

Instructions for the EFA FTI Global and Regional Activities (GRA) Program Stakeholder Consultations

Thematic Papers

The EFA FTI Secretariat's Global Good Practice (GGP) Team prepared thematic issues papers on education financing, out of school, and learning outcomes. These papers will serve as the main discussion tool for the consultative sessions, and are not considered exhaustive, rather we seek your inputs on who is doing what, where, and how, and good practices to be shared, scaled up, etc.

All papers describe:

- "gaps" in knowledge and practice at the country and regional level that need to be addressed as well as the results needed and expected (outputs and outcomes) from new activities to fill those "gaps", and
- eligible activities to address each priority theme.

Based on the outcomes of the consultations, the GGP Team will develop Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for specific GRA programmatic activities in each thematic area. All RFPs will fund concrete activities from the eligible activities list. RFPs will be results-oriented and will identify the specific outputs and outcomes that the EFA FTI Partnership wants to support. Proposals that are tendered in response to these RFPs will be assessed according to objective criteria and discussed by panels of external experts. Each activity or set of activities will be implemented by a Supervising Entity (SE) which will act as a funds-holder (via a transfer agreement) and may contract out to other entities (implementing body at the local level) if appropriate. SEs will be official bodies such as bilateral donor agencies or multilateral technical or financial agencies.

Instructions for Responding

For both consultations:

1. Provide written comments in a separate file, not using Track Changes or a commenting option such as in Word.
2. In the file, organize your comments so that all of the comments on each of the 3 thematic area papers are together and properly labeled with a heading.
3. Send comments to Koli Banik at the EFA FTI Secretariat at kbanik@educationfasttrack.org. All comments will be posted on the EFA FTI website— unless you specify otherwise.

Consultation 1

According to each stakeholder's technical expertise, read one to three of the thematic papers on out of school, education financing, and learning outcomes. When preparing written responses, please think about the following guiding questions:

- Are there gaps in knowledge and practice areas which are missing? Or are there some areas we have identified as gaps that are in fact redundant because plenty of knowledge and experience exists? If redundant, please provide evidence (i.e. point to studies, projects already implemented by an institution, well-implemented policies in many countries, etc).
- Identify organizations/supervising entities best suited to coordinate/carry out program activities as described. Please explain why you think these organizations are best suited.

Deadline for comments: **June 3rd**

Consultation 2

We will do our best to accommodate comments, views, and opinions received from Consultation 1. However, we cannot promise to make sure every single opinion is reflected as there may be contradictory views, or views that exceed the budget. We will carefully study all views and do our best to deal with them. On that basis we will engage in a second consultation, in which we will ask the following.

- Read revised thematic papers (Approximately June 17th)
- Provide written comments on the revised papers if you feel strongly that your concerns have not been addressed.

Deadline to provide comments: **July 1st**.

EFA FTI Global and Regional Activities Program (GRA)

Thematic Area: Out of School Children

I. Introduction

According to the 2011 Global Monitoring Report, there are some 67 million children out of school. Children can be out of school for a number of reasons, however, primarily they are out of school because of poverty, disability, poor health and nutrition, HIV-AIDS orphanhood, child labor (including its more abusive sub-categories), being part of linguistic and ethnic minorities, geographic disadvantages, cultural factors, and living in fragile or conflict areas (Fast Track Initiative, 2009).

The identification and understanding of the complex needs of out of school children has proven to be a difficult task. Millions of hard to reach children are often left out of Education Sector Plans due to faulty data collection and a lack of practical and technical knowledge and expertise on how to identify and include these groups in Education for All planning.

Addressing the problem of out of school children is one of FTI's priorities. Seven of the top twelve countries with the highest number of out of school children are FTI countries. These countries are Ethiopia, Kenya, Niger, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Mozambique, and Yemen. However, the three countries with the largest out of school populations are not FTI countries – Democratic Republic of Congo, India, and Nigeria.

The EFA FTI Partnership's goal is to ensure barriers for out of school children are lifted so that every child has an opportunity to enroll and succeed in school. EFA FTI Partners-- UNICEF and UNESCO have established the Global Initiative on Out of School Children and their goal is to reduce the number of out of school children through the development of a methodology for estimating the number of primary school age children who are out of school and to present national, regional, and global estimates for this indicator (UNICEF/UIS Brochure). This global initiative as well as other targeted interventions are needed to include these children in Education for All programs. If we do not act quickly, 56 million boys and girls will remain out of school in 2015.

This paper summarizes and conceptualizes three "gaps" in the world's ability to reach out of school children: Data, Policy, and Management. It concludes with a list of proposed activities the GRA can support.

II. Background

A. Data Gaps

The **data gap** in out of school children is in itself a challenge. UIS needs to better capture the out of school population number. As referenced above, UNICEF and UIS have created a

Global Initiative to address the data gap. The 2005 UIS report on *Children Out of School: Measuring Exclusion From Primary Education*, maintains that the issue of which children can be counted as out of school is heavily debated. For instance, up to now there has been insufficient consensus on whether dropouts can be considered out of school, and yet others propose that even those at risk for dropping out should be targeted by out of school initiatives. In addition, the reporting systems within countries often provide imperfect measures of out-of-school populations, especially if the countries are suffering or recovering from conflict (the Democratic Republic of Congo is an example).

Currently, there are two main sources of data for the number of out-of-school children: administrative records (EMIS) plus population projections and interpolations and household surveys. The numbers of out-of-school children from these sources can differ substantially because of the difference in the methodology used to derive them. Moreover, there are advantages and limitations in the use of administrative data and existing household surveys for counting out-of-school children.

Using enrolment data, which are based on administrative records (EMIS), and population data, which are often based on intercensal estimates or projections, the number of out-of-school children is derived from EMIS using the “complement of enrolment.”

Administrative data are collected by national governments every year, and thus allow for the annual monitoring of the number of out-of-school children. However, administrative data are mostly disaggregated by gender only and information at the sub-national level is often lacking. EMIS-derived data provide no information on the reasons why children are out-of-school, and hence contain little clues for management and policy. Furthermore, administrative data may be subject to unknown biases in both over-and under-reporting directions, making corrections extremely difficult. They also do not provide information on children who are being schooled outside the “regular” school system (schools registered in EMIS data). Finally, the poor quality of age data provided by administrative sources affects the reliability of the out-of-school figure derived from these sources. EMIS data have to be combined with population data that are interpolations or projections from censuses, and therefore could suffer from considerable measurement error.

Household surveys mostly derive the number of out-of school children using the “complement of attendance.” The use of existing household surveys can lead to an under-estimation of the number of out-of-school children because dropouts during the school year are not always properly captured. Existing household surveys mostly collect only the age of children at the time of the survey and therefore the age of each child at the beginning of the school year is not known.

Moreover, in many household surveys education is often used as a background characteristic to describe other phenomena rather than being the object of the study, and for this reason 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 (primary school age children) out-of-school from existing household surveys can be unreliable.

In addition, 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.

Nevertheless, education data collected in these surveys provide information on both children in the regular schools system and outside the regular school system. Additionally, household surveys collect information on other children’s characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, and family status, as well as information on the households in which they reside, e.g., location (urban/rural), wealth status, and education and gender of the household head. This information can be used to identify some target groups of the population for policy interventions (using a profiling or statistical approach), and specifically out-of-school children. In addition, though not all surveys collect direct, self-reported information on the reasons why children do not attend school, more surveys could, and should, collect such information, and the information that does get collected is insufficiently used for policy prioritization. Cases exist of countries where the data on self-reported causes of non-enrollment put “lack of schools” as a distant third or fourth cause (and poverty may be the first cause), yet in these countries the preferred donor and government solution may be to build schools and train 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. (And the latter relates to quality and learning outcomes issues related to time on task.) In fact, little is known about how countries use data at the local level to actively manage enrollment and attendance. Moreover, in systems where attendance is only desultory and where there is no active management of attendance, it is not even clear whether children who are enrolled can even be considered in school. Here there is not just a data gap but a conceptual gap, and one that is difficult to find good data for. In systems where attendance is relatively rigorously managed, the meaning of being “in school” and being “out of school” is clear, because almost all enrolled children attend. In systems where children, particularly in early grades, or in their first year in school, might attend only 30% of the time, and then only for the first few months of school, are such children in school or out of school? The applicability of the concepts is unclear, and the data are lacking to even understand how big the problem is. 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 clear who is in school and who is not. It may well be that the issue of poor attendance is nearly as pressing (at least in the early grades) as the issue of being completely out of school or not-yet-enrolled. Furthermore, this issue directly links with another issue of importance to EFA, namely learning outcomes, 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.

Given the lack of data needed to finely characterize the out-of-school issue, one can suggest several types of work that can be used to improve this area: a) a clearer conceptualizing of the meaning of “enrollment” or being “in school” when attendance is very low, not-managed, or unknown, b) improved measurement techniques in both EMIS and household surveys, including better-designed forms, for capturing both enrollment and attendance issues for policy analysis

and action, c) compatibilization of EMIS and survey data so as to better pin-point causes of non-enrollment and non-attendance, including self-reporting, and to provide countries with optimal suggestions for the uses of both types of data (given the pros and cons of both, and given that neither is perfect), and d) linking data for policy (obtainable via EMIS and surveys) with data utilization for localized management action on enrollment and attendance.

B. Policy Gaps

In addition to data gaps, countries face policy gaps, in that, even if the causes for non-enrollment and non-attendance are known, not every country has well-considered, cost-effective policies for addressing each of the many causes of non-attendance. Furthermore, there is, sometimes, a contradiction between what is known about non-enrollment and non-attendance and the policies in place; with the result that the policies do not achieve the desired results. A lot of countries' Education Sector Plans, particularly in the past, have tended to identify school construction and teacher training as the key means for addressing the out-of-school problem, so as to provide more spaces in school or making sure the school is closer to children. However, issues of cost and relevance may be just as important, if not more important, to parents and children.

Research indicates that the obstacles out of school children face are complex, and challenges include, but are not limited to: a) *poverty* – children in the lowest socioeconomic quintiles are less likely to regularly attend school than other children, and this factor looms strong even when all other factors are taken into account, b) *lack of inputs* -- in many countries there is a need for basic resources such as school buildings, teachers, books, or uniforms; b) *distances children have to travel to schools* -- region of residence and distance to schools (EPDC Policy Brief, 2007), or cultural distance to schools (Lehman, 2007) can impact whether a child is enrolled and/or remains in school; and c) *the quality of education/cultural relevance of curriculum* -- research shows that children perform better in school, and stay longer in school, when they learn in their local language (Mule, 1999 and Abadzi, 2006) and learn from culturally relevant curriculum (Jegade, 1999; Kawakami, 1999; Armstrong, 2000; and Srikantaiah, 2005), and when they and their parents feel that school is preparing them adequately for life and work. Furthermore, there are some particularly hard to reach categories, such as girls(in some but not all contexts), children with disabilities, children living in fragile states, or ethnically marginalized children. Not all countries have a clear view of which of all these (and other) constraints are most binding on their own out-of-school children. They therefore lack ability to prioritize or set cost-effective policies. Disappointment at the effectiveness of policy, then, is likely.

For example, an important factor in determining out-of-school status is gender. The 2011 GMR reports that over half the 67 million children who are not in school today, 36 million, are girls. Research indicates that girls are often “doubly disadvantaged” as compared to boys (Tembon and Fort, 2008) in attending school and that girls drop out of school (or never attend) for the reasons mentioned above, but such research also indicates that sometimes the obstacle is as simple as a lack of girls' toilet facilities (UNICEF, 2005).

Policy gaps may be due to lack of knowledge and data about the main determinants of out-of-school status, or may be due to lack of a stock of demonstration projects and experience on how to address the problems. However, even when there are data and there is experience and

available knowledge, the knowledge does not always get used. In the case of gender, for example, there is basic knowledge and there are demonstration projects (and of course even whole-country success stories) on good practices for including more girls in education; in fact the stock of knowledge appears to be vast, and has been compiled into “how-to” booklets many times, by many donors. However, there are gaps in the application of this existing knowledge. In such cases, the gaps appear to be related more to political will, *managerial* know-how, or budget, than to basic knowledge about what to do. In other cases the policy gap is determined by a knowledge or data gap. Furthermore, there are cases where national figures show near gender parity, but where there are nevertheless sub-national contexts where girls are at a disadvantage (hence part of the knowledge and data gap). There is then a tendency to overlook the need for remedial policy to address those ‘pockets’. Policy should look beyond national parity figures and address gender equality – to ensure relevant, gender sensitive strategies to keep girls in school.

Given the policy gap, work is needed on:

- 1) Characterizing or inventorying FTI countries according to whether they have clear, well-articulated, and cost-effective policies to prioritize the out-of-school problem according to its many causes;
- 2) If there is not a policy, assessing whether it is due to:
 - a) lack of a stock of easy-to-access best practices of approaches from other countries
 - b) lack of accessing existing knowledge,
 - c) lack of political will
 - i) ineffective managerial know-how to implement policies (which would refer to “Management Gaps”, below), and
 - ii) lack of budget (total or relative) and lack of budget targeting (e.g., no pro-poor allocations);
- 3) Providing resources for improving policy-making (depending on the various causes for policy gaps or lack of policies).

C. Management or Implementation Gaps

In cases where basic data and knowledge can be assumed to have been sorted out, where political will has been generated and budget has been assigned, there often remain management or implementation gaps. For example, in spite of the fact that donors have been funding school-building programs for years, many countries still experience serious problems with school costs, works supervision, lack of contractual ability to deal with builders, lack of input supplies (including lack of cement, and other simple and basic inputs), insufficient capacity and numbers of builders, non-learning from past mistakes, conflicting and unclear policy agendas that mix school construction with stimulating local builders and the small business sector, collusion or monopolistic tendencies of school builders, unwarranted faith in the ability of localized construction to deliver on time and on budget, and so forth.

Similarly, in cases where school quality and input scarcity limit enrollment and attendance, such as in the provision of textbooks, countries still struggle with fundamental management gaps that make books expensive and scarce. These gaps include poor contracting with and supervision

of book publishers and printers, inability to deal with non-competitive tendencies, poor distribution systems, book specification sometimes overly influenced by input suppliers or not informed by serious analysis on what is pedagogically necessary, unintended consequences (such as small print runs, high representation costs, and low quality of many titles rather than higher quality of fewer titles) of providing schools with “too much” choice, and so on. Thus, good policy, if management is weak, might not be sufficient. Yet another example may have to do with the use of finance instruments to address the needs of the poorest. 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. In countries where there is a policy will to undertake such approaches there may be a lack of practical know-how in both the design of these sorts of instruments, and in their management. For instance, there may be excessive use of specific targeting mechanisms with a proliferation of funding approaches, all for specific problems that are (perhaps) just basically manifestations of poverty, and some of them poorly targeted or creating perverse incentives.

A significant management gap is the management of enrollment and attendance itself, especially of hard-to-reach groups. Evidently, when schools are over-crowded or when there are “objective” barriers to enrollment and attendance such as over-crowding in schools that do exist, or high fees, high uniform costs, or under-nutrition, it may be unjust to try to enforce a goal of making schooling effectively compulsory. However, under circumstances that are less dire, the non-management of compulsory enrollment and attendance creates very inefficient vicious cycles of non-attendance leading to low learning outcomes, leading in turn to further non-attendance and high repetition rates, all of which increase the cost of enrollment and primary school completion. Furthermore, non-attendance and ensuing re-enrollment in the same grades (and sometimes non-attendance on the assumption that re-enrollment in the same grade is the expected norm), creates a problem of age-heterogeneity, particularly in the early grades, leading to a problem of “failure at the first step.” Thus, a relatively basic issue of management of non-attendance and non-enrollment needs to be addressed.

In populations with special needs the problem of managing attendance and enrollment is even thornier. District-level and school-level staff in many countries lack the practical managerial skills for dealing with even simple disabilities, or making simple judgments as to how to address the enrollment and attendance of children with special needs, even when all that is needed is a simple and inexpensive adaptation. For example, confusing possibly temporary disabilities, such as nutritional or gastroenterological problems, with more permanent disabilities (which can in turn lead to more permanent disabilities) appears to be fairly common—though no one knows precisely how common, - and the skills to deal with this “case management” issue are not abundant.

To address the management and implementation gaps, activities may be needed which address practical managerial gaps in (a) input-related barriers such as availability of teachers, school construction, input supplies, nutritional supplementation, (b) cost and poverty factors such as conditional cash transfers and poverty-targeted allocations, (c) the direct management of enrollment and attendance in cases where other fundamental causes are not operational. This latter issue includes the management of enrollment and attendance of any population with special needs such as nomadic populations, children with disabilities, etc.

III. Proposed activities

Proposed activity #1 - Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development and use of new measurement instruments and approaches that will provide improved ways to count of out-of-school children, to assess the characteristics of these children, to classify the reasons why they are out of school and that can help manage the situations at the local level. For example, partnering or supporting existing partnerships such as the UNICEF/UIS.
Type of Activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and basic knowledge • Technical workshops, peer learning events • Technical assistance • Pilot interventions to demonstrate usage of instruments
Targeted Gap	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data
Results Framework (Indicator)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes: intake, gender parity, enrollment, completion, and transition.
Notes on Proposed Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new measurement instrument will be designed so that it can be administered repeatedly in any given country, for example every 2 or 3 years, and over a sufficient period of time to allow the collection of comprehensive data on out-of-school children at both national and sub-national levels. • The new measurement instrument for directly counting out-of-school children will be designed so it can be administered through a household survey as a stand-alone questionnaire or piggy-backed on another household survey. • The development of the new instrument will build on existing household survey questionnaires. Specifically, it will explore how these existing questionnaires can be modified so as to allow the direct estimate of the number of out-of-school children. • In addition to including questions from which a direct estimate for the out-of-school population can be obtained, the new measurement instrument will also collect information on all children's individual characteristics (e.g., date of birth, sex, or family status) as well as characteristics of households in which they reside (e.g. residence, wealth-related variables, education and sex of household head) and the reasons for school dropouts. • Following these consultations, the new questionnaire along with the rationale for each question and interviewers' instructions will be designed and field tested by survey specialists in a

	<p>number of pilot countries (e.g., 3 to 5 countries).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptualize practical ways to measure attendance, and to focus on the enrollment-attendance gap, and study the issue in the same countries, even if with a sub-set of households and schools. • Similarly, research and improve EMIS forms and the understanding and analysis of EMIS data on out of school issues, including problems of repetition and school dropouts. • Methods for analyzing and comparing surveys and EMIS results so as to analyze out-of-school issues, and taking advantage of the benefits of both while mitigating the disadvantages of both. • Linking 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 local authorities are using measurement to target the issue. This is to include the development of specific assessment techniques for specialized needs such as disability issues. • The Supervising Entity and/or Implementation Partner chosen for this activity must 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 Deliverable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Model household survey questionnaire(s) • Model improvements in EMIS forms • Workshops to advocate for the use of these better instruments • Field testing of the instruments in 3-5 countries. • A report on the results • A set of instructions and how-to for the process going forward, that survey supervisors, field survey workers, EMIS officials, and others can refer to when administering new forms and approaches.
Timeframe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the activity starts January 2012, then it should be completed in one year.

Proposed Activity #2 - Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification and addressing of policy gaps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducting an inventory and assessment of countries' existing policy frameworks to deal with the main categories and causes of non-enrollment and non-attendance • Assessment and characterization of reasons for lack of policies • Assistance and workshops to improve Education Sector Plans policy content in key areas addressing out of school issues • Development of policy statement on out of school children at the national level • For example (but there could be others), partnering or supporting existing partnerships such as the UNICEF/UIS.
Type of Activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and dissemination • Technical workshops and knowledge dissemination • Technical Assistance
Targeted Gap	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy
Results Framework Indicator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes: Intake, gender parity, enrollment, completion, and transition. • Output 1: FTI partner countries develop and implement sound sector policies in education
Proposed Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systematically assess all Education Sector Plans with regard to their ability to address key out-of-school issues from a policy planning point of view, in cases where there is not a data gap • In 3-4 countries, provide a deeper assessment of main causes of policy inattention. • Provide or enable targeted technical assistance to improve policies in these cases <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For example, working with Local Education Groups, which include government representatives, in FTI countries to use tools such as the EFA FTI Equity and Inclusion in Education Guide to develop a country based policy statement and action plan on out of school children. This can involve: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fostering dialogue and the planning process among other stakeholders, including civil society organizations (CSOs) and communities ▪ In country consultations with key stakeholders ▪ Sensitivity training for government officials and LEGs/raising awareness on out of school children • Document the successes and good practices emerging • Provide similar practices in regional and workshop gatherings, emphasizing shared experiences and peer-to-peer learning.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development of ESPs scaling up these interventions ○ Linking data collection/profiling with service provision (use of data for planning)- demonstrated use of data for policy setting (noting that emphasis will be on country-issue cases where the data gap is not constraining and where key gap is a policy gap) ○ Creating a network of specialized people across the countries that can be share expertise with other countries
Expected Deliverable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All Education Sector Plans assessed for their capacity to address and prioritize key out of school issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Should include country policy statements as part of the FTI endorsed Education Sector Plan ● Identification of issue-country combinations where the data gap is not an issue and the issue is a policy gap (i.e., where good policy could be made, because there is enough basic information) ● Successful support to 3-5 countries in Education Sector Plan development or improvement (even if support is out of cycle with Education Sector Plan development) ● Gathering of the experiences into source-book and a network of expertise ● Sharing of expertise in regional workshops via both experts and networks of peers. ● Improved ESP planning in next set of 3-5 countries in period 2012-13
Timeframe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Piloted beginning of 2012. Activity can be done simultaneously with the development of the instrument (activity #1)

Proposed Activity #3 - Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification and sharing of best practices to address management issues in reducing out-of-school populations
Type of Activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and dissemination • Technical workshops and knowledge dissemination • Initiating replicable experiences in coordination with LEGs
Results Framework Indicator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes: Intake, gender parity, enrollment, completion, and transition • Output 1: FTI partner countries develop and implement sound sector policies in education
Targeted Gap	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management
Proposed Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literature review and key informant interviews to identify and share good practices in addressing key out-of-school limitations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Input-related barriers (only in areas where there is a clear knowledge gap) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School construction ▪ Input supplies ▪ Low-cost teacher training while maintaining high quality ▪ Nutritional supplementation ▪ Inputs needed for special populations such as nomadic children and children with disabilities ○ Cost and poverty factors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conditional cash transfers ▪ Poverty-targeted allocations and funding formulas ○ Other key management issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Methods for localized management of enrollment and attendance, using communities, school outreach, etc.; link to reporting of data on attendance and enrollment (feedback to the policy and data gaps) • Dissemination of research in workshops to government officials, and other policy makers • Start-up or continuation of well-evaluated replicable experiences in areas, identified above, where existing experiences do not yet provide sufficiently clear evidence
Expected Deliverable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational models linking obstacles/barriers with services and interventions targeting specific groups of out of school children • Guidelines and approaches for linking measurement at national/policy level with measurement at local level, and with

	<p>action and management of enrollment and attendance at the local level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country staff will have a better understanding of the issues surrounding out of school children, and also management/logistical issues surrounding out of school children in their countries. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Could lead to better accountability/data on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School attendance ▪ Number of students in a classroom ▪ Better management of data • Replicable pilots started up in 4 countries
Timeframe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge products mid 2012 • Workshops and events mid to late 2012 • Pilot start-ups operational by mid 2013

IV. Summary

This paper highlights three areas where there are gaps in how countries and donors think about, set policy, and manage inclusion of out of school children - data, policy, and management - and proposes three activities the GRA can finance to fill these gaps. The first activity, and most important, is the development of an instrument that accurately identifies the number of out of school children. Once countries know how many out of school children they have, and how to identify them, targeted interventions can be developed to address the specific needs to the population so that they not only have access to school, but enroll, retain, and achieve. In addition, the quality of education students receive can be tailored to meet the students’ needs. The activities presented in this paper, will move us towards better serving the out of school children population. Next steps will include consultation with key stakeholders and possible implementers to alter or add to these notes, and begin to design activities that can be turned into Requests for Proposals. Requests for Proposals will be out by late summer 2011.