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Achieving universal education is one of the main goals of our time, which is reflected in the ambitious international agenda of providing Education for All by 2015. As a global community, our collective responsibility is to ensure that quality education for all remains a priority on global and national agendas, today and in the future. Education is a moral and development imperative and key to socio-economic advancement, justice, equality and the recognition of the dignity of every human being. With less than three years from the EFA target year, it is timely to not only review experiences and progress made thus far, but to start reflections on a new vision for education for the future, while taking stock of past experiences and Drawing on lessons learnt. In this view, this meeting will initiate the process towards shaping education for the post 2015 era in the Asia-Pacific region. I have high expectations for this meeting as it will ultimately help to shape the very future of education in our region and build the important partnerships we will need to improve the lives of all through education.

Statement by Mr. Taecksoo Chun,
Secretary-General, Korean National Commission for UNESCO

The Korean National Commission for UNESCO (KNCU) is very pleased to co-operate with UNESCO Bangkok in organizing this important meeting on EFA beyond 2015. The six EFA goals formulated in Dakar have provided the international framework for educational development and cooperation during the past decade and have been essential for Member States to set priorities in their development policies. However, with advancements in technology and ideas combined with the Dramatic changes in our global environment, we are in need of a new set of educational agendas that would guide the collective action of the international community in the coming years. I hope this meeting provides the stimulus to start and accelerate this important discussion in the region and beyond. And I promise that the Republic of Korea and the KNCU wish to continue its assistance and contribute to this process.
Towards EFA 2015 and Beyond - Shaping a new Vision of Education

Summary

UNESCO's Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education, in co-operation with the Korean National Commission for UNESCO and UNICEF Regional Offices, is holding this regional high-level expert meeting on the post-2015 education agenda and the future of education development for the region in Bangkok, Thailand, on 9 – 11 May 2012.

The overall aim of this meeting is to initiate the process of establishing a new vision for future education development and cooperation for the region and create partnerships and networks which will work jointly with UNESCO in pursuit of this goal. It will also identify research and analytical work to be undertaken and formulate recommendations on the way forward in developing a regional post-2015 education agenda.

The meeting is undertaken within the framework of the work of UNESCO Bangkok, serving as the Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education, to support the shaping of a regional vision for the future of education development, as well as contributing to the global thinking about the international education agenda beyond 2015, in concert with the United Nations post-Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) discussions.

Background and Rationale

In the run up to 2015, UN organizations and the international community have commenced discussions regarding the effectiveness of the Millennium Development and the Education for All (EFA) Goals and reflections on defining a new vision for education and the post-2015 development agenda. Within the framework of establishing a post-2015 education agenda, UNESCO will assess the implications of wider development trends for education today and tomorrow, take stock of achievements and identify areas for further improvement.

Today's world is marked by its complexity. Multi-faceted and rapid changes, challenges and opportunities are emerging, ranging from increasing economic interdependency, globalization and technological development, growing pressure on natural resources and increased energy consumption leading to environmental degradation; rapidly changing labour markets; greater interconnectedness, shifting geo-politics; older and more urbanized populations; amid growing unemployment and widening inequalities.

These emerging trends all have implications for education policy-making and delivery, and this needs to be reflected in the direction of international efforts toward future educational development. UNESCO Bangkok will stimulate discussions and the thinking of regional stakeholders including universities and research institutions on a new vision of education whilst also considering the broader connections between education and societal development.
UNESCO will create platforms for dialogue and exchange; catalyzing critical debate, creative thinking and knowledge; and feed contributions to global discussions.

Development Trends in the Asia and Pacific Region

The Asia-Pacific region has propelled global economic growth in the world over the past decade. Together with the emergence of a growing number of middle-income countries, wider social development achievements, and an increasingly outward-looking political environment, the region has become a considerable economic and political force.

However, despite these positive macro trends, there are vast disparities between and within countries and the highest prevalence of extreme poverty in the world is found in this very region. As elsewhere across the globe, the region’s Dramatic economic development has often led to a widening, rather than narrowing, of disparities in living standards and social and economic opportunities.

This phenomenon has underscored the need for development models that incorporate a wider range of dimensions in measuring progress, such as UNPD’s Human Development Reports, OECD’s Social Development Indicators, Bhutan’s Gross National Happiness Index, and the ‘Stiglitz, Sen and Fitoussi’s’ Commission’s report on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress.

The global economic crisis has also had its impact and progress has slowed considerably. To add to these difficulties, societies are changing. Rapidly ageing populations, youth bulges and large migrant populations raise questions of how education policy should adapt for the future. Issues of globalization, versus the need to maintain regional and local identities are also coming on to the agenda. The ubiquity of technology has raised questions about what role it should play within the education system. In turn, intensifying global competition and an increasing recognition of the importance of education to wider development has also sparked new conversations on how education can not only reflect on, but respond and lead social and economic change.

Education Trends and the Post-2015 Agenda in the Asia-Pacific Region

While education is central to many Asia-Pacific countries’ development approaches and noticeable achievements have been made in the context of EFA, significant challenges remain. For example, enrolment in basic education has increased considerably; however, there are great disparities between and within countries. Peoples from war-torn zones, remote communities, ethnic minorities and women still face difficulties accessing education. Youth and adult literacy has made considerable progress, but is still inadequate to meet needs in Asian and Pacific countries, and the region contains the largest number of illiterate adults of any region in the world.\(^1\) In the process of implementing the EFA agenda, countries have also become concerned with improving the quality of education, increasing access to post-basic education and to skills development, as well as improving learning environment.

These circumstances raise questions about the approach to the international educational agenda. The EFA goals were often perceived to be aimed at developing countries and were, to some extent, disregarded by middle and high-income countries. Yet despite their higher overall levels of educational development, these countries also face challenges and need to make improvements to ensure all children have access to quality education. We must also ask ourselves, should there be a single blanket agenda? Or would it be better to have specific goals pertinent to each country or group of countries? What will be the main priorities of education development and cooperation beyond 2015? Will there be separate education goals like EFA’s or will they be integral part of a wider development framework? What about region-specific educational goals and indicators like in European Union and Latin America? As 2015 approaches, it is imperative that these questions now be raised and considered carefully by the international community.

Objectives and Outcomes of the Regional High-Level Expert Meeting

The overall aim of this meeting is to initiate the process of developing a new vision for future education development and cooperation for the region and create partnerships and networks which will work jointly with UNESCO in pursuit of this goal. It will also identify research and analytical work to be undertaken and develop recommendations on the way forward in developing a regional post-2015 education agenda.

The objectives are to:

- Share information on the region’s progress under the EFA agenda and identify areas for future focus;
- Take stock of global and regional processes of consultation, dialogue and research initiated to support the development of a post-2015 education agenda;
- Discuss emerging regional development trends and identify their implications for education and learning within Asia and the Pacific;
- Examine the relevance of the four pillars of learning\(^2\) as a means of conceptualizing education in light of the changes underway; and
- Formulate recommendations on the way forward towards the identification of the regional education priorities, including on areas of analytical work and forward-looking research and the role and contribution of regional research and development partners in this process.

As a follow up to the meeting, further reflections, debates and work will be undertaken, in association with a wide array of partners to ensure that the development of the post-2015 education agenda is enriched by a range of experience, knowledge and ideas. Moreover, UNESCO plans to establish and facilitate a core high-level expert group that will help to lead this important work.

Format of the Regional High-Level Expert Meeting

This three-day meeting is divided into three main parts: Information sharing on on-going initiatives; debate on developments trends and their implications for education; and development of recommendations for follow-up action to jointly build a new vision for education.

1. Information Sharing
The status, progress and challenges for reaching the EFA goals in the region are the point of departure for the discussions, with a view to looking ahead in light of changed contexts, development issues and opportunities which will shape the design of future education systems and international cooperation, globally and in this region. Information on on-going work on the post 2015 agenda from different perspectives will also be shared.

Presentations and Discussions:
• Regional initiatives and strategies for a new vision of education development and cooperation
• International initiatives and strategies for a new vision of education development and cooperation
• Reflections of regional education think tanks and institutions towards developing a new education policy agenda
• The post-2015 UN development agenda – MDGs and post-2015 reflections
• Rethinking educational paradigms: UNESCO’s reflection on the four pillars of learning

2. Discussion on Implications for Education of Development Trends
The meeting then proceeds to discuss key emerging development trends in the region and identify their implications for education as we look to 2015 and beyond.

Panel Discussions:
• Economic trends in the Asia-Pacific region and implications for education
• Demographic trends, migration and urbanization in the Asia-Pacific region and implications for education
• Socio-cultural trends in the Asia-Pacific region and implications for education and challenges
• Emerging trends in the education policy environment in the Asia-Pacific region and implications for education

3. Development of Recommendations
The final day of the meeting consolidates findings and develops recommendations in the lead up to 2015 and beyond. The sessions on the final day are guided by the following questions:

Guiding Questions:
• How should education be situated within the broader development agenda/discourse?
• Should there be an education-specific or a broader post-2015 agenda?
• Should there be a universal or a context-specific post-2015 agenda or both?
• What future policy directions are required for a new vision of education?
• What should be the key areas of this agenda?
• What are the research gaps and key areas for forward-looking analytical work and research to feed into the process of developing the post-2015 education agenda?

The meeting concludes with the development of recommendations as to future research and analytical work that needs to be conducted and advise on and propose modalities through which regional research partners may contribute to this process. The final day of the meeting also serves to facilitate the building of partnership and networks for future work.
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Session Details

Session I: EFA: Overview of the present situation

Presentation 1: Where do we stand on EFA and key development gaps?
Mr. Gwang-jo Kim, Director, UNESCO Bangkok and Dr. Festo Kavishe, Deputy Regional Director, UNICEF Regional Office for East Asia and the Pacific

Gwang-jo Kim

Where do we stand on EFA and key development gaps?
Where do we stand on Education for All (EFA) and what are the key development challenges we face today? Over 20 years have passed since the EFA goals and targets were set in Jomtien and re-affirmed in the form of 12 major strategies and six major goals by 164 governments in 2000 at the World Education Forum in Dakar, to achieve quality education for all by 2015. Collective efforts by governments and EFA partners have led to significant progress throughout the Asia-Pacific region - notably so, with the expansion of ECCE, increase in access to primary education and movement towards gender parity.

The other end of the spectrum however, teems with multiple factors of marginalization (socio-economic, socio-cultural, health, ethno-linguistic, poverty, wealth, gender, geography, group-based, disabilities, conflict etc.) that contribute to the out-of-school and illiterate populations ranging in the millions, and large groups unaccounted for and unreached.

As the 2015 target deadline closes in, countries must accelerate efforts and look to innovative and targeted approaches to address cross-sectoral issues and challenges that compromise the rights of all to a quality education. This presentation provides a quick overview of progress and challenges made in each EFA goal and offers measurable steps that may be taken up by the post-2015 agenda in education. Only in properly reviewing the past and assessing the present, can we look to the future, beyond 2015, to determine the core elements and direction of education.

Festo Kavishe

Taking stock and accelerating EFA progress towards 2015
As the Asia-Pacific region takes stock of progress and gaps in relation to the EFA goals, it is also crucial to link the discussion to the wider Millennium Development Goals. More importantly, steps should be taken to ensure that the broader education agenda as reflected in the EFA goals be integrated in the post 2015 MDG discussions. Where does the region stand vis-à-vis the EFA goals and the education MDGs? There have been major achievements. But substantial gaps prevail. These are highlighted by the millions of children still not in school, and the poor quality of education with majority of children in school not learning. Disparities also exist in relation to geographic location, income levels, gender, ethnicity, disabilities, etc. Emerging issues outside of
education such as widening inequality and inequity, urbanization and migration, increasing disaster risks and climate change should also be taken into account and addressed if EFA and the education MDGs are to be achieved by 2015. The presentation includes recommendations for accelerating progress to 2015, particularly highlighting the need to refocus on equity.

**Biography**

**Mr. Gwang-Jo Kim (Ph.D)** is the Director of UNESCO's Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education, located in Bangkok. Before coming to UNESCO, he worked in various capacities for the Government of the Republic of Korea. As Deputy Minister of Education and Human Resources, he initiated the “Global Human Resources Forum”, aimed at providing an international platform for sharing information, knowledge and best practices in human resources issues among leaders. He also worked in the Office of the President of the Republic of Korea, where he assisted former President Young Sam Kim in the fields of education and social policy. Mr. Kim played a key role in an education reform initiative that aimed to restructure the entire Korean educational system. While at the World Bank in Washington D.C. as a Senior Education Specialist, Mr. Kim acquired widespread international expertise, coordination, networking and overall programmatic management and delivery skills. He is a member of various professional associations on education policy, finance and economics, and has published works in education and ICT, and educational reform.

Mr. Kim holds a B.A. degree in Public Administration from Korea University, Seoul (1978), a Master’s degree (1984) and a Ph.D. (1994) in Education from Harvard University, U.S.A.

**Dr. Festo Kavishe** is Deputy Regional Director of UNICEF EAPRO. He is responsible for the representation and advancement of UNICEF’s core mandate; the provision of strategic direction, programme guidance, management and oversight to country offices; and external relations and partnerships. He previously worked for UNICEF in Zimbabwe, Eritrea and Cambodia; he has developed several UNICEF country programmes. Prior to joining UNICEF, he was director of the Tanzania Food and Nutrition Centre. He is on the board of the International Journal of the Food Science and Nutrition, the International Journal of Public Health Nutrition and the Centre for Nutrition Counseling and Health Services, Dar-Es-Salaam. Dr. Kavishe obtained his Doctor of Medicine at the University of Dar-es-Salaam and a Master of Science in Human Nutrition at the University of London. He is the author of many significant publications.
Presentation 2: Action towards 2015 and EFA review

Mr. Abdul Hakeem, UNESCO Bangkok and Ms. Lieke van de Wiel, Regional Education Adviser, UNICEF Regional Office for South Asia

Ms Lieke van de Wiel

Looking Forward – EFA 2015 and Beyond

The EFA agenda has contributed to remarkable success in educational attainment over the last 20 years. As 2015 approaches, education stakeholders have the opportunity to rethink the global agenda and apply lessons learnt in order to reach quality education for all.

Ensuring the right to education is crucial not only to provide each individual with the opportunity to reach its fullest potential but also to overcome poverty and to reduce inequality within and among countries. As a strategy education is fundamental in achieving the MDGs as education attainment is strongly linked with better health, higher income and less risk of reoccurring poverty. The global community, including those most marginalized, must participate in an open dialogue to choose the best way forward.

Rethinking the global agenda will have to be innovative and anticipate aspects not considered for 2015, such as women's empowerment, social mobility, reduction of disparities, economic and environment sustainable development. The new agenda must address learning, quality, and empowerment of the most disadvantaged. Business as usual will not be sufficient in addressing current and future gaps and bottlenecks.

Reaching the attainment of universal education has traditionally been sectoral in nature which not necessarily does justice to the interconnectedness related access challenges and equality of learning. Therefore, we must holistically address the questions:

1) How do we ensure that everyone is able to access their right to education and grow to their fullest potential?

2) How best to make full use of education and capitalize on its transformative capacity.

Abdul Hakeem

Action towards 2015 and EFA review

The 2015 EFA target year is only a few years away. The Asia and Pacific region has the urgent need to accelerate and scale up progress towards achieving the EFA goals and at the same time review the achievements, remaining challenges and lessons learnt so as to contribute to inform the education agenda beyond 2015.

In close collaboration with Member States and EFA partners, UNESCO’s Regional Bureau for Education in Bangkok proposes to undertake work in the following areas:
Firstly, support acceleration efforts towards achieving EFA by 2015 by creating an acute awareness of the urgency to speed up EFA progress to meet the six EFA goals and support and enhance national capacities, thereby enabling countries to identify priority bottlenecks, prioritize acceleration solutions, share best practice and by helping Member States to strengthen country-level partnerships to support the implementation of their priority acceleration interventions.

Secondly, to strengthen the region’s readiness and mechanism for the regional EFA review 2015. The regional review will build on national reviews of EFA status and also analyze how policies, strategies, partnerships, governance, and resources were deployed to deliver on and achieve EFA goals. Countries will be assisted in the use of existing methodological tools to identify information and capacity gaps. The regional review will contribute to inform the education agenda beyond 2015.

**Biography**

**Mr. Abdul Hakeem** is the Education Advisor and Coordinator of the Asia and Pacific Programme of Education for All (APPEAL) at UNESCO’s Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education (UNESCO Bangkok). One of his key responsibilities at UNESCO Bangkok Office is coordination of EFA in the Asia and Pacific region. A citizen of Maldives, he received his education (Bachelor of Education and Master of Education) at the University of Western Australia. His areas of specialty are teacher education, curriculum development and distance learning.

Prior to taking up his appointment at UNESCO Bangkok in January 2000, Mr. Hakeem was Deputy Minister of Education in the Maldives, a position which he held for over 8 years. As Deputy Minister of Education he was responsible for overseeing and providing professional leadership in a number of areas and directing national projects in educational planning, teacher education, curriculum development and continuing education. He also served as Secretary-General of the Maldives National Commission for UNESCO. Earlier Mr. Hakeem had worked at other high levels of responsibility in several key positions in the education sector in the Maldives. They included the posts of Director of the Institute for Teacher Education and, later, Director of Educational Planning at the Ministry of Education. He began his career as a teacher in a leading school in the Maldives where he later served as Principal for over 3 years.

During the period of his service with the Government of Maldives Mr. Hakeem also served on a number of national committees and commissions including those dealing with issues of children, environment and educational policy.
Ms. Lieke van de Wiel is currently Regional Education Adviser in UNICEF Regional Office for South Asia based in Nepal. Before taking up this post, she was chief of education in UNICEF Country Offices of Nepal, Yemen and Mexico. Besides her expertise in education, Lieke van de Wiel has wide experience in child protection and humanitarian work. Lieke van de Wiel holds a Master of Sociology of non-Western Societies and a Master in Public Administration, both from the University of Leiden, The Netherlands.

Session II: Overview of global and regional initiatives to define a new vision for education

Presentation 3: International and regional initiatives and strategies for a new global vision of education development and cooperation

Mr. Mae Chu Chang, WB and Mr. Jouko Sarvi, ADB

Mae Chu Chang

The World Bank and Education

While in general, education systems around the world have improved over the past few decades, too many young people are still finishing school without the knowledge and skills required for productive employment in a 21st-century labour market.

Education systems must do a better job preparing young people for the rapidly changing economic and technological landscape. Countries need more skilled and agile workforces to increase their competitiveness and growth. Demographic shifts are creating “youth bulges” at the secondary and tertiary levels in middle-income countries. Rapid advances in information and communication technologies hold promise for making education more effective and inclusive.

These changes call for a rethinking of the Bank's education strategy over the next decade, setting out new priorities for investment, technical support, and policy assistance. The World Bank's new Education Strategy lays out a ten-year agenda focused on the crucial goal of “learning for all”.

The Strategy emphasizes the need to: Invest early. Invest smartly. Invest for all.

• Invest early. Guarantee that in early childhood, young people acquire the foundational skills that will translate into a lifetime of learning.
• Invest smartly. Support efficient interventions and policy reforms that result in schooling and learning gains.
• Invest for all. Ensure that all students—including girls and disadvantaged groups—are able to acquire the knowledge and skills that they need to succeed in life.

In working with partners to achieve Learning for All, the World Bank will focus on two strategic goals:
• Reforming education systems, beyond inputs
• Building the knowledge base for reform

Jouko Sarvi

**ADB’s Reflections**

Drawing on ADB’s recent studies in the region, the presentation will focus on the changing Asia region, the implications for human resource development and the ensuing challenges to the role of education in supporting these efforts. The rationale and demand for new approaches and strategies in education and skills development are discussed, particularly from the perspective of contributing to meeting the challenges of innovation, inclusiveness and integration in the region. In this context, the presentation will also discuss the position of education sector among the priorities of ADB’s long term corporate strategy and highlight strategic issues and initiatives in the implementation of ADB’s new education sector operation plan.

**Biography**

**Ms. Mae Chu Chang (Ph.D)** is the Head of Human Development in Indonesia and Lead General Educator for the East Asia and Pacific Region of the World Bank. She leads a comprehensive program of support to Indonesian education from early childhood to higher education, with a focus on school based management and teacher policy reform. Ms. Chang has worked with development partners in the region to lead key research in emerging issues in education as well as spearheaded policy change as a result of the research. The program in Indonesia amounts to about US$1.5 billion.

She was the Lead General Educator for Middle East and North Africa (MENA) Region. She has worked intensively in countries such as Iran, Egypt, Yemen, Jordan to help the governments develop comprehensive education reform strategies aimed at all levels of education. These government strategies are supported by the Bank’s technical advice and financial support through projects and programs in partnership with other donors.

Before her work in the MENA region, she served in South Asia for six years and won a Human Development Award for Excellence for her work on girls’ education in Pakistan. Before South Asia, she worked in education in a diverse set of countries in East Asia, including China, Malaysia, Thailand and Laos.
Prior to joining the World Bank in 1983, Ms. Chang held various positions in the U.S. Department of Education including: Coordinator of International Affairs, and Team Leader for bilingual education. She also undertook various advisory and consulting assignments to Boston school districts, OECD and United States Information Agency.

Ms. Chang holds a Doctoral Degree in Education and M.A. in Psycholinguistics from Boston University, U.S.A. She graduated with a B.A. from Melbourne University, Australia.

Mr. Jouko Sarvi has 25 years of experience in education and international development cooperation in Asia, Africa, Middle East, and the Balkans. As the Practice Leader in the education sector at ADB he is responsible for coordination of policy and strategy of ADB's support to education development in Asia and the Pacific region. He leads knowledge sharing on good practice and innovation in education development, supports staff development activities and coordinates external partnerships in the sector. Mr. Sarvi is also the Chair of Education Community of Practice of ADB. He led the preparation of Education by 2020: A Sector Operations Plan, and guides ADB's operation departments in the implementation of the Plan. He also supervised Focus on Education -series on good operational practice on timely topics in e.g. ICT for education, technical and vocational education and workforce skills training, financing in higher education, inclusive education, and public-private partnerships in education. Mr. Sarvi is currently finalizing Higher Education in Dynamic Asia – publication series, which is an output from a major regional study project he supervised recently. Earlier Mr. Sarvi served as Mission Leader in education sector operations in South Asia Department of ADB. Prior to joining ADB in 2001, Mr. Sarvi worked in a major international management consultancy which specializes in development of education in developing countries. He has extensive experience in leading multi-donor and multidisciplinary teams tasked with design, appraisal, review, and evaluation of education projects/programs. He has also served as long term resident expert in education project implementation in developing countries. Mr. Sarvi holds Masters Degrees in Education (M.Educ) and Business Administration (MBA).
Presentation 4: Reflections of regional education think tanks and institutions towards developing a new education policy agenda

M. Tae-Wan Kim, President, KEDI and Mr. Nipon Poapongsakorn, President, TDRI, Prof. R. Govinda, NUEPA and Ms M. Meiers, ACER

Tae-Wan Kim

Reflections of KEDI
The society is undergoing a rapid change and the future is unpredictable. While simple repetitive, cognitive and physical works are decreasing, analytic and creative tasks are increasing. This is an international trend Korea is currently facing. In this sense, it is required to design educational policies aimed at fostering creative talents with future capabilities and knowledge as well as sociality and emotions. Korea is trying to foster all children to be global talents through creative and character education.

Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI) is conducting various researches based on scientific analysis in order to advance schools; settle creative and character education; enhance professionalism of teachers and improve competency in higher education, etc. KEDI’s recent research is especially emphasizing future education, educational indicators and indices, higher education and global educational collaboration.

In the area of future education, KEDI is conducting a research on “Development Direction and Strategy for Future Education in Korea (2013-2017).” It aims to establish educational vision and present a road map for the policy plan. It focuses on capacities-centred curriculum and project-oriented education.

KEDI is also building educational indicators and indices on social and emotional learning as well as academic learning. In addition, KEDI seeks measures not only to strengthen university’s competency for international student management but also to improve capabilities in learning process, assessment, financing and research.

Lastly, KEDI is strengthening the partnership with international and regional organizations, and leading educational research institutes in foreign countries through collaborative research and joint seminars to take an active role in international education agenda. Besides, KEDI will enhance educational ODA for developing countries through cooperative education research.

Nipon Poapongsakorn

Reflections of TDRI
Despite the rapid expansion of tertiary education enrollment in the last ten years, the private sector still has difficulty recruiting college and university graduates with adequate skills. College and university graduates with adequate skills and required quality. As a result, many companies and the industrial associations have decided to establish their own colleges/universities. Some
companies have cooperated with the public vocational colleges in creating the work-based learning programs. This study identifies the common threads of the success of 5 colleges and universities. It also describes the factors that account for the failure of colleges and universities. It also describes the factors that account for the failure of colleges and universities in producing quality graduates to serve the employers in the formal sector. Finally, some policy implications on the new skill agenda for Thailand are discussed.

Marion Meiers

Reflections of ACER
The Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) is Australia's independent, not-for-profit, national educational research organisation, with a mission to create and promote knowledge and tools that can be used to improve learning across the lifespan.

ACER's work assists educational decision makers at all levels in their collection, analysis, interpretation and use of reliable data. This work supports the development of knowledge and understanding of educational challenges, opportunities and progress over time. Consultancy work and professional development programs provide support to countries establishing national assessment programs. ACER undertakes a broad range of consultancy work to support development projects, as well as commissioned research on a range of issues including sociological and labour market trends. ACER has significant expertise in the evaluation of educational reform initiatives. ACER works in partnership with governments and a range of agencies, and is committed to community building through regional cooperation in education. Current partners include AusAID (through the Education Resource Facility), the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). An interesting example of ACER's work can be seen in the current four-year project with UNICEF, the Zimbabwe Early Learning Assessment, Education Transition Fund program. The project was commissioned by UNICEF to support and enhance national capacity to review, reform and re-orient the current system of assessment in Zimbabwe. In the longer term, feedback from the findings of this project will support better teaching and school-management processes that lead to improved learning outcomes.

Biography

Mr. Tae-Wan Kim (Ph.D) is currently President of the Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI). Previously, Mr. Kim has been professor of Keimyung University while serving as the chairman of the Self-Evaluation Committee for Teacher Training Courses. Currently, Mr. Kim is a member of the UNESCO Educational Committee as well as the chief editor of KEDI Journal of Educational Policy (KJEP). Mr. Kim attained his bachelor's and master's degree in Education at Seoul National University. He also completed a second master's degree and
a doctoral degree from the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor) in Sociology of Education and in Educational Policy, respectively. His research is mainly focused on Educational Administration and Higher Education.

Mr. Nipon Poapongsakorn (Ph.D) is President of the Thailand Development Research Institute Foundation. He is also a member of the following professional associations: The Thai Economic Society, Thai Social Sciences Society and the International Association of Agricultural Economists. Prior to his appointment at the TDRI, he was Dean of the Faculty of Economics at Thammasat University. He has also worked as a consultant on many projects run by the ADB, the World Bank and the FAO.

He obtained a B.A, M.A and Ph.D in Economics at Thammasat University, Middle Tennessee State University and the University of Hawaii respectively.

Prof. R. Govinda is Vice Chancellor of National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA), New Delhi. Previously he has worked in the Institute of Education, University of London, M.S. University of Baroda and the International Institute of Educational Planning (IIEP), UNESCO. He is a member of several national and international bodies. He has been on the editorial board of the Education for All Global Monitoring Report; is a Consultant Fellow to International Bureau of Education; Member of the Governing Board of UNESCO Institute of Statistics, Montreal; Member of the Central Advisory Board of Education; and member of the National Advisory Committee on Rights to Education of the Government of India. His research interests include primary education and literacy, decentralized management, programme evaluation, and reforms in higher education. He has published widely on these issues in several books and journals. Oxford University Press has recently published an edited volume by him entitled "Who Goes to School? Exploring Exclusion in Indian Education".

Marion Meiers is a Senior Research Fellow at ACER. Her research interests include literacy education, longitudinal studies, curriculum development, assessment, programme evaluation, and teachers’ professional learning. Throughout her career Marion has contributed actively to the teaching of English and literacy at all levels of education. She has played leading roles in major literacy projects in Australia, for state and federal governments and non-government groups, for example as Executive Liaison Officer of the Australian Literacy Federation from 1993-1996, and in 1997 as a full-time consultant to the Literacy Section in the Commonwealth education department. In 2009-2010 she was a member of the Curriculum Advisory Panel for the Australian Curriculum: English. In recognition of her national work in literacy education Marion was awarded Life Membership of the Australian Literacy Educators’ Association in 2011. She
has an extensive publications record, and has presented papers at major national and international conferences since 1986. In 2008 she undertook a consultancy for curriculum developers in Brunei Darussalam. In June 2011 she reviewed the thematic paper on Learning Outcomes for the Education for All (EFA) Fast Track Initiatives Secretariat within the GRA program cycle 2011-2013.

Presentation 6: The post-2015 UN development agenda - MDGs and post-2015 reflections
Mr. Biplove Choudhary, Poverty Reduction Team, UNDP APRC

Biplove Choudhary

Reflections on the MDGs - Path to 2015 and the evolving Development Agenda beyond 2015
The latest Asia-Pacific MDG Report 2011/12 (Accelerating Equitable Achievement of the MDGs: Closing the Gaps in Health and Nutrition in Asia and the Pacific, ESCAP/ADB/UNDP) has revealed a mixed score card of regional progress on MDGs: illustratively, while the incidence of poverty has been halved, achievements have been noted on promoting gender equality in education, reduction of HIV prevalence and halting the spread of TB, increasing forest cover, it does appear that at current rates of progress the region as a whole is unlikely to meet many goals, in particular those of eradicating hunger, reducing child mortality and improvement of maternal health. Distressingly, the report reveals persistence of wide disparities across the region on underperforming goals linked to health and nutrition. Clearly, in the run up to 2015, there ought to be a strong UN-wide premium on staying focused on accelerating and sustaining MDG progress so that the commitments are fully met across and within countries. Simultaneously, the development community is also looking ahead towards crafting the contours of a development agenda beyond 2015, with MDGs and its conceptual underpinnings as the starting point. The upcoming Rio+20 process is expected to throw up key pointers as well. A number of development challenges vying for attention include moving ahead on the residual MDG agenda as well as incorporating issues of quality enhancement of the goals already achieved (rather than achievement of quantitative targets alone), opening up the agenda to bring in climate change linked vulnerabilities, economic crises, patterns of inequalities, urbanization, governance issues, to name a few, within an overarching framework of equity, sustainability and human rights. It is increasingly felt that the development agenda beyond 2015 should be informed by the current and emerging development opportunities and challenges, the transformed global development context and see to incorporate the lessons learnt from the MDGs while being guided by core UN values, norms and commitments in an inclusive and bottoms up manner.
Biography

**Biplove Choudhary** is Programme Specialist with the Inclusive Growth and Poverty Reduction Team, UNDP Asia-Pacific Regional Centre, Bangkok. A development economist with over 13 years of experience at the policy, research and grass-roots levels, he has been working with UNDP since 2007. Prior to joining the Asia-Pacific Regional Centre, he was posted at the Regional Centre in Colombo. Earlier, he headed CENTAD, the Trade and Development arm of Oxfam in South Asia and had been an advisor to civil society organizations, national governments and international agencies such as Commonwealth Secretariat-DFID, USAID, and UN agencies. Biplove holds a Ph.D. in international trade and human development from the Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India. He is a former Fellow of the Cambridge Advanced Programme on Rethinking Development Economics and has published extensively on MDGs, poverty and inclusive growth in academic journals, books and mainstream media.

Presentation 7: Rethinking educational paradigms: UNESCO’s reflection on the 4 pillars of learning

*Sobhi Tawil, Education Research and Foresight Team, UNESCO*

**Sobhi Tawil**


Still largely rooted in the industrial model of the 19th century, current conceptualisations of education are increasingly being challenged by a combination of both an acceleration of factors of change, as well as by structural crises and unforeseen shocks at the global level. We must consequently critically re-examine our conceptions of learning, the relevance of current modes of production and transmission of knowledge, skills and values, as well as the nature and significance of the processes of socialization in an increasingly complex, interdependent and unpredictable world. The 1996 “Delors Report” Learning: The treasure within published - unanimously considered to be an important landmark in thinking on education and learning worldwide - has been a key international reference for the conceptualisation of education. Although the paradigms of life-long learning and the four pillars of learning to learn, to be, to do and to live together continue to serve as important references, the global development context has significantly changed since the mid-1990s and requires an adjustment in the way we conceptualise education. It thus seems particularly opportune that we re-examine the relevance of the 1996 Delors report in order to determine what portion of this vision remains relevant in today’s world and what might need to be refined, adapted, or further developed, as we look to the future.

N.B. The full paper is contained among the additional papers at the end of the brochure.
Biography

Sobhi Tawil (Ph.D) joined UNESCO in 2002 after a career with diverse institutions and organizations including the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the Graduate Institute for International and Development Studies (Geneva), the Northern Education Policy Research Review and Advisory Group (NORRAG), as well as the International Institute for Higher Education (Rabat). He has experience in education policy analysis, research in basic education and development, planning, curriculum reform, as well as in conflict and social cohesion. Within UNESCO, Sobhi Tawil initially worked as head of the Capacity Building Programme for Curriculum Development at the International Bureau of Education (IBE) in Geneva, as Education Programme Specialist at the Rabat Cluster Office (2005-2010), and as Chief of the Education Policy Analysis and Strategies Section (2010). Since December 2010, Sobhi Tawil is Senior Programme Specialist for Education Research and Foresight.

Mr. Tawil holds a Ph.D in Education and Development and a Diplôme d'études supérieures (DES) in development studies from the Graduate Institute for International and Development Studies (Geneva), as well as a Masters in Comparative Education from the Faculty of Psychology and Education at the University of Geneva.

Session III: Emerging Development Trends in the Asia-Pacific Region and Implications for Education Policy

Panel Discussion 1: Economic Trends and Challenges

- Globalization, regional economic communities and emerging economies: what skills are required for tomorrow’s world?
- Technological changes, changing job profiles and their impact on education
- Climate change, green economies and educational response

Moderator: Mr. R. Govinda

Presenters: Mr. Gwang-Jo Kim and Mr. Kai-ming Cheng, Mr. Yoshiyuki Nagata and Mr. J. R. Guevara. Please see background papers at the back of the brochure for further information.
Gwang-Jo Kim

Globalization, regional economic communities and emerging economies
Changes in the macro-economic climate of the Asia Pacific Region have been notable. Despite the Global Economic Crisis, GDP overall in the region has continued to rise and Asia-Pacific economies have appreciably increased their share of global trade. Regional economic integration has helped produce prosperity in some of the nations in the region, in particular the ASEAN countries. Migrant workers also continue to send increasing remittances to their home countries, contributing substantially to their national economies. Yet, the region is defined, perhaps, by its economic disparities and income gaps between rich and poor remain considerable.

Economic changes have been accompanied by industrial changes. The region is moving away from its traditional agricultural routes and manufacturing industry into the service sector and knowledge based industries. To reflect this transition, the labour market is also developing. Employers now place a higher premium on "soft skills" such as leadership, communication, problem solving and critical thinking skills, than was previously the case. Whilst considering this environment, one must not forget the other changes which go hand in hand with these developments: demographic change, technological advancements and a changing environmental situation.

The education system must adapt to deal with these changes. Education has become more inclusive and opportunities for learning now continue throughout life, consequently, there needs to be a continued emphasis upon this life-long learning. In a time of such change, education systems must also focus on the new skills which will be required in the twenty-first century environment. Soft skills, ICT skills and adaptability must be taken into consideration. EFA aimed to improve the quality of education, but there are still clearly gaps remaining and work that needs doing.

Kai-ming Cheng

Trends in the workplace and challenges to education
There have been discussions on the rapid advancement of technologies and the replacement of low skill tasks by automation. This certainly poses a major challenge to education, which used to be an apparatus for sifting and weeding-off young people for repetitive, routine, manual labour. However, overhauling changes in the economy is further shaking the very assumptions of education systems. Changes in the mode of production, from mass production to “less of more”, has made conventional bureaucratic structures inappropriate. Division of labour is giving way to one-stop operations. Individuals now bear comprehensive responsibilities and have to embrace multiple procedures even as front-line workers. Such a challenge is exacerbated by the expansion of the service sector, where individualized service and customized products prevail. All these have re-shaped society’s expectations on young people. Fundamentally different from job-specific and rigid skills, the workplace now anticipates rapid adjustments to changing environment, swift adoption of new knowledge and skills, human competence beyond technical skills, as well as moral and ethical commitments which are no longer guaranteed by procedures, rules and regulations.
If we could push the argument further, education is now facing tremendous pressure to move away from a purely economic discourse, and to prepare young people for a life that transcends jobs and careers, goes beyond the economic life, in anticipation of precarious environmental changes due to natural disasters, mad-mad accidents, economic crises, wars and social unrest. Education reforms have to address these challenges!

Yoshiyuki Nagata

Challenge of ESD: Approaches to ‘bridge’ the concept of sustainability and educational practices

As environmental educator and the author of *Ecological Literacy: Education and the Transition to a Postmodern World*, David W. Orr stressed, “The [sustainability] crisis cannot be solved by the same kind of education that helped create the problems.” Ironically the more we have ‘educated’ people, the less sustainable the world becomes. Unfortunately education has been no guarantee of wisdom for us to create more positive and sustainable future.

This is why Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) has been a challenging theme. ESD addresses the three key areas of sustainable development – society, environment and economy with culture as an underlying dimension. This multi-faceted education turns up as rather complicated concept especially to the teachers at conventional schools.

In Japan UNESCO ASPnet schools are expected to serve as centre of ESD, and teachers of new ASPnet schools are currently confronted with a challenge to transform their practices into sustainability-oriented ones. In order for these teachers to get acquainted with the concept one needs unique approaches or ‘tools.’ Four approaches – heuristic approach, infusion approach, whole-school approach and problem-solving approach – for the implement of ESD at schools and in communities will be of great help for teachers facing the challenge and a first step towards ‘different kind of education that help create the solutions’.

Jose Roberto Guevara

Climate Change, The Green Economy and Education

The impacts of climate change and the global financial situation have been viewed as part of a broader crisis, sometimes called a civilisational crisis that embraces other global issues such as peace and security, forced migration, poverty and hunger, all seeking an urgent response. If we are to reflect on the current propositions within the climate change platforms, much of the educational responses are framed around building capacities to understand and adapt to the impacts of climate change - building resilience. Such a perspective has a tendency to frame the educational responses to one that can potentially be merely reactive and therefore, short-term. But this situation of multiple crises also presents for us an opportunity where we can, and we must, address the urgent need to prepare individuals and communities to respond and adapt to the impacts of climate change, but equally to contribute to re-shaping our environment to one where crisis situations are Dramatically mitigated.
We should be celebrating the opportunity to envision an education that will contribute to achieving the 'green economy', given the understanding that 'green' means the integration of environmentally sustainable values into the economy. However, I will propose that a focus only on the 'green economy' potentially misses out on the larger opportunity to build on the earlier works by thinkers like Faure, Freire, Delors, and the educators who work tirelessly in local situations of crisis, towards a more holistic, integrated and long-term vision of education for sustainable development that embraces the economy, society, culture and the environment.

It is urgent that we learn with people about how to cope and adapt to the challenges posed by climate change and the associated disasters - a form of learning that is based on knowledge that is grounded in context and directed towards action. It is equally urgent that we learn from people about how they have adapted to living within crisis and, perhaps most importantly, how we might together transform the very foundations that have contributed to this crisis.

**Biography**

**Professor R. Govinda** *(see session 2)*

**Mr. Gwang-Jo Kim** *(see session 1)*

**Kai-ming Cheng (Ph.D)** is Chair Professor of Education at the University of Hong Kong. He was Dean of Education, Pro-Vice-Chancellor and, until recently, Senior Advisor to the Vice-Chancellor of the University. Trained as a mathematician, he was a school teacher and a principal before he pursued doctoral study at the London Institute of Education. He taught at the Harvard Graduate School of Education as Visiting Professor 1996-2006. His research projects are initially about rural education in China, but have moved into reforms in various systems. His current attention has been on the fundamental changes in society and their challenges to education.. He has undertaken various projects related to policy-making, legislation and institutional evaluation in Mainland China, Taiwan, Singapore and Australia. He has been consultant with the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, UNESCO and UNICEF. Recently, he has advised on national reform projects in Swaziland, Indonesia and Pakistan, and participated in national policy discussions in Vietnam, Saudi Arabia, Malaysia, Thailand, India, Lesotho, Columbia, and Mexico. He plays advisor to higher education institutions in Japan and China on funDrasing and internationalization. Most recently, he has been appointed to national and provincial advisory committee on education reform and policies in China. He is co-convenor of the interdisciplinary Strategic Research Theme on Sciences of Learning at HKU. Locally he is member of the Education Commission and was instrumental in the on-going comprehensive reform which started 1999. He writes a weekly column in the *Hong Kong Economic Journal Daily* and a monthly column in *Shanghai Education*. 
Robbie Guevara is currently a Senior Lecturer in International Studies/ Development at RMIT University in Melbourne. His recent research work has focused on learning for global citizenship and school-community learning partnerships for sustainability and he is particularly committed to participatory, creative and experimental learning methodologies within the context of ecological sustainability. He is the President of the Asia-South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education (ASPBAE) and the Vice-President (Asia Pacific) of the International Council of Adult Education (ICAE). Robbie leads the Learning for Sustainability in a Climate Changing World Program for both networks. He is regularly engaged by the Asia Pacific Centre for Culture of UNESCO (ACCU) in their Education for Sustainability (ESD) Program as part of the UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development, since 2005.

Yoshiyuki Nagata is Associate Professor of Department of Education, University of the Sacred Heart, Tokyo. His research is devoted to alternative or sustainable form of education with a special interest in holistic approaches to implement and evaluate Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) and others. He is a member of the Monitoring and Evaluation Expert Group (MEEG) of UNESCO, and contributes to creating monitoring and evaluation systems especially from Asia-Pacific perspectives. He also served as an expert to promote ‘HOPE (Holistic, Ownership-based, Participatory and Empowering)’ methodology, an endogenously developed ESD evaluation approach under the initiatives of ACCU (Asia-Pacific Cultural Centre for UNESCO), and as an editor of the project report, Tales of HOPE II with a variety of case studies in Asia and the Pacific. He is the author of Alternative Education: Global Perspectives Relevant to the Asia-Pacific Region (Springer). His other publication includes articles on the issues of ESD.
Panel Discussion 2: Demographic trends and challenges

- Youth bulges, Aging populations, youth employment and the need for diverse educational responses in the perspective of lifelong learning (LLL)
- Migration and urbanization: challenges for quality and equity in education
- Student mobility in the region
- Disparities across and within countries of the region and diversity of educational needs (including issues of highly educated societies versus large numbers of unreached populations concentrated in a few countries)

Moderator: Hon. Dato’ Khairil Awang
Presenters: Mr. SoongHee Han and Mr. Kamol Jiyankhodjaev and Mr. Kazuo Kuroda and Ms. Maria Khan. Please see background papers at the back of the brochure for further information.

SoongHee Han

Youth bulges, aging populations, youth unemployment and the need for diverse educational responses in the perspective of lifelong learning

EFA is not only ambitious but also significant in achieving a huge contribution to the social as well as economic development in global education. Ten or more years of global experience provided enough chance to reflect the nature and strategies of the programme that needs to be expanded with upgraded stages. An important reflection and redesign of the programme for next vision, I believe, comes from the reconsideration of the nature of learning and education, instead of understanding of the changing environments. I believe the EFA programme was launched with naive conceptions of educational system and practice, with a few simple indicators that can never be achieved, or at best fragmented in goal settings that are even subject to each countries' responsibilities, which is vulnerable to global economic attacks. Now, the EFA six goals need completely to be re-written by considering the notion of global lifelong learning and responsibility. I believe the grand vision of education next stage needs to be shifted from securing EFA (Education for All) to fulfilling LLL (Lifelong Learning). Lifelong learning is (1) a principle of educational system and practice, (2) based on the new societal platform of global learning society; where (3) having each component of the learning system linked properly to generate self-organization to make self-evolution; (4) and to make the learning system operate a virtuous circle to embrace emerging new learning demands, either social or economic, of various demographic groups; (5) that eventually lead various development agendas, e.g. economic development, social cohesion, to co-evolution with the lifelong learning system. Today, lifelong Learning is not only for advanced countries but became a new standard platform of educational system and practice in new era. All people in all population groups have right to
access, having adequate support, and to be recognized in full qualifications on the life skills and competences that they have obtained. Post-2015 needs to re-shape the fundamental mechanism of education system and re-locate it in the center of the developmental issues and agendas to get more focus on.

Kamol Jiyankhodjaev

Migration and Urbanization
There are several modern migration routes in the Asia-Pacific Region. The majority of migration trends represent binary oppositions: Poor-Wealthy, Rural-Urban, South-North, East-West, Developing-Developed. The demographic features of these oppositions are contradictory. The left hand side of the oppositions tend to have high population growth rates with a prevalence of youth, while the right hand sides often have low birth rates and ageing populations. It seems that, due to migration into urban areas and developed countries, these oppositions complement each other in terms of supply and demand for the labour market. Other routes of migration, such as South-South, are mostly Driven by economic reasons and sometimes exacerbated by religion and armed conflicts.

The recent slow recovery of economies in OECD countries suggests a similar trend for labour demand. Faster recovery in the Russian Federation and large governmental programmes accompanied by more lenient policies towards migration imply an increased in labour demand and cause migration from Central Asian states.

Migrants' profiles: migrants normally have low overall education levels, low or irrelevant professional education levels, sparse knowledge of rules and regulations, little knowledge of the language of the recipient countries, and a lack of environmental awareness. The majority of migrants keep their families in the home countries but tend to take them when conditions allows. That creates additional pressure to the public services and social security in the host countries.

Therefore the challenge for education of both sending and receiving countries is to fill these gaps. Very few sending countries have sound migration strategies and policies. Lack of resources and policies make the levels of those unachieved by education very high in Asia and the Pacific. Therefore, many wealthy recipient countries initiate programmes for migrant social integration, with such components as adult education and training for migrant workers and their spouses. These aim firstly to develop their communication skills, professional skills and responsible citizenship. These programmes provide incentives for migrant children to access to primary and secondary education.

The education systems of the sending countries should consider responses to the challenges of migration and focus on the following “core subjects”: languages of recipient countries, a complex of Geography / History / Culture of the recipient countries, the basics of Maths and Calculus, the basics of IT/ICT, environmental awareness. These responses, in a variety of forms, could be implemented within frameworks of formal and non-formal education and training.
Kazuo Kuroda

**Student mobility in Asia and its regional impacts**

Underpinning the concept of the “East Asia Community” or Asian regional integration lays a situation where the weight of this region in the world economy is expanding and economic interdependence within the region is growing. Some economists referred to this as ‘Asianization of Asia.’ If trade and foreign direct investment statistics point to a shift in this way in the region, can a similar shift in the mind-set of students, educational administrators and policy makers also be occurring? To answer this question, this presentation tries to canvass the current status of student mobility in the region. While Asia has been historically a great sending region of international students to North America and Europe, Asian countries are now growingly becoming a great host region for international students. Given the fact that the most of these international students in Asia are coming from other Asian countries, the intra-regional student mobility in Asia is found to have grown more rapidly than the traditional pattern of inter-regional student outbound mobility to North America and Europe. Regionalization of Asian higher education and creation of Asian regional higher education market are evident at least looking at the student mobility statistics. ‘Asianization of Asia’ is also occurring not only in international economy but also in international higher education. This de facto regionalization of Asian higher education demands harmonization of higher education systems in the region and establishment of regional framework to assure quality of education to even more smoothly promote the intra-regional mobility. This presentation also tries to the implications of this student mobility trend for national and regional education policies.
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Panel Discussion 3: Social and Cultural trends and challenges

- Culture, traditions and values: What social learning outcomes for tomorrow’s world?
- Cultural diversity, languages and education policies
- Citizenship and social cohesion – learning to live together

Moderator: Ms. Nina Sardjunani
Presenters: Lopen Lungtean Gyatso, Ms. Konai Thaman and Mr. Seunghwan Lee.
Please see background papers at the back of the brochure for further information.

Lopen Lungtaen Gyatso

Educating for the 21st Century

Today, governments all over the world are considering education more of an investment and less of a service because of its enormous impact in designing national characters, conceptualizing nation-specific development philosophies and models, defining the ultimate value of a country, creating the national conscience etc.

Despite all these endeavours, the aim of Education has never been able to set-off beyond the mundane objective of producing productive and competent citizens. And the curriculum are consciously structured and meticulously designed in ways to create highly performing citizens and literate geniuses. But the irony is that not all become socially and morally responsible individuals, which the world badly needs.
Our existing curriculums are directly or remotely influenced by the dominant worldview that is largely dependent on and fed by free trade, free market and foreign investment. Universities accordingly, prescribe the outcomes of every academic programmes based on this economic model where the capacity to contribute to or impact material progress through economic efficiency is emphasized. What remains almost missing is the moral value part of education be it in business, humanities, sciences, or for that matter any discipline.

Therefore, the purpose of education should go much beyond teaching, training and learning to improve knowledge and develop skills. So, there is a need to redefine the purpose of education and explicitly create space for development of human values in the educational curriculum structures irrespective of the nature of discipline so that balance is maintained between academic and spiritual pursuits.

Konai H. Thaman

Education for All for Whom and for What? A voice from a sea of islands
While ‘diversity’ can be used to describe the Asia Pacific region as a whole, it is particularly apt in relation to its socio-cultural contexts. This presentation would focus on Oceania where diversity is again the best description of the sub-region's socio-cultural contexts against which a consideration of recent cultural and educational policies will be made, especially in relation to language. The discussion takes into consideration the 2001 Universal Declaration of Cultural Diversity and the 2005 UN Convention on the promotion and protection of diversity of cultural expressions as well as some major challenges now facing Pacific Island Nations as they try to fulfil global obligations especially in relation to EFA, UNDL and DESD. A suggestion is made in relation to a possible way forward especially for UNESCO and other UN agencies and development partners working in the Pacific region.

Seunghwan Lee

Citizenship and Social Cohesion- Learning to live together
The international community is currently experiencing the crisis of education. Education, which used to be a symbol of hope, has become a symbol of problems that threaten the social cohesion. There are many reasons for the educational crisis, but the most important one is that the purpose of education has degenerated into competition over college entrance exams. As clearly stated in the UN Human Rights Declaration, education essentially aims for “the full development of the human personality” and “the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms,” but the current educational system is too much biased to the goal of entering prestigious universities and fostering a competent labour force.

In this context of today’s education, this presentation for “Panel Discussion III: Socio-cultural Trends in the Asia-Pacific Region and Implications for Education” identifies the key problems including the high-level of illiteracy, commercialization of education and diminishing authority of teachers. Responding to these issues, it is suggested to revisit the purposes of education, prioritize the reduction of illiteracy rate, and reallocate resources to education. In addition, EIU
(Education for International Understanding) should be the mainstream of the current education to foster "learning to live together."

The Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding under the auspices of UNESCO, also known as APCEIU, has the mandate to create peace and social cohesion through a means of education. The Centre's various programs and activities give further ideas to improve citizenship and social cohesion in the micro and macro level.
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**Panel Discussion 4: Emerging Trends of Education Systems and Policies**

- Findings from student learning assessments and implications for education policy
- Key stakeholders, partnerships and shifting policy
- Financing education: role of government and household expenditure

*Moderator: Mr. Gwang-Chol Chang, UNESCO*

*Presenters: Mr. Barry McGaw, Mr. Xiaojin Zhang and Mr. Mark Bray. Please see background papers at the back of the brochure for further information.*

**Barry McGaw**

**Findings from student learning assessments and implications for education policy**

In the 1990s, OECD’s statistics and indicators on education were transformed with the addition of more indicators on outcomes. There were indicators of post-school education and labour market outcomes but direct measures of student learning were gradually added, culminating in the introduction of PISA. This offered a measure of human capital that focused on quality and not quantity, as ‘educational attainment’ does, and produced much stronger conclusions about the impact of education on economic development.

The use of outcomes to shape policy development raises concern about potentially perverse consequences of the choice of outcomes on which to focus, in particular whether that choice will
narrow the curriculum and direct too much attention to the readily measurable. On the other hand, there are efforts to take advantage of that effect, by developing new measures outcomes, including the so-called 21st century skills, in the hope that their measurement will create increased focus on them.

Monitoring can be undertaken at the system level with sample-based surveys. These are low impact and low stakes at least for students and schools. Monitoring can also be undertaken with full cohort testing. This may still be low stakes for students but can become high stakes for schools when coupled with public reporting under a 'transparency agenda'.

Reform and action are expected to flow from monitoring. How these are funded and governed is raising important questions about the capacity of the state alone to undertake the work and ways in which private investment and expertise might contribute.

Mark Bray

**Financing Education: Roles of Government and Household Expenditures**

The 1990 Jomtien and 2000 Dakar conferences recognized that EFA will not be achieved without attention to financing. This observation is no less valid in 2012.

Throughout the world, governments are the main sources of financing for basic education; but in few countries are they able to bear the burden alone. The period since 2000 has brought increasing attention to the private sector. In some settings, government schools are perceived to have been insufficiently responsive to the communities that they are expected to serve, and private schools have developed to serve even low-income households.

Attention is also focusing on the scale and implications of the so-called shadow education system of private supplementary tutoring, which is especially prominent in the Asian region. Pressures on families to invest in shadow education may undermine the goals of EFA.

Governments and households need to find balances across levels of education. Among the achievements of the last decade has been expansion of early childhood care and education as well as primary education and, in some settings, technical/vocational education and training. As countries have moved towards and beyond the EFA goals, they have required increasing resources for post-secondary and higher education that were not part of the EFA agenda.

A final issue concerns the sources of revenue for government budgets. The most obvious source is domestic taxation. Some governments have additional sources of revenue, including external aid. Budgets were seriously hit by the global economic crisis that hit in 2008, and have not yet fully recovered.
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**Session IV: Towards a regional programme for the development of the post 2015 education agenda**

**Summary Report: Key outcomes of the discussions on day one and day two**

*Mr. Gwang-Chol Chang, UNESCO, Mr. Sobhi Tawil, UNESCO, Urmila Sakar, UNICEF*

**Guided Discussion 1:**
- How should education situate itself within the broader development agenda/discourse?
- Should there be an education-specific or a broader post-2015 agenda?
- Should there be a universal or a context-specific post-2015 agenda or both?

*Moderator: Mr. Mark Bray (see panel discussion four for biography)*
Guided Discussion 2:
• What future policy directions are required for a new vision of education?
• What should be the key areas of this agenda?

Moderator: Mr. Kai-ming Cheng (see panel discussion one for biography)

Guided Discussion 3:
• What are the research gaps and key areas for forward-looking analytical work and research to feed into the process of developing the post 2015 education agenda?

Moderator: Mr. Witaya Jeradechakul
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Development of Recommendations and Next Steps:
• What future research and analytical work needs to be done?
• Which institutions should carry out this work in collaboration with UNESCO?
• Setting up partnerships and networks for future work
• Presentation of the preparations for the high-level meeting on the EFA review and the post 2015 agenda, to be hosted by RoK in 2015
• Next steps and Establishing a timeline

Moderator: Prof. Barry McGaw (see panel discussion four)
Introduced by Mr. Utak Chung, ASG, Korea National Commission
Mr. Gwang-Jo Kim, UNESCO
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Panel Discussion 1: Economic Trends and Challenges

Introduction
Over the past two decades, the Asia-Pacific region has undergone rapid economic growth, with numerous countries in the region such as China, India and the ‘East Asian Tiger’ economies having recorded remarkable increases in GDP. Notwithstanding the damaging effects of the global financial crisis, the region has continued to grow and the pace and scope of globalization and regional economic integration is accelerating. ASEAN’s integration agenda and an expansion of bilateral economic and trade links continue to shape the region’s development. Recent figures show trade dependence across the region has almost doubled since 1990 (UNESCAP 2011) and while international conditions remain uncertain, the region is still expected to lead global growth (ADB 2012).

Technological advancement has also played a crucial role in both introducing profound changes in agricultural and industrial production as such and in Driving and facilitating globalization and economic integration. Technology has changed economic activities profoundly, from reducing the costs of cross-border transactions to enabling international, real-time information flow which improved efficiency of international businesses. Technological penetration to households is also expanding at a rapid rate: the number of internet users in the region quintupled between 2000 and 2009 (UNESCAP 2011).

It is worth noting, however, that these macro trends belie vast disparities between and within countries and that economic growth has not necessarily resulted in equivalent increases in living standards in all countries. While the Asia-Pacific region has made historic achievements in terms of reducing the absolute number of people living in extreme poverty over the past twenty years, relative poverty has been on the rise (UNESCAP 2011, ADB 2012). Disparities in income, wealth and economic opportunities mean individuals’ experiences of economic development continue to differ markedly, and trends favour a widening, rather than a narrowing, of these gaps (OECD 2010, ADB 2012). Despite their capacity to improve living standards if harnessed effectively, technology, globalization, and market reforms, have been blamed for exacerbating such disparities, through their tendency to place favour capital over labour; high-skilled over low-skilled labour, and urban over rural regions. These tendencies have materialised in rising inequality in terms of income and wealth but also opportunity (ADB 2012).

Simultaneously, governments in the region, together with their international counterparts, are also increasingly attentive to the need to strike a balance between economic growth and social well-being, environmental protection and political stability. The integration of economic and environmental interests is a principal example. As the potential impacts of global climate change become clearer, attention has turned to how countries can and should adapt their economies to overcome these changed circumstances. Such adjustments have now begun to be understood in realms beyond natural resource use and energy, to encompass the ways in which other sectors can help to position countries to make the most out of these changes.
Implications for education

That education and economic objectives are linked is not new. However, the nature of this relationship is changing and so too is the policy discourse. Where education may once have been seen as a means to achieving economic development Driven by industrialization and foreign trade, it is increasingly being seen as a way of addressing a wider range of challenges. In the face of concern over social equity and equal participation in development, population pressures and environmental degradation, and a foreseeable scarcity in natural resources, education for sustainable development is gathering momentum around the world, with many nations in the region leaders in this field. Skills development to support a sustainable, ‘green’ economy has become a common catch-cry; and the role that education can play not only in providing young people with the requisite knowledge of environmental challenges, but the skills and aptitudes to innovate, adapt and be resilient have also come to the fore.

In the light of the transformation of economies and labour markets, training for pre-established job profiles is no longer possible or desirable. Enhanced international economic integration has also facilitated the freer flow of people as well as ideas. Countries in the region are now turning to harmonization of areas that directly affect education, including skills recognition and educational strategies. This growing skills mobility has intensified competition among countries, concentrating attention on ensuring that education equips young people with the skills and aptitudes to compete in a global labour market where needs are constantly changing. Under such circumstances, education systems must train learners to be innovative, able to adapt to and assimilate changes. For some countries, however, such mobility has led to fears of a ‘brain Drain’ in which trained young people seek out better economic opportunities elsewhere, to the overall detriment of the nation’s development. For these countries, the benefits of educational investments are no longer contained to the country, with impacts on the balance of the education system as a whole. In this circumstance, education systems must also adDress the disparities in economic development and be aware of the training needs for the informal market, which in many countries represents a large segment of the economy.

This Panel will discuss which economic trends, challenges and opportunities observed in the region have the most significant implications for education. Attention will be paid to economic inequalities and in which way education can play a role to adDress them. At the same time, education is not simply regarded as being reactive to economic and labour market needs, and as such, the panel will discuss the proactive role education can play in spurring new economic sectors and approaches to economic priorities. More in particular, the panel will look more in detail into two themes: green economies as an emerging sector as a response to ecological challenges as well as globalization, technological changes and the role of ICTs and consequent changes in educational requirements.

Key questions for discussions:

1. What are the key current and future economic challenges and opportunities impacting on education and what are the implications for education policy making?
2. In particular, how should education policies best respond to prepare citizens for the rapidly evolving requirements of economies?
3. How can the education sector take a key role in alleviating socio-economic inequalities?
4. What particular education policies should be developed to influence economies as regards ecological requirements in view of a sustainable development?
5. In what way can learners be better prepared for the rapid changes in technologies including IT and what policies should be developed in this view?
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Panel Discussion 2: Demographic trends and challenges

Introduction
The Asia-Pacific region is home to over four billion people, constituting 61 per cent of the world’s population (UNESCAP 2011). Yet this population is far from evenly distributed. The region contains a number of the world’s most populous countries – Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia and Pakistan, which together account for almost half of the world’s population – as well as its smallest island states. It also houses some of the most (Macau-China, Singapore, Hong Kong-China) and least (Mongolia, Australia) densely populated regions in the world.

This population is also changing, with significant demographic shifts occurring over recent decades. The demographic profile of Asia-Pacific region is characterized by a large share (estimated at 60 per cent) of the world’s youth\(^3\) population. This is both an asset and a challenge. Youth represent the most valuable asset for development and growth. Yet, there are many young people who are provided with insufficient and inadequate education. Forthcoming statistics suggest there are as many as 69 million illiterate youth (UNESCO and UNICEF (forthcoming) suffering from unemployment in the region (UNESCO and UNICEF forthcoming). While the working-age population will continue to grow for some time in the region as a whole, this growth has started to slow and will decrease sharply over the next two decades. Many countries in the region are already increasingly concerned with ageing populations. These trends will create a polarized pattern of a very large youth population in South and West Asia and increasingly older populations in East and South East Asia. In the long run, there will be a gradual demographic shift towards an older population in all countries which will have deep social, economic, political and educational implications.

Increasing economic integration of the region coupled with high unemployment in some countries have given rise to increasing migration across countries, both permanent and temporary, and both low-skilled and high-skilled labour. In the Asia-Pacific region, cross-border movements of labour have been growing two times faster on average than the growth of the labour force of the origin countries. Over 50 per cent of the migrants in the region come from

\(^{3}\) Youth: 15-24 year olds (UN Definition)
South Asia (primarily from India, Bangladesh, Pakistan and Sri Lanka), and the rest mainly originate from South-East Asia (Indonesia and the Philippines) (ILO 2006).

While the region as a whole has historically had a relatively rural population, internal migration (mainly rural to urban) has also accelerated as countries move away from agriculture-based to manufacturing and services-based economies (UNESCAP 2011). This requires planning for and action to cater for social and educational needs of migrants and their families of the receiving urban centres. Increasing human pressure on arable land, growing scarcity of water per inhabitant, environmental degradation, and infrastructure bottlenecks are also challenges facing governments in the region and more globally posed by these population trends.

**Implications for education**

The implications of demographic changes for education is manifested not only by increased numbers of learners to be catered for, but also through the changing socio-cultural and economic profiles of children, men, and women who compose the diversity of populations. These changes affect the demand for and supply of education as well as the type and content of education required to respond to changed and diverse educational needs.

The region is still marked by wide disparities across and within countries as regards educational attainment with highly educated societies versus large numbers of un-reached populations concentrated in a few countries, leading to questions of equity, quality and inclusiveness of education. This diversity of educational needs requires diverse education policy approaches.

Youth bulges in some countries and ageing populations in the others have important implications for educational policies and will require diverse educational responses to evolving skills needs in the perspective of lifelong learning.

In addition to demographic shifts, the implications of migration need to be taken into consideration for developing education policies. Increasing migration of labour has given rise to new training needs as regards work and language skills. This requires enhancing access and quality of lifelong learning opportunities, including through non-formal channels. Moreover, learners must be prepared for work and live not only in their own locations but also beyond, implying a new regional and international character for education and the need to respond to an increasingly mobile workforce. At the same time, receiving countries have to adjust their education systems to deal with increasingly multi-cultural and multi-lingual school populations. The same is true within countries with important internal migration from rural to urban areas. It is of paramount importance that urban policies acknowledge the interdependence among actors in areas such as education and environment.

The growing mobility of labour across borders has benefited sending and receiving countries as well as the migrants themselves. Increased mobility and migration, however, also can bring about negative consequences such as cultural conflicts, brain-Drain (migration of highly skilled workers), brain waste (educated and skilled migrants from developing countries being only able to find unskilled jobs in developed countries) and the risk of dependency on foreign labour. Student mobility, in particular in the higher education sector, and labour mobility require
regional and cross border collaboration and harmonization and mutual recognition of educational and skills qualifications.

This panel discussion will examine the implications for education of rapid demographic shifts, and important migration and urbanization in the region. It will discuss how education policies should best respond to the resulting challenges while seizing the opportunities and shape education policies for the future.

**Key questions for discussion:**

1. What are the key current and future demographic challenges and opportunities impacting on education and what are the implications for education policy making?
2. In particular, what are the implications for education policies of youth bulges and increasingly ageing populations?
3. What national and regional education policies are required to best respond to migration and growing urbanization challenges and opportunities?
4. In particular, what would be adequate educational responses in terms of policies and content in the light of rapidly changing societal structures and increasingly multi-cultural, multi-ethnic and multi-lingual societies?
5. How should education policies best respond to disparities within countries to deliver equitable, inclusive and quality education in particular to marginalized and unreached populations?
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**Panel Discussion 3: Social and Cultural trends and challenges**

**Introduction**

More than a decade into the 21st century, it is increasingly being acknowledged that a purely economic model of development is not sufficient to respond to the problems facing the world. Research and initiatives by many different bodies and individuals, including UNDP’s human development reports since early 1990s, more recently OECD’s Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, the University of London’s Institute for Education and the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress (‘Stiglitz, Sen and Fitoussi Commission’ 2009), have highlighted that a more appropriate model of human development would be one that incorporates socio-cultural dimensions, including consideration of cultural practices and traditions, ethnic identities and language.
While there is an inherent tension between the increasingly globalized character of the world today and the need to preserve cultural identities and value systems, minority languages and the traditions of indigenous populations, there is growing awareness that development – and the development of education systems in particular – must find the right balance between the local and the global, tradition and modernity, preservation and innovation, academic and non-cognitive skills (also see: Delors 1996).

The trend toward a wider vision of development is also motivated by the persistence of intra- and inter-national conflict, social unrest, and consequently, the increasing attention paid to how social institutions can support peace and social cohesion. At the same time as countries become increasingly interconnected, national and global citizenship and civics have come to the fore, as well as the importance of learning to live together as one key social learning outcome.

Implications for education

Education should not only respect local socio-cultural traditions but draw upon existing knowledge systems and values and incorporate them into modern education, building upon them. Some national systems of education are increasingly working to find ways to accommodate the socio-cultural sphere, including the teaching of indigenous and other minority groups’ histories in culturally sensitive ways, the teaching of ethics and values and bilingual or mother tongue education. The latter is particularly significant given that teaching students in their mother tongue has been shown to not only improve their academic results, but also to provide communication skills, critical mindsets and opportunities to learn through aspects of one’s own culture. Given the linguistic diversity of the region (2500 languages are found in the Asia-Pacific region and Papua New Guinea alone has more than 850 languages (UNESCO 2007)), this is a particularly pertinent consideration.

In some other countries, governments prefer to promote the dominant language in the interest of national unity. Regardless of the diverging ways in which countries may attempt to balance these two forces, it is important to better understand and explore the complexities of this issue. At the same time, it is interesting to note that the more holistic and culturally sensitive vision of human development has inspired the construction of new indices and measures which take account of socio-cultural factors, such as Bhutan’s Gross National Happiness (GNH) Index, the OECD’s better life index (based very much on the findings of the ’Stiglitz, Sen and Fitoussi Commission’), and OECD’s social indicators, which include measures of equity, health and social cohesion.

A related consideration concerns the purpose of education. Beyond its cognitive dimensions aimed at producing highly performing students for the labour market, there is increasing recognition of the role of education in teaching people to live together. This more comprehensive conception of education acknowledges its centrality in promoting peace, citizenship and sustainable development and responding to crucial challenges such as ethnic and religious conflict, youth unemployment, social unrest and HIV and AIDS. While this aspect of education has been largely neglected in both international discourse and national policy, there
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4 The four pillars of GNH are the promotion of sustainable development, preservation and promotion of cultural values, conservation of the natural environment, and the establishment of good governance.
are a number of nascent initiatives to define and measure this domain, including the OECD’s projects on the Social Outcomes of Learning and Education and Social Progress as well as the University of London Institute for Education’s Centre for Research on the Wider Benefits of Learning. In the lead-up to 2015 and beyond, it is important to increase our exploration of how education systems should go about promoting learning for the acquisition of the non-cognitive skills needed to confront contemporary challenges and to be responsible and engaged members of society. Additionally, the need to evaluate the acquisition of such skills requires new paradigms of assessment.

This panel on socio-cultural trends and challenges and their implications for education will discuss these issues, and in particular, how education systems can harness the opportunities posed by an increasingly complex socio-cultural environment.

**Key questions for discussion:**

1. What are the key current and future socio-cultural challenges and opportunities impacting on education and what are the implications for education policy making?
2. How can education policies ensure the right balance between meeting educational needs in a globalized world while preserving cultural identities and value systems, minority languages and the traditions of indigenous populations?
3. How should education policies best reflect cultural and linguistic diversity?
4. What social outcomes should be generated by education? How can education policies promote the achievement of these outcomes in concrete terms?
5. In particular, in which way can citizenship and social cohesion be fostered by education and how can this be reflected in education policies?
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Panel Discussion 4: Emerging Trends of Education Systems and Policies

Introduction
In an environment in which the world is becoming smaller or “flatter” (Friedman 2005), many have argued that the sheer force of globalization has placed governments in increasingly similar and constrained policy environments, including in education. In this view, while globalization has certainly produced a range of social and economic benefits, the increased transnational flow of information, capital, goods and people has undermined the sovereignty of the nation state. Governments are now exposed to an ever more challenging new policy environment; one characterized by, amongst other things: increased global competition; widening income and wealth gaps between and within countries; and enhanced financial volatility. In this view, openness has simultaneously made countries increasingly vulnerable to external “shocks” and increased the costs of disengagement.

Under such circumstances, there is little contestation that the nature of education policy-making has changed, and these changes are likely to intensify. Education policies are now made in an environment in which there is: (1) a push for quantifiable results; (2) an increasing role of non-state actors; (3) stronger emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness; (4) greater prominence given to questions of accountability and transparency of government; and (5) a more intense pressure on public financing. These trends can be observed across the Asia-Pacific region, despite the diversity in national economic, demographic and socio-cultural profiles. While being home to the largest number of people living in extreme poverty and of youth and adult illiterates in the world, coupled with gender inequality, concentrated in some parts of the region, Asia-Pacific is also a region that drives global development with some of the world’s biggest economies. Yet notwithstanding these differences, countries in the region are increasingly comparing themselves with higher-income countries in the region such as Australia, Japan, Republic of Korea and Singapore. This has resulted in increasing active policy benchmarking within the region, whereby South-South cooperation is taking the place of the traditional North-South transfer of policies. Together, these dynamics are resulting in a greater similarity in policy responses across multiple sectors, including education.

Implications for Education
Although education policy transfer has been taking place for centuries, the magnitude and speed of transfer is unprecedented. The world surrounding education has become increasingly complicated, influenced by global competition, international benchmarking, and financial

constraints, to name just a few factors. The search for “best practice” has become a major preoccupation for national governments, often Driven by international development partners, consultants, and academics.

As a result, education systems around the world seem to be converging into an “international norm.” At the level of policy objectives, building a “knowledge-based economy” or “knowledge-based society” through good quality education has become a mantra for every country, either developed or developing, and international development partners (both financial and technical) are actively facilitating education transfer in this area. In this process, similar policies were introduced in many countries under the flag of “improving the quality of education,” including a movement away from input-based to outcomes-based analysis and the quantification of learning results; greater involvement of the private sector in education both in financing and service delivery; focus on student-centred learning; and increased governance and accountability through greater scrutiny of education system performance.

For many policy makers, international standardized-assessments of student learning such as OECD’s PISA, TIMSS, and TALIS have become some of the most important tools in setting trends of education policy reforms. While these assessments have traditionally focused mostly on cognitive skills, there is increased international reflection and research on looking at social outcomes of learning as well as on wider non-cognitive and so-called ‘softer’ skills beyond measurement of academic achievements, which include behavioural and emotional development, communication skills and interpersonal relationships, values, ethics, social responsibility, civic engagement, citizenship, and health (see OECD 2011 SQL Indicators, and University of London Institute for Education (IOE’s) Centre for Research on the Wider Benefits of Learning (WBL).

As a recent publication (Breakspear 2012) points out, PISA results not only stir heated policy discussion, they also have a significant influence on policy reform in the majority of participating countries and economies. System Assessment and Benchmarking for Education Results, or SABER (World Bank 2012), a recent endeavour by the World Bank and UNESCO Bangkok, aims to develop an international benchmarking tool to interrogate the relationship between education policies and the quality of learning measured largely using PISA scores. The willingness of countries to participate in these initiatives demonstrates that they are increasingly looking to international benchmarking and standards not only in inputs to education systems (e.g., public expenditure on education, teacher salary, and class size) but also in education systems design and implementation by looking at more qualitative aspects of education policies (see also McKinsey and Co. 2007 and 2010).

There is a growing awareness of the pressures being placed on public financing of education and a resulting need to seek more efficient use of these limited resources. This has brought about greater accountability in the investment of public resources for education, and turned attention to ways in which to supplement them through greater fiscal capacity, new
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partnerships with non-state actors, as well as through advocacy for increased official development assistance.

As a corollary, governments in Asia and the Pacific are also witnessing an increasing role of non-state actors in education financing and delivery. Private schooling is on the rise in many countries – both developed and developing – and numerous studies have shown that private household expenditure on education has increased in recent times (both in terms of private tutoring/shadow education and education support). This may reflect a real or perceived failure on the part of the public education system to deliver quality education for all, or simply households’ desire to keep up in an increasingly competitive economy. Either way, the implications for equity, efficiency, and quality are real, and attempts to address them raise thorny questions about choice, regulation and the appropriate role of government.

Increased focus on efficiency and effectiveness through accountability and good governance is another major trend in policy reforms. Decentralization – or more specifically, school-based management – has become a popular reform item in many countries, backed by some empirical evidence suggesting that it could be associated with improved learning. There is a move towards more decentralized policy planning, making, and implementation while developing necessary capacity at lower levels of authority remains a major challenge in many countries.

Taken together, these trends point to an increasingly complex education policy environment. While globalization in education policy-making has certainly benefited countries to take advantage of lessons learned and “leap-frog” in order to introduce policy reforms that demonstrated promising results elsewhere, there is a risk that such reforms are being introduced at the possible expense of accounting for local context. Existing studies show that education policies imported out of context will not be effective to produce desired results. In addition, studies have also pointed to the role that policy ‘competition’ can play in promoting innovation and performance; benefits which may be undermined by a movement toward greater homogeneity in education policy.

This panel will discuss the above trends in policy environment and their implications on education for all stakeholders, while making an effort to identify potential national and regional education policies that enable countries in the region to best respond to the changing world. It will also discuss how non-cognitive skills can be systematically included in student assessment, in order to inform policy making. It will further discuss financing of education, investigating both the role of government and household expenditures.

**Key questions for discussion:**

1. What are the key current and future challenges and opportunities in the policy environment impacting on education and what are the implications for education policy making?
2. How can findings from student learning assessments be better harnessed for education policy making? How can assessment of learning be broadened to systematically include non-cognitive learning aspects, and be used effectively for policy making?
3. How are these new policy developments affecting key actors (teachers, students, parents, education leaders, policy-makers etc)?
4. How should non-state actors in education such as INGOs, IFIs, and private enterprises be taken into consideration for educational policy making and what should be the role of the State with regard to educational standard setting, quality control, equity, etc.

5. What are the key shifts in education finance that need to be taken into consideration for education policy making? What financial measures should be taken to use limited resources more efficiently? What role could non-state actors play to support education financing?
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Additional Papers

Overview of content

*The 1996 ‘Delors Report’ Vision, Impact and Relevance*

This discussion paper briefly outlines the vision of education and learning as articulated in 1996 Delors Report, as well as the impact that this vision has had on education policy and practice worldwide. The paper examines these issues as a basis for the revisiting of the report by an international panel of high level experts (currently being established by UNESCO) in order to determine the degree of continued relevance of this vision for education in the future given societal transformations since the mid-1990s. To what extent does the analysis remain valid in the contemporary global context, what would need to be adjusted or refined in the vision given new emerging challenges for education and learning?

*Reflections on the post-Millennium Development Goal agenda*

This paper canvasses the reflections of a selection of non-governmental and research-based institutions on the Millennium Development Goals and the post-2015 development agenda. It aims to provide a picture of the considerations and priorities of non-United Nations stakeholders on the overarching future development framework, within which education priorities will be determined.

Further useful documents and related resources are available on the UNESCO Bangkok Website ([http://www.unescobkk.org/education/epr/erf/](http://www.unescobkk.org/education/epr/erf/)).

Introduction

Background

One of the main functions of UNESCO is to serve as an international laboratory of ideas to guide the global debate on the future of education. As part of this function, the former Director-General of UNESCO, Federico Mayor, established the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century presided by Jacques Delors which produced a report in 1996 entitled: *Learning: The treasure within*. Much like the Faure report *Learning to Be: The world of education today and tomorrow* which was published a quarter of century earlier in 1972, the ‘Delors’ report has been widely considered to be a key worldwide reference on the conceptualisation of education and learning.

Rationale

While these analyses continue to inspire thinking on education worldwide, it to be noted that societal transformations underway since the 1990s have given rise to fresh challenges which call for a re-conceptualisation of education. Moreover, in the current juncture of the close of the international development agenda defined by the Education for All (EFA) and education-related Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) set for 2015, it is timely to revisit the 1996 Delors report in view of informing both the current debate on the international development agenda post-2015, as well as the shaping of a renewed vision for education for the future.

Purpose

The purpose of this discussion paper then is to briefly outline the vision of education and learning as articulated in 1996 Delors Report, as well as the impact that this vision has had on education policy and practice worldwide. This paper examines these issues as a basis for the revisiting of the report by an international panel of high level experts (currently being established by UNESCO) in order to determine the degree of continued relevance of this vision for education in the future given societal transformations since the mid-1990s. To what extent does the analysis remain valid in the contemporary global context, what would need to be adjusted or refined in the vision given new emerging challenges for education and learning?

Guiding questions

The vision:

- As a vision document, in what way has the delors report inspired thinking on education and learning?
- Are the four pillars of learning conceptualised in 1996 - *Learning to be; Learning to do; Learning to know;* and *Learning to live together* – still relevant and adequate to respond to the multifaceted changes and crises we are experiencing in societal development world-wide?
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• Is *Learning to be*, as articulated in 1972, still relevant in the context of an information, knowledge and communication revolution that has fundamentally transformed our understandings of time and space, and our own individual roles and relations in societal development?
• Is the 1996 conceptualisation of *Learning to live together* fully appropriate in the context of our heightened exposure to multiple and seemingly conflicting value systems and cultural models?
• Is the articulation of *Learning to know* and *Learning to do* as developed in the 1996 “Delors Report” still sufficiently valid in the current context of thinking focused on more flexible and adaptable skills capable of addressing new and unforeseen changes in the labour market, as a result of scientific research, technological innovation and their application to the world of production?
• Is it necessary to possibly explore the need for “*Learning to unlearn*” and “*Learning to relearn*” throughout life in order to harness our creative and innovative capacities that are key to increasingly knowledge-based societies?

**Impact on Policy and Practice:**

• What has been the impact of the ‘Delors’ vision both on international, as well as national educational discourse, policy and practice?
• Is it true that the Delors report is difficult to translate into educational practice? Is this equally true for countries in the ‘North’ as in the ‘South’?
• How does the Delors report relate to EFA? Why revisit the Delors report as we approach 2015?

**1. The Vision of Learning**

*Learning: The Treasure Within* (1996) was a report specifically prepared for UNESCO by an independent commission chaired by Jacques Delors and composed of fifteen personalities from various backgrounds. In early 1993, the Director General of UNESCO thought it was time to aggregate contemporary ideas on education and gather existing views on how we should consider education for the twenty-first century. The Delors report reaffirmed and broadened the concept of *learning throughout life* already presented in the 1972 Faure report *Learning to Be*. The concept was to be one of the keys of the 21st century because “it meets the challenge of a rapidly changing world, and it is necessary because of its advantages of flexibility, diversity and availability at different times and in different places. It also goes beyond the traditional distinction between initial schooling and continuing education”. *Learning: The Treasure Within* highlights various recommendations such as: Learning to respect diversity; combating inequitable economic growth, building bridges between school and work life; formulating a time credit for education; reviewing the role of teachers; and rethinking the challenges posed by the development of new information technologies. The introductory essay on "*the education: a necessary Utopia*" indicates clearly that the vision articulated in the report is placed in long-term
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8 “The literate person of the twenty-first century will no longer be the one who cannot read or write, but the person who does not know how to learn, unlearn, and relearn”. (Alvin Toffler).
9 Delors et al. (1996).
perspective of the 21st century. Considering the extraordinary diversity that characterizes education in our world, the report had the strong ambition to focus on a subject that occupies a central place in the world; namely, how education and its institutions can promote the creative capacity of individuals and thereby promote cohesion in an increasingly globalized world.

**The four pillars of learning**

The report is based on four key pillars underlying education and life; learning to be, learning to know, learning to do and learning to live together:

**Learning to know:** Learning to know, includes *Learning to learn*, an instrumental learning skill inherent to basic education, which allows individuals to benefit from educational opportunities that arise throughout life. "Bearing in mind the rapid changes brought about by scientific progress and new forms of economic and social activity", Learning to know allows for the combination of a "broad general education with the possibility of working in depth on a selected number of subjects".10

**Learning to do:** Learning to do emphasizes the acquisition of vocational skills necessary to practice a profession or trade. Partnerships between the worlds of education and that of business and industry are encouraged in view promoting a variety of arrangements that allow education and training to interact with the world of work. In addition to learning to practice a profession or trade, people need to develop the ability to adapt to a variety of often unforeseeable situations and to work in teams – these skills have conventionally not been given due attention in education.

**Learning to be:** Learning to be was the central theme of the Faure Report published by UNESCO in 1972 which emphasized the development of the human potential to its fullest. The 1972 recommendations were still considered to be extremely relevant in the Delors Report "for in the twenty-first century everyone will need to exercise greater independence and judgment combined with a stronger sense of personal responsibility for the attainment of common goals."

**Learning to live together:** Learning to live together is seen as needing to develop an understanding of others, of their history, their traditions, and their spirituality. Such understanding "would provide a basis for the creation of a new spirit which, guided by recognition of our growing interdependence and a common analysis of the risks and challenges of the future, would induce people to implement common projects or to manage the inevitable conflicts in an intelligent and peaceful way" [...] and "to escape from the dangerous cycle sustained by cynicism and complacency.11

**Tensions12**

Finally, the Delors report argues that technological and social changes observed in the mid 1990s were generating a range of tensions between:

**The global and the local:** "[...] people need gradually to become world citizens without losing their roots and while continuing to play an active part in the life of their nation and their local community."

10 Delors et al. (1996).
11 Delors et al. (1996).
12 The citations relative to these tensions are all taken from the 1996 Delors Report.
The universal and the individual: “[... ] culture is steadily being globalized, but as yet only partially. We cannot ignore the promises of globalization nor its risks, not the least of which is the risk of forgetting the unique character of individual human beings; it is for them to choose their own future and achieve their full potential within the carefully tended wealth of their traditions and their own cultures which, unless we are careful, can be endangered by contemporary developments.”

Tradition and modernity: “[... ] which is part of the same problem: how is it possible to adapt to change without turning one’s back on the past, how can autonomy be acquired in complementarity with the free development of others and how can scientific progress be assimilated? This is the spirit in which the challenges of the new information technologies must be met.”

Long-term and short-term considerations: “[... ] this has always existed but today it is sustained by the predominance of the ephemeral and the instantaneous, in a world where an over-abundance of transient information and emotions continually keeps the spotlight on immediate problems. Public opinion cries out for quick answers and ready solutions, whereas many problems call for a patient, concerted, negotiated strategy of reform. This is precisely the case where education policies are concerned.”

The need for competition and the concern for equality of opportunity: “[... ] this is a classic issue, which has been facing both economic and social policy-makers and educational policy-makers since the beginning of the century. Solutions have sometimes been proposed but they have never stood the test of time. Today, the Commission ventures to claim that the pressures of competition have caused many of those in positions of authority to lose sight of their mission, which is to give each human being the means to take full advantage of every opportunity. This has led us, within the terms of reference of the report, to rethink and update the concept of lifelong education so as to reconcile three forces: competition, which provides incentives; co-operation, which gives strength; and solidarity, which unites.”

The extraordinary expansion of knowledge and human beings’ capacity to assimilate it: “[... ] the Commission was unable to resist the temptation to add some new subjects for study, such as self-knowledge, ways to ensure physical and psychological well-being or ways to an improved understanding of the natural environment and to preserving it better. Since there is already increasing pressure on curricula, any clear-sighted reform strategy must involve making choices, providing always that the essential features of a basic education that teaches pupils how to improve their lives through knowledge, through experiment and through the development of their own personal cultures are preserved.”

The spiritual and the material: “[... ] often without realizing it, the world has a longing, often unexpressed, for an ideal and for values that we shall term ‘moral’. It is thus education’s noble task to encourage each and every one, acting in accordance with their traditions and convictions and paying full respect to pluralism, to lift their minds and spirits to the plane of the universal and, in some measure, to transcend themselves. It is no exaggeration on the Commission’s to say that the survival of humanity depends thereon.”
Beyond the utilitarian economic vision of the 1990s

In order to fully appreciate the novelty proposed by the Delors report in 1996, it is useful to recall the international education development context in which it was published. Indeed, the end of the Cold War spelled the end of what might be termed the “Golden Age” of development that spanned the previous decades marked by a global context of bi-polar geopolitics. During the period prior to the 1990s, a range of disciplines in the social sciences supplemented the earlier classical macro-economic approaches to development, acknowledging the importance and diversity of social dynamics in local contexts. The dynamics of development cooperation was enriched by the emergence of international and national NGOs and other non-state partners. However, the end of the Cold War - symbolized by the fall of the Berlin Wall – saw the emergence of a mono-polar world order in the 1990s and the triumph of economic liberalism and capitalist ideologies. With what was perceived of as the confirmation of the failure of the socialist development model, the market was increasingly seen as the main factor of regulation in a globalized world. Within this ideological context, there was a return to the more traditional utilitarian economic approaches to development, in which investment in education was framed in terms of its positive impact of education on human development.13

A humanistic and integrated vision of education

Published in the mid-1990s, the Delors report offered a different vision for education than the dominant utilitarian, economic one prevalent at that time. The Delors report was based on a vision of “education as a public good with a fundamental role to play in personal and social development” thus providing a guide for education systems to “make them more meaningful, flexible, and fair, based on the four pillars of education.”14

The context in which the report was written was one of important changes in thinking about education and in education development policy. The humanistic and optimistic view dominant in the sixties and seventies of a holistic education aimed at both individual and societal progress had ceded predominance to a more utilitarian view based on policymakers’ desires to build human capital. The value of education was widely expressed in “rates of return” on investment (public and private) and helped reinforce a strongly capitalistic and productivistic view of the value of education.(...). It proclaimed a deeply humanistic vision of education as a holistic process, linking the acquisition of knowledge to practice, and balancing individual with collective competence. It posited the fundamental and idealistic view of education as much broader than economics.15
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13 This discourse rests on rationales for investment in education illustrated through its return in terms of increased rural productivity and urban self employment, higher levels of earnings in the formal sector, lowered fertility, better diet and earlier and effective diagnosis of illness, food security, better child health care (particularly through higher levels of female education), and longer life expectancy.
14 Burnett (2008).
15 Draxler (2010).
Limits of the vision

While the report has been seen as being “more profoundly humanistic [...] and less market Driven” than the visions of education proposed by such development partners as the World Bank or the OECD, others are more critical. Bhola (1997), for instance, argues that the vision remains influenced by conventional development discourse in which education is seen “as preparation for a future working life, not for social praxis in the present” and that it promotes a “formalization of education, not a freeing of the process of education from bureaucratic systems of delivery”. Noting that ideological analysis of the Delors Report has remained rare, Lee (2007) analyses the ideological underpinnings of the educational vision proposed. “[W]hile the Delors Report reaffirmed social democratic liberalism based on the Faure Commission’s humanistic and utopian ethos of learning throughout life, it was the schooling discourse which was centered in its social democratic liberalism”. Furthermore, Teasedale (1999) has argued that “[...] many people in the Asia-Pacific region see it as a Eurocentric document, notwithstanding the diverse cross-cultural composition of its 15 member Commission.”

The challenges of translating the vision into practice

Some have also argued that this vision is too utopian and does not easily translate into practice. Even proponents of the report admit that the “conclusions were more philosophical than practical”, but go on to affirm that this – as the report itself states in its introduction - is perhaps a “necessary utopia”. It is true that the challenges of operationalizing a vision of lifelong learning and monitoring the quality and relevance of education through the four pillars of learning are daunting as they suppose system-wide frameworks and interdisciplinary approaches. It is interesting to note in connection with this the ‘Discussion kit’ prepared by the Canadian Commission for UNESCO in 1997 precisely as a tool “to facilitate discussion of the principal ideas contained in the Delors Report” among “young people, parents, teachers, adults in training, practitioners in the non formal sector, education and training officials and government employees and members involved in education reform”. The report was clearly a vision document, proposing a philosophical approach to the ultimate purpose of education. As such, it required a dedicated effort to translate the framework in an operational way into education strategies and practice. Recognizing the continued relevance for thinking on education, Bhola (2000) has characterized the report as a “postmodern document in need of intelligent deconstruction”.

2. The Impact of the Delors Vision

What do we know about the impact that the Delors report has had? As a document proposing paradigms for the conceptualisation of an integrated and humanistic vision of education, it is not always easy to determine the impact it has had on policy and practice. Although there has been no systematic follow-up on the influence and impact of the report, it is safe to say that it
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18 Lee (2007).
19 Teasedale (1999).
20 Draxler (2010).
22 Bhola (2000).
generated a great deal of interest both in terms of education policy debates and curriculum development. Its impact has been likened to that of a 'White Paper':

It informed but did not dictate legislation and policy at the international level. It formed a backdrop for reflection for decision-makers. It was translated into more than 30 languages, was an integral part of policy debate in every country where a language version was available, and generated special initiatives in at least 50 countries. Schools and districts took the four pillars the report proposed as a way of viewing the purpose of education as a basis of reviewing their curricula.23

While the evidence on the direct impact of the Delors report is "scattered", it was affirmed that by 2008, it had impacted on:

Fifty or so major policy conferences had the report as a central theme, reports of legislation in a dozen or so countries, local applications, continued debate in scholarly and other publications, and continued references in the policies of UNESCO, the World Bank, and bilateral donors' papers...24

**Influencing policy concepts and focus**

The Delors report has undeniably had a visible impact on education policy at the global level. It is important to stress that the four pillars of learning were envisaged against the backdrop of the notion of *lifelong learning*, itself an adaptation of the concept of Lifelong Education as initially conceptualised in the landmark 1972 UNESCO publication *Learning to Be*. Understood not only as lifelong, but also as life-wide, lifelong learning is seen as the key organizing principle for education and training systems, as well as for the building of the “knowledge society”.25 As such, assessing the quality of learning cannot be reduced to schooling or to the formal education and training sectors. Bearing in mind that learning happens both within and outside of school, analysis of the social and economic context of learners is essential to reaching a better understanding of quality in education.26 Nor can employability and socioeconomic integration be seen as the only purpose or result of (successful) learning. In the lifelong learning perspective, learning is about the development of the whole person:

It is about allowing every individual to participate in society and making our society more cohesive. Learning enables people to develop to their full potential and to play an active role in their environments. It allows them to try new things and to harness untapped talents. Along with enhancing employment opportunities and professional standing, learning lays the groundwork for fulfilment in life.27

This Lifelong Learning paradigm, so central to the Delors vision of a 'learning society', has had a significant influence in terms of global education policy. While the paradigm is not new, "it is undisputable that the Delors Report is UNESCO's most important policy report on lifelong learning since the 1972 Faure Report" (...), and, as such, "seems to have had a policy influence
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23 Draxler (2010).
25 Torres (2010).
not only on UNESCO's member countries but also on some leading international agencies such as the EU." 20

**Monitoring policy implementation**

There have also been some interesting attempts to monitor such policy orientations in the Canadian and European contexts. Indeed, Drawing on the pioneering work of the Canadian Council of Learning in developing the Composite Lifelong Learning Index29, the Bertelsmann Stiftung has developed an index for European countries based on indicators that cover the various domains of lifelong learning as defined by the four pillars of learning. These European Lifelong Learning Indicators (ELLI) and composite index are an attempt to capture at least a portion of the concept of lifelong learning in the European context.30 The selection of relevant indicators is necessarily conditioned by the social, economic and cultural realities of each context and it would be interesting to see how this composite index may be adapted (or not) to ensure relevance to non-European context-specific realities. Indeed, others (Bola 2010; Torres 2010) have argued that while the vision of “learning throughout life” outlined in the Delors report may become a reality for countries in the North, the “paradigm has so far had little impact on countries in the South”.31 Indeed, it “will remain a fantasy for most of the countries in the developing world where learning throughout life has to be translated into basic education with development-oriented content and taught through adult literacy and adult education programs.”32

"Pathway" for education reform

As a philosophical document providing a broad vision, the 'Delors report' has arguably served as a "pathway for reform" guiding policy debate for education reform in a number of countries and regions. In Latin America and the Caribbean, for instance, it was been suggested - in the context of globalization of the late 1990s - that the Delors report should serve as an important reference in the debate on the nature of reform required for education systems:

The pathway for reform is laid out in the philosophy and agenda of the Delors Report. In its emphasis on the value of education as a tool for economic and human capital development; in its vision of learning as learning to know, learning to do, learning to live together and learning to be; in its central focus on teachers and policy-makers as the keys to change and reform; the Report provides a broad vision of the direction of change efforts.33

The Delors report was thus seen as an essential philosophical framework that could help guide the reform agenda as countries within the Latin American and Caribbean region attempted to “reengineer their education systems”.34 Another example of the role of the 'Delors Report' in inspiring thinking on education policy is evident in the 1998 India Country Paper on Vocational Education in which “both learning to know and learning to do would be critical” to the process of adaptation throughout life within an integrated vision of learning:
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20 Lee (2007).
29 Canadian Council of Learning (2010).
30 Bertelsmann Stiftung (2010).
31 Torres (2010).
32 Bhola (2010).
Learning to be and learning to live together – the other two pillars of learning, the one based on self actualization and the other on tolerance and non-violence towards others would mesh with the first two producing an integrated man and commutatively an integrated society. There would thus to be in the education scenario of tomorrow no room for separation of work and education. The pursuit of a vocation, skill or technology would not be a stand-alone one but fused with the pursuit of education as a whole in a lifelong synthesis.35

Reference to gauge the quality and relevance of education

The four pillars of learning outlined in the Delors report may also serve as a reference to gauge the relevance of education.36 While the assessment of the effectiveness, efficiency and equity of education systems is a more objective exercise and can be approached through qualitative data, assessing the relevance of the educational processes, their outcomes and impact, is much more challenging. This is due to the fact that the perceived relevance of education is subjective and can only be defined in any given context at any given time, in terms of the consensus reached - between stakeholders with differing perspectives - on what the purpose of education is/should be, how best to produce this, and if existing education systems are doing that in a satisfactory manner. As has been suggested by the UNESCO Regional Bureau for Education in Latin America and the Caribbean, relevance is a key dimension of quality, albeit subjective, of the quality of education.37 The four pillars of learning, as outlined in Learning: The treasure within, are thus a useful reference when gauging the relevance and quality of educational processes. Quality education may be seen to be founded on the four pillars of learning, inspired by an integrated conceptualization of the quality and relevance of learning that provides the cognitive, moral and cultural dimensions of learning. As such, de Lisle (1998) has argued that "[t]he four pillars constitute [...] a broad guide to the reform of the instructional subsystem which include the elements of pedagogy, curriculum, and teacher trainer methodologies", as well as "outlining a direction for the reform of teachers and teaching...".38

Informing curriculum design

As a broad set of integrated goals, the four pillars of learning provide a useful reference for the reorientation and reorganization of school curriculum. In emphasizing the "all-rounded development and the full flowering of the human potential of individual learners", the pillar of 'learning to be', for instance, encourages more balanced school curricula “taking into account not only the cognitive-intellectual dimension of personality but its spiritual, moral, social skills and values aspects.” In addition, the pillar of “learning to live together” calls for the strengthening of a learning area devoted to promoting skills and values based on the principles of respect for life, human dignity and cultural diversity. Taken collectively, the four pillars provide a vision towards learning throughout life in which “school education is only part or a phase of the learning continuum”.39 Seen within this lifelong and lifewide perspective, the Delors vision is a useful reference to ensure that curricular objectives in basic schooling aim to equip learners with the learning tools to enrich and expand their learning outside and beyond schooling. One interesting example of the concrete translation of the Delors vision into curriculum design is the recent development of the Basque curriculum for compulsory

37 UNESCO Santiago.
schooling in Spain. The 1996 ‘Delors Report’, as well as the 2005 Council of Europe’s White Book on Education and training served as the two basic references for the development of the 2005 Basque curriculum for basic schooling. The curriculum framework is based on the following general competencies adapted from the ‘Delors Report’: Learning to learn and to think; Learning to communicate; Learning to live together; Learning to be oneself; Learning to do and to initiate/undertake. Articulation is then ensured between these general competencies and more specific multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary and disciplinary competencies. UNESCO has also generated a number of sourcebooks inspired by the “four pillars of learning” and that are designed for educators, teachers and learners.

### 3. How does Delors vision relate to EFA?

What impact has the Delors report had on UNESCO’s own program, in particular EFA that has framed the organization’s work in education at least since 2000? Burnett (2008) has argued that the lifelong learning vision, on which the Delors report is based, is “embedded in the Dakar framework” and that the recognition that learning starts in the early years, for instance, influenced the formulation of the first EFA goal set in 2000 and which calls for the expansion of early childhood care and education. Likewise, it has been argued that the Delors Report has been influential in the development of the concept of *life skills* - understood to go beyond vocational and practical skills and knowledge to encompass social skills - particularly as it was elaborated in the Dakar Framework for Action in 2000.

Others, however, do not agree. Torres (2010), for instance, argues that “EFA goals replicate the conventional education mentality and do not facilitate a holistic understanding of education and of learning throughout life”, but rather a segmented view of learning. Indeed, she argues that the linkages between the goals are not apparent, they are organized by age, perpetuate the dichotomy between formal and non-formal education, neglect informal learning, and view literacy in isolation. Furthermore, EFA focuses on basic education and primarily on “meeting basic learning needs”, and neglects the need to expand them and generate new learning needs. While the Delors report recognizes the notion of basic education (as articulated in Jomtien in 1990) as the “passport to life”, it also emphasizes the importance of secondary education as the “crossroads of life”, as well as of higher education as the site for learning throughout life.

The impact of the Delors vision on EFA thus appears to be limited. As has been pointed out:

It is a seminal and very ambitious document, wider in scope than anything UNESCO has attempted since the late 1960s. It attempts to identify both ‘the state of play’ and desirable future direction for education across all sectors around the world. While its messages are particularly relevant for developing countries, the report Draws developed countries into UNESCO’s common purpose of establishing a united, equitable and sustainable world. He goes
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41 See, for example, the series produced by the Asia Pacific Network for Education and Values Education (APNEIV) in partnership with the Asia Pacific Centre for Educational Innovation for Development (APEID), and UNEVOC (2002; 2005).
42 Burnett (2008).
on to affirm that "The report is much wider in scope than its other major initiative in the decade, the Education for All program launched in 1990.\textsuperscript{44}

This is indeed regrettable as it undoubtedly contributed to the exacerbate the progressive disengagement with EFA by more ‘developed’ countries since 2000 which have come to perceive the international education agenda as one that is more relevant for lower-income countries.

Indeed, the MDG framework adopted in 2000, only several months after the adoption of the Education for All (EFA) Dakar Framework for Action the same year, not only challenged EFA as the sole reference for educational development at the global level, but also narrowed the international education agenda to Universal Primary Education (UPE) and gender equality (narrowly equated with parity). The narrower MDG focus resulted in a neglect of a broader vision of EFA that encompasses – within its vision of basic learning – early childhood care and education, youth and adult literacy, vocational skills development, as well as concern for the improvement of the quality and relevance of basic learning. The limited impact of the vision articulated by the ‘Delors’ report on EFA further weakened the perceived relevance of the international education agenda among middle and upper-income countries as many had achieved or were close to achieving the more limited education-related MDG goals.\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{44} Sriniger (1999).
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Reflections on the post-Millennium Development Goal agenda

This paper canvasses the reflections of a selection of non-governmental and research-based institutions on the Millennium Development Goals and the post-2015 development agenda. It aims to provide a picture of the considerations and priorities of non-United Nations stakeholders on the overarching future development framework, within which education priorities will be determined.

Beyond 2012

Essential must-haves for a global development framework

- **Who leads, owns and implements?** – the UN must lead the process and national governments must have primary ownership of, and accountability for, the framework and its delivery.
- **How do we develop it?** – the UN should lead the inter-governmental debate and development of a framework which involves statistical experts and Draws on a full evaluation of the MDGs. The process should be "completely open, transparent, participatory, inclusive and responsive to voices and experience of those directly affected by poverty and injustice" (pg. 1).
- **What should it contain?** – the framework should "set global goals, as well as contextualized national targets for developed and developing countries aiming at sustainable and equitable global development, as well as the eradication of extreme poverty." (pg. 2) It must recognize that aid is only part of the approach, and it should address:
  - the root causes of poverty and injustice;
  - inequality and inequity;
  - environmental sustainability and climate change;
  - the responsibility of national governments to sustainably manage their natural and financial resources;
  - the responsibility of the international community to support developing countries in the face of global challenges through respecting their ODA commitments as well as through innovative redistributive funding mechanisms which would generate additional predictive finance; and
  - the responsibility of developing country governments to deliver on development commitments.
- **Accountability** – it must contain enforceable accountability measures (at all levels) based on mutuality, and involve national and external oversight as well as mechanisms for citizens to hold governments to account. It must involve disaggregated statistical monitoring data and active and wide consultation.

---

European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (EADI), Development Studies Association (DSA), Institute of Development Studies (IDS), UK Department for International Development (DFID), Action Aid

After 2015: Promoting Pro-Poor Policy after the MDGs

• “The main conclusions from the plenary sessions of the Policy Forum can be summarised as follows:
  o Focus must still remain on achieving the MDGs;
  o Developing country ownership of the new framework is essential and the approach must therefore be Southern-led;
  o The obligations of the developed countries towards the achievement of the MDGs need clarification;
  o International income and wealth redistribution should be a ‘right’ ('automatic' rather than discretionary) including international redistributive taxes;
  o International inequality and its reduction should be given more emphasis;
  o Ethical and moral perspectives need emphasising within a global social justice, rather than a purely indicator-Driven, approach;
  o ‘Fragile’ states and global uncertainty need special treatment;
  o The ‘quality’ of MDG achievements, rather than ‘quantities’, needs emphasising;
  o The science and technology capacity of developing countries is critically important;
  o Processes which deliver the quantitative indicators (MDGs) require more emphasis – such as Global Governance; and
  o Serious research is needed to ensure the debate is well informed.” (pg. 1)

Overseas Development Institute (ODI)


• Amongst other reflection, report devised a set of ‘key questions for post-2015’ which include:
  o What would we want a global agreement to do, and how?
  o How could a global agreement be designed to encourage these changes at global or international level?
  o How should a global agreement link to the national level?
  o What kinds of politics and coalitions are needed to produce a new global agreement?

---


CAFOD

100 Voices: Southern perspectives on what should come after the Millennium Development Goals

- Report was motivated by a desire to bring the voices of the ‘south’ into the post-MDG debate.
- Collected views of 104 civil society organisations across 27 countries and found that:
  - there was strong support for developing a new framework;
  - the MDGs were considered a ‘good thing’ despite problems;
  - the next framework needs to be inclusive in its creation (North-South);
  - almost all believed there needed to be greater focus on country context;
  - the new framework should address climate change and the environment; and
  - the new agenda should not be simply existing targets with extended deadlines.
- Considered that the context of the post-MDG world is shaped by three factors:
  - greater uncertainty and instability (which creates a more difficult environment for international consensus than was the case for the MDG agreement);
  - changing patterns of poverty (most of the poor now live in middle income countries);
  - indicator innovation (greater work has been undertaken to diversify, refine and expand development indicators).

World Vision International

Reaching the MDGs 2.0: Rethinking the Politics

- Characterizes the context of the post-2015 agenda as one that is more constrained economically and suffering from questionable political will (dwindling funding commitments).
- Contends that the ‘tenor of the debate’ is one shaped by the following trends:
  - Need to move away from reliance on aid alone;
  - Greater focus on involving middle income countries as well as ‘Southern’ voices; and
  - Movement toward use of national and/or regional targets.
- Some concerns identified in the lead-up to the post-2015 agenda:
  - The short timeframe for developing the framework;
  - The UN should lead but should focus on enhancing the transparency of the process;
  - There is a "multitude of processes" which makes engagement by external groups difficult (including civil society organisations that find it hard to navigate);
  - As a corollary, there is also a "multitude of options" – as conceptualized in Figure 1, below:
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The debate needs to be participatory, and involve all of the following partners: governments, the private sector, international financial institutions, trade unions, environmental groups, and civil society organisations.

- Proposes the following priorities for the post-2015 agenda:
  - Coherence – targets need to be linked to lending frameworks used by international financial institutions; and
  - Need for buy-in – from ‘Southern’ countries; ‘new players’ such as the emerging BRIC countries; the public writ large (including in their capacity as tax-payers); and from a global ‘champion’ of the cause.