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What are we trying to measure?
- What are the elements of “Quality of Education”?

(1) healthy, well nourished and motivated **students**
(2) well-trained **teachers** and active learning techniques
(3) adequate **facilities** and learning **materials**
(4) a relevant **curriculum** that can be taught and learned in a local language and builds upon the knowledge and experience of the teachers and learners
(5) an **environment** that not only encourages learning but is welcoming, gender-sensitive, healthy and safe
(6) a clear definition and accurate **assessment** of learning outcomes, including knowledge, skills, attitudes and values
(7) Participatory **governance and management**
(8) respect for and **engagement** with local communities and cultures

MEANING OF “QUALITY” MEASUREMENT & CONCEPTUALIZATION


- **Reputation** • Measured informally, socially
- **Inputs** • number of teachers; education levels of teachers; class size; number and class of school buildings; background characteristics of students; numbers of textbooks, instructional materials; extent of laboratories, libraries and other facilities
- **Process** • interactions of students and teachers; teaching and learning processes; ‘Quality of life’ of the program, school, or system
- **Content** • skills, attitudes, behaviors, and values to be transmitted through the intended curriculum
- **Outputs** • cognitive achievement; completion ratios; entrance ratios to next/higher level of education; acquisition of desired skills, attitudes, behaviors, values
- **Outcomes** • Typical measures include: income; employment; health; civic engagement; social cohesion; social levels of desirable attitudes, values, skills and behaviors
- **Value-Added** • Measures extent of improvement
- **Selectivity** • Measures include: percentages of children excluded, or failed
What are we trying to measure?
- What are the elements of “Equity of Education”?

- Understanding the different concept of “equity of education” in terms of **parity**, disparity, **equality**, inequality, **justice**, injustice, **fairness**, unfairness...
- Comparing what aspects of education, such as **access**, **input**, **output and outcome**.....
- Comparing whose situation and whose situation in terms of **gender**, **ethnicity**, location (urban/rural), **income gap**, and **disability**....

“It is a difficult concept, with a history of different interpretations, varying by country and academic discipline.” (World Bank, 2006)
Definition on equity of education and equality of education

1. Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) denied that schools simply mirrored capitalist society and they saw schools as largely autonomous institutions indirectly influenced by powerful economic and political forces. Schools, they said, reproduced the cultural relations of society through symbolic mechanism, for example, the uses of certain kinds of language and the legitimation of certain kinds of texts reflecting the interests, values and tastes of the dominant social class.

Cultural Reproduction Theory → reproduction of social inequalities
Existence of inequalities, thus a state of inequity

2. Rawls (1972) argues that inequalities are just only if they improve everyone’s well-being, particularly that of the disadvantaged. Thus, if an unequal distribution of resources, for example of educational opportunities, leads to greater productivity than an equal distribution of resources, it is fair and just. Moreover, Rawls argues that education should at least not widen the gaps between the bright and the less bright. At best, it might even enable some narrowing of the gap.

A Theory of Justice

3. Oxenham (1985) argues that since education is linked to equality and inequality, the two seemingly contradictory dimensions underlie notions of equality with respect to education. Equality includes the notions of fairness and equity, and generally means that random inequalities of nature should be acknowledged and taken into account in the educative process. On the other hand, education should also help to mitigate the random inequities of nature and that every person should have an equal opportunity to excel in ways that are not constrained by natural differences.
History of Special Needs Education (SNE): IE as an emerging alternative

The Framework for Action on Special Needs Education adopted at The World Conference on Special Needs Education held in Salamanca, Spain in 1994
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Note: Figure created by presenter
Confirming the goals of EFA and MDGs

- World Education Forum (Dakar, 2000)
  - Dakar Framework for Action
    Goal 1: Expand early childhood care and education
    Goal 2: Provide free and compulsory primary education for all
    Goal 3: Promote learning and life skills for young people and adults
    Goal 4: Increase adult literacy by 50 per cent
    **Goal 5: Achieve gender parity by 2005, gender equality by 2015**
    **Goal 6: Improve the quality of education**

  Goal 2: Complete a full course of primary schooling
  Goal 3: Eliminate gender disparity in education
  → EFA and Education MDGs  Target year: 2015
How do we try to measure quality and equity in this current MDGs/EFA Frameworks?

Revisiting EFA Development Index:

- universal primary education (goal 2), proxied by the total primary net enrolment ratio;
- adult literacy (goal 4), proxied by the literacy rate for those aged 15 and above;
- gender parity and equality (goal 5), proxied by the gender-specific EFA index (GEI), which is an average of the GPIs for primary and secondary gross enrolment ratios and the adult literacy rate;
- quality of education (goal 6), proxied by the survival rate to grade 5.
How do we try to measure quality and equity in this current MDGs/EFA Frameworks?

Revisiting Official list of MDG indicators on Education by UN

Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education

- Target 2.A: Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling

  2.1 Net enrolment ratio in primary education
  2.2 Proportion of pupils starting grade 1 who reach last grade of primary
  2.3 Literacy rate of 15-24 year-olds, women and men

Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women

- Target 3.A: Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and in all levels of education no later than 2015

  3.1 Ratios of girls to boys in primary, secondary and tertiary education
  3.2 Share of women in wage employment in the non-agricultural sector
  3.3 Proportion of seats held by women in national parliament
Do we try to measure quality, equity and inclusion?  
Revisiting **FTI Indicative Framework**

- Suggested benchmarks (not targets) drawn from analysis of successful countries. Crucial for long-term sustainability of MDG progress

**INDICATORS**

- Government spending on education – about 20% of budget
- Spending on primary education – about 50% of education budget
- Teacher salary – about 3.5 times GDP per capita
- Pupil-teacher ratio – about 40:1
- Non-teacher salary spending – 33% of recurrent spending
- Average repetition rate – 10% or lower
- Annual hours of instruction – 850 or more
**Goal 6: Quality of Education**

- 41. Percentage of primary school teachers having the required academic qualifications
- 42. Percentage of school teachers who are certified to teach according to national standards
- 43. Pupil/Teacher Ratio (PTR)
- 44. Pupil/Class Ratio (PCR)
- 45. Textbook/Pupil Ratio (TPR)
- 46. Public expenditure on education as a percentage of total government expenditure
- 47. Percentage of schools with improved water sources
- 48. Percentage of schools with improved sanitation facilities
- 49. Percentage of pupils who have mastered nationally defined basic learning competencies
- 50. School life expectancy
- 51. Instructional hour

*Can these indicators capture “Quality of Education”? Oh, oh......They are mostly looking at quality as “Input” only.*
Criticizing is easy!

- Can we be satisfied with these indicators to monitor the progress of quality and equity of education? No, but....
- Do we need to monitor the global goals after 2015 anyway?
- Do we really have to be stuck with such simple indicators?
- Don’t we need to monitor not only educational input but also content, process, output and outcome?
→ Do we have any alternative ways of monitoring education goals?
Do we have any alternative ways of monitoring education goals?

- International assessments
  - Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ, 1995-)
  - CONFEMEN Programme on the Analysis of Education Systems (PASEC, 1991-)
  - Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS, 1995-)
  - Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS, 2001-)
  - Southeast Asian New Initiative lead by SEAMEO-INNOTECH and UNICEF
  - Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA, 2000-) and PISA for Development? Collaborative Problem Solving Skills?

→ International assessments are becoming a new form of global education policy tool.

- Is this direction acceptable?
How about the World Bank’s initiative to develop the Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER) as policy process indicators of educational progress?

a. **SABER in general:**
The what, why and how of the Systematic Approach for Better Education Results

* **Source:** SABER Overview, World Bank, April 2013

- SABER (Systems Approach for Better Education Results)
- An initiative currently being developed by the World Bank along with partners around the world that helps countries systematically examine and strengthen the performance of their education systems to achieve learning for all.
- SABER is developing diagnostic tools that benchmark education policies according to evidence-based global standards and best practices.
- Determine and compare the levels of commitments of national governments.
**a. SABER in general:**
The what, why and how of the Systematic Approach for Better Education Results
Source: *SABER Overview, World Bank, April 2013*

**The 13 Domains of SABER**
SABER monitors a part of policy process for educational progress.

School Autonomy and Accountability

SABER-School Autonomy and Accountability (SAA) documents and analyzes school-based management policies aimed at increasing autonomy and accountability at the school level and within the education system, in both developing and developed countries. By deepening school autonomy and accountability, school systems can redefine incentives to create better conditions for teaching and learning. Autonomy and accountability do not generate incentives in isolation; they are intertwined with the assessment of teachers and learning at the school, with the use of information, and the role of school councils. Such interconnections are critical in improving the education system as a whole, which is at the core of SABER’s approach.

- What does SABER-School Autonomy and Accountability do?
- How does SABER-School Autonomy and Accountability help countries improve education policies and systems?
- What matters most in school-based management policies?

Policy Goal - Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Goal</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL AUTONOMY IN BUDGET PLANNING AND APPROVAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL AUTONOMY IN PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION OF THE SCHOOL COUNCIL IN SCHOOL GOVERNANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT OF SCHOOL AND STUDENT PERFORMANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What does SABER-School Autonomy and Accountability do?
What is the SABER pilot rubric in Equity and Inclusion?

This pilot SABER rubric has been uniquely developed by JICA Research Institute (Dr. Kazuo Kuroda, Ms. Makiko Hayashi and Dr. Takako Yuki) as part of an original pilot activity in an attempt to contribute to the SABER domain on “Equity and Inclusion”.

The objective of utilizing this rubric is to determine and compare the levels of commitments of the national government in achieving equity and inclusion in policy frameworks, targeting different social groups from four perspectives, from five dimensions and from four patterns.

The four perspectives include: equity of access, equity of resource inputs for quality of education, equity of outputs/learning achievement and diversity (inclusion).

The five dimensions include: gender, ethnicity, disability, income gap, rural/urban.

The proof and explanation of evidence-based education policies will be judged from sources including; policy documents of the Ministry of Education, and policy documents developed in alignment with the international community (e.g. EFA National Action Plan).
What equity are we trying to look at through the SABER pilot rubric?

**Equity of Education:**

1. **Equity of access:** Levels of commitments of national governments towards equity of quantitative distributions of educational opportunities for different social groups

2. **Equity of resource input for education:** Levels of commitments of national governments towards attaining equity through school factors such as pupil-teacher ratio, teaching methods and learning materials

3. **Equity of learning achievement (equity of learning outcomes):** Levels of commitments of national governments towards attaining equity in student performance

**Inclusive Education:**

4. **Diversity (inclusion):** Levels of commitments of national governments towards how widespread the notion of embracing diversity in education has become explicit
(3) *Equity of learning achievement (equity of learning outcomes)*: Levels of commitments of national governments towards attaining equity in student performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of dimension</th>
<th>Pattern 1</th>
<th>Pattern 2</th>
<th>Pattern 3</th>
<th>Pattern 4</th>
<th>Proof and Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Disability</td>
<td>No government policy for disability in equity of learning achievement.</td>
<td>Disability in equity of learning achievement is recognized as one of the national policy goals.</td>
<td>Legal and administrative frameworks are structured to promote and achieve equity of learning achievement for disability.</td>
<td>Allocation of the national budget is assured to promote and achieve equity of learning achievement for disability. (Or equity of learning achievement for disability is already achieved.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Income gap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rural/Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Equity of access

2. Equity of resource input for education

3. Equity of learning achievement
   (equity of learning outcomes)

4. Diversity (inclusion)
A NEW GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP: ERADICATE POVERTY AND TRANSFORM ECONOMIES THROUGH SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

1. Leave no one behind.
2. Put sustainable development at the core.
3. Transform economies for jobs and inclusive growth.
4. Build peace and effective, open and accountable institutions for all.
5. Forge a new global partnership.
Leave no one behind

The current EFA and MDGs goals focuses on gender and equity.

But...

- UNICEF (1999)---The number of pupils with disability is 150 million, only 3% are able to go to school.
- World Bank (2003)---115 million children are out of school, among them 40 million are pupils with disability. Only 5% can complete primary school.

Equity in education should be more comprehensively approached and monitored for different kinds of disadvantages (disability, ethnicity, location (urban-rural), income gap and with different concepts of equity and inclusion.)
**Put sustainable development at the core**

- The current EFA and MDGs goals do not have discussions on the contents of education or what to teach.
- Therefore...
  - **Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) approach should be integrated in the new education goals setting.**
  - “ESD means including key sustainable development issues into teaching and learning; for example, climate change, disaster risk reduction, biodiversity, poverty reduction, and sustainable consumption. It also requires participatory teaching and learning methods that motivate and empower learners to change their behavior and take action for sustainable development.” (UNESCO 2013)
  - **Necessity to monitor educational content as well as policy process.**
**Build Peace**

- Historically, peace was central of international cooperation in education. But, the current EFA and MDGs goals do not have much consideration on peace.

- Peace approach should be integrated in the new education goals setting.


  - **OECD PISA introducing “Collaborative Problem Solving Skills”**

  - Emerging discussions on “Global Citizenship Skill”, “21 Century Skill”, “Soft Skills”, and “Non-cognitive Skills”


  - Necessity to bridge the UNESCO’s ongoing initiative for the “Post Delors Report” initiative with post 2015 discussion.

  - **Necessity to monitor educational content as well as policy process.**
Implications for the Post 2015 Agenda setting

There are still many out-of-school children who tend to have multiple disadvantages to attend schools. The international society should more focus on comprehensive approaches and “Inclusive Education” to create welcoming school environment for diversity.

Educational content is as important as educational quantity and quality. The post 2015 discussions on international cooperation in education should more focus this area, reflecting and revising the ongoing UNESCO’s efforts such as ESD, Inclusive Education and Delors Report.

Integrating peace, human right and sustainable development is necessary to anticipate the post 2015 education goals setting. However, it should not end as just philosophical principles but needs to be operationalized and monitored. Especially, education for peace and sustainability approach should be more studied empirically so that international cooperation in education can effectively contribute to enhancing mutual understanding and tolerance, and then to constructing peaceful and sustainable world.
This PPT was jointly developed by Ms. Hayashi Makiko and Kazuo Kuroda of Waseda University.

Thank you!