalization of concepts on “in school” and “out of school” from industrialized countries where, once enrollment occurs, attendance is relatively rigorously managed, to low-income countries where attendance is often so poorly managed that it is not always clear who is in school and who is not. In systems where children—particularly in the early grades—might attend only 30 percent of the time, and then only for the first few months of the school year, are such children in school or out of school? Here there is not just a data gap but a conceptual gap, and one for which it is difficult to find good data. This issue directly links with the issue of learning outcomes (addressed in a separate GRA program), particularly in early grades, where attendance is often most desultory and where the line between being in school and out of school is most porous.

2.1.2 Gaps in data sources

There are two main sources of data on out-of-school children: administrative records (EMIS) and household surveys. The numbers of out-of-school children from these sources can differ substantially due to the difference in the methodology used to derive them. There are both advantages and limitations in the use of either type of data for counting out-of-school children, and neither EMIS nor household surveys provide enough information on partial attendance situations.

Administrative data are collected by governments every year, and thus can allow for the annual monitoring of the number of out-of-school children. However, the reporting systems within countries often provide imperfect measures of out-of-school populations, and administrative data may be subject to unknown biases through both over- and under-reporting. In order to create indicators (ratios), EMIS data based on administrative records are combined with population data that are interpolations or projections from censuses, and therefore often suffer from considerable measurement error. The number of out-of-school children is derived using the “complement of enrolment.” But enrolment is a one-time event which can be followed by ongoing non-attendance. EMIS systems also often do not provide information on children who are being schooled outside the “regular” school system. The poor quality of age data provided by administrative sources further affects the reliability of the out-of-school figure. EMIS-derived data provide no information on the reasons why children are out-of-school, and hence contain few clues for management and policy, unless profiles are created. When they are developed, such profiles often correspond to fairly simple sociological categories, since more complex social issues are not “seen” by EMIS systems.

Household surveys mostly derive the number of out-of school children using the “complement of attendance.” They can under-estimate the number of out-of-school children because dropouts during

the school year are not always properly captured. Household surveys are insufficient in determining children's regular school attendance, and hence their risk of dropping out or failing to complete their education. Existing household surveys mostly collect the age of children at the time of the survey, and the age of each child at the beginning of the school year is not always known. In part, this depends on whether the child's birth date is even known, as lack of birth certificates remains a major problem in many countries. In many household surveys, education is used as a background characteristic to describe other phenomena, rather than being the object of the study. Data collection may take place late during the school year, during school holidays or across two school years. As a result, the estimated number of children out-of-school can be unreliable. Household surveys typically do not collect "censal" information and, therefore, while they may be very useful for policy analysis, policy-setting, and general tracking, they are not so useful for targeting funding and resources, or localized tracking.

On the positive side, education data collected in household surveys provide information on children both inside and outside the regular school system. Additionally, household surveys collect information on children's other characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, health, and family status, as well as on the households in which they reside, such as location (urban/rural), wealth, and education and gender of the household head. This information can be used to identify target groups for policy (using a profiling or statistical approach). Although not all surveys collect direct, self-reported information on the reasons why children do not attend school, more surveys could, and should, do so.

In short, there are pros and cons to both EMIS and survey data, and there is a need to further understand and link them, to provide rounded views of the out of school and in-and-out of school phenomena. This dialogue too seldom happens in countries. In some countries controversies erupt, or poor policy decisions are made, because information is partial and there is an inability to bring to bear both EMIS and survey information. There is also a need to link EMIS and survey data with qualitative data. In addition, community-level data collection on children out of school (including by school children) has been successful in many contexts, and linkage with these kinds of initiatives should be explored to complement EMIS and survey data.

2.1.3 *Gaps in use of data*

The information collected through both administrative data and household surveys is insufficiently used for policy prioritization. For instance, even in countries where the data on self-reported causes of non-enrollment sets "lack of schools" as a distant third or fourth cause (and poverty may be the first), the preferred donor and government solution is sometimes to build more schools and train more teachers.

The data gaps identified above pertain to high-level systems data. In addition, in many countries there are gaps in the localized use of data to encourage and manage enrollment and in particular attendance (the latter relates to quality and learning outcomes issues linked to time on task). In fact, little is known about how countries use data at the local level to actively manage enrollment and attendance.

Another point to highlight is that there has been limited connection between education planning and analysis of survey-based data on child labor. Yet information collected through household-based child labor surveys could provide important information in efforts to develop strategies for out-of-school

children. Child labor surveys might illustrate patterns of non-attendance and bring out issues concerning the geographical focus of new interventions, or the impact on hours of work on schooling.

2.1.4 Suggested actions

<p>Proposed activity #1: Data</p>	<p>The GRA intends to stimulate a process of stock-taking of previous and current work, develop improved approaches, and promote linkages and strengthened cohesion and collaboration among partners with regard to the out-of-school data gap. To this effect, the following components have been identified through the consultation process and should be considered by partners preparing a proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and disseminate an operational definition of out-of-school children and related indicators for statistical measurement purposes; • Conceptualize the meaning of enrollment and being in school when attendance is low, not managed or unknown; taking into account both formal and non-formal education programs (with due attention to whether non-formal programs create further education opportunities or are ‘dead-end’); • Contextualize the data issue by analyzing why data on out of school children is not available in any given country where this is the case; • Develop an improved measurement instrument for identifying and counting out-of-school children; • Develop a database on health indicators of school aged children to identify and address those health issues impeding school enrollment and attendance; • Improve compatibility and complementarities of EMIS, survey and qualitative data to better pinpoint causes of non-enrollment and non-attendance, and to provide optimal suggestions for the use of data; • Contribute to improve coherence between the data collection and management activities of Global Partnership for Education partners, and collate information on best practices in data collection and management; • Link data for policy with data utilization for localized management action on enrollment and attendance, and develop and document pilots that strengthen data collection, analysis and planning capacity at local levels; • Address challenges around capacity for data collection and analysis in fragile states and develop creative, adapted solutions.
<p>Types of activities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and basic knowledge development; • Technical assistance through the direct involvement of national partners (government and civil society) in the development of tools, approaches and pilots; • Develop/strengthen technical networks for peer learning.
<p>Link with Results framework indicators</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes: intake, gender parity, enrollment, completion, and transition, as well as school health indicators. • Output 1: Global Partnership for Education partner countries develop and implement sound sector policies in education.
<p>Proposed approach</p>	<p>The tasks below have been identified through the consultations. Ideally, a proposal will need to draw up a concept that integrates the different tasks into a coherent approach, and which pays due attention to fragile states, where a high proportion of out of school children are. This could be done by several partners together, drawing on</p>

the comparative advantages of each partner, or through separate supervising entities taking on complementary activities:

- Improved measurement techniques of out-of-school children through improved **EMIS** (e.g. documenting cases where EMIS has improved through better instruments combined with capacity building, and determine strategies for how to achieve similar improvements in other countries).
- A **measurement instrument for directly counting out-of-school children**, which could be administered as a stand-alone household survey questionnaire or be piggy-backed on another household survey. The instrument:
 - ✓ should be able to collect information on children's individual characteristics (e.g., date of birth, sex, or family status) as well as of households (e.g. residence, wealth-related variables, health-related variables, education and sex of household head) and the reasons for non-enrolment, non-attendance and dropout;
 - ✓ would need to interact with and inform administrative or EMIS-based efforts to gather some form of information on attendance (e.g. whether schools are keeping attendance);
 - ✓ could be designed to be administered e.g. every 2 or 3 years and over a sufficient period of time to allow the collection of comprehensive data on out-of-school children and in-and-out of school children in any given country, at both national and sub-national levels.
- A Supervising Entity could design and field test questionnaires, along with the rationale for questions and interviewers' instructions, in a number of pilot countries (e.g., 3 to 5 countries where data gap on out of school children is explicitly identified in the ESP; fragile states should also be considered).
- Development of **qualitative tools for problem analysis** to identify causes/barriers and capacity gaps in order to develop relevant, sustainable strategies, with the involvement of communities, civil society and education officials at different levels.
 - ✓ Include identification of reasons why children work instead of going to school or why they drop out to enter the labor market; reasons for girls' non-enrollment or non-attendance, and other issues influencing children's school attendance;
 - ✓ Make explicit links to quality issues as a cause for children's non-attendance;
- Using **EMIS, household survey and qualitative data together**, calculate and profile out-of-school children, establishing processes to monitor the figures on a regular basis. Methods for analyzing and comparing surveys, EMIS results and qualitative data could be developed to analyze out-of-school issues, taking advantage of the benefits while mitigating the disadvantages of all three.
- Practical approaches could be conceptualized to measure attendance and to focus on the enrollment-attendance gap, studying the issue in the same countries, potentially with a sub-set of households and schools.
- Activities could link high-level measurement to local-level measurement, and use of local reporting to provide evidence and data on non-enrollment and non-attendance, including methods to track whether and how local authorities are using measurement to target the issue. This could include the development of specific assessment techniques for special needs such as disability issues.
- A particular component could focus on child labor and better linkage between child labor data and education data; working towards better coherence between on-going initiatives for out-of-school children and for child labor.
- Fragile states could be addressed either in an integrated way or as a separate component.
- A supervising entity for this activity could consult good models of both survey and

	EMIS form design and data use with key survey and EMIS research groups around the world, to obtain practical examples upon which recommendations can be based.
Expected Deliverables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good strategies for data collection, management and analysis collated, examined and built on to develop good tools for governments and partners, including in fragile states. • Model household survey questionnaire(s) and model improvements in EMIS, as well as efficient methodologies to collect and integrate complementary qualitative data in the analysis of out-of-school problems. • Workshops to integrate the use of these improved instruments in ESP development. • A report on the results of field testing of instruments in 3-5 countries. • A set of guidance and 'how-to' for the process going forward, that planning and EMIS officials, survey supervisors, field survey workers, and others can refer to when developing country-level systems and capacity and administering new forms and approaches for data collection.
Timeframe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately three years from start-up (2012-2014).

2.2 Gaps in Evidence-Based Policy Development

Policy gaps may be due to lack of knowledge and data about the main determinants of out-of-school status, lack of demonstration projects, experience and effective strategies, or failure to apply existing knowledge to address out-of-school children in policy development. Governments constrained by the availability of resources may decide that they cannot afford to prioritize a focus on particular excluded groups perceived as more complicated to address. Some governments may also not see immediate political value in addressing the needs of more disenfranchised populations who are excluded from education, in part because civil society may not be focusing on their needs or may not be effective policy advocates. The lack of linkage between education policy and other policy areas such as health and poverty alleviation is another obstacle: The problem of out-of-school children cannot be addressed by ministries of education alone.

2.2.1 *Gaps in knowledge about the determinants of out-of-school status*

Knowledge on the causes for exclusion from education is a prerequisite for developing appropriate, effective policies to get out-of-school children into schools. Research indicates that the factors contributing to exclude children from schools are a complex mix of socio-economic, cultural and political factors and individual circumstances, attributes and learning needs.

Challenges related to limitations in the educational offer include, but are not limited to -

- Lack of basic resources and facilities such as school buildings, teachers, books, water/sanitation infrastructures, etc.;
- Distances children have to travel to schools, often combined with risks and dangers children face along the way;

- The quality of education and relevance of the curriculum: Research shows that children perform better and stay longer in school when they learn in their local language, learn from a culturally relevant curriculum, and when they and their parents feel that school is preparing them adequately for life and work;
- The opportunity (or not) to transition to the next level of education can also be a determining factor.

Whether or not a child is in school is also determined by context or personal circumstances, such as:

- Conflict and fragile contexts, where weak institutional capacity, poor or non-existent education plans, poor governance, political instability and in many cases, ongoing violence, all contribute to prevent or limit children's school enrolment and attendance;
- Poverty – children in the lowest socioeconomic quintiles are less likely to regularly attend school, and household wealth looms strong even when all other factors are taken into account;
- Social exclusion – children in certain ethnic, linguistic or caste groups are excluded through discrimination and/or and lack of relevance of education;
- Personal attributes and situations that subject individuals to discrimination and exclusion, such as gender, disability, and being affected by HIV/AIDS. This might also include environmental situations, such as living with a lack of water and hygiene, that impacts a child's health and acts as a barrier to enrolment, attendance and learning.

Children are more at risk of being excluded when dealing with a combination of obstacles. For example, a girl with a disability living in poverty in a remote, rural community faces multiple challenges. The factors interact, so it is difficult to say whether they key limitation is an offer (supply) or poverty (demand) factor. Quality-for-money is a key determining factor, since cash and opportunity costs exist even when fees are eliminated. Holistic approaches, or multiple approaches to address the out-of-school issue holistically, are needed.

Not all countries have an evidence base for policy development that clarifies which constraints are most binding on their out-of-school children, or which are the main groups of excluded children. As a result, many countries do not have well-considered, cost-effective policies for addressing their needs. Strategies specifically adapted to the needs of hard-to-reach groups, such as non-formal pathways to provide alternative learning opportunities, are often overlooked in education sector plans.

2.2.2 *Gaps in the application of knowledge*

Even when there are data and available knowledge, knowledge is not always applied. There is sometimes a contradiction between what is known about non-enrollment and non-attendance, and the policies in place. Many education sector plans have identified school construction and teacher recruitment and training as the key means for addressing the out-of-school problem. However, issues of cost and relevance may be just as important, if not more, to parents and children. While improving equity in the distribution of quality infrastructure is a laudable goal on its own, it may nonetheless come as a policy surprise when such a change does not lead to significant increase in enrollment in cases—for instance because the barrier to enrollment was attendance costs rather than the lack of complete schools or poor quality of school infrastructures.

In the case of gender, there is basic knowledge and demonstration projects—and even whole-country success stories—on good practices for including more girls in education. However, there are gaps in the application of this knowledge. In such cases, gaps appear to be related to political will, managerial know-how, or budget, rather than to lack of basic knowledge. Moreover, links to other policy areas such as health and poverty alleviation are often weak or non-existent, even when they are clearly relevant. Although poverty is recognized as a root cause for the exclusion of children and particularly girls from schools, policy often fails to combine demand and supply strategies to effectively bring children living in poverty into schools and to keep them there.

Although there is strong evidence that the inclusion of children with disabilities in mainstream schools advances universal primary education, is cost effective and contributes to the elimination of discrimination, effective policy to provide education for children with disabilities is the exception rather than the rule. A number of system-wide interventions are needed, including legislation, policy, national plans, funding, as well as school and community interventions. Education for children with disabilities is often left to NGOs and private providers, and is given little notice in education sector development. Successful experiences by NGOs or local governments are often not scaled up. Despite the production of a multitude of guides and studies globally, the commitment, resources, guidance and support to adapt these into operational, national strategies are insufficient.

Similarly, ill health and hunger often act as a barrier to education and contribute to the out-of-school population. Children have the highest burden of intestinal worm infection, which increases absenteeism and may lead to dropout. HIV/AIDS and orphan hood have also been associated with out-of-school status (or, perhaps quantitatively more important, desultory attendance and poor concentration). Many children are withdrawn from school or prevented from enrolling to care for sick relatives—with disproportionate impact on girls. While a number of FTI partner countries have put in place policies and strategies to deal with such issues, more could be done to strengthen national policies on school health and nutrition.

In fragile states, policy development to address out-of-school populations has obvious constraints, which the international community has largely failed to address through consolidated approaches and resources. Where the education authorities are conflicted, fragmented or de facto, the development of

sound education programs must sometimes be achieved through alternative means, with a stronger role for international and civil society partners. The experiences of NGOs and multilateral partners delivering education support in these contexts, increasingly through clusters, are an important basis for improved overall strategies.

To develop relevant, effective policies for access to quality education for out-of-school children, there needs to be a clear understanding of what drives governments and local educators in making or resisting changes to schooling. Beyond technical knowledge, policy development is based on political, social, cultural and economic dynamics. Moreover, the global focus has given governments incentives to concentrate on enrolment, with less attention to attendance and learning. For the EFA partnership, this means that while development and dissemination of experiences and studies is important, it is equally important to engage in dialogue with governments, partners and constituencies to shift the agenda and to support the adaptation of global and regional knowledge to local realities. Local Education Groups have a key role to play.

2.2.3 Suggested actions

<p>Proposed activity #2: Policy</p>	<p>The Global Partnership for Education should contribute so that all developing country partners have the information and capacity to develop a culture of evidence-based policymaking, enabling the development of effective policies to bring out-of-school children into school. Activities should cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of existing policy frameworks, assessing to what extent countries have clear and cost-effective policies for out-of-school children that deal with key specific reasons (and combinations of reasons) for non-enrollment and non-attendance; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ This could involve an analysis and comparison of policies across countries, to develop an evidence base on what works, where and for whom, and the associated costs; ✓ It should involve analysis of whether structures, resources, capacity, support and monitoring mechanisms are in place to effectively implement policies on out-of-school children; ✓ It should be seen in the context of how political dynamics affect the choice of policies and resource allocation; • Byproducts focusing on particular populations: working children, children with disabilities, children living in fragile contexts, girls, children infected/affected by HIV, migrating populations and marginalized ethnic groups. <p>Through the above, the GRA should contribute to dialogue among governments, global partners and local constituencies, using knowledge and data to inform and strengthen advocacy, policy development and equitable resource allocation.</p>
<p>Types of activities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative research and knowledge development among global, regional and local partners. • Development and dissemination of policy guidance tools. • Development of South-based knowledge-hubs and/or South-South networks around education equity and policy development.

Link with Results Framework indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes: Intake, gender parity, enrollment, completion, and transition, school health indicators. • Output 1: FTI partner countries develop and implement sound sector policies in education.
Proposed approach	<p>In collaboration between international partners and interested LEGs, assess Education Sector Plans' strengths and weaknesses in how they address out-of-school issues from a policy planning point of view. A broader analysis could be combined with a deeper analysis in 3-5 countries, as well as with specific analyses on particular groups; this could require more than one Supervising Entity. There should be particular attention to fragile states.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct political economy analysis to better understand what drives stakeholders in developing (or not) policies to bring excluded children into schools. • Explore planning and budgeting processes and implementation issues that cause a disjuncture between intended approach and outcomes, including governments' dissemination of information and allocation of resources all the way down to school level, and their monitoring and evaluation of implementation. • Focus on the capacity and adaptability of education systems to meet the needs of diverse populations; assess whether structures in place are the right configuration for addressing out-of-school issues and inequities, and draw conclusions on effective structures in order to inform education sector planning. • Link to overarching policy and complementary interventions that affect children's school enrolment and attendance (e.g. social protection programs, conditional cash transfers, etc.), assessing their potential to increase enrolment and reduce dropout. This should look beyond ministries of education and consider other ministries, as well as other stakeholders such as civil society. • Consider initiatives by governments, civil society and international partners, including alternative basic education, to provide more detailed information on what is already being done, to what extent these initiatives are integrated into national policy, how they could be effectively integrated, and the strengths and weaknesses of existing efforts. • In selected countries where policy on out-of-school children is highlighted explicitly as a gap in the ESP, conduct in-country consultations with LEGs and key stakeholders, fostering dialogue in the planning process, including with communities, civil society organizations and other ministries. Based on this, develop country-based policy statements and action plans on out-of-school children (using tools such as the EFA FTI Equity and Inclusion in Education Guide and the tools being developed through the UNICEF/UIS OOS initiative). • Document emerging successes and good practices, including where collaboration between different arms of government and civil society is making positive progress together; and including in fragile states. • Develop and pilot tools to improve policy-making according to the various causes for policy gaps. • Conduct regional and global workshops, emphasizing shared experiences and peer learning. • Create knowledge hubs or networks across countries to share experiences and expertise (in general on out-of-school children and specifically for key target groups such as working children, children with disabilities, children living in fragile contexts, girls, migrating populations and marginalized ethnic groups).
Expected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An evidence base on what works, where and for whom, and the associated costs.

Deliverables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy guidance catering to particular groups or contexts – working children, children with disabilities, children living in fragile contexts, children infected/affected by HIV, girls, migrating populations and marginalized ethnic groups. • Successful support to 3-5 countries in ESP development to improve inclusion within the context of an existing ESP, recognizing that this may require a more detailed action plan than was originally sketched in the ESP. • Successful support to a small number of countries to improve inclusion of children with disabilities. • Successful support to improve school enrolment and attendance in fragile contexts; • Gathering of experiences into source-book, networks of expertise and a platform for learning from effective policy responses.
Timeframe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2012-2014.

2.3 Management and Implementation Gaps

The effective and efficient implementation of policies is often prevented by management gaps. These are often not specific to the out-of-school problem, but affect the performance, expansion or improvement of the school system as a whole. Management gaps can be a barrier to the development of strategies for addressing out-of-school children, as they tend to overtake the policy dialogue and intimidate any notions of taking on an even more complex set of challenges. In many cases, decentralized education officials responsible for the implementation of policy lack information and knowledge on the policy itself, and do not have clarity on roles and responsibilities for implementing it. If an education system lacks the basic capacity for managing enrolment, attendance, teachers, assessment, materials, construction, etc., for children who are “average” within the context of their societies, then these (and worse) constraints will also have to be taken into account when planning and implementing strategies targeting specific groups of out-of-school children. In addition, there are specific management challenges in delivering education programs for hard-to-reach groups.

2.3.1 *Gaps in the management of enrollment and attendance*

Education ministries sometimes lack the capacity to use available data and knowledge to develop and cost relevant strategies for bringing out-of-school children into the system, and furthermore to track the impact of strategies on vulnerable populations. Education sector planners could sharpen their reflexes and capacity to look beyond the management of schools and teachers to better plan for, manage and monitor cohorts of children as they enter into and move through the system.

Education systems generally lack adequate mechanisms to identify children at risk of dropping out or to identify conditions that affect non-enrollment and non-attendance. The gap in management of compulsory enrollment and attendance creates vicious cycles of non-attendance leading to low learning outcomes, further non-attendance and high repetition rates, all of which increase the cost of enrollment and completion and perpetuate inefficient use of limited resources. This also creates a problem of age-heterogeneity, particularly in the early grades, leading to a problem of “failure at the first step.”

When schools are over-crowded or when there are “objective” barriers to enrollment and attendance such as over-crowding, high fees, high uniform costs, or under-nutrition, it may be considered inappropriate to try to enforce a goal of making schooling effectively compulsory. In such cases, complementary efforts are needed to enable families to send their children to school, including financial support such as cash transfers, as well as mechanisms for communities to get involved in ensuring that children go to school. Addressing the needs of out-of-school children holistically will often require inter-ministerial collaboration, although practical inter-ministerial collaboration is often easiest at the local level. Various NGOs and international agencies have experience in this area, but to take it to scale requires a decentralization agenda that encourages local actors to see their children’s needs more integrally and to insist that line ministries also do so. Access for civil society organizations to engage with the government at different levels would be another enabling factor.

2.3.2 Gaps in managing the provision of education inputs

Many countries experience capacity gaps in the management of school construction, including the management of planning, costs, bidding processes, works supervision and quality control. Similarly, countries struggle with fundamental management gaps that make books and other learning materials expensive and scarce. These gaps include poor contracting with and supervision of publishers and printers, inability to deal with non-competitive tendencies, ineffective distribution systems, and so on.

Gaps in teacher management have an adverse effect on time-on-task and education quality. Many countries struggle to manage teacher rosters and salaries, resulting in payments to ‘ghost’ teachers and disproportionate deployment of teachers compared to numbers of students. Lack of school management and leadership, the need for teachers to travel long distances to pick up salaries, low salaries pushing teachers to engage in other income generating activities, and poor work conditions, all lead to high teacher absenteeism, which in turn takes a heavy toll on student attendance and learning.

Gaps in education management take on a particularly complicated dimension in contexts of conflict and fragility. In collaboration with global partnerships such as the INEE, the EFA FTI partnership can play an important role to bring together partners in these contexts to ensure less fragmented, more coherent interventions for planning, capacity building and school management.

2.3.3 Gaps in the management of interventions targeting children out of school

Hard-to-reach out-of-school children often require targeted interventions and support to overcome the multiple disadvantages and barriers that lead to their exclusion from schooling. Greater attention is needed to the management difficulties, cost burdens and scaling-up strategies of such interventions. Although education officials are accustomed to dealing with key inputs such as the management of schools and teachers, they are not necessarily used to adapting education provision to specific needs, identifying and setting up support strategies, mobilizing community participation, etc. Civil society can play (and often does play) a key supportive role in such programs.

If poverty is a major cause of non-attendance, the use of financial instruments to deal with this issue, from conditional cash transfers to pro-poor school funding formulas, may be a suitable response (see

GRA paper on Finance, where this is dealt with explicitly). In countries where there is a will to undertake such approaches there may be a lack of practical know-how in the design and management of such financial instruments. For instance, there may be excessive use of specific targeting mechanisms with a proliferation of funding approaches, all for specific problems that are just basically manifestations of poverty, and some of them poorly targeted or creating perverse incentives

2.3.4 Suggested actions

<p>Proposed activity #3: Management</p>	<p>The Global Partnership for Education should take stock of, document and share best practices to address management issues: Actively involve countries in reviewing their current strategies on out of school children, desultory attendance and dropout, assess implementation strategies with a view to fine-tune where necessary and develop new ways to tackle areas that are currently weak or neglected, building national capacity while ensuring a sense of ownership of the review process and engage relevant stakeholders in a meaningful way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The direct management of enrollment and attendance, including of populations with specific needs such as nomadic populations, children with disabilities, etc. ✓ The management of enrollment and attendance in fragile contexts. ✓ Management of programs targeting cost and poverty issues, such as alternative and community-based programs, conditional cash transfers and poverty-targeted allocations. ✓ Successful partnerships between government and civil society in school management and inclusion of excluded children. <p>Where relevant, direct links should be made to input-related barriers such as school management and leadership, management of qualified teachers, school construction, input supplies, nutritional supplementation, etc.</p>
<p>Types of activities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and documentation. • Literature reviews, consultations, key informant interviews and capacity development for the development of effective management of initiatives to bring out-of-school children into schools. • Technical workshops and knowledge dissemination.
<p>Link with Results framework indicators</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes: Intake, gender parity, enrollment, completion, and transition, school health indicators. • Output 1: FTI partner countries develop and implement sound sector policies in education.
<p>Proposed approach</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify methods for localized management of enrollment and attendance, using communities, school outreach, etc., with link to reporting of data on attendance and enrollment (feedback to the policy and data gaps). • Analyze existing inputs for specific excluded populations such as girls, working children, children with disabilities, children infected/affected by HIV, children in fragile contexts and children in ethnic minority groups. • Engage with civil society with government at different levels to identify and address accountability issues. • Marginal budgeting for bottlenecks' approach for identifying why resources are not fully achieving their targets.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due attention to management difficulties, cost burdens and scaling-up of effective strategies; document where scaling up has been done successfully, including learning from NGOs/Civil Society. • Review and assess the effectiveness of programs addressing poverty factors such as targeted school feeding programs, conditional cash transfers and poverty-targeted allocations and funding formulas (with due attention to partnership, civil society and inter-ministerial collaboration); Review financial instruments dealing with conditional cash transfers and pro-poor school funding formulas (link with Finance GRA) and identify instruments and approaches that could be replicable in targeted contexts (e.g. in fragile states). • Dissemination of research in peer-learning events and workshops for interested government officials, LEGs, etc. • Linking the above to start-up or continuation of well-evaluated replicable experiences through sector plans with LEGs.
Expected Deliverables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational models (integrated in education sector plans) linking obstacles/barriers with services and interventions targeting out-of-school children. • Guidelines and approaches for linking measurement at national/policy level with management of enrollment and attendance at the local level. • Tools and capacity development to address management and logistical issues affecting out-of-school children and children at risk of dropping out. • Replicable pilots started with LEGs in 3-5 countries where management issues related to out-of-school populations have been identified as a gap in the ESP. • A bottleneck model (see World Bank below).
Timeframe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge products by end 2012, workshops and events mid to late 2013, and pilots 2013-2014.

3. SUMMARY

The purpose of the out of school (OOS) GRA program is to enhance the understanding of key issues surrounding out-of-school children through research, knowledge development, practice and capacity building. The GRA OOS program aims to improve knowledge development and sharing among EFA FTI partners and strengthen the capacity of global, regional and country level partners to develop, implement and monitor sustainable national strategies to reach out-of-school children.

This paper highlights three areas where there are gaps in how countries, partners and donors address the issue of out-of-school children: data, policy, and management. The paper proposes three activity areas to fill these gaps. First, the OOS GRA proposes collaboration in efforts to develop and agree on an improved instrument that accurately identifies the number of out-of-school children and helps to understand their characteristics and the reasons why they are out of school (with due attention to on-going efforts). Secondly, the OOS GRA proposes systematic assessment of whether/how existing policies address out-of-school populations, with concrete actions to improve education sector planning. Finally, the OOS GRA proposes strategies to address management issues that affect the inclusion of out-of-school populations. Once countries have better capacity to identify and count out-of-school children, targeted policies and interventions can be developed to address their specific needs, so that they not only have access to school, but attend school regularly and complete their schooling.

Next steps will include consultations with key stakeholders and possible implementers to begin to design activities that can be turned into Requests for Results Partnerships.