Target for 2030: lifelong quality education for all

The Education 2030 Framework for Action was adopted in Paris on 4 November 2015, concurrently with the 38th UNESCO General Conference. It embodies the commitments made by the Member States, civil society and international organisations at the World Education Forum held in Incheon, Republic of Korea, on 19-22 May 2015.

Education is reaffirmed as a fundamental right and key factor for employment, development and poverty reduction. And the international community has set itself a new more ambitious programme for 2030, namely ‘to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all’.

The Pôle de Dakar of the International Institute for Educational Planning, which was initially established as a follow-up to the 2000 Dakar Forum to support African countries draw up their education policy, welcomes this renewed commitment of the international community. The Pôle de Dakar will continue to work with the various entities of UNESCO, the technical and financial partners and, above all, national governments to support the world movement for education, by playing a pivotal role in the analysis and planning of education policies in Africa.

Our services to African countries are very much part of this endeavour and include proposals for support from early childhood provision to higher education but with growing emphasis on quality. And the Platform for Expertise in Vocational Training, which was set up within our entity in November 2015, means that the question of matching skills to the labour market will also be an active component of our work with its sights firmly set on 2030.

Guillaume Husson
IIIEP Pôle de Dakar Coordinator
Launch of the Pefop: Platform for Expertise in Vocational Training

The inaugural workshop of the Platform for Expertise in Vocational Training (Pefop) at the IIEP Pôle de Dakar was attended by almost 100 national and international senior officials in Dakar on 2-3 November 2015. The Pefop is a platform intended to support the implementation of vocational training reform policies on the African continent. It offers non-material support to public and private players involved in putting vocational training policies into practice.

Vocational training is not widely developed in Africa. On average, it accounts for less than 10% of students enrolled in secondary education, while under 15% of the working population possess a formal vocational qualification.

In a first phase, direct support for reform concerns four countries, namely Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Mauritania and Senegal. This support will concentrate on five priority action focal points: i) public-private partnership, ii) steering by economic demand, iii) validation of skills processes, iv) equity and access, v) sustainable long-term funding. At the same time, a broader network of countries and stakeholders involved in implementing vocational training policies in Africa is being developed to contribute to the promotion of better practice. The Pefop receives funding from the French Agency for Development.

First attainments from the project to improve data analysis concerning public funding of education in Zimbabwe

Launched at the end of 2013 thanks to the Global Partnership for Education under its global and regional activities programme, the project to improve the analysis of data on funding in education supports eight countries (five in Africa and three in Asia) in developing tools for collection and evaluation. The aim is to achieve better financial planning of education policies and full compatibility of processing methodologies.

The Pôle de Dakar is supporting in particular activities concerned with public funding of education in Zimbabwe. And the results are already apparent. During the mission to present them in September 2015, Zimbabwe national officials were in a position to provide a full and detailed report on public expenditure in the education and training sector, and to analyse its productivity and equity. They were thus able to conduct the session and present the methodology and policy implications to the Minister of Primary and Secondary Education.

The project should be completed in June 2016 with the production of an international guide to methodology for implementing national education accounts.
Early childhood development in West and Central Africa: encouraging early-learning activities at home

Only 60% of children aged 3-4 are developing soundly in West and Central Africa, according to the latest IIEP Pôle de Dakar analytical document. Based on household surveys of eight countries in the sub-region, the study shows that children too often grow up in particularly harsh socio-economic environments affected by alarming levels of poverty and insecure health and social environments. Furthermore, the early learning context is not particularly stimulating, as is clear from the general shortage of books or toys and the weak level of adult involvement in children’s learning. These conditions impair not just the ‘good development’ of children, viewed here in terms of early numeracy and reading ability, but their physical and socio-emotional development, as well as the learning abilities of children aged 36 to 59 months.

Strong variations have also been highlighted by the study. While virtually all children have appropriate levels of motor development, a third of them have inadequate levels of socio-emotional development, and only 25% have barely satisfactory ability in early numeracy or reading. Disparities between countries are also marked with very disturbing results for Chad (33% of children whose development is reportedly ‘on track’), the Democratic Republic of the Congo (49%) and Sierra Leone (53%). The level of household wealth is especially discriminating: 77% of children from the wealthiest households have a satisfactory level of development compared to 48% of those from the poorest.

According to the surveys, only a third of children have access to preschool activities. Yet access to an early learning programme has a marked impact on children’s development, greater than that of household wealth or mothers’ education. Increasing their access to preschool provision should thus be encouraged by reducing the financial burden on the poorest households, and through cost-free measures or cheaper community approaches. Furthermore, access to preschool activity has compensatory effects from the standpoint of equity. Children from the poorest households but who benefit from a protective family environment and participate in early learning activities achieve a level of development at the age of three that is 40% higher than for those from wealthy households displaying other risk factors.

Action from the earliest possible age as lagging development is difficult to remedy

Finally, it is hard to remedy lagging development in children. The developmental level of those aged 59 months who are exposed to all risk factors is lower than the average level for all children aged 36 months. It is therefore vital to act early. Too many households in the region still lack a firm grasp of the basic habits conducive to learning, health, hygiene and nutrition, which will ensure the optimal development of their children. Yet early stimulation of learning in the home has the same positive effects at very little cost, as around half of those acquired in preschool provision. This gain is similar to the benefits of the level of wealth, hinting at the possibility of compensating for an insecure economic environment by improving parental practices. Parental activities to support children’s learning and its stimulation from the earliest possible age are thus a priority concern in pursuing an effective, equitable and realistic early childhood development policy, and should be actively promoted in a context where preschool provision will take time to become widespread.
Identifying education policy goals inevitably means coming to terms with budgetary parameters. This involves identifying, with respect to a prescribed budget, what goals are achievable and what possible means of achieving them should be adopted. Trade-offs in education policy are based on this process of weighing various scenarios that focus on the aims of the education sector. This means pinpointing the needs of each educational level – from early childhood to higher education – and estimating their implicit costs. Such needs assessment and education policy option cost estimates are central to action taken by IIEP Pôle de Dakar staff in support of national staff teams. This action is contingent on data specifics: for example, to achieve a given level of sectoral coverage – say, 100% of children enrolled in primary schools – how many schools will have to be built and how many teachers recruited, how much will be needed in terms of teaching and play facilities, and how many administrative staff should be employed? And what level of financial resources, therefore, will be required to achieve these education policy goals?

In practice, this needs assessment exercise is based on a financial simulation model of main education system indicators. The model may contain several hundred possible options and objectives, such as average weekly amounts of teaching time (in hours), average class sizes, percentage enrolments in private education, and numbers of grant-holders. It focuses on targets of this kind which are discussed and eventually embodied in future education policy.

**Transition difficulties from theory to practice**

To understand the trade-off process, consider an imaginary example of policy prioritisation. A government wishes to set at 50% the proportion of children receiving pre-school education, although no service of this kind yet exists in the country concerned. The first data item required is the number of children in the age group eligible for such provision. If the number is found to be one million, the facilities to cater for 500,000 children will be needed. Various scenarios for achieving this policy goal will then be defined and quantified, in terms of class size, the status of child educators, types of classroom construction, and the provision of teaching equipment, etc.

For example, issues regarding standards and forms of construction have a direct bearing on average unit costs in school infrastructure. With the same budget, it will not be possible to build the same number of classrooms in a permanent structure as in unbaked clay, and thus cater to the same number of pupils. The construction method also affects costs, according to whether the government is the contracting authority or delegates this responsibility to a partner. Finally, it is vital to check the physical sustainability of the preferred scenario. Even where the necessary financial resources are available, the ability of countries to develop new infrastructures has to be taken into account.

The average pay of child educators is also a key issue regarding both policy and the financial sustainability of the model. Yet in reality, legislation governs the wages of government employees (with respect to categories and indexes) and the ministry may not have any room for manoeuvre in the matter. For this reason, the advice may be to regard teacher pay levels as an underlying concern rather than a policy objective. For example, a country experiencing strong growth may be expected to raise the salary index of its government-paid education staff.

In line with this reasoning, a key variable affecting all concerns at stake is the pupil/teaching staff ratio. Achieving smaller classes means employing more teachers, thus leaving a smaller budget earmarked for other expenditures (on educational and administrative necessities, etc.). The trend, therefore, is towards a ratio consistent with financial sustainability and the care necessary to ensure the quality of education, given that oversize classes result in poor quality provision. Yet, the pupil/teacher ratio is one of the most delicate issues in a trade-off. It is important to fix a rela-
tively competitive salary level to attract quality teachers but also one that enables the recruitment of enough teachers to achieve acceptable ratios without compromising attainment standards. If these two needs are not reconciled, the system will tend to regulate itself, either through the pupil/teacher ratio as it moves upwards, or through the recruitment of community teachers paid directly by parents (to compensate for the lack of government-paid teachers). In the long term, the effects may be highly problematic.

**An exercise in financial but also political sustainability**

Technical and financial questions of this kind continually arise in the course of education policy trade-offs. However, technical experts are not the sole variable in the discovery of solutions. On the contrary, the political dimension is central to any decision. For example, if a country with a 60% completion rate in primary education is determined to reach 100% and the government is politically committed to this target, 100% becomes a non-negotiable objective. One response here may be to postpone its achievement and set a target date compatible with the resources at hand, but the political goal is always a government responsibility.

The country makes its own decisions regarding the model, and endorses its own scenario for achieving the results of future education policy. It is the government that stakes its credibility on the options selected and the realism of its policy aims will be instrumental in determining the sustainability of the model.

**TRADE-OFF BETWEEN STATE SECTORS OF INTERVENTION**

The trade-off between education policy scenarios is a totally different exercise from the trade-off underlying the total state budget, which is known as an inter-sectoral trade-off. This corresponds to the commitment of the government to allocate a certain level of its budget to the various sectors of state intervention, such as health, education and defence. It is managed by the authority responsible for budget programming, usually the ministry of finance. This stage results in commitment to a budget earmarked for the education sector, generally over a 10-15-year period. On average, in Africa, the operational budget allocated to education is 22% of current state expenditure, with strong variations, ranging for example from 37% in Sao Tomé and Principe to 6% in South Sudan.
It was our pleasure to welcome you to Dakar on 17-25 September 2015 for a week’s work on Burundian Education Country Status Report (CSR). This is the third such diagnosis carried out with IIEP Pôle de Dakar support. What led you to work again with our institution?

Burundi received support from the technical partners during two previous analyses in 2005 and 2011. The Pôle de Dakar was especially active in the second of them, during which a sectoral plan for education up to 2020 was drawn up. In order to take stock of progress with this plan and identify the challenges still to be met, we have sought to update our diagnosis. Furthermore, the country was seeking to use this process to strengthen capacities in the national staff team. Given the outcome of our previous cooperation with the Pôle de Dakar, as well as its twofold expertise in sectoral analysis and education system management training, it was natural that we should turn to it.

During the previous exercises, have you observed limits to the scope of CSR diagnosis and what steps have been taken to make the most of the present exercise?

The main challenge to the analysis is its appropriation. Appropriation of the results to assist in carrying out the reforms, and appropriation of the method so as to be able to repeat the exercise. This aspect was inadequately addressed on the first two occasions. In 2005, only five people were responsible for monitoring the diagnosis which was almost entirely conducted by the World Bank. In 2011, around ten Burundian senior staff were consulted but to no greater effect: on this occasion the diagnosis was carried out by the Pôle de Dakar. In both cases, the process involved little real participation. Furthermore, the national staff team consisted solely of management officials from the directorate of planning and the Ministry of Finance; any effort to involve the other ministries responsible for education, or the unions and technical partners was clearly lacking. This time, we have attempted to remedy these shortcomings. The national staff contingent has been increased to 22 people from a variety of backgrounds and the Pôle de Dakar has been appointed to impart the required analytical skills throughout the diagnosis. Our aim is to achieve increased autonomy.

There are also plans to devise a financial simulation model to perform budget trade-offs for future education policy. In what respect might reliance on the model result in a review of certain policy preferences or priorities?

We shall indeed continue working with the Pôle de Dakar in the planning phase of our education policy. It is through the financial simulation model that we identify sustainable reform scenarios. Today, for example, Burundi is in the process of reforming its basic education which now lasts nine years instead of six. This reform raises the key question of the qualifications that teachers recruited for the three extra years should have: should they be qualified to work in primary education, or the first stage of secondary education? With the financial simulation model we can estimate the costs for each of these education policy options and review our goals in relation to what is possible. That said, the budget trade-off should not be viewed as a static exercise. Any clearly apparent funding gap between our preferred and feasible policies, is a very strong bargaining chip vis-à-vis our technical and financial partners. Ambition must be our watchword for the future.
From January 2015 to December 2015

**Platform for expertise in vocational training (Pefop)**
Launch of the diagnostic analysis of barriers to the implementation of vocational training reform policies (December 2015, Nouakchott and Abidjan).

**Funding of education – Global Partnership for Education Project**
• Capacity building of senior officials dealing with household expenditure on education in Côte d’Ivoire (January 2015, Abidjan).
• Development of methodological tools for analysing data on the funding of education in Zimbabwe (March 2015, September 2015, Harare).
• Support to senior national officials in Uganda on financial statistics in education (October 2015, December 2015, Kampala).

**School Profile – Global Partnership for Education Project**
Missions undertaken for the ‘School Profile’ project in Madagascar in April and December 2015, Zambia in April 2015 and Togo in June 2015.

**Other missions and seminars**
• Programme for the Analysis of Education Systems (PASEC) workshop in Senegal (January 2015, Saly).
• Sub-Saharan Africa Regional Ministerial Conference on Education Post-2015 (February 2015, Kigali).
• Meeting on the state of the regional prototype for Early Childhood Development in West and Central Africa (April 2015, Dakar).
• Seminar on higher education in Mauritania (April 2015, Nouakchott).
• UNESCO headquarters ‘Youth, Literacy and Skills Development’ section workshop: presentation of a working document on forecasting labour market demand in countries with little information concerning education, training and employment (June 2015, Paris).
• Participation in the conference of ministers responsible for employment and vocational training in West African Economic and Monetary Union (UEMOA) member states (July 2015, Abidjan).
• International events of the Francophone education and training research network (October 2015, Montreal).
• One-day meeting for IIEP partners (November 2015, Paris).
• ADEA seminar on funding of vocational training (December 2015, Abidjan).
Democratic Republic of the Congo: education country status report,

State of early childhood development in West and Central Africa in 2010-11,

Togo: education country status report – Vol. 1

Togo: education country status report – Vol. 2
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