

© Abbie Trayler-Smith/PANOS

Break time in a school located in a slum area, Yemen.





Chapter 5

The way forward

As we move beyond the midway point from Dakar to 2015, key questions arise. How can we maintain the recent positive primary school enrolment and completion trends? What about the slower progress towards achieving the goals for early childhood, youth and adults, and quality education for all? What about literacy, the most neglected of the EFA goals? And the missed gender parity goal? With just eight years remaining to achieve EFA, will we make it? What can be done to accelerate the movement, to increase aid and target it better? How can governments and actors at every level sustain the effort to fulfil the Dakar commitments, especially for the most poor, disadvantaged and vulnerable? This concluding chapter addresses these and other questions. It proposes an agenda for the way forward and suggests some of the roles various stakeholders should play if we are to meet our obligations to present and future generations.

Introduction	178
Trends and prospects for 2015	178
Financing the EFA goals to 2015	185
Towards an agenda	191

Introduction

Chapters 2 to 4 discuss developments relevant to Education for All that have taken place since 2000. This concluding chapter examines education indicators and financing issues to determine if EFA is on track to being realized by 2015. It then proposes the elements of a policy agenda for governments, for civil society organizations and for international agencies and donors to accelerate these trends, focusing on neglected goals and on countries that are lagging behind global progress towards EFA, and taking account of the changes in the global environment since Dakar that are discussed in Chapter 1.

Trends and prospects for 2015

The period from 1999 to 2005, as chapter 2 showed, was one of sharp growth in enrolment at both primary and secondary level, with some reduction in the gender gap and in socio-economic disparities. Especially impressive was performance in countries of sub-Saharan Africa, and South and West Asia, the two regions whose situation was noted at the Dakar World Education Forum as being of particular concern. Yet, a majority of countries missed the gender parity goal fixed for 2005, the poor quality of education is becoming a major issue worldwide and the goals pertaining to young children and to youth and adults have been relatively neglected, particularly as regards adult literacy. This section examines the implications of these trends for the achievement of EFA goals in the near future.

For the three goals that have an explicit quantitative target – goal 2 (universalization of primary education), goal 4 (reduction by half in the level of adult illiteracy) and goal 5 (elimination of gender disparities in primary and secondary education) – relevant education indicators were projected to 2015 and 2025,¹ extrapolating trends observed in each country between the early 1990s and 2005.² It is important to note that these are extrapolations of past trends, rather than forecasts: they make no attempt to simulate the impact of education policy alternatives on education indicators and thus may not reflect the impact of recently implemented education policies. What they show is

1. Goal 4 was projected only to 2015.

2. The years vary for each indicator according to data availability.

whether the continuation of ongoing trends is consistent with the achievement by a given country of a given goal by 2015 or 2025.³ As such, these projections are a useful monitoring tool and provide an early warning of the consequences of maintaining current rates of progress.

Goal 1: early childhood care and education

ECCE is receiving increasing attention, but much remains to be done. Even without projections, it is evident on present trends that participation rates will remain relatively low to 2015:

- in all developing country regions except Latin America and the Caribbean, and especially in sub-Saharan Africa and the Arab States;
- among children under 3, for whom there is much less provision than for those aged 3 and over despite increases in pre-primary schooling;
- among the poor and disadvantaged, who stand to benefit relatively the most from ECCE programmes.

Goal 2: universal primary education

The likelihood that countries will achieve universal primary education (UPE) by 2015 or 2025 was assessed using the total primary net enrolment ratio (TNER), which takes into account children of primary school age enrolled in either primary or secondary school but, of course, does not reflect learning but only enrolment. Table 5.1 shows the most recent situation and prospects for the achievement of this goal by 2015 for the 149 countries having sufficient data. Of these, 63 (42%) had already achieved universal primary enrolment by 2005, with a TNER of 97% and above. These include a large number of OECD countries where compulsory and usually free public education has been long established and rigorously enforced, but also a number of developing countries as diverse as Bangladesh, Cambodia, Egypt, Indonesia and Peru.

Trend projections were run for the remaining 86 countries.⁴ Table 5.1 summarizes the results by classifying countries according to how far they were from universal primary enrolment in 2005 (TNER below or above 80% in 2005) and whether they are projected to achieve it by 2015 (projected 2015 TNER below or above 97%):

- Twenty-eight countries (Quadrant I) have a high chance of achieving universal primary enrolment by 2015, as their 2005 ratio is above 80% and their projected 2015 ratio is above 97%. They include mostly middle income countries of Central and Eastern Europe, and Latin America, but also several low-income sub-Saharan African countries, some Arab States and India.
- Seventeen countries (Quadrant II) are making rapid progress but have a low chance of achieving the goal by 2015, mainly because they still have a very low TNER (below 80%). They include thirteen sub-Saharan African countries, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and Yemen. Some of these countries, including Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique and Yemen, have abolished tuition fees in recent years. As the vertical arrow in Table 5.1 indicates, six of the seventeen countries are projected to reach universal primary enrolment by 2025.
- Thirty-three countries (Quadrant III) are at risk of not achieving universal primary enrolment by 2015 because, while their enrolment ratio was relatively high in 2005, it has progressed very slowly or declined, particularly since 1999. They include several former Soviet republics; some countries severely affected by the HIV/AIDS pandemic (South Africa, Swaziland, Zimbabwe) and by conflict (Iraq, Palestinian Autonomous Territories); and others that have relatively well-developed school systems but have seen their TNER declining over the past few years (Cape Verde, the Dominican Republic, Jordan, Turkey). However, seven of the thirty-three countries are likely to achieve universal primary enrolment by 2025 (horizontal arrow in Table 5.1).
- Eight countries (Quadrant IV) located in sub-Saharan Africa and the Arab States are at serious risk of not achieving universal primary enrolment by 2015, as they combine low TNERs in 2005 with slow positive or even negative change, particularly between 1999 and 2005. These countries stand in contrast with those of the same regions that have made quick progress since Dakar (Quadrant II), and they deserve specific attention.

To summarize, of the 149 countries for which sufficient information is available:

Forty-one countries are at risk of not achieving universal primary enrolment by 2015

3. The projections of universal primary enrolment and gender parity were run for the *EFA Global Monitoring Report* by the Education Policy and Data Center. See the annex for a discussion of the projection methodology and Education Policy and Data Center (2007a) for the complete results. The projections of adult literacy were run by the UNESCO Institute for Statistics.

4. Countries were included in the projections if at least five observations were available between 1999 and 2005.

Table 5.1: Country prospects for achieving universal primary enrolment by 2015

Goal achieved by 2005
(total NER ≥ 97%)
63 countries

Algeria, Argentina, Aruba, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Canada, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Luxembourg, Mexico, Montserrat, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia and Montenegro, Seychelles, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, TFYR Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tunisia, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania

Distance from 100% total primary NER in 2005	Close or in intermediate position (total NER: 80–96%)	<p>QUADRANT I High chance of achieving the goal by 2015 <i>(moving towards the goal, with steady progress)</i> 28 countries</p> <p>Belarus, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia, El Salvador, Georgia, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Islamic Republic of Iran, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Morocco, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Philippines, Romania, Russian Federation, Ukraine, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Zambia</p>	<p>QUADRANT III At risk of not achieving the goal by 2015 <i>(moving away from the goal or progress too slow)</i> 33 countries</p> <p>Albania, Anguilla, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Botswana, Cape Verde, Cayman Islands, Croatia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Grenada, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lithuania, Macao [China], Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Mongolia, Palestinian Autonomous Territories, Republic of Moldova, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, South Africa, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe</p>	61
	Far (total NER: <80%)	<p>QUADRANT II Low chance of achieving the goal by 2015 <i>(moving towards the goal, with rapid progress)</i> 17 countries</p> <p>Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chad, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Yemen</p>	<p>QUADRANT IV Serious risk of not achieving the goal by 2015 <i>(moving away from the goal or progress too slow)</i> 8 countries</p> <p>Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Maldives, Namibia, Nigeria, Oman, Rwanda, United Arab Emirates</p>	25
Total	45	41	86	
	On track	Off track		
Total primary NER projected for 2015, extrapolating 1991–2005 trends				

Not included in the prospects analysis
(insufficient or no data)
54 countries

Afghanistan, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Cook Islands, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gabon, Germany, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Latvia, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Monaco, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands Antilles, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Tokelau, Turkmenistan, Turks and Caicos Islands, Tuvalu, Uganda, United States, Uruguay, Uzbekistan

- Sixty-three countries had achieved universal primary enrolment by 2005 and twenty-eight will achieve it by 2015.
- Fifty-eight (eleven of them fragile states⁵) will not achieve universal primary enrolment by 2015 if past trends continue.
- Forty-five (seven of them fragile⁶) of the fifty-eight countries will not even achieve universal primary enrolment by 2025 unless recent positive trends accelerate or negative ones are reversed.

Finally, owing to lack of data, projections could not be run for fifty-four countries. Among these are thirteen low-income countries, twelve of them fragile states, that have been identified as having low levels of education development.⁷ The challenge of achieving universal primary enrolment is likely to be particularly difficult in these countries.

Goal 3: learning needs of young people and adults

Most countries have yet to seriously address the challenging tasks that EFA goal 3 entails: meeting the diverse learning needs of young people and adults through organized programmes of education, training and the building of basic skills, life skills and livelihood skills. This is of particular concern as the youth and adult populations in sub-Saharan Africa and in South and West Asia will continue to grow in coming decades (UN Population Division, 2007). These are also the two regions with the lowest adult literacy rates and highest numbers of out-of-school children.

Given the understandable pressure to extend the cycle of basic education in schools and to expand secondary education, there is a clear risk of the disparities between formal and non-formal schooling becoming further accentuated in coming years. Most countries, and especially those in sub-Saharan Africa, and South and West Asia, will need to pay much stronger attention to the inclusion of youth and adults in education through literacy, equivalency, life-skills and livelihood-skills programmes, which are frequently provided outside formal education systems.

Goal 4: adult literacy

The likelihood of achieving the adult literacy target by 2015 was assessed for the 127 countries with sufficient data available.⁸ Of these, 26 had reached levels close to 'universal literacy' (literacy rates above 97%) by the period 1995–2004, most of them in Central and Eastern Europe or Central Asia. By contrast, no country in sub-Saharan Africa, South and West Asia or the Arab States belongs to this category.

Projections were run for the 101 remaining countries. As adult literacy rates are increasing everywhere, a distinction was made between countries progressing rapidly (fast performers) or slowly (slow performers). A target rate representing the achievement of goal 4 by 2015 was computed, corresponding to a halving of the adult illiteracy rates observed over 1995–2004. The resulting targeted literacy rates were compared with projections of adult literacy rates in 2015. Countries likely to achieve the goal have projected rates equal to or above the targeted rates. Table 5.2 summarizes the results:

- Thirty countries (Quadrant I) stand a high chance of achieving the adult literacy target by 2015 as their literacy rate is already relatively high and continues to increase steadily. They include countries from most EFA regions, but particularly Latin America and the Caribbean, and East Asia and the Pacific. Some developed countries, such as Greece, Malta and Portugal, are also included.
- Eighteen countries (Quadrant II) are moving rapidly towards the target but have a low chance of achieving it, mainly due to low starting positions (adult literacy rates well below 80%). All are in the Arab States, South and West Asia or sub-Saharan Africa.
- Twenty-eight countries (Quadrant III), many of them in East Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, the Arab States and sub-Saharan Africa, are at risk of not achieving the target. Despite relatively high current literacy rates, they are moving too slowly towards the goal.
- Twenty-five countries (Quadrant IV) are at serious risk of not reaching the adult literacy target by 2015 due to a combination of low and slowly increasing rates. More than two-thirds of these

Most countries have yet to seriously address EFA goal 3

5. Burundi, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Eritrea, the Gambia, Guinea, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Niger, Nigeria and Zimbabwe.

6. Burundi, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Eritrea, the Niger and Nigeria.

7. Afghanistan,* the Central African Republic,* the Comoros,* the Democratic Republic of the Congo,* Guinea-Bissau,* Haiti,* Liberia,* Nepal, Papua New Guinea,* Sierra Leone,* Solomon Islands,* Somalia* and Sudan.* Asterisks indicate fragile states.

8. Internationally comparable figures on adult literacy are based on conventional measures of literacy, such as self-reporting of the ability to read or write, rather than results of actual tests of literacy skills (see Chapter 2, in particular Box 2.6). Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, the United States and many European countries are excluded from the analysis for lack of conventional literacy data, but most of them are close to 'universal literacy'.

Table 5.2: Country prospects for achieving adult literacy by 2015

Universal literacy achieved <i>(Adult literacy rate ≥97%)</i> 26 countries Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Aruba, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cuba, Estonia, Italy, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mongolia, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Ukraine				
Distance from universal literacy in 1995–2004	Close or in intermediate position (adult literacy rates: 80–96%)	QUADRANT I High chance of achieving the target by 2015 <i>(moving towards the goal, with steady progress)</i> 30 countries Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, China, Congo, Cyprus, Colombia, Costa Rica, Gabon, Greece, Indonesia, Jordan, Kuwait, Macao (China), Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Netherlands Antilles, Palestinian Autonomous Territories, Peru, Portugal, Serbia and Montenegro, Singapore, South Africa, Thailand, TFYR Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zimbabwe	QUADRANT III At risk of not achieving the target by 2015 <i>(moving towards the goal, but progress too slow)</i> 28 countries Bahrain, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cape Verde, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Honduras, Islamic Republic of Iran, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritius, Mexico, Myanmar, Namibia, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Viet Nam	58
	Far (adult literacy rate: <80%)	QUADRANT II Low chance of achieving the target by 2015 <i>(moving towards the goal, with rapid progress)</i> 18 countries Bangladesh, Benin, Burkina Faso, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo, Yemen	QUADRANT IV Serious risk of not achieving the target by 2015 <i>(moving towards the goal, but progress too slow)</i> 25 countries Algeria, Angola, Burundi, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Guatemala, India, Iraq, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Sudan, Swaziland, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia	43
Total		48	53	101
		Fast performers	Slow performers	
Adult literacy rate projected for 2015, extrapolating 1995–2004 trend				

Most countries at risk of not achieving the literacy goal are in sub-Saharan Africa

Not included in the prospects analysis <i>(insufficient or no data)</i> 76 countries	
Afghanistan, Andorra, Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bermuda, Bhutan, British Virgin Islands, Cameroon, Canada, Cayman Islands, Comoros, Cook Islands, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Kiribati, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Monaco, Montserrat, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niue, Norway, Palau, Poland, Republic of Korea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Slovakia, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Tokelau, Turks and Caicos Islands, Tuvalu, United Kingdom, United States, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu	

countries are in sub-Saharan Africa, but the list also includes some countries in Asia (Cambodia, India, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Pakistan) and Latin America (Guatemala and Nicaragua). For these countries, more efforts are needed to provide learning opportunities to adults and to accelerate progress, especially as several have or will have achieved universal primary enrolment, including all those in Asia (other than Pakistan) and Latin America.

The group of countries not included in the analysis because of insufficient data is very mixed. Some in this group are developed countries or countries in transition that are close to achieving 'universal literacy'. Others, including several in sub-Saharan Africa, are likely of concern as regards the expansion of literacy.

Goal 5: gender parity in primary and secondary education

Projections of gender parity in primary and secondary education are possible for 172 countries with sufficient data available for both levels. Of these, 59 had achieved gender parity (defined as a GPI between 0.97 and 1.03) at both primary and secondary level by 2005. Central and Eastern Europe (15 countries), North America and Western Europe (14 countries) and Latin America and the Caribbean (12 countries) together account for nearly 70% of the countries in this group.

The remaining 113 countries missed the 2005 gender parity goal, although a number of them are likely to reach it by 2015 or 2025. Projections summarized in Table 5.3 show that:

- Nineteen countries (light green quadrant) are likely to achieve gender parity in both primary and secondary education by 2015. Many are in the Arab States, and Latin America and the Caribbean. The list also includes a small number of developed countries, such as Finland, Spain and Switzerland.
- Ten countries (yellow quadrant) are likely to reach the gender parity goal at both levels by 2025. Among these are some sub-Saharan African countries (Burkina Faso, the Gambia, Guinea) that have made significant progress in increasing overall access and participation of children in school since 1999, including girls.
- For the remaining eighty-four countries (red quadrant), there exists a risk that gender disparities will remain even in 2025, in either primary or secondary education, or at both levels, if efforts are not strengthened to improve access and participation of both boys and girls in school. In particular:
 - In forty-six countries, disparities are likely to remain in secondary education but not in primary education. These include thirty-four countries that had achieved gender parity in primary education by 2005 and twelve that have a high chance of doing so by 2015 or 2025. In many of these countries (in blue in Table 5.3), gender disparities in school participation favour girls, particularly in upper secondary education. This situation, which requires policy attention (UNESCO, 2005a), is the reason some

developed countries, such as Ireland, Luxembourg and New Zealand, together with several in Latin America and the Caribbean, and East Asia and the Pacific, appear in Table 5.3 as being at risk of not achieving gender parity at secondary level even by 2025.

- In twenty-eight countries, disparities are likely to remain in both primary and secondary education. More than two-thirds of these countries are in the Arab States and sub-Saharan Africa, where increasing access and participation of girls remains a challenge at both levels.
- In twelve countries, mainly in Latin America and the Caribbean, disparities will remain at primary level while gender parity in secondary education had either been achieved by 2005 or is likely of being so in 2015 or 2025.

Goal 6: quality

This Report monitors three dimensions of education quality: learning outcomes as measured by international, regional and national assessments; enabling conditions for teaching and learning, such as instructional time, access to textbooks and a safe, healthy and adequately supplied school environment; and the quantity and quality of the teaching workforce. While it is difficult to extrapolate from existing patterns and trends into the future, the evidence suggests that the issue of quality in education is gaining the attention of many stakeholders worldwide: national governments, international partners, school authorities and parents. Discussions, reports and assessments of education quality have proliferated in recent years.

Despite this growing interest, the accumulated evidence points to the prevalence of weak pupil performance, widespread learning disparities, insufficient instructional time and high dropout rates in many countries, both developed and developing. Disparities in learning outcomes, while having narrowed between girls and boys in many contexts, remain significant among other groups, to the disadvantage of poor, rural, urban slum, marginalized indigenous and minority pupils.

A key element of education quality highlighted in Chapter 2 is the quality and quantity of the teaching workforce. The UIS has projected the number of additional primary school teachers needed between

Access and participation of girls remain challenges in the Arab States and sub-Saharan Africa

Table 5.3: Country prospects for achieving gender parity in primary and secondary education by 2005, 2015 and 2025
(based on past trends, 1991-2005. All countries with GPIs between 0.97 and 1.03 are considered to have achieved parity)

		Gender parity in secondary education				
		Achieved or likely to be achieved in 2005	Likely to be achieved by 2015	Likely to be achieved by 2025	At risk of not being achieved in 2015 or 2025	
Gender parity in primary education	Achieved or likely to be achieved in 2005	Albania, Anguilla, Armenia, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Chile, China, Cook Islands, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominica, Ecuador, Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Mauritius, Myanmar, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Sweden, TFYR Macedonia, United Kingdom, United States, Uzbekistan 59	Bahrain, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Fiji, Finland, Maldives, Mongolia, Palestinian Autonomous Territories, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Emirates 14	Costa Rica, Ghana, Kuwait, Lesotho, Nicaragua, Venezuela 6	Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bermuda, Bulgaria, Colombia, Ireland, Kiribati, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Namibia, Nauru, Netherlands Antilles, New Zealand, Oman, Panama, Philippines, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Suriname, Tunisia, Ukraine, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zimbabwe 32	111
	Likely to be achieved in 2015	El Salvador 1	Saint Lucia, Solomon Islands, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey 4	Guinea 1	Cambodia, Egypt, India, Nepal, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo 7	13
	Likely to be achieved in 2025		Guatemala, Gambia 2	Burkina Faso 1	Benin, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mali, Pakistan, Zambia 5	8
	At risk of not being achieved in 2015 or 2025	Aruba, Cuba, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Viet Nam 4	Cayman Islands, Kenya, Macao (China), South Africa 4	Brazil, Marshall Islands, Portugal, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines 4	Algeria, British Virgin Islands, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Sudan, Swaziland, Tokelau, Tonga, Yemen 28	40
Number of countries	64	24	12	72	172	

Not included in the prospects analysis

(insufficient or no data)

31 countries

Afghanistan, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Central African Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Micronesia, Monaco, Montserrat, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Timor-Leste, Turkmenistan, Turks and Caicos, Tuvalu, United Republic of Tanzania

Notes:

1. In countries whose names are shown in blue, gender disparities at the expense of boys are observed in primary or secondary education.
2. Four countries, among them Cuba, that have achieved gender parity in secondary are at risk of not doing so at primary level, which may seem inconsistent. In the case of Cuba, data available show that while parity was achieved in primary education until 1996, the GPI of GER declined from 0.97 to 0.95 in 2005. This trend in Cuba, along with the situation in the other three countries, requires further investigation.
3. In Australia, enrolment data for upper secondary education include adult education (students over age 25), particularly in pre-vocational/vocational programmes, in which males are in the majority. This explains the high GER (217%) and relatively low GPI (0.90) at this level.

Table 5.4: Primary school teacher needs between 2004 and 2015 by region (millions)

Region	Number of primary school teachers 2004	Additional teachers needed to reach UPE (among 76 countries)	Teachers to fill vacancies due to attrition (6.5%)	Total number of teachers needed
Sub-Saharan Africa	2.4	1.6	2.1	3.8
Arab States	1.8	0.5	1.4	1.8
Central Asia, and Central and Eastern Europe	1.6	0.1	0.8	0.9
East Asia and the Pacific	9.4	0.1	3.9	4.0
South and West Asia	4.4	0.4	3.2	3.6
Latin America and the Caribbean	2.9	0.0	1.6	1.6
North America and Western Europe	3.6	0.1	2.4	2.5
World	26.1	2.7	15.4	18.1

Note: Numbers to fill vacancies are based on a yearly attrition rate set at 6.5% (medium scenario).

Source: UIS (2006c).

2004 and 2015, both to reach UPE and to offset attrition (UIS, 2006c). Overall, the world will need more than 18 million new primary education teachers,⁹ compared with its 2004 stock of 26 million (Table 5.4). Sub-Saharan Africa faces the greatest challenge; the teacher stock will have to increase by two-thirds, from 2.4 to 4 million, if UPE is to be reached. Allowing for attrition, which is compounded by the HIV/AIDS pandemic, sub-Saharan Africa will need 3.8 million new primary education teachers by 2015. Challenges are also significant in East Asia and the Pacific, and in South and West Asia, mainly because of attrition. Countries in the Arab States region also need to make a substantial effort by employing 1.8 million new teachers by 2015. In addition, while increasing the number of teachers is important, providing them with adequate training is also key to universal access to and participation in quality education, and the resources needed to hire, retain and train teachers will be significant.

Financing the EFA goals to 2015

Chapter 4 showed that, following a general increase over the first five years after the Jomtien Conference of 1990, the share of national revenue devoted to education fell back in many countries in the late 1990s. In the five years after the World Education Forum in Dakar in 2000, the share increased again in the majority of countries. Maintaining this upward trend through the next decade will need conscious decisions by governments and donors. This section reviews prospects for increasing financial resources from both sources.

Government expenditures

The main funders of programmes aimed at completing the EFA goals are national governments. The degree to which EFA will be financed depends on (a) the growth of total government expenditure, which, in turn, is strongly influenced by the rate of economic growth; and (b) the share of government expenditure allocated to provide for basic learning needs.

There are both opportunities and challenges. Overall, economic growth rates in low-income countries since Dakar have been higher than in the previous decade and are still accelerating. Table 5.5 shows that per capita income across all low-income countries increased by 4% a year between 2001 and 2005, compared with 1.8% between 1991 and 1995 and 2.2% between 1996 and 2000. The estimate for 2006 and 2007 is even higher, averaging 5.6%. Even if government expenditure only rises in line with the growth of per capita

The main funders of EFA programmes are national governments

9. The projections were made on the basis of a pupil/teacher ratio of 40:1 for countries that were above this benchmark. For countries with pupil/teacher ratios below this, the 2004 value was used as the basis.

Table 5.5: Real per capita GDP^a growth in low-income countries, selected periods (% per year)

	1991–1995	1996–2000	2001–2005	2006*	2007*
World	0.8	2.0	1.5	2.9	2.2
Low-income countries	1.8	2.2	4.0	5.9	5.4
Sub-Saharan Africa	-1.6	1.0	2.4	4.0	4.4
Middle East and North Africa	0.9	2.1	0.4	0.8	-0.6
Europe and Central Asia	-11.3	3.8	6.8	11.5	9.3
East Asia and Pacific	5.4	0.4	3.8	4.7	5.1
South Asia	3.0	3.5	4.7	6.8	5.9
Latin America and Caribbean	-0.3	1.4	0.7	1.8	1.8

a. GDP in constant 2000 US\$.

* Projections.

Source: World Bank (2007d).

The need to expand secondary and tertiary education is being increasingly emphasized

income, the increased resources becoming available each year are significantly higher now than in previous years. In addition, the share of national income that governments have been able to raise has been increasing. In five of seven South Asian countries, total revenue as a share of GDP was higher in 2006 than in 2000 (Asian Development Bank, 2007). In thirty-three of forty-three sub-Saharan African countries the share in 2006 was higher than for 2000–2004 and the unweighted country average increased from 25% to 30% (African Development Bank, 2007).

If both these trends continue, the potential for much higher levels of public expenditure on basic education will exist and the likelihood of recent gains in enrolment being sustained will be greater. But whether this occurs will depend on whether the overall share of government expenditure for education is at least maintained, including the share for basic education. This may not be simple. The need to expand secondary and tertiary education is being increasingly emphasized, partly as a consequence of the larger numbers of primary school graduates for whom there is no immediate employment and partly due to the growing focus on the knowledge economy. Thus, it may be more difficult in the future to maintain the current share for primary education in total education spending. There are two dangers for the EFA agenda. First, while the universalization of primary education is likely to remain a top priority, the focus may be placed on access alone rather than on increased quality if the inputs required for this part of the agenda are squeezed. Second, there may continue to be insufficient resources for ECCE and for literacy and other learning needs of youth and adults.

It might be expected that the countries in the different quadrants in the projections for primary education in Table 5.1 have behaved differently in their financing of education in recent years. To some extent this is the case.

- The average¹⁰ share of education expenditure in GNP in countries with TNERs of 80% and above in 2005 and with rapid expansion of enrolment (Quadrant I) remained constant at 4.1%.
- In countries with similarly high TNERs but insufficient recent progress (Quadrant III), education expenditure as a share of GNP decreased from 4.8% in 1999 to 4.6% in 2005.

- The differences between countries in Quadrants II and IV are clearer. Countries that had a TNER below 80% in 2005 but had been improving significantly (Quadrant II) increased education expenditure as a share of GNP from 3.4% in 1999 to 4.2% in 2005. In countries with slower progress (Quadrant IV) the share decreased, from 5.7% to 5.4%.

It is clear that countries that have made significant progress have tended to increase or maintain their education expenditure as a share of GNP, while in countries where progress has been slower, the share has tended to decrease. Besides the level of resources that governments allocate to education, ways to increase efficiency must be addressed. The institutional context in which public spending takes place requires more attention than it has so far received.¹¹

Donors

Rough estimates of the costs of achieving the EFA goals have been made since 2002, including in previous Reports, with a concentration on the amounts required from donors. The 2007 Report stated that the annual level of external support would need to increase to around US\$9 billion (at 2003 prices) from 2005 to 2015 and that allocating US\$1 billion each for the literacy and early childhood goals would result in an average annual external funding requirement of US\$11 billion. These estimates have covered all low-income countries, irrespective of the extent to which their governments have produced the conditions which would 'trigger' additional support, as described in the Dakar Framework for Action and made more explicit in the Monterrey Consensus. The Monterrey Consensus underlined the importance of ownership, leadership, sound national policies, absorptive capacity and financial management as crucial for more effective aid. At both Dakar and Monterrey, the main role of donors was described as augmenting government expenditure in countries where the political will to achieve EFA was being demonstrated. Donors also have a responsibility, however, to help develop capacity in fragile states. In general, aid effectiveness depends on a partnership with aid recipient countries that are committed to improving education access and participation, and education quality.

The amount of aid to basic education for low-income countries in 2004 and 2005 – an average

10. Weighted average by population.

11. The 2009 Report will address issues related to the governance, management and financing of education.

of US\$3.1 billion a year – is clearly well below the rough estimates of the amount required each year if the EFA goals are to be reached. While there are questions about the current ability of low-income countries as a group to effectively absorb a three- to fourfold increase in aid for basic education, the evidence of several countries where significant amounts of aid have been channelled successfully – including Ethiopia, India, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen and Zambia – suggests that the opportunities for scaling up exist and could be widened. Even if aid for basic education for low-income countries in 2005 had been twice as large as it was, the share in total aid would have been only 8%.

Several donors, particularly those in the European Union, have stated their intention to increase overall aid in the next few years. The OECD-DAC Secretariat has calculated that this could result in

a 60% increase in aid between 2004 and 2010 (OECD-DAC, 2006b). In 2005, there was a large increase in disbursements – 90% of which was for debt relief – but 2006 saw a 5% reduction. A determined effort needs to be made over the next four years if the target is to be reached and declining amounts of debt relief are to be replaced by aid to sectors. If donors do keep their promises to 2010, what might this imply for education and for basic education?

A rough estimate of the amounts of aid that might be allocated to education and to basic education in 2010 can be inferred from the estimated increase in total ODA, assuming initially that the share of sector-allocable aid in total aid is the same in 2010 as in 2004. If the amounts for education increase at the same rate as the amounts for all sectors, i.e. if the share of education in total sector-allocable aid remains constant, bilateral aid to education will

The opportunities for scaling up aid exist and could be widened

Table 5.6: Prospects for bilateral aid to education and basic education in 2010 for all developing countries (commitments)

	Total aid to education (constant 2005 US\$ millions)			Total aid to basic education (constant 2005 US\$ millions)			
	2004		2010	2004		2010	
	Amounts	As a share of total sector-allocable aid (%)	Amounts if education's share remains constant	Amounts	As a share of total sector-allocable aid (%)	Amounts if basic education's share remains constant	Amounts if basic education's share is at least 10%
Australia	116	11	195	77	7	129	174
Austria	84	41	206	4	2	11	51
Belgium	164	21	314	34	5	66	146
Canada	200	12	280	158	10	221	231
Denmark	145	11	155	94	7	100	145
Finland	79	23	178	52	15	118	118
France	1 578	41	2 635	321	8	536	649
Germany	1 103	26	2 273	130	3	269	888
Greece	23	17	59	3	2	7	36
Ireland	59	18	110	38	12	70	70
Italy	86	20	323	39	9	148	163
Japan	1 238	15	1 659	298	4	399	1 092
Luxembourg	23	23	32	11	11	16	16
Netherlands	419	19	507	274	12	331	331
New Zealand	50	38	68	14	11	19	19
Norway	165	14	216	117	10	153	153
Portugal	56	31	50	6	4	6	16
Spain	126	13	358	45	5	128	272
Sweden	85	8	125	68	6	101	162
Switzerland	46	6	52	26	3	30	90
United Kingdom	956	25	1 769	830	22	1 536	1 536
United States	600	3	732	530	3	647	2 275
Total DAC countries	7 401	14	12 296	3 169	6	5 041	8 633

Notes: Projections based on OECD-DAC Secretariat simulation of DAC members' net ODA disbursements volume in 2010 (OECD-DAC, 2006b). It was assumed that commitments would grow at the same rate as disbursements and that the share of aid going to sectors would remain constant. The assumption made for the last column was that, if the share of basic education in a given donor's total aid to sectors was less than 10% in 2004, it would rise to 10%; or, if the share was already above 10%, it would remain constant.

Total aid to basic education could reach US\$10 billion in 2010 only if pledges are met and bilateral donors reset their priorities

grow by an average of 7% a year between 2004 and 2010, reaching US\$12.3 billion (Table 5.6). Similarly, if the priority given to basic education compared with all other sectors remains the same, annual bilateral aid to basic education will reach US\$5 billion by 2010.

The assumption underlying these results is that aid to sectors will grow at the same rate as total ODA. If proportionally more of the overall amount is used to provide additional aid to sectors, which might occur as the share of debt relief in total ODA declines, future amounts of aid to education and to basic education may be even higher. Another factor that will directly affect the amount of aid available for basic education in 2010 is the priority bilateral donors give it. Several donors allocate to basic education less than 10% of their aid to sectors. If all donors were to allocate 10%, and those currently allocating more were to maintain their allocations, bilateral aid to basic education would grow by 15% annually between 2004 and 2010, reaching US\$8.6 billion. This is possible. None of the three largest donors of sector-allocable aid, Germany, Japan and the United States, allocated more than 4% to basic education in 2004. These donors could increase the share of education in their total aid (especially the United States) or the share of basic education in their total allocation to the education sector (especially Germany and Japan), or both.

Multilateral aid to basic education accounted for one-third of total aid to basic education in 2004 and 2005, the vast bulk of it from the European Commission and the World Bank's International Development Association, which together contributed one-quarter of total aid to basic education. Hence, any changes in the amounts these organizations allocate to basic education in the next few years will be crucial. At a high-level meeting in Brussels in May 2007 (European Commission, 2007), the Commission announced that it estimated its direct aid for education in the new programming cycle would amount to €1.7 billion over five years, or not quite US\$500 million a year. The IDA commitments for education in the poorest countries are US\$1.5 billion in 2007 and at least that much in 2008. Neither pledge, however, provides details as to the share for basic education, though both donors are active supporters of the Fast Track Initiative (FTI). If they maintain the priority they now give to basic levels, about half the amounts mentioned, or around US\$1 billion a year, will likely be for basic education. Adding this to the

US\$8.6 billion from bilateral donors would bring total aid to basic education to almost US\$10 billion in 2010, if all bilateral donors increased their share of basic education in sector aid to at least 10%.

The distribution of these increased levels of aid for basic education is also of great importance. Chapter 4 underlined that most aid to the basic levels of education is in fact allocated to primary education. Less than 2% of aid to basic education goes to pre-primary education and evidence shows donors give very little priority to literacy programmes for youth and adults (UNESCO, 2005a). As an essential part of the EFA agenda, it will be important for donors to include ECCE along with literacy and other basic education programmes for youth and adults in their funding.

While estimates of financing gaps at global level are important, improving the forms of aid, creating effective channels for delivering it to the countries most in need and capable of using it, and reducing the constraints that currently limit its impact are also important. These points are discussed below.

Forms of aid

Aid to education needs to be better integrated into wider public expenditure strategies and managed through improved country processes. Where such 'alignment' exists, donor efforts will likely be harmonized. Where it does not, donors need to coordinate their activities, including missions and reporting requirements. In addition, aid could be used more effectively if it were more predictable and long term, allowing finance ministers to make decisions, such as over the hiring of teachers, with an expectation of financial sustainability. The European Commission with its MDG contracts and the United States with its Millennium Challenge Account are experimenting with such an approach; it is also implicit in the United Kingdom's encouragement of ten-year education sector plans.

Another major development since Dakar has been the strengthening of the Fast Track Initiative, described in Chapter 4. The FTI is meant to work in two ways: first, donors collectively align their support to primary education through the endorsement of country sector plans; second, donors directly contribute to the Catalytic Fund, from which programmes can be financed in countries where there are few active donors. For donors, an advantage of allocating resources to the FTI Catalytic Fund, rather than to multilateral

institutions, is that they can be more involved in the governance of the aid programme. Gradually, the FTI has grown stronger and increased its operations and credibility. However, the number of donors contributing meaningful amounts to the Catalytic Fund remains low; more need to sign up if there is to be progress in further matching aid flows with basic education needs across all low-income countries.

Geographic distribution of aid

What do the projections imply for the future distribution of aid across countries for EFA? The quadrant analysis of the projections for primary education in Table 5.1 and the aid data in the annex provide the basis for discussing the future geographic distribution of aid for basic education.

- The twenty-eight countries with relatively high TNERs that are identified as likely to attain universal primary enrolment (Quadrant I) are very mixed in terms of income groups. Some are middle-income countries such as Brazil, Bulgaria and Ukraine, which receive only small amounts of aid for primary education. The seven low-income countries (Benin, India, Kyrgyzstan, Madagascar, Malawi, Myanmar and Zambia) receive more aid for primary education. Three of the seven have had their plans endorsed by the FTI and all the others but Myanmar expect to by 2008, which should help ensure a continuation of aid to these countries at current levels.
- Most of the thirty-three countries with TNERs over 80% but limited recent progress (Quadrant III) are middle-income and, in general, capable of reversing recent trends by devoting more government expenditure to primary education. Possible exceptions are countries such as Mongolia and the Palestinian Autonomous Territories, where, in addition to internal problems, external factors have led to a reversal of education development. Some low-income countries in this group (including the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Togo, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe) will continue to need external financing. In general, however, this group would not appear to be of high priority for future aid.
- The thirty-two low-income countries identified as having the lowest levels of education development¹² need to be given priority for aid allocations over the next decade, providing their governments give priority to basic learning needs in their own expenditure and can demonstrate the institutional capacity to use aid effectively. Twenty of the thirty-two are fragile states. Table 5.7 describes the current situation regarding aid to basic education for these countries. Overall, this group of countries received one-third of total aid to basic education in 2004–2005, roughly the same as before Dakar. While the situation varies at country level, it appears this group has received no increased focus in the past few years. That situation may be changing, however. Fifteen out of the thirty-two countries have had their plans endorsed by the FTI (Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, the Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Yemen), and nine (Burundi, Chad, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Nigeria, Pakistan and Solomon Islands) are expected to receive endorsement by 2008. A key question is thus how to channel aid to the eight remaining countries, all but one of which are fragile states.
- Individually, it is worth noting that six of the thirty-two countries (Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia, Nigeria, Somalia and Sudan) received below-average amounts of aid to basic education per primary school-age child. All either lack sufficient information for the projection or are among the nine countries with the least prospect of achieving UPE (Quadrant IV). Differences between their circumstances preclude any overall recommendation regarding future aid. At the other extreme, twelve countries received well above the average per child for all developing countries: Afghanistan, Burkina Faso, the Comoros, Eritrea, the Gambia, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, the Niger, Senegal, Solomon Islands and Yemen. All, apart from Afghanistan, the Comoros and Solomon Islands, are in the group of countries that have made rapid progress (Quadrant II). The case for continuing to allocate significant amounts of aid to all countries in this group is very strong indeed.
- In considering aid flows in the future, it is also instructive to see in which countries the amount of aid per school-age child decreased between 1999–2000 and 2004–2005. Among the thirty-two low-income countries identified as having the greatest needs, the amount declined slightly in the Central African Republic, Ghana, Guinea and Haiti, and significantly in Côte d'Ivoire, the Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda and Senegal.

A key question is how to channel aid to fragile states

12. These are the nineteen low-income countries with TNERs below 80% (quadrants II and IV) plus thirteen countries with insufficient data for projection of movement towards UPE but identified as having low levels of education development. These two groups comprise Afghanistan,* Burkina Faso, Burundi,* the Central African Republic,* Chad,* the Comoros,* Côte d'Ivoire,* the Democratic Republic of the Congo,* Eritrea,* Ethiopia, the Gambia,* Ghana, Guinea,* Guinea-Bissau,* Haiti,* Kenya, Liberia,* Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nepal, the Niger,* Nigeria,* Pakistan, Papua New Guinea,* Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone,* Solomon Islands,* Somalia,* Sudan* and Yemen. Asterisks indicate fragile states.

Table 5.7: Allocation of aid for basic education to the low-income countries most at risk of not achieving UPE, 1999–2000 and 2004–2005

	Year of FTI endorsement	Total aid to basic education				Total aid to basic education per primary school-age child	
		Constant 2005 US\$ millions		Country's share in total aid to basic education (%)		Constant 2005 US\$ millions	
		1999–2000 annual average	2004–2005 annual average	1999–2000 annual average	2004–2005 annual average	1999–2000 annual average	2004–2005 annual average
Afghanistan	no	2	162	0.1	3.7	0	33
Burkina Faso	2002	35	111	1.3	2.5	17	51
Burundi	pending 2007	2	9	0.1	0.2	2	8
C. A. R.	no	7	6	0.2	0.1	11	9
Chad	pending 2007	11	13	0.4	0.3	8	8
Comoros	no	3	6	0.1	0.1	27	47
Côte d'Ivoire	no	45	8	1.6	0.2	17	3
D. R. Congo	expected 2008	6	48	0.2	1.1	1	5
Eritrea	expected 2008	27	41	1.0	0.9	53	69
Ethiopia	2004	25	70	0.9	1.6	2	8
Gambia	2003	9	5	0.3	0.1	48	25
Ghana	2004	86	70	3.1	1.6	28	21
Guinea	2002	19	17	0.7	0.4	15	11
Guinea-Bissau	pending 2007	5	4	0.2	0.1	26	16
Haiti	pending 2007	18	15	0.6	0.4	14	12
Kenya	2005	39	52	1.4	1.2	6	10
Liberia	2007	1	3	0.0	0.1	3	6
Mali	2006	44	67	1.6	1.5	24	30
Mauritania	2002	11	17	0.4	0.4	25	36
Mozambique	2003	81	129	3.0	2.9	32	34
Nepal	no	47	100	1.7	2.3	15	28
Niger	2002	13	60	0.5	1.4	7	27
Nigeria	expected 2008	40	32	1.5	0.7	2	2
Pakistan	expected 2008	9	169	0.3	3.9	0	9
Papua New Guinea	no	48	31	1.7	0.7	67	33
Rwanda	2006	36	14	1.3	0.3	29	10
Senegal	2006	75	44	2.7	1.0	48	24
Sierra Leone	2007	11	14	0.4	0.3	16	17
Solomon Islands	pending 2007	4	14	0.1	0.3	48	184
Somalia	no	2	8	0.1	0.2	1	6
Sudan	no	5	21	0.2	0.5	1	4
Yemen	2003	48	110	1.8	2.5	15	31
Total		810	1 457	29.4	33.3
All developing countries		2 756	4 373	100.0	100.0	5	8

Note: FTI status as of August 2007.

Sources: Annex, Aid Table 4; FTI Secretariat, 2007.

For many countries, aid to primary education will continue to be needed to sustain and improve the quality of primary schooling

This analysis based on UPE prospects can be usefully complemented by an analysis of progress towards the literacy goal. Among the countries with low primary enrolment that are moving rapidly towards UPE, nine of the fourteen countries for which data are sufficient are doing so in parallel with rapid progress towards the literacy goal. They are low-income countries, mostly in sub-Saharan Africa: Burkina Faso, Chad, Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Mozambique, the Niger, Senegal and Yemen. This

further strengthens the case for continuous support to them. On the other hand, some countries that have achieved UPE (Algeria, Cambodia, Egypt, Tunisia and the United Republic of Tanzania) or will achieve it by 2015 (Guatemala, Madagascar, Nicaragua and Zambia) are at serious risk of not achieving the literacy goal by 2015. For many of these countries, aid to primary education will continue to be needed to sustain and improve the quality of primary schooling. In others, aid for

literacy programmes for youth and adults might help accelerate progress towards the literacy goal. These examples underline the need in some countries for better balance in distribution of aid to basic education, among primary education, early childhood programmes and learning programmes for youth and adults.

Chapter 4 showed that the aid policies of bilateral donors reflected diverse motives, not only poverty alleviation in the poorest countries, and that, this being so, the distribution of aid overall or by sector is unlikely to correspond directly to need. Multilateral agencies, such as the World Bank and regional development banks, are more likely to allocate concessional aid according to need. In respect of efforts to increase the likelihood that aid resources allocated outside of bilateral programmes are directed to specified priorities, the growing amount allocated by the FTI through the Catalytic Fund is encouraging but remains limited.

Constraints on increasing aid for basic education

In addition to the overall focus on a relatively small number of countries by the bilateral donors and the limited amounts allocated to the FTI for countries with few donors, there are several other constraints to increasing the global amount of aid to basic education. Many concern countries' capacities to absorb aid effectively and they are of two types. The first, which is of limited applicability to most low-income countries, relates to arguments that increased aid could destabilize the macro-economic environment. The second and more important involves the management of increases in aid and the effectiveness of aid use (Rose, 2007). This concern is greatest for fragile states, including conflict and post-conflict countries, where there may be a general lack of infrastructure and orderly processes and where governments have a limited ability to deliver services. In such cases it is difficult to move large amounts of resources, and innovative financing mechanisms and funding channels need to be developed to provide the basis for further support. It is estimated that 37% of the world's out-of-school children live in fragile states, many of them in conflict and post-conflict settings.

Limits on the ability to make effective use of large amounts of aid, however, are not confined to conflict and post-conflict countries. The World Bank's recent review of its support for primary education since 1990 showed that programmes

aimed at institutional development have had the lowest success rate (World Bank Independent Evaluation Group, 2006b). The implication, however, is that these efforts should be improved, not reduced. As overall enrolment rates rise, the difficulty of achieving further increases by attracting hard-to-reach children intensifies, necessitating more innovative approaches, while interventions to improve quality and learning achievement require even greater management capacity. Appropriate aid for capacity development (not traditional technical assistance) must thus be a very high priority if EFA is to be achieved.

In addition, donors face the same questions as governments when it comes to the relative priority to give basic education within the overall education sector. Evidence favouring arguments for shifting support towards post-primary education is growing. A recent indication is the World Bank's Africa Action Plan, which emphasizes skills development and includes only secondary and tertiary education in the set of monitorable indicators for education. This shift is a further challenge for national and international organizations working to ensure that the basic learning needs of all are met.

Towards an agenda

Enormous strides have been made towards achieving universal enrolment and gender parity at the primary level, and aid has demonstrably supported effective national efforts, as the diverse examples of Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, India, Mozambique, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen and Zambia demonstrate. If this momentum is to be maintained and even accelerated, if it is to be complemented by progress towards the other EFA goals of quality, literacy, early childhood and the learning needs of youth and adults, and if it is to be extended to all countries, action is needed by all stakeholders at the global level and by national governments, civil society and donors at the country level.

Global priorities

All stakeholders need to ensure that:

- 1) *EFA remains a priority on the global agenda* in the face of emerging global issues such as climate change and public health. It is critical to keep up broad advocacy for EFA and to show that

As overall enrolment rates rise, the difficulty of attracting hard-to-reach children intensifies, necessitating more innovative approaches

The EFA movement should take account of the trend towards an extended vision of basic education in the formal sector

it can also contribute in important ways to these other dominant issues.

- 2) *EFA as a whole is the focus and not just UPE.* Since the MDGs include only UPE and gender parity, and since primary enrolment has so far been the area of greatest success, there is a danger of focusing exclusively on this one goal.
- 3) *Policy and implementation emphasize five key factors – inclusion, literacy, quality, capacity development and finance.*
 - a) *Inclusion* means encompassing: the marginalized and disadvantaged, whether they be poor, rural and urban slum residents, ethnic and linguistic minorities, or the disabled; all age groups, from early childhood (ECCE) to adults (especially literacy); and girls and women, particularly as the 2005 gender parity goal has been missed. It is essential not to write this goal off but rather to achieve it on a new timetable.
 - b) *Literacy* is, of course, part of inclusion, but must be singled out separately as it is the most neglected goal and the world suffers the shame of having about one in five adults still not literate, despite the notable example of China.
 - c) *Quality* is now receiving increasing priority but remains a major challenge everywhere, especially in low-income countries.
 - d) *Capacity development*, increasingly the obstacle to achieving the full, challenging EFA agenda, is especially an issue as attention turns from broad system expansion alone to encompass inclusion, literacy and quality.
 - e) *Finance* is a key element when governments face the need to increase national expenditure on EFA as well as on secondary and higher education, and when aid for basic education in low-income countries must be raised to at least US\$11 billion a year to achieve EFA.
- 4) *More focus is put on sub-Saharan Africa and on fragile states*, the region and group of countries least likely to achieve the goals by 2015 or even 2025 on present trends, though other low-income countries must not be neglected.

- 5) *The international architecture is made more effective*, encompassing all of EFA and integrating the various partial initiatives, with a focus on the five priorities above.

Also, with many countries extending the concept of basic education beyond primary level, the EFA agenda is moving beyond a strict interpretation of the six goals, as reflected by the increased coverage of secondary education in this Report. While it may not be appropriate to redefine the EFA goals formally, the EFA movement can and should take account of the trend towards an extended vision of basic education in the formal sector.

National governments

National governments must focus on the global priorities, appropriately adjusted to each country's individual circumstances. In effect, this means reaffirming the twelve strategies in the Dakar Framework for Action:

- 1) *All of EFA* – Governments must take full responsibility for ECCE, quality, adult literacy and the learning needs of youth and adults, as well as for universal primary education. This may not mean delivering all necessary services through the public sector but it certainly means taking public responsibility and assuring adequate financing, as envisaged at Dakar. In particular, it is important for governments to recognize, as Chapter 3 showed, that there is not necessarily a trade-off between access and quality but that the two can be mutually reinforcing.
- 2) *Inclusion* of the poorest and most marginalized children, youth and adults, by:
 - a) ensuring that all children, particularly the marginalized and disadvantaged, have access to good ECCE programmes;
 - b) expanding the physical infrastructure of the basic education system in rural and disadvantaged urban areas, providing mechanisms for teachers to work in these areas and improving their working conditions;
 - c) eliminating school fees through a well-planned and well-managed process to ensure that schools are adequately prepared to deal with increases in enrolment and reductions in school income;

- d) providing financial support such as scholarships, cash or in-kind transfers to households, appropriately targeted;
 - e) taking measures to alleviate the need for child labour and allowing for flexible schooling, non-formal equivalency courses and bridging courses to provide for the learning needs of working children and youth;
 - f) sustaining efforts to assure gender parity, including improving girls' access to and retention in primary and secondary education and addressing the emerging boys' issues at secondary level;
 - g) promoting inclusive education for the disabled, indigenous people and other disadvantaged groups;
 - h) promoting a great diversity of youth and adult education programmes through legislation, public funding arrangements and policies, such as regulation and oversight of the non-state sector and bridges between non-formal and formal education;
 - i) developing constructive partnerships between governments and the non-state sector to increase access to quality education.
- 3) *Literacy* – Governments need to step up their efforts on adult literacy through inclusion and quality in primary and lower secondary school and boldly expanding adequately staffed and funded literacy programmes for youth and adults that harness all the different forms of modern media. Policies should be instituted to promote media and publishing, and to encourage reading in schools, the home and the workplace.
- 4) *Quality* – Governments must ensure that priority is placed on pupils mastering basic skills and competences, with particular attention to:
- a) making sure there are enough trained teachers and deploying them appropriately throughout the country;
 - b) enhancing the professionalism and motivation of teachers by providing ongoing professional development;
- c) creating safe and healthy learning environments by tackling violence, particularly against girls and women, and providing health programmes, including deworming and nutrition;
 - d) maximizing *quality* school time in which teachers and pupils are actively engaged in learning activities, notably by creating administrative supports for teachers' presence in the classroom, ensuring that children arrive at school ready to learn and embracing multilingualism, particularly recognizing the importance of mother tongue instruction in the first years of school, among other measures;
 - e) ensuring that curricula are inclusive and relevant, and that they incorporate HIV/AIDS education, among other measures;
 - f) promoting gender equality through teacher training, gender-sensitive curricula and textbooks, and ensuring that there are female teachers in countries and areas with low enrolment of girls;
 - g) ensuring that there are sufficient learning resources, especially textbooks, for teachers and students to use.
- 5) *Capacity development* – In addition to training teachers, governments need to step up their efforts to:
- a) improve and make better use of the national assessments that are being introduced in growing numbers;
 - b) develop management capacity at all levels of government – not just the national level – by paying attention to staff training as well as organizational and institutional structures;
 - c) improve the timeliness and coverage of the statistics used to formulate policy and monitor progress;
 - d) coordinate complex multisectoral and multiministry programmes such as ECCE and adult literacy, including with the NGOs that often deliver such programmes;
 - e) formally engage civil society in EFA policy formulation, implementation and monitoring.

Governments must make sure there are enough trained teachers and deploy them appropriately throughout the country

Public spending on EFA must be maintained and increased where necessary

6) *Finance* – National governments must maintain public spending on EFA and, indeed, increase it where necessary. It is critical to ensure that pressure from other priorities does not reduce EFA spending to the minimum necessary for primary school access. Funding is essential for:

- a) inclusion, with unit costs likely to rise for enrolling the most disadvantaged and marginalized (often in remote areas or requiring special attention such as the disabled or linguistic minorities);
- b) the expansion of ECCE and literacy, so far neglected both financially and as policy priorities;
- c) quality, especially as regards teachers and their training and the provision of sufficient textbooks for both teachers and students;
- d) capacity development, including for statistical systems and staff training, which are often underfunded.

Civil society

Civil society organizations (CSOs), a vital component of the compact to achieve EFA, have grown in numbers and influence since Dakar. There is a need for:

- a) strong and vibrant CSOs that enable citizens to advocate for change and hold government and the international community to account;
- b) consistent, regular and timely engagement between CSOs and national governments in education policy formulation, implementation and monitoring;
- c) training in education policy analysis and finance to enable CSOs to take on the challenging role envisaged at Dakar more effectively.

Donors and international agencies

Both bilateral and multilateral agencies urgently need to increase the amount of aid and deploy it differently. Measure should be taken to:

- a) immediately reverse the decreases in aid to education and basic education of 2005, and increase aid to basic education in low-income countries to meet the annual external financing need of US\$11 billion, as soon as possible and no later than 2010;
- b) increase the priority given to basic education compared with other levels, particularly higher education;
- c) raise to at least 10% the share of basic education in bilateral sectoral aid and further increase multilateral aid for basic education;
- d) within aid to basic education, allocate more to early childhood programmes, literacy, other programmes for youth and adults, and capacity development;
- e) improve the geographic distribution of aid to more closely reflect needs, involving a particular focus on sub-Saharan Africa, on fragile states and on increased participation in and support for the FTI Catalytic Fund.

Improving the delivery of aid requires more explicit attention to aligning and harmonizing aid behind country-led education sector plans, as stated in the Paris Declaration. This requires:

- a) further aligning all programmes, whatever their financing modalities, with government programmes, including through the FTI process and other sectorwide approaches;
- b) making longer-term commitments so that aid for basic education is more predictable and ministers of finance can approve major policy initiatives, such as hiring more teachers, in the knowledge that sustainable financing is in place;

- c) working with governments to improve their capacity to absorb larger amounts of aid at all levels of service delivery and improving aid in support of capacity development;
- d) reducing the transaction costs governments face in managing multiple aid agency partners, multiple aid missions and multiple reporting requirements.

Increasing the quantity and quality of aid requires joint and integrated efforts of all international partners including major multilateral and bilateral agencies, and in particular UNESCO and the other Dakar convening agencies (UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF and the World Bank). It is vital that such efforts fully involve developing country governments and civil society.

Will we make it?

The evidence since Dakar is clear – determined national governments have made much progress in all regions, and increased aid aligned to national efforts has demonstrably worked to support this progress. We must maintain this momentum – and accelerate it if all the goals are to be met. Time is short. Only if all stakeholders now embrace and maintain a relentless focus on EFA as a whole, rallying around the key elements of inclusion, literacy, quality, capacity development and finance, will the right to education at every age be fulfilled. ■

The evidence since Dakar is clear: determined national governments have made much progress, supported by aid