

Findings from the review experiences - Issues and key steps

Regional Technical Feedback Workshop on the National EFA 2015 Reviews in Asia-Pacific
Bangkok, Thailand
30 April 2014

The sub-regional peer-learning session

Objective:

- ▶ To share and exchange country experiences in carrying out the review and preparing the national EFA reports

Expected Results:

- ▶ Achievements and challenges of the national EFA 2015 reviews shared
- ▶ Steps to improving the national EFA reports identified

Q1: Review Process

- ▶ Government-led process, with strong government commitment (CA, EA, SWA, SEA1, SEA2)
- ▶ Participatory - horizontally and vertically (EA, SWA, SEA1, SEA2)
- ▶ Through existing mechanisms (e.g., National EFA Committee) (SEA2)
- ▶ New team established (SWA, SEA1, SEA2)
- ▶ Public forum, peer review (SEA1)

Challenges

- ▶ Coordination (especially inter-ministerial coordination) (EA, SEA2)
- ▶ Communication within the ministry (CA)
- ▶ National consensus building (SA)
- ▶ Linking the findings of the EFA review reports to education planning (SA)

Q2: Data issues

- ▶ Data quality (EA, SEA1, Pacific)
- ▶ Coordination among different ministries, compromising different definitions, reporting periods etc (EA, SA, SEA1, SEA2)
- ▶ Data availability
 - ▶ Disaggregated data (gender, urban/rural, ethnicity, disabilities, public/private etc) (SWA, SA, SEA1, SEA2, Pacific)
 - ▶ Data on TVET, NFE and lifeskills (CA, EA, SWA, SEA2)
 - ▶ Indicators on quality (e.g. learning outcomes etc) (EA)
- ▶ Adult literacy - self reporting vs test-based (SEA1, SEA2, Pacific)
- ▶ Limited data analysis capacity (SWA, SA, SEA2, Pacific)
- ▶ Use of NER not appropriate (Pacific)
- ▶ Reliance on secondary data (SA)
- ▶ Use of Census data to complement EMIS data useful (SEA1)

Q3: Forward-looking

Issues

- ▶ EFA as an unfinished agenda (SWA)
- ▶ Quality of learning (CA, EA, SA, SEA1)
- ▶ Equity (EA, SWA, SA, SEA1)
- ▶ Lifelong learning (beyond basic education) (EA, SWA, SA)
- ▶ Attention beyond academic excellence (e.g., GCE, ESD, peace education, “happiness” education) (EA, SWA, SA)
- ▶ ICT in education (CA, SA)
- ▶ Increasing government’s financial commitment (SWA, SEA2)

Processes (SEA1, SEA2)

- ▶ Further gap analyses (SEA1, SEA2)
- ▶ Reflecting wider national, regional and international development priorities (e.g., Vision 2030, Education Blueprints, ASEAN integration, SDGs) (CA, SEA1, SEA2)

Q4: Key steps to improving the reports

- ▶ Data
 - ▶ Ensuring consistency (EA, Pacific)
 - ▶ Improving presentation (SEA1, SEA2)
 - ▶ Inclusion of case studies (SEA2, Pacific)
 - ▶ Reflecting findings from diverse sources (EA, SEA2)
 - ▶ Indicators for quality (EA)
- ▶ Participation and partnership
 - ▶ More CSO participation (EA, SA)
 - ▶ Further consultation with partners (SA, SEA2)
- ▶ Further reflecting emerging issues (SA, SEA2, Pacific)
- ▶ Learning from successful examples (CA)
- ▶ Better linkage between analysis and recommendations (SEA2)
- ▶ Enhancing sub-regional cooperation (SA)

Commonalities and differences

Commonalities

- ▶ The review process was government-led and participatory, involving key stakeholders at all levels
- ▶ Coordination is a challenge
- ▶ Data Issues - availability of disaggregated data, data on quality, data from other ministries (e.g., ECCE, TVET), indicators for Goals 3, data analysis capacity
- ▶ “Learning” and “Equity” at the center of the post-2015 agenda
- ▶ Linking education to wider developmental frameworks (e.g., SDGs, regional integration plans, national visions etc)

Differences

- ▶ Some used existing mechanisms for the review (e.g., National EFA Committee), while others established a new team
- ▶ EFA as an unfinished agenda vs going beyond basic education
- ▶ Peculiarities of small island nations (e.g., possibly skewed indicators)