Equity and Inclusion for All in Education

Global Campaign for Education UK

GLOBAL CAMPAIGN FOR
EDUCATION

Contents

Acronyms

DFID	Department for International Development
EFA	Education for All
EMIS	Education Management Information Systems
ESSPIN	Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria
GCE	Global Campaign for Education
GEQIP	General Education Quality Improvement Programme [Ethiopia]
GMR	Global Monitoring Report
GNP	Gross National Product
HDRC	Human Development Resource Centre
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OHCHR	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
PEDP2	Primary Education Development Programme 2 [Bangladesh]
SSA	Sarva Shiksha Abihyan [India]
SSRP	Schools Sector Reform Programme [Nepal]
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UIS	UNESCO Institute for Statistics
WHO	World Health Organization

Cover Photo: © Marcus Lyon, Consortium for Street Children

Executive Summary

This report advocates that DFID dedicate adequate resources to tackling the exclusion of all marginalised groups from education in a strategic manner, in line with Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 2 to achieve universal primary education, the Education for All (EFA) goals and international human rights instruments such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Addressing the lack of education for girls and women is entirely appropriate. Yet there are other important groups who face severe disadvantage in accessing and completing quality education, such as disabled people, ethnic and religious minorities and people living in certain vulnerable locations. This research focuses on these groups.

Barriers to educational opportunity for marginalised groups are the result of a complex set of factors involving social, economic and political systems, and the way in which schools engage with children and families from these groups. Responding to these barriers requires strategic cross-sector planning. It is also necessary to empower school systems so that they work hand-in-hand with local communities, in order to identify and remove obstacles to learning and participation.

An analysis of a sample of DFID's operational plans demonstrates that there is little evidence of DFID engaging in strategic planning to support marginalised children (apart from girls) to access a quality education. Some of DFID's education work appears to tackle some aspects of marginalisation beyond concerns around gender. But this is not the same as ensuring that all education initiatives prioritise addressing the rights of all marginalised groups in a comprehensive and coordinated way. Moreover, there is evidence that, at least in some countries, DFID is increasing support for private sector initiatives in education. This raises a number of questions, including the evidence base for such an approach and how it can contribute to creating an education system that promotes equity and inclusion.

DFID's project and programme documents are not always publicly available. Those that are available for external analysis do not appear to have a clear focus on marginalised children other than girls. If DFID wishes to strategically reduce marginalisation, it needs to develop a clear structure for all project and programme documents which sets out: the groups of children in each area of the country who are most marginalised and why (including data which is disaggregated by population group); the evidence base for any interventions being put in place to reduce barriers to participation and achievement in school; and clear targets for accessing quality education for all marginalised groups of children. Moreover, evaluators/reviewers employed by DFID should be asking critical questions about DFID's approach to ensuring that the most vulnerable can access a quality education.

DFID can learn from successful interventions to promote equity and inclusion. These interventions respond effectively to a range of important factors (including discriminatory attitudes and behaviour, and a lack of trained teachers and materials) in a way that is appropriate to local contexts. This enables a clear yet flexible implementation approach which can develop according to local needs and realities but is always properly monitored and evaluated. Interventions need to engage directly with and for marginalised groups, and work both at a systems level and at the school level.

The Global Campaign for Education (GCE) UK calls on DFID to:

1) Develop a strategic approach to equity and inclusion of all marginalised groups and a coherent policy towards inclusive education across all countries in which DFID operates.

2) Invest in research and programmes which promote equity and inclusion in education, and provide resources and materials to support such initiatives.

3) Encourage and support participation of civil society – particularly those representing marginalised groups – to promote equity and inclusion in education.

4) Advocate for inclusive education on the international stage when in dialogue and negotiation with other donors and other governments.

5) Implement effective and transparent monitoring and evaluation to ensure equity and inclusion is a core component of education programmes.

6) Ensure that any support for private sector solutions is: based on rigorous evidence; not undermining the right to education, especially for the most marginalised; and contributing to strong and sustainable education systems under the ultimate authority of states.

Photo: © Laura Crow, Sightsavers

1.0 Introduction

In recent years, donors – including the UK's Department for International Development (DFID) – have paid increased attention to including girls and women in education. This is appropriate, as girls and women face widespread and systematic marginalisation in education specifically and in development more broadly. However, there are other population groups who face serious exclusion from education, including disabled people,[1] ethnic and religious minorities and people living in certain vulnerable locations. This report focuses on these wider issues of marginalisation.

Equity and inclusion are closely intertwined. Equity is fundamentally about fairness and means that '... personal and social circumstances... should not be an obstacle to achieving educational potential'.[2] Inclusion is ensuring that all students not only access education but also participate and learn together effectively, in ways that promote human rights and critical thinking (inclusive education is discussed in more detail in the following section).

DFID has identified that:

'it is mainly children who are disabled, come from poor rural areas or have mothers who didn't get to go to school that are excluded from education. Failure to address the root causes of exclusion – poverty, gender, disability, ethnicity, language and location – is holding back further progress'.[3]

This report advocates that DFID dedicate adequate resources to tackling the exclusion of all marginalised groups from education in a strategic manner, in line with Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 2 to achieve universal primary education,[4] the Education for All (EFA) goals[5] and international human rights instruments such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child.[6]

The report encompasses two main areas, each with different sub-topics. These are as follows:

1) Understanding why marginalised children and adults are excluded from education.

- What is preventing children and adults that belong to marginalised groups from accessing education?
- What is preventing children and adults that belong to marginalised groups from learning effectively?

2) Examination of the education aspects of DFID's work from an equity and inclusion perspective.

- To what extent do DFID's operational plans engage with marginalisation beyond concerns around gender?
- Are there examples of where DFID has successfully tackled wider issues of marginalisation in education?
- Are there examples of DFID-funded education programmes that are clearly failing to promote equity and inclusion?
- Are there examples of good practice in tackling wider issues of marginalisation in education that DFID can learn from?
- Is DFID's support for the private sector in education impacting on the equity and inclusion agenda (either negatively or positively)?

1   In this report we use the UK terms 'disabled children' and 'disabled people' in line with the idea that humans are 'disabled' by the interaction of their impairment with their social environment.
2   OECD 2008, p2
3   DFID 2011
4   See http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/education.shtml
5   See http://www.unesco.org/new/en/education/themes/leading-the-international-agenda/education-for-all/efa-goals/
6   Convention on the Rights of the Child (adopted 20 November 1989, entered into force 2 September 1990) A/44/49

2.0 Understanding why marginalised children and adults are excluded from education

A wide range of research in recent years[7] has drawn attention to the fact that significant numbers of children and adults are failing to access educational opportunities. Internationally, 61 million children[8] and 74 million adolescents are out of school (most of these being in Sub Saharan Africa and South Asia),[9] 793 million people do not have basic literacy skills and current trends indicate that the number of children not in school in 2015 may be higher than it is in 2012.[10] Of additional concern is the fact that those who are accessing education are often either not learning effectively or dropping out before completing primary education. In many countries relatively few children progress from primary to secondary school.[11]

However, there are some encouraging signs. For example, longitudinal data would seem to indicate that enrolment rates in parts of Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia are increasing and that in many countries gender inequality in enrolment rates is beginning to be addressed.[12] At secondary level, the situation is more worrying. In many poorer countries, less than half of children enrol in secondary school and of those who do, only half again will complete their secondary education.[13] Even less will enrol in any form of further or higher education. Most data indicates that children from economically poorer families are significantly more likely to drop out of secondary school even if they do enrol, reinforcing the link between poverty and lack of access to education.

Overall, global monitoring data suggests that two thirds of the one billion people worldwide who have had no schooling, or left school after less than four years, are women or girls.[14] Gender injustice clearly presents a significant challenge to efforts to ensure that all human beings enjoy their right to education. At the same time, it is important to look further when trying to identify which groups of children and adults are most likely to experience barriers to participation and achievement in education. This report focuses on key groups of people that research suggests are experiencing particular disadvantage in accessing and completing quality education:

- disabled people;
- ethnic and religious minorities;
- people living in certain vulnerable locations: street children; people living in certain informal settlements; people living in remote areas; and nomadic people.

This section will focus on specific marginalised groups addressing the questions:

- What is preventing children and adults that belong to marginalised groups from accessing education?
- What is preventing children and adults that belong to marginalised groups from learning effectively?

2.1 Inclusive education

Save the Children's 2008 publication *Making Schools Inclusive*[15] applied the approach of the *Index for inclusion*[16] in arguing that enabling schools to respond to the diversity of students in their locality involves restructuring school culture, policies and practice. It therefore involves engagement with a set of rights-based inclusive values which:

- acknowledge that all children and adults can learn;
- acknowledge and respect differences in people: age, gender, ethnicity, language, disability, HIV and TB status, etc.;
- enables education structures, systems and methodologies to meet the needs of all students;
- is part of a wider strategy to promote an inclusive society; and
- is a dynamic process that is constantly evolving.

7   e.g. CREATE 2011; UNESCO 2008
8   UIS 2012, p1
9   CREATE 2011, p8
10   UNESCO 2011
11   UIS 2012
12   UIS 2012
13   CREATE 2011, p8

14   Unterhalter 2010, p2

15   Save the Children 2008
16   Booth & Ainscow 2002

The *Global Monitoring Report 2010*[17] outlined a model for enabling the inclusion of marginalised groups in schools. This was based on the three specific and interlinked areas highlighted below.

■ *Learning environment:* allocating teachers equitably; recruiting and training teachers from marginalised groups; providing additional support to disadvantaged schools; developing a relevant curriculum; and facilitating intercultural and bilingual education.

■ *Accessibility and Affordability:* cutting direct and indirect costs; providing targeted financial incentives; investing in school infrastructure; bringing classrooms closer to children; supporting flexible provision; and coordinating and monitoring non-state provision.

■ *Entitlements and Opportunities:* developing poverty reduction strategies; tackling early childhood deprivation; enforcing anti-discrimination legislation; providing social protection; and allocating public spending more equitably.

These strategies demand a holistic, systems-wide approach to educational reform. They also require that school systems are empowered to work hand-in-hand with local communities,[18] in order to identify and remove barriers to learning and participation.[19] Furthermore, it is essential that schools and the wider education system are adapted to respond to local contexts.[20] The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) argues that:

'Understanding local context is critical to developing policies for

inclusive education… Making schools accessible requires innovative policy responses geared towards specific circumstances'.[21]

Despite the fact that the wide range of world cultures and contexts requires different frameworks for action, it has been argued that there are common features that constitute inclusive education systems.[22] There are certain prerequisites to ensuring that such a reform process will succeed; these are outlined below.

■ *Ensuring that negative attitudes are tackled:* Negative attitudes, based on fear of difference in society and associated crude stereotyping, create serious barriers for the successful inclusion of many marginalised children.[23] Cultural factors can influence this, in the form of attitudes based on, for example, religious belief or superstition. As a result, vulnerable children are not allowed to attend school by family members, powerful community members or teachers, or if they do attend, they can often face discrimination and violence (including sexual abuse).[24]

■ *Enabling legislation, policies and targets, supported by the reliable collection of data and the development of Education Management Information Systems (EMIS):* States must develop legislation and policies (including clear and ambitious targets) which facilitate strategic and targeted interventions to support the participation of all marginalised groups in education. These must be based on reliable evidence, which in turn requires the development of systems at all levels of society that collect accurate data. One of the main challenges

often faced by governments is that there are not always effective systems for the accurate collection of data, particularly regarding disabled children and other vulnerable children who are out of school, and therefore policy and funding decisions are based on unreliable estimates.[25]

■ *Participation of marginalised groups in school management processes and in education sector planning and reviews:* Marginalised groups must be represented and fully participate in all aspects of school management. Policy initiatives will only be successful if the views and experiences of marginalised members of society are a fundamental part of education planning and review processes. It is important for the government to go beyond inviting marginalised groups to strategic meetings and actively support them to influence the evolution of the education system.

■ *Developing appropriate curriculum, pedagogy and assessments in inclusive schools:* Schools must be supported in developing inclusive approaches to both the curriculum and pedagogy. Inflexible curricula and teaching methods can create additional barriers to participation and achievement in school for many marginalised children, as they do not positively engage with diversity and fail to innovate. Moreover, assessment which focuses on measuring narrow outcomes of learning often restrict success for marginalised children; the subsequent underachievement may then result in grade repetition or even drop out. There can also be reluctance on the part of schools to include marginalised children from certain groups because of the often mistaken belief that this will have a negative impact on

17   UNESCO 2010
18   UNICEF 2009
19   Booth & Ainscow 2002
20   Rao, Morris & Sayed 2011

21   UNESCO 2010, p192
22   Myers & Bagree 2011
23   Rieser 2010
24   UNESCO 2010; WHO, 2011

25   Grimes 2009

assessment results (and thus reduce grade averages).

■ *Developing training and support for teachers:* Successful inclusion requires the development of teachers who are adequately prepared and supported to work in inclusive ways.[26] Many countries have overcrowded classrooms with teachers who have not been trained to respond to diverse needs. Therefore even where marginalised children are in school, they may not be expected to achieve academically, leading to a lack of individual attention within the classroom. Pre-service and in-service training for regular teachers in developing countries often do not include any inclusion component. This must be addressed, and teachers also should be provided with good support from sufficient numbers of well-trained local advisers who understand the challenges of creating inclusive classrooms.

■ *Dedicating the required funds to meet the challenge:* Many countries do not dedicate the necessary funding to support the inclusion of marginalised children, leading to, for example, inadequate facilities, insufficiently trained teachers and a lack of accessible learning materials. This failing in domestic budgetary processes can be compounded by the fact that donors are failing to properly commit to funding education. Donors only allocate 4.1% of Official Development Assistance (ODA) to basic education when the international benchmark is 10%.[27] If donors dedicated 0.7% of Gross National Product (GNP) to ODA (in line with an international target dating back to 1970) and met the 10% benchmark, an additional US$21 billion would be generated annually.[28] It is also important for donors to ensure that ODA respects

principles of aid effectiveness and further builds the capacity of developing country governments to raise and invest revenues so that they can fulfil their obligations.

The following section of this report will focus on specific marginalised groups and discuss ways in which their access to schooling and effective learning is currently hindered.

2.2 Disabled children

It is becoming increasingly clear that the MDGs will not be achieved 'without the inclusion of disabled children and young people in education'.[29] There has also been criticism that disability is not explicitly mentioned in the MDGs.[30] It is estimated that in some countries being disabled more than doubles the chance of never enrolling in school.[31] Disabled children are also less likely than their non-disabled peers to remain in school and transition to the next grade.[32]

DFID is one of many donors to have recognised that there is a clear link between poverty and disability.[33] As Singal explains:

'Being poor also increases one's probability of becoming impaired and then disabled. This is not surprising as people living in poverty have limited access to basic health care, have insufficient and/or unhealthy food, poor sanitation facilities, and an increased risk and likelihood of living and working in hazardous conditions'.[34]

Having a disabled parent who is poor increases the likelihood of seven to sixteen year olds never having been

to school, for example by 25% in the Philippines and 13% in Uganda.[35]

In many countries, unequal access to education is exacerbated by the prevalence of a medical deficit model of disability, which perpetuates the notion that disabled children must adapt in order to 'integrate' into mainstream schooling, or be educated in a separate 'special' education system. At the same time, it is also important to note that the nature of the impairments that children possess is often poorly understood, resulting in inappropriate service provision.[36] Ultimately, as Sightsavers has documented, carefully planned and implemented strategies to support the inclusion of disabled children in mainstream schools can enhance the quality of teaching and learning for all children, not just disabled children.[37]

The recent *World Report on Disability*,[38] produced jointly by the World Health Organization (WHO) and World Bank, summarised much of the recent research evidence regarding what prevents disabled children from accessing a quality education. The report concluded that there are both systemic and school-based barriers. One systemic barrier that is of particular relevance to disabled children includes the problem of divided ministerial responsibility, where education for disabled children is the responsibility of a different ministry than that responsible for the education of non-disabled children. This division usually reflects the view that the disabled need welfare rather than equity in educational opportunity. It often leads to segregated responses to disability. School-based problems that are of specific relevance to

26 Florian & Rouse 2010
27 Global Campaign for Education 2011, p3
28 Global Campaign for Education 2011, p8

29 Croft 2010, p1
30 Albert et al 2005
31 Filmer 2008, p141
32 WHO 2011
33 DFID 2000
34 Singal 2007, p1

35 UNESCO 2010, p184
36 Grimes, Sayarath & Outhaithany 2011
37 Myers & Bagree 2011
38 WHO, 2011

disabled children include: a lack of accessible equipment and learning materials; insufficient numbers of teachers with sign language, braille and other specialised skills; and physical barriers as a result of absent or inaccessible infrastructure.

2.3 Ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities

Language, religion and ethnicity are complex inter-linked factors in marginalisation in education and are often linked to poverty. For example, in some areas of the world malnutrition rates among indigenous children can be significantly greater than the level for non-indigenous children,[39] leading to poor performance in school. The cycle of social deprivation is reinforced by the effects of poor schooling experience. A key reason why many linguistic and ethnic minority students perform poorly in school is that they are often instructed in a language they do not understand well enough. Indeed, 'around 221 million children speak a different language at home from the language of instruction in school, limiting their ability to develop foundations for later learning'.[40] In Lao PDR, for example, it has been estimated that there over 100 ethnic minority languages[41] yet the curriculum is taught in a majority language only spoken by 60% of people.

Pinnock has argued that:

'The world's most linguistically diverse societies, many of which use a single national or international language for schooling, account for a significant proportion of out-of-school children'.[42]

Educational language policy tends to highlight complex political issues and tensions concerning group identity. In some countries, 'national unity' is promoted through use of a single language which excludes linguistic minorities or puts them at a disadvantage in the education system. However, it has also been noted that parents with social and economic aspirations often express a strong preference for their children to learn in the official language because they identify this as a route to enhanced social mobility.[43]

UNESCO's 2003 report into multilingual education made a series of key points, all of which are still highly relevant in 2012. Many children in minority language communities, especially those living in remote areas, face significant challenges in accessing a good quality education including the fact that textbooks and lessons focus on the language and culture of the dominant ethnic group. If the learners are unfamiliar with that culture, as many are, it is very difficult for them to understand the concepts that are being communicated. Teachers who come from the dominant language society may fail to appreciate the learners' heritage language and culture, and may consider the learners 'slow'.[44]

2.4 Street children, children living in informal settlements and in remote areas, and nomadic children

Children in these groups live in vulnerable locations, both urban and rural. They face significant and often similar barriers in accessing and participating in education, not least because they are often 'invisible' from official government data.

Urban

The term 'street children' includes children who live on the streets all the time, others who live there occasionally or seasonally, and those who move between home, street and welfare shelters. For these children, the street is a central point of reference, and significantly affects their identity and development.[45] Although there is a lack of current, accurate data,[46] it is estimated that there are approximately 100 million street children in the world, and their numbers are likely to be increasing due to a range of country factors.[47] Street children tend to be more likely to drop out of school if they do attend,[48] and excluded from education altogether for a range of reasons, some of which are explained below.[49]

■ *Poverty:* families cannot afford the cost of children attending school or the loss of income this would entail. Street children with no family members have to rely entirely on their own resources.

■ *Lack of parental support:* children may have parents (or carers) who are unable to support them in their learning, or simply no parental contact and no carer.

■ *Lack of self-esteem:* children living on the street who have experienced abuse will tend to possess low self-esteem, which affects their capacity for self-efficacy and decision making. This is also reinforced by the fact that if they do attend school, their presence may be irregular, causing significant learning gaps and motivational and social difficulties (as these children are separated from their age groups).

39   Larrea & Montenegro Torres 2006; Shapiro 2006
40   UNESCO 2010, pp 10-11
41   Cincotta-Segi 2011
42   Pinnock 2009, pp 8-9

43   UNESCO 2010
44   UNESCO 2003

45   OHCHR 2012
46   OHCHR 2012
47   UNICEF 2005, pp 40-41
48   Child Welfare Scheme UK 2004
49   Consortium for Street Children 2009

■ *Response of schools:* teachers may lack training in how to engage and stimulate street children, who often suffer behavioural and learning difficulties as a result of time on the street. Street children may face considerable discrimination in accessing school in the first instance.

Children living in poor households in informal settlements ('slums') are also more likely to either not attend school, attend sporadically or not complete school.[50] This is partly because of poverty and partly because many governments fail to provide these citizens with the legal rights required to establish an entitlement to education.[51] Children living in informal settlements are more likely than street children to live in family groups with parental support. Yet they are also vulnerable to being excluded from education for similar reasons, including: low income; lack of self-esteem; delayed achievement in education due to non- or sporadic attendance; lack of literacy and/or education

in the home to support their learning in school; and untrained teachers lacking skills and expertise to encourage and support their learning. For many children living in informal settlements, it may also be the case that access to school is hindered simply by a lack of local schools and/or a lack of teachers.

Rural
Some of these factors also affect children living in remote areas or living nomadically. Children living in remote areas may face many of the challenges described in this section and also in the previous section detailing ethnic minorities. However, they are particularly susceptible to specific barriers such as physical access to school and a lack of qualified teachers. There are also additional risk factors such as the impact of economic hardship causing families to keep children away from school.[52]

Children from nomadic families also face challenging barriers to

participation in education. It is estimated that as many as 8.5 million nomadic children do not attend school at all.[53] Their families may depend upon them for support in their day-to-day work,[54] but in addition education systems can be very inflexible and unresponsive to their needs. The organisation of school days and academic years, as well as curricula set by governments, are often seen by nomadic peoples as incompatible with their lifestyle.[55]

In summary, barriers to educational opportunity for marginalised groups are the result of a complex set of factors involving social, economic and political systems, and the way in which schools engage with children and families from these groups. Responding to these barriers requires strategic cross-sector planning. The next section of the report examines the work of DFID and explores how far the organisation is reducing barriers to marginalisation for vulnerable groups of children, other than girls.

....
50   UNESCO 2010
51   UNESCO 2010

....
52   UNESCO 2010

....
53   UNESCO 2010, p178
54   Ruto et al 2009
55   UNESCO 2010

3.0 To what extent do DFID's operational plans engage with marginalisation beyond concerns around gender?

In order to address this question, a sample of 14 of DFID's operational plans was chosen, from Africa and Asia. It was ensured that DFID's 6 largest (by budget) countries for education programmes were included. The remaining 8 countries were chosen by selecting every third country from a list of DFID operational plans in Asia and Africa. This gave an overall total of 14 operational plans sampled, exactly one half of all of DFID's operational plans. These were: Bangladesh, Burma, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Vietnam (Asia); and Burundi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, Rwanda, South Africa, Tanzania and Uganda (Africa). Where an operational plan had an annex, this was also included in the keyword search. Of the 14 countries sampled, Bangladesh and Burma both had a Gender Annex and Nepal had a Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Annex.

A keyword search of each operational plan was then undertaken, to identify how far DFID were strategically planning to respond to the needs of marginalised groups in education, beyond the issue of gender. The keywords chosen reflect the main marginalised groups described earlier in this report:
- 'disabled'/'disability'
- 'ethnic'/'ethnicity'
- 'religion'/'religious'; 'faith'
- 'language'/'linguistic'
- 'slum'/'informal'/'street children'/ 'rural'/'remote'/'nomadic'

3.1 Main findings in relation to education

A summary of the results of this keyword search is included in Appendix A. Brief details of the references to each keyword is provided in Appendix B. In total there were only 40 keyword references in the 14 sampled plans. Strikingly, just 10 of these related to education: 5 were in Burma; 2 in Vietnam; 2 in Kenya; and 1 in Nepal. Of these 10 keyword references relating to education, a mere 2 represented clear strategic aims to tackle the educational exclusion of marginalised groups. It is important to remember that the sample purposefully included the six countries where DFID is investing the most in education.

In Burma, all but 1 of the references to education were part of the situation analysis. In Vietnam, they referred specifically to primary education in remote areas and to the completion of primary school by children from ethnic minority groups. In Kenya the keywords referred specifically to supporting schools in hard-to-reach slum areas and to the establishment of low-cost private schooling in slum areas. In Nepal, the sole reference to education related to a statement on inequality. Beyond these references, none of the plans would communicate to the reader that there was any form of planning to reduce educational marginalisation for any vulnerable

group except for girls. As an example, there were 4 references to girls in the Vietnamese operational plan and 2 in the Pakistan operational plan. Overall, the country with the least references to the keywords was Pakistan with 0; Burma had the most with 8.

As already noted, only 2 references, in Burma and Vietnam, were clearly linked to strategic educational planning aimed at increasing participation and achievement for marginalised groups of children. Moreover, it is significant that out of the 14 operational plans, only 1 has an annex which focuses on social inclusion and that this offers no strategic overview of how DFID intends to reduce the marginalisation in education of those most vulnerable to experiencing exclusionary barriers. The operational plan is the key published summary of DFID's strategic planning for each country in which it works. If there are strategies in place in these countries to enable the inclusion of all children in school, the operational plans should provide clear details of targets and areas of marginalisation which require attention. On the basis of the analysis, there is little evidence that DFID is engaging in strategic planning to support marginalised children to access a quality education.

4.0 Are there examples of where DFID has successfully tackled wider issues of marginalisation in education?

At the time of writing this report, DFID was approached and asked to identify examples where the organisation believed it was successfully tackling wider issues of marginalisation in education. DFID's response is included below.

'DFID has promised to support, worldwide, at least 9 million children in primary school, over half of whom will be girls, and 2 million children in secondary school by 2014. Improving the quality of learning is crucial and all our programmes are expected to measure learning, in particular improvements in reading fluency in the early years. Our commitment is to education for ALL children, but we recognise that lifting the poorest and most marginalised people out of poverty is essential for achieving all the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). We are acutely aware that more must be done to ensure that those who are most marginalised (girls, the disabled, ethnic and linguistic minorities, slum dwellers and others) are able to access good quality education services. DFID has a very decentralised model; we have 27 focus countries in which we work, all of which have a DFID country team. In the countries where we have education programmes the adviser in country is able to adapt policies and programmes to address the challenges of the local context. In terms of what this means for marginalisation this is different in each country. Some examples of where we are assisting disabled children, for example, to access good quality education services are:

DFID Nepal provides financial and technical support to the country's national education programme, known as the Schools Sector Reform Programme (SSRP). SSRP's approach to improving enrolment and attendance in school by children with disabilities includes a number of initiatives some of which include: Targeted scholarships are provided to disabled girls; Enrolment and progress by disabled students is tracked to understand why they drop out, if they do; Schools are constructed for children with special needs. And, the Government is implementing its National Environmental Guidelines for schools improvement. These ensure that schools are child-friendly, gender-sensitive and appropriate for disabled students. In 2010, 77,348 of children in basic education (primary and lower secondary) were classified disabled (1.2%) and 8,333 in higher secondary (0.77%).

In Vietnam, DFID has co-financed with the Government of Vietnam, the World Bank and other donors the Primary Education for Disadvantaged Children programme, which aims to identify children requiring support in their learning and to target resources.

In Bangladesh the BRAC education programme supported 53,536 disabled children to receive high quality education in 2009. The primary focus of the third phase of the Primary Education Development Programme is on ensuring access for vulnerable children including disabled children.'[56]

Access to project documents through the DFID website to verify this data was very limited at the time of writing.[57] Although DFID aims to have project documentation available online, the great majority of documents had not been uploaded. A request was made directly to DFID to provide access to relevant project documentation to enable the above claims to be verified. However, only a limited number of these documents have been provided to the author. This raises concerns in regard to the transparency of DFID's project implementation and dissemination of results. DFID country operational plans all have a section aiming to demonstrate transparency. Yet unless all project documentation, including evaluations (and details of the methodologies used to evaluate programmes) and reviews, is made publicly available, it is not possible for external assessment processes, such as this report, to judge how reliable DFID's reporting process is.

56   DFID 2012d
57   As of 2 July 2012.

Analysis of whatever documentation and publications were available at the time of writing (either through the website or sent to the author directly by DFID country offices) indicates that much of DFID's success in combating marginalisation is related to gender. Case studies available on the DFID website note a range of achievements in this regard.[58] In several of these case studies, analysis reveals that in addition to improved educational outcomes for girls, there were also improved outcomes for other vulnerable groups. Some examples are detailed below.

4.1 Universal primary education in Zambia[59]

Support for Zambia's strategy to address access to education has increased the number of teachers from 50,123 (27,559 males and 22,564 females) in 2002 to 77,362 (39,733 males and 37,629 females) in 2009. Student enrolment has increased from 2.5 million students in 2005 to 3.3 million in 2009. In addition, the participation of girls increased from 1.4 million in 2005 to 1.65 million in 2009 and the Gender Parity Index (GPI) improved from 0.95% to 0.99%. Support for communities to initiate and manage local schools increased the number of community schools from less than 200 in 1996 to over 3,000 in 2009. This means that significant numbers of children living in more remote areas can now access a local school.

4.2 Vulnerable boys in Tanzania[60]

The Dogodogo Centre, a centre for street children supported by DFID in Dar es Salaam, offers support for boys aged 10 to 18. Under the programme these children receive counselling, rehabilitation, primary and secondary school scholarships, food, shelter and sanitation, as well as vocational skills. In 2008, about 160 vulnerable children were enrolled in primary school through the Dogodogo Centre's support, while 39 street boys received vocational training.

4.3 Bridging ethnic divides to reach the classroom in Vietnam[61]

In the period 2003-2009, DFID supported a programme aimed at improving primary education for disadvantaged children in remote areas of Vietnam. Many of these children were also from ethnic minority groups, who were identified as educationally underachieving in comparison to non-minority pupils. Overall, it is claimed that the programme built 14,000 new classrooms, renovated 3,300 classrooms, trained 120,000 teachers and 7,000 bilingual teaching assistants, and established parent-teacher associations in 18,000 schools. Innovation grants were awarded through the programme to address the needs of disabled children, street children, minority girls and other children at high risk of being excluded from education.

While these initiatives appear to be commendable, they only demonstrate that in some countries there are some projects (of varying scale) which tackle some aspects of marginalisation. This is obviously not the same as having a comprehensive strategic approach to equity and inclusion across DFID. Such an approach would ensure that all education initiatives prioritise addressing the rights of all marginalised groups in a holistic (rather than fragmented) way.

58   DFID 2012e
59   DFID 2011b
60   DFID 2010
61   DFID 2010b

5.0 Are there examples of DFID-funded education programmes that are clearly failing to promote equity and inclusion?

In order to examine this question, this research aimed to analyse results from the six countries with the largest DFID education programmes: Bangladesh, Ethiopia, India, Nigeria, Pakistan and Tanzania. However, as noted above, at the time of writing there was limited access to essential project documentation that would enable a critical analysis of DFID's work to ensure equity and inclusion in education. For example, the Bangladesh webpage for the Primary Education Development Programme 2 (PEDP2), a project which ran from 2001-2004 and cost £62,692,290, no project documents are listed as being available. Overall, when examining the DFID website for information on education programmes in these six countries, very few documents were listed as available for analysis.

Searches under each of the six countries on the DFID website for relevant project- or programme-related evaluation or review documentation revealed the documents listed in Appendix C. A request was made to DFID to provide access to relevant project and programme documentation covering the last three years. As of the week commencing 2 July 2012, DFID advisers in Bangladesh and Ethiopia (i.e. in only two of the six countries) provided documents to inform this research. However, some of these documents included those that were already available online, and others were not suitable for this research as they were not evaluations or reviews.

In order to understand as best as possible whether or not education programmes in these six countries are failing to promote equity and inclusion, an analysis of the documents listed in Appendix C, as well as an analysis of DFID's 2011 *Annual Report and Accounts*,[62] was undertaken. This analysis involved applying the keywords used earlier in this report (in the analysis of DFID country operational plans). More broadly, it aimed to identify where there was evidence that DFID was promoting equity and inclusion in education and where it was failing to provide detail of any impact on marginalised groups. The results are detailed below.

5.1 Bangladesh
In regard to achieving universal primary education, Bangladesh is making progress, with 93.9% enrolment, and has achieved gender parity. However, only 55% of these children are completing primary school. The main issues identified by DFID are poor quality of teaching, overcrowded classrooms and an outdated curriculum. In 2010-11, DFID supported the construction of over 2,300 classrooms and trained 55,000 teachers. DFID also contributed to the improvement of teaching standards in the classroom, the quality of the curriculum and children's levels of attainment. None of the documents analysed provided evidence of any strategic focus on marginalised groups in education or impact which might have been made on reducing marginalisation for any groups other than girls.

5.2 Ethiopia
DFID has been working in partnership with the Government of Ethiopia to support greater access to, and enhance quality of, primary education. Primary enrolment increased by 240,000 to 15.8 million children in 2010. Of these students, almost half were girls. DFID supported 1.26 million of these children in primary school (600,000 girls). In the same period, the Grade 8 completion rate increased from 44% to 48% (41% to 45% for girls) at least partly as a result of greater quality-focused investment through the General Education Quality Improvement Programme (GEQIP) supported by DFID.

There was no reference to any impact which might have been made on reducing marginalisation for any groups other than girls. One of the evaluations (2009) notes that it is important to ensure that 'cross-cutting issues (gender, HIV/AIDS, environment and disability) are addressed in the implementation of projects', but the main findings in regard to education related to gender and primary/secondary enrolment.[63] There is no evidence in this evaluation report to suggest that funded project work in the country up until 2009 had strategically engaged with reducing educational marginalisation for vulnerable groups other than girls.

62   DFID 2011

63   DFID 2009, p61

5.3 India
Net primary school enrolment for 6 to 14 year olds in India is 98% but is only 58% for 11 to 14 year olds. Only 70% of children who are enrolled attend school regularly. DFID has supported the Government of India's national elementary education programme, Sarva Shiksha Abihyan (SSA), which aims to ensure that all children are able to access quality elementary education. DFID has supported the enrolment of 1.2 million previously out-of-school children since 2003 as part of the 60 million achieved by the SSA scheme. Through support to SSA, DFID has provided more than 1,800 functional classrooms and, in 2010, trained 28,600 teachers. A 2012 review of the SSA refers to 'special interventions to enrol urban, SC [scheduled caste]/ST [scheduled tribe]/[64]Muslim/girls and Children with Special Needs'[65] and the fact that 90% of the 3.02 million children identified as having 'special needs' were enrolled in school or provided with home-based education.[66]

Due to the nature of the report format, it was not possible to analyse this data more critically. For example, there was no detail provided of the quality of education offered to disabled children, nor the extent to which the data related to the identification of all disabled children was considered reliable. In addition, while there were references to other marginalised groups, including scheduled tribe and scheduled caste children (reported as being enrolled in school, in 'numbers equal to their population'),[67] children learning through their mother tongue and children living in slums, there was no clear evidence presented regarding the quality or impact of initiatives to support any of these children. The report noted that 'on average student attendance declined from 73.4% in 2007 to 70.9% in 2011 in rural primary schools',[68] suggesting that serious challenges remained in addressing marginalisation in rural areas.

Similarly, the evaluation of the West Bengal State Programme (2007) makes references to:

'Strategies to promote social inclusion and gender equity... have resulted in increasing numbers of girls, Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes, Muslims and the disabled attending school. The fact that many are in the less effective SSKs [informal schools] (in terms of trained teachers, infrastructure etc.) presents an equity issue that is still to be resolved'.[69]

However, there were no details on the ways in which strategies had been developed and implemented to not only increase enrolment, but also ensure appropriate educational opportunity once at school. While the evaluation referred to the 'creation of in-slum infrastructure',[70] there were no explicit references to strategies which had been designed to reduce marginalisation for children living in informal settlements.

5.4 Nigeria
In 2007, the enrolment rate for primary education was only 63% in Nigeria, and it is currently estimated that at least eight million primary age children in the country are still not in school (more than in any other country in the world). By 2007, the gender ratio in primary school enrolment was 88%, up from 80% in 2000. DFID has supported Nigeria in developing and implementing stronger plans and strategies for the delivery of education. DFID is also working with community, faith-based and private schools to encourage more children to go to school and improve the quality of education. It is noteworthy that the most recent data referred to in the Nigerian section of DFID's 2011 annual report was from 2007, suggesting a stark need for more up-to-date data to assess progress and challenges.

The 2011 mid-term review of the Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN) discusses the reduction of marginalisation for vulnerable groups. ESSPIN has aimed to 'raise awareness on inclusive education and the right of all children to education.'[71] The review highlights that this aim is evident in:

'School improvements to address supply side dimensions of quality (such as improved teaching methods, better water and sanitation); safety and sensitivity to needs of different categories of pupil (by sex, children living with disability, nomadic children, those out of school)'.[72]

However, it also goes on to note that '… no specific targets or estimates are available for these interventions'.[73]

The review itself argues that, two and half years into the Programme, 'in terms of definable access, equity and quality results' results are 'insufficient'.[74] It can perhaps best be summarised that although there is evidence of inclusivity in some of the aims of the Programme, it is not possible to argue that it has had a clearly positive impact on reducing marginalisation.

---

64   Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are two groups of people who have been historically excluded and oppressed in social, cultural, economic and political affairs.
65   DFID 2012f, p2
66   DFID 2012f, p5
67   DFID 2012, p4

68   DFID 2012, p3
69   DFID 2007, p45
70   DFID 2007, piv

71   ESSPIN 2011, p48
72   ESSPIN 2011, p48
73   ESSPIN 2011, p48
74   ESSPIN 2011, p10

5.5 Pakistan

In 2008, only 55% of children in Pakistan were enrolled in primary education, although the gender parity ratio in primary education increased to 86% (from 76% in 2005). DFID has helped to increase primary school enrolment in 44,000 primary schools in Punjab province. Through a sector budget support programme, DFID has: helped to upgrade school buildings; provided teachers and supported their professional development; and supported low-cost private sector schooling to improve access for out-of-school children. DFID has also helped to provide free school books and worked with the government to ensure free public sector education. Dedicated stipends have encouraged more girls to continue their education. DFID's support for improved primary education may have had some impact on marginalised groups of children (other than girls) who were already in school, in terms of accessing higher quality education, but no specific reference is made.

None of the documents that were analysed demonstrated evidence for successful strategies for reducing marginalisation other than in relation to gender. One evaluation report (2008) acknowledged inequality: 'There has been little progress in reducing the literacy gap between rural and urban areas'.[75] The same report also recognised:

'…deep-seated factors (including the structure and processes of political power, the nature of the state, class, caste, ethnicity, gender, religion) that affect the behaviour of agencies or stakeholders'.[76]

5.6 Tanzania

DFID's 2011 annual report argues that almost all Tanzania's

children of primary school age are enrolled in school and that the net primary enrolment rate in 2010 was 95%. This statistic needs to be interrogated more closely in regard to enrolment of children from particular vulnerable groups, such as disabled children and those in remote areas or living nomadically, who are often not accurately counted in official surveys.[77] Furthermore, the quality of education that is provided for marginalised children also requires consideration.

DFID has supported the primary education of 200,000 children and enabled the expansion of primary schooling including training of additional teachers. There was no reference to any impact which might have been made on reducing marginalisation for any groups other than girls. However, the 2004/5-2009/10 evaluation does acknowledge inequalities in the education system:

'In 2007, 82% of children in rural areas were in primary school, compared to 91% in urban areas. Children from poor households are still less likely to continue into higher education where they are unable to pay school fees and few scholarships are available. Children from the poorest household constituted 24% of all primary school pupils; but only 13% in secondary school and 0% in tertiary schools in 2007'.[78]

5.7 Summary

It seems reasonable to conclude from the available evidence that because DFID has placed an emphasis on reducing barriers to participation and achievement in schools for girls, as a consequence when reporting headlines of what has been achieved, outcomes for

girls tend to be portrayed as most significant. It is likely that many DFID-funded programmes have had some impact on the promotion of equity and inclusion for a wider range of vulnerable groups than just girls, through (for example) attempts to increase enrolment and improve the quality of teaching in schools.

However, from the evidence analysed there is little indication that, other than girls, those groups of children identified as being most likely to be excluded have been strategically targeted. The main exception to this would appear to be the SSA in India, where it is reported that there have been some successes in strategically identifying and enrolling disabled children and certain minorities. However, it should also be noted that greater detail in published documentation regarding the SSA would enable a more critical and in-depth analysis of the quality of provision for these marginalised children.

It is worth noting that the lack of evidence regarding the inclusion of disabled children is supported by research undertaken by RESULTS UK in 2009. This research revealed serious concerns about the implementation of DFID's policy on education and disability. It found that there was:

'little evidence of a sustained, consistent response to disability, and clearly a substantial amount of work to do before inclusive education is achieved in DFID priority countries … In many cases country offices do not support any targeted programmes for children with disabilities, while in programmes that ostensibly 'mainstream' disability the levels of resources that can be identified as supporting disabled children are worryingly low, for example just 3% of DFID India's support of the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan

75   DFID 2008, p55
76   DFID 2008, p12

77   Grimes 2009
78   DFID 2010, p13

programme (which aims to increase access to education for the most marginalised groups in Indian society), and only 0.25% (£66,000 of £26 million) of DFID Tanzania's sector budget support is targeted at supporting disabled children'.[79]

A recurrent issue is the generalised way data is presented in the available documentation. Project and programme documents do not appear to have a clear focus on marginalised children other than girls. If DFID wishes to strategically reduce marginalisation, then there needs to be a clear structure for all project and programme documents which sets out: the groups of children in each area of the country who are most marginalised and why (including data which is disaggregated by population group); the evidence base for any interventions being put in place to reduce barriers to participation and achievement in school; and clear targets for accessing quality education for all marginalised groups of children. In most of the evaluation and review reports which were available, there was little evidence that the authors had a clear focus on issues related to marginalisation. Given the clear evidence base regarding vulnerable groups of children who are not in school or not learning effectively, evaluators/reviewers should be asking critical questions about DFID's approach to ensuring that the most vulnerable can access a quality education.

Finally, as a matter of some urgency, DFID should aim to ensure that the country pages on its website are more easily navigable with clearer signposting to different types of project and programme documents. All such documents should be available to allow independent analysis of DFID's work.

79   Results UK 2010, p6

6.0 Are there examples of good practice in tackling wider issues of marginalisation in education that DFID can learn from?

This section of the report refers to global research in order to identify areas where there have been strategic successes in reducing marginalisation. Section 2 of this report outlined the range of contexts and challenges faced by different marginalised groups. Successful interventions respond effectively to a range of important factors in a way that is appropriate to local contexts, enabling a flexible implementation approach which can develop according to local needs and realities. Interventions need to engage directly with and for marginalised groups, and work both at a systems level and at the school level.

6.1 Systems-wide interventions

Inclusive education is dependent on the commitment of countries to develop appropriate legislation, policies and financing to support implementation.[80] Legislation must enable equality of opportunity in education and ensure policies provide clear details of implementation approaches and targets. Educational reform has begun to take place in countries such as Lao PDR, Vietnam and Lesotho, where there have been clear policy directives at a national level.[81]

The Lao Inclusive Education Project is an example of this. Running from 1993 to 2009,[82] it expanded from one mainstream school enrolling children with 'mild' disabilities to 539 schools, (including pre-school, primary and secondary) and covered all 141 districts of the country. By 2008, it was estimated that over 3000 disabled children were being educated alongside their peers. Its success was built upon the enactment of policy at all levels (school, district, provincial and national) that aimed to strengthen the education system as a whole. Another project, supported by Save the Children from 1998 in Mongolia,[83] had similar success to the Lao project. One of the key elements of this project was the selection of 1600 teachers, who demonstrated that they had motivation and commitment, for inclusive education training. Follow-up support was provided to the teachers involved, and collaboration and sharing between schools was also promoted. There was a clear increase in the numbers of disabled children enrolling in preschool and primary school: from 22% to 44% where the approach was used.[84]

The significance of positive attitude and commitment at legislative and policy levels applies to all groups of marginalised children. For example, in regard to multilingual education, Ministries of Education should establish a policy commitment to prioritise parts of the country where national or foreign 'prestige' languages are not extensively utilised in daily life, and where education outcomes are poor, for assistance to develop mother tongue-based multilingual education approaches.[85] Malawi and Uganda are examples of countries whose education policies state that learning should take place in the mother tongue, at least at lower levels of education, so that students may better grasp content.[86]

Legislation and policy must be developed in collaboration with those members of society who are most likely to experience marginalisation, to ensure that they are non-discriminatory, practical and transparent with aims and targets clearly set out. All measures must seek to eliminate discrimination and guarantee equal opportunities in education.[87] In part, this means that it is especially important for those living in poverty or in marginalised communities to be guaranteed free education.[88] In Nepal, the Education Act enshrines the right of vulnerable children, including Dalits[89] and ethnic minorities, to receive secondary education free of charge, and affirmative policies have been drawn up to ensure that disadvantaged groups can access the education system.[90] More broadly, as marginalisation is multi-dimensional, it is necessary to ensure that the education system is properly connected to health and other social services that also work to promote equity and inclusion.

80   WHO 2011
81   WHO 2011
82   Grimes 2009; Grimes, Sayarath & Outhaithany 2011

83   Save the Children 2008
84   Save the Children 2008, pp24-25

85   Pinnock 2009
86   UNESCO 2010b
87   UNESCO 2010b
88   Gurung 2004
89   Dalits are people who traditionally have been considered untouchable by 'higher' castes.
90   UNESCO 2010b

6.2 School-level interventions

Much of the successful work undertaken in recent years to reform education systems has focused on developing schools that respond to diversity and individual difference. Examples of this include the UNICEF Child Friendly Schools initiative.[91] This initiative has worked across a number of countries to introduce flexible and enabling: curricula; teaching methods; materials; assessment and examination systems; and approaches to the management of classes. At a school level, child friendly schools aim to:

- promote good quality teaching and learning processes with individualised instruction appropriate to each child's developmental level, abilities and learning style, and with active, cooperative, and democratic learning methods;
- provide structured content and good quality materials and resources;
- enhance teacher numbers, capacity, morale, commitment, status, and income – and their own recognition of child rights; and
- promote quality learning outcomes by defining and helping children learn what they need to learn and teaching them how to learn.

UNESCO has produced a range of resources in conjunction with teachers and advisors in various countries to support schools to become more inclusive.[92] The *Embracing Diversity* toolkit[93] advocates the developing of schools as 'learning-friendly' environments, which are welcoming and inspiring for both children and teachers. The toolkit places emphasis on the significance of students and teachers learning together as a learning community, where children are placed actively at the centre of the learning process. The toolkit also stresses the importance of developing teachers who are fulfilled and engaged in their work, so that they are enabled to ensure high quality education.[94]

Examples of successful projects which incorporate these kinds of approaches include Inclusive Tanzania. This was a 4-year advocacy project, in rural Mwanga District and in Dar es Salaam. The project involved disabled people working together with parents, teachers and children who: identified disabled children; ensured sufficient teaching and learning materials and assistive teachers; made the learning environment welcoming; organised events to raise awareness; and collected funds for physical access improvements. In total, '390 children with disabilities were enrolled in 11 schools. The project contributed to the development of Tanzania's new inclusive education policy by raising awareness through the media, lobbying politicians and debating at public consultations. It also lobbied parliament to ratify the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities,[95] which it did on 24 April 2009'.[96]

Save the Children's research into multilingual education projects in South and East Asia[97] examined the features of the education system which were considered crucial to support successful teaching for children who were not learning in their first language. These features included: the capacity to deliver active learner-centred education against a clear curriculum; finding and developing teachers who can communicate with children; an ability to share and act on evidence about good practice; and capacity to coordinate changes across different areas of education management. Additional research[98] in this field also advocates that ensuring teachers understand that the more they help children use and develop their mother tongues, the better children are likely to do in educational performance, including second language skills.

As previously noted, a key factor in developing successful learner-centred education seems to be developing responses to local needs which account for individual differences and which are flexible. The Child Welfare Scheme's research into successful educational provision for those children living in fragile environments such as street children[99] noted that a variety of approaches to educational provision may need to be developed to cover the diverse range of needs which children may have. It is not always the case that a generic set of interventions and provision will be effective in supporting all children. As UNESCO notes:

'Mali has developed some noteworthy practices for the protection of nomadic populations. In the Northern areas, where there is a high concentration of nomadic tribes, the Government has established special schools where teachers follow the students as the populations move around the country. This permits continuity in the education provided. In these schools, free lunches are offered in order to promote the enrolment and retention of children in school'.[100]

91   UNICEF 2009
92   UNESCO 2004; UNESCO 2004b; UNESCO 2009c
93   UNESCO 2004b

94   UNESCO 2004b
95   Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (adopted 13 December 2006, entered into force 3 May 2008) A/61/611
96   Noussi 2009, p4
97   Pinnock 2011

98   Pinnock 2009
99   Gurung 2004, pp89-90
100 UNESCO 2010b, pp140-141

With some groups of marginalised children it may be the case that additional forms of support are also needed and these need to be strategically planned and provided. For example, where disabled children are being included in mainstream settings, research indicates that both they and their schools will need access to additional support services.[101] These may take the form of peripatetic services, which work across communities and schools providing equipment, advice and training, or they might be based within schools. The most important factor emerging from research is that these services must be organised in such a way that they promote inclusion within mainstream settings rather than creating additional exclusionary barriers, including by supporting the professional development of mainstream teachers.

In order to ensure mainstream teachers develop the confidence and skills required to teach children with diverse educational needs, a variety of forms of professional development opportunities need to be created. The principles of inclusion should be built into teacher training programmes, which should be about attitudes and values as well as knowledge and skills.[102] This applies to both pre-service and in-service training, but its success also depends on the training and support available to those who are providing training programmes. Therefore successful inclusive teacher education requires strategic planning at a national level to ensure equitable and sustainable programmes of training, support and deployment are in place to avoid 'disparities in teacher supply, quality, qualifications and deployment'.[103] It is also important to note that the role of local advisers or teachers in different schools working together has been found to be fundamental in supporting the development of more inclusive practices. Advisors and teachers can encourage the identification of areas for improvement through collaborative work, and classroom teachers can then be empowered to develop their own strategies for trying to ensure the participation and learning of all the students, including marginalised children.[104] In order to enable meaningful changes in practice to occur, policy-makers needed to create the conditions whereby teachers are likely to engage in deep learning in regard to their educational practice.[105]

In summary, approaches which place inclusive values at the heart of educational reform at all levels of the system are the most likely to have a sustainable impact on the identification and reduction of barriers to participation and achievement for marginalised groups of children. These approaches need to be developed strategically at all levels in such a way that they aim to eradicate discriminatory practices whilst allowing for flexibility according to local needs and contexts. Whilst there is no blueprint for inclusive education that can be replicated in every context with the same results, supporting and training schools and teachers to work with their local communities to develop more inclusive practices has been shown to the most effective and sustainable strategy.

101 Grimes et al 2011; Lynch et al 2011; Myers & Bagree 2011; WHO, 2011

102 WHO 2011, p246
103 Florian & Rouse 2010, p187

104 Grimes, Sayarath & Outhaithany 2012
105 Howes, Grimes & Shohel 2011

7.0 Is DFID's support for the private sector in education impacting on the equity and inclusion agenda (either negatively or positively)?

The 14 DFID operational plans sampled in section 3 were further analysed to identify where DFID is strategically planning to support the development of the private sector in education provision.

In 3 of the 14 sampled plans, there is direct evidence of strategic planning to support the development of the private sector in education. In Pakistan, this involves the development of public-private partnerships; in Nigeria there is reference to private provision for education. The Kenyan plan[106] is noteworthy, in that it specifically refers to an evidence base for private provision:

'In education, we plan to re-focus on the arid lands and low cost private schooling in slums because data show that these areas are where most out-of-school children live... supporting private schools for the poor will be the most cost-effective [way] of getting children into the classroom'.[107]

This plan justifies its strategic focus on low cost private schooling in slum areas on the basis that data from the Kenyan Ministry of Education indicates that these areas are where most out-of-school children live. The plan does not provide an evidence base indicating why private sector

provision is the most effective way to provide schooling in slum areas. The plan goes on to make the case (under 'Value for Money') that supporting private schools for the poor will be one of the most cost-effective ways of increasing school enrolment. This is supported by reference to evidence from a report arguing:

'The fees may indeed be very low: it may cost parents little more to send their child to a non-government school after taking into account the hidden costs of "free" education such as the stringent requirements for uniform, and non-fee payments to schools'.[108]

This argument is linked to research[109] which has found that, in some countries, there are hidden costs (such as the ones mentioned above) involved in state education, which in itself can create barriers to school enrolment and completion.

In all 14 of the sampled operational plans there is direct evidence of strategic planning to strengthen the private sector in order to boost development. In most of these it is clear that this strategy could be extended to include support for private sector provision in education. For example, in Tanzania's plan, in relation to strategic delivery, it states:

'This plan marks a rebalancing of DFID Tanzania's programme. DFID will continue to deliver results through support to the Government of Tanzania's budget, while delivering more programmes directly, by working with Government and a range of partners beyond Government, notably civil society organisations and the private sector'.[110]

Similarly, the Rwandan plan states:

'DFID's approach over the next four years presents a shift from an almost exclusive support to government towards increased support to private sector and civil society.'[111]

This is evidence of the re-positioning of some of DFID's programmes, allowing funding to be directed towards private sector initiatives in areas where previously funding might have supported state provision. Whilst there is no direct evidence from the analysis of the operational plans that strategic support for the private sector in education is having a negative or positive impact on marginalisation experienced by particular groups, the plans, particularly Kenya's, raise a number of critical questions regarding the policy assumptions being made. For example:

---

106 DFID 2012a
107 DFID 2012a, p5

108 HDRC 2010, p64
109 UNESCO 2010

110 DFID 2012b, p6
111 DFID 2012c, p6

- if private sector provision is being identified as the most effective way to provide education in slum areas, what is the evidence base for this use of funding?
- is there a clear justification for encouraging private sector providers rather than strengthening state provision?
- if supporting private sector providers is indeed the right choice, then how will it be ensured that these providers are properly regulated (to protect the right to education) and contribute to overall education system strengthening?

Without acceptable answers to these questions, such a strategy is open to accusations of being driven by ideology rather than evidence of impact on outcomes for all vulnerable children. Similarly, the assertion that private sector schools may be more cost-effective does not address the point that strengthening finance for state sector schools in order to eradicate hidden costs may not only be more cost-effective in the long term but also have greater impact on ensuring equitable provision for all children. The argument provided by the HDRC report cited in the plan, that private schools may be more cost-effective, does not constitute a firm evidence base on which to make strategic decisions.

A number of arguments have been put forward advocating that there are clear benefits in the promotion of low-cost private education. These arguments include: increased resource and financial efficiency; targeted provision; flexibility in selecting students; improved outcomes; greater accountability; and enhanced choice.[112] These points are in part driven by the slow progress towards meeting EFA targets and the belief

that private sector initiatives have the potential to achieve significant results. They demonstrate an ideological view which positions the poor as consumers of education.

Arguments against the promotion of low-cost private education note that it is less likely to ensure equity, sustainability and accountability, or offer scaled provision of education.[113] Market-based systems will tend to have limited resilience and can also create hidden costs which are borne by the state (such as curriculum development). Private education is also likely to lead to rural areas becoming increasingly marginalised in a scenario whereby profitability begins to determine the location of schools; poor families are likely to become more marginalised as school fees begin to divert income from other priorities.[114] Moreover, the evidence base for using vouchers in developing countries is weak, and points to increased inequality even where benefits may be detected.[115] Most research has concluded that the only sustainable way in which to achieve the right to education is to develop state capacity to strategically plan and organise education, and actively lead on the delivery of learning for all.[116]

In regard to the development of schools and teachers who are professionally equipped to respond to the diverse needs of students once they are in school, much of the research advocating private education solutions appears to ignore a range of significant issues. One example concerns the fact that, on average, students in private schools outperform their counterparts in public institutions. While true, comparisons between public and private schools generally

fail to consider differences in student population, including ability and socio-economic status.[117] Another example is the argument that private schools can be more cost-effective than state schools in providing educational opportunity. Whilst it may be the case that, in some contexts, schooling can be provided at a lower cost through private schools paying teachers lower salaries than in the state sector, this is only one way of evaluating effectiveness.

School effectiveness needs to be evaluated through a broader lens than cost and enrolment. In relation to the concept of inclusive schools which are aiming to ensure the participation and achievement of all students in learning, significant research from a wide range of studies[118] indicates that, in order to develop the skills and systems required to respond to diversity, schools and teachers need a wide range of conditions to be created including strategic development of: curriculum and pedagogy; training and support/advisory systems; networks of supported collaboration between schools; and policy contexts which value and enable the development of teachers as skilled professionals in society. Current research suggests that it is unlikely that such a wide range of key factors can be strategically enabled through a major expansion of private education provision. This does not mean that there is never a justification for supporting poor and excluded people to access private schools. Yet any such support must be: evidence-based (including understanding the limits of private education); carefully monitored to ensure equity and inclusion; and contribute to the development of strong and sustainable education systems that are well regulated by states.

....
112 IFC 2007; LaRocque et al 2001; Nechyba 2005; Patrinos 2009; Stanfield 2010; Tooley 2005; Tooley 2007

....
113 Alexander 2001; Oxfam, 2006; Härmä 2010
114 Lewin 2007; Rose 2003; Rose 2007
115 Thapa 2010
116 Commonwealth Education Fund 2006

....
117 Watkins 2012
118 Booth & Ainscow 2002; Forlin 2010; Grimes 2009; Rieser 2012; UNESCO 2010

8.0 Recommendations

The Global Campaign for Education (GCE) UK calls on DFID to:

1. **Develop a strategic approach to equity and inclusion of all marginalised groups and a coherent policy towards inclusive education across all countries in which DFID operates:**

   - Make tackling marginalisation in education (in terms of both access and quality) a priority and develop a strategic approach to ensure the inclusion of all marginalised groups in education.

   - Develop a policy position on equity and inclusion in education to further develop work already done on marginalisation (e.g. the *Guidance Note on education of children with disabilities*).[119]

   - Develop ambitious yet realistic time-bound targets for including all marginalised groups in education in a strategic manner.

2. **Invest in research and programmes which promote equity and inclusion in education, and provide resources and materials to support these initiatives:**

   - Invest to improve its capacity to identify the most marginalised groups in different contexts and tailor its responses to fit local contexts. Use effective tools and data-collection systems to analyse contexts and to plan and monitor interventions that robustly promote equity and inclusion.

   - Invest in research on marginalisation in education, in order to build a solid evidence base for any interventions to reduce barriers to participation and achievement in school.

   - Ensure robust materials and guidance are developed for country programmes to reflect a policy of ensuring that all marginalised groups are included in education.

   - Make specific efforts to learn from previous and existing initiatives to include girls and women in education, and apply lessons as appropriate when tackling wider issues of marginalisation.

   - Dedicate adequate resources to meeting equity and inclusion targets in a way that adheres to internationally agreed principles on aid effectiveness.

119 DFID 2010d

3. **Encourage and support participation of civil society – particularly those representing marginalised groups – to promote equity and inclusion in education:**

   - Support civil society organisations representing marginalised people to develop their capacity to advocate for inclusion and engage in education sector planning and reviews.

   - Regularly review progress in a participatory and transparent manner, including working with civil society, particularly representatives of marginalised communities, in the UK, in country offices and other countries in which DFID operates.

4. **Advocate for inclusive education on the international stage when in dialogue and negotiation with other donors and other governments:**

   - Advocate for inclusive education and the need to focus on marginalisation in a holistic way at the international level, particularly when engaging with other bilateral and also multilateral donors (including the European Union, Global Partnership for Education, UN agencies and World Bank).

5. **Implement effective and transparent monitoring and evaluation to ensure equity and inclusion is a core component of education programmes:**

   - Ensure that senior DFID staff are responsible and accountable for tackling marginalisation in education at country level.

   - Strengthen the capacity of partner governments to address inclusion through planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation processes across all aspects of the education system. This should include teacher training (both mainstream and specialist) and robust and effective data collection.

   - Ensure that the country pages on its public website are more easily navigable with clearer signposting to different types of project and programme documents, making all such documents available to allow independent analysis of DFID's work.

   - Ensure that evaluators and reviewers are given the mandate to ask critical questions about DFID's approach to ensuring that the most marginalised receive a quality education.

   - Ensure that any support for private sector solutions is: based on rigorous evidence; not undermining the right to education, especially for the most marginalised; and contributing to strong and sustainable education systems under the ultimate authority of states.

Bibliography

Albert, B. et al 2005 *Has Disability Been Mainstreamed into Development Cooperation? Disability Knowledge and Research Programme*, Norwich/ London: Overseas Development Group, University of East Anglia/ Healthlink Worldwide.

Alexander, N. 2001 'Paying for Education: How the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund Influence Education in Developing Countries', *Peabody Journal of Education*, 76, 285-338.

Booth, T. & Ainscow, M. 2002 *Index for inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools*, Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.

Carr-Hill, R. 2009 *Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Issues in Data and Monitoring and Evaluation*, Oxford/Cambridge: Mokoro Ltd/ Cambridge Education/Oxford Policy Management.

Child Welfare Scheme UK 2004 *Study of policies and programmes addressing the right of street children to education*, CWSUK Research Report.

Cincotta-Segi, A. 2011 'Talking in, talking around and talking about the L2: three literacy teaching responses to L2 medium of instruction in the Lao PDR', *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 41, 195-209.

Commonwealth Education Fund 2006 *Making public schools work for all children*, London: Commonwealth Education Fund.

Consortium for Street Children 2009 *DFID consultation on 'Education Strategy 2010': Submission from the CRC*.

CREATE 2011 *Making Rights Realities: Researching Educational Access, Transitions and Equity*, Consortium for Research on Educational Access, Transitions & Equity, University of Sussex/DFID.

Croft, A. 2010 *Including Disabled Children in Learning: Challenges in Developing Countries*, CREATE Pathways to Access Research Monograph No. 36.

DFID 2007 *Evaluation of DFID Country Programmes: West Bengal State Programme.*

DFID 2008 *Pakistan Country Evaluation Report EV687.*

DFID 2009 *Ethiopia Country Evaluation Report EV697.*

DFID 2010 'Vulnerable boys find their vocation in Tanzania', http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Stories/Case-Studies/2010/Vulnerable-boys-find-their-vocation-in-Tanzania/.

DFID 2010b 'Bridging ethnic divides to reach the classroom in Vietnam', http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Stories/Case-Studies/2010/Bridging-ethnic-divides-to-reach-the-classroom-together/.

DFID 2010c *Joint Irish Aid and DFID Country Programme Evaluation: Tanzania 2004/5 – 2009/10.*

DFID 2010d *Guidance Note: Education for children with disabilities – Improving quality and access*, http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/edu-chi-disabil-guid-note.pdf?epslanguage=en.

DFID 2011 'Getting kids into school', http://www.dfid.gov.uk/What-we-do/Key-Issues/Education/Getting-kids-into-school/.

DFID 2011b 'MDG 2 – Universal primary education in Zambia', http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Stories/Case-Studies/2011/MDG2---Universal-primary-education-in-Zambia/.

DFID 2011c *Annual Report and Accounts 2010–11 Volume I: Annual Report*, London: DFID.

DFID 2012a *Operational Plan 2011-2015 DFID Kenya* [Updated June 2012].

DFID 2012b *Operational Plan 2011-2015 DFID Tanzania* [Updated May 2012].

DFID 2012c *Operational Plan 2011-2015 DFID Rwanda* [Updated June 2012].

DFID 2012d Email response to report author and editor from DFID Education Team, 31st May 2012.

DFID 2012e 'DFID Case Studies', http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Stories/Case-Studies/?t=ED.

DFID 2012f *Annual Review: Universal Elementary Education (Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan).*

ESSPIN 2011 *The Independent Monitoring and Evaluation Project for the State Level Programmes (IMEP) Mid Term Review of the Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria* Abuja: ESSPIN.

Ethiopian Federal Ministry of Education 2010 *Education Sector Development Program IV (ESDP IV) 2010/2011 – 2014/2015* Addis Ababa: Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.

Filmer, D. 2005 *Disability, Poverty and Schooling in Developing Countries: Results from 11 Household Surveys*, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3794.

Filmer, D. 2008 'Disability, Poverty, and Schooling in Developing Countries: Results from 14 Household Surveys', *The World Bank Economic Review*, 22:1, 141–163.

Florian, L. & Rouse, M. 2010 'Teachers' professional learning and inclusive practice' in Rose R. (Ed) *Confronting Obstacles to Inclusion: international responses to developing inclusive education*, London: David Fulton.

Forlin, C. 2010 'Developing and implementing quality inclusive education in Hong Kong: implications for teacher education', *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 10, 177-184.

Global Campaign for Education 2011 *Fund the Future – Education Rights Now*, http://www.campaignforeducation.org/docs/reports/ftf/Fund%20the%20future_education%20rights%20now.pdf.

Grimes, P. 2009. *A Quality Education for All: The History of the Lao PDR Inclusive Education Project 1993 – 2009*, Vientiane: Save the Children.

Grimes, P. et al 2011 'Inclusive Education in Southeast Asia: critical challenges in Vietnam, Lao PDR and Cambodia', *The Development Bulletin,* Journal of the Development Studies Network, No 74.

Grimes, P., Sayarath, K. & Outhaithany, S. 2011 'The Lao PDR Inclusive Education Project 1993–2009: reflections on the impact of a national project aiming to support the inclusion of disabled students', *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 15, 1135-1152.

Grimes, P., Sayarath K. & Outhaithany, S. 2012 'It's better than catching frogs': Understanding the importance of local context in the development of inclusive school self-evaluation in Lao PDR', *Improving Schools*, 15, 148 – 162.

Gurung, H. 2004 *Study of Policies and Programmes addressing the right of street children to education September 2004*, London: Child Welfare Scheme UK.

Härmä, J. 2010 *School choice for the poor? The limits of marketisation of primary education in rural India*, CREATE Research Monograph No. 23.

HDRC 2010 *Economic Appraisal and Status Report of Kenya Education Sector.*

Holdsworth, J. 2003 *Seeking a fine balance: Lessons from inclusive education in Lao PDR,* Vientiane: Save the Children.

Howes, A., Grimes, P. & Shohel, M. 2011 'Imagining inclusive teachers: contesting policy assumptions in relation to the development of inclusive practice in schools', *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 41, 615-628.

IFC 2007 *IFC supports private education in Africa*, 17 July, Washington DC.

Lewin, K. 2007 *The limits to growth of non-government private schooling in sub-Saharan Africa,* CREATE Research Monograph No. 5.

LaRocque, N., Tooley, J. & Latham, M. 2001 *IFC Handbook on Public Private Partnerships*, http://www.ifc.org/ifcext/edinvest.nsf/Content/PublicPrivatePartnerships.

Larrea, C. & Montenegro Torres, F. 2006 'Ecuador' in Hall, G. and Patrinos, H. A. (eds), *Indigenous Peoples, Poverty and Human Development in Latin America* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 67–105.

Lei, P. & Myers, J. 2011 'Making the grade? A review of donor commitment and action on inclusive education for disabled children', *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, iFirst Article, 1–17.

Lynch, P. et al 2011 'Inclusive Educational Practices in Uganda: Evidencing Practice of Itinerant Teachers Who Work with Children with Visual Impairment in Local Mainstream Schools', *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 15, 1119-1134.

Miles, S. & Singal, N. 2010 'The Education for All and inclusive education debate: conflict, contradiction or opportunity?' *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14, 1-15.

Myers, J. & Bagree, S. 2011 *Making inclusive education a reality*, Haywards Heath: Sightsavers.

Muñoz, V. 2007 *The right to education of persons with disabilities: Report of the special rapporteur on the right to education.* Human Rights Council report A/HRC/4/29.

Nechyba, T. 2005 *Mobilizing the Private Sector: A Theoretical Overview*, Prepared for the PEPG conference 'Mobilizing the Private Sector for Public Education', Kennedy School of Government, Harvard, 5-6 October 2005.

Noussi, K. 2009 'Advocating for Inclusive Education in Tanzania', EENET Newsletter 13, http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/eenet_newsletter/news13/page15.php.

OECD 2008 *Ten Steps to Equity in Education*, Policy Brief.

O'Keefe, P. 2007 *People with disabilities from India: from commitments to outcomes,* World Bank Human Development Unit, South East Asia Region.

OHCHR 2012 *Protection and promotion of the rights of children working and/or living on the street*, http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Children/Study/OHCHRBrochureStreetChildren.pdf.

Oxfam 2006 *In the Public Interest: Health, Education, and Water and Sanitation for all* Oxford, U.K.: Oxfam, http://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/in-the-public-interest.pdf.

Patrinos, H. A., Barrera-Osorio, F. & Guaqueta, A. 2009 *The Role and Impact of Public-Private Partnerships in Education*, http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-1099079877269/547664-1099079934475/547667-1135281523948/2065243-1239111225278/Role_Impact_PPP_Education.pdf.

Pinnock, H. 2009 *Language and education: the missing link. How the language used in schools threatens the achievement of Education For All,* Save the Children/CfBT Education Trust Research Paper.

Pinnock, H. 2011 *Reflecting language diversity in children's schooling: moving from 'Why multilingual education' to 'How?'* CFBT Education Trust.

Rao, N., Morris, P. & Sayed, Y. 2011 'The continuing relevance of context for national and global educational policy and Practice', *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 41, 1-4.

RESULTS UK 2010 *DFID, disability and education: bridging the implementation gap*, London: Results UK.

Rieser, R. 2012 *Implementing Inclusive Education: A Commonwealth Guide to Implementing Article 24 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* (2nd Edition), London: Commonwealth Secretariat.

Rose, P. 2003 *Communities, gender and education: Evidence from sub-Saharan Africa,* Background paper for 2003 GMR.

Rose, P. 2007 *Supporting non-state providers in basic education service delivery,* CREATE Research Monograph, No. 4.

Ruto, S. J. et al 2009 *Educational marginalisation in Northern Kenya,* Background paper for 2010 GMR.

Save the Children 2008 *Making Schools Inclusive: How Change Can Happen,* London: Save the Children.

Stanfield, J. 2010 *Self Help and Sustainability in Education in Developing Countries*, E.G. West Centre EFA Working Paper No.10, http://research.ncl.ac.uk/egwest/egwest/pdf/pdfs/Self%20Help%20and%20Sustainability%20in%20Education%20in%20Developing%20Countries%20latest.pdf.

Shapiro, J. 2006 'Guatemala' in Hall, G. and Patrinos, H. A. (eds), *Indigenous Peoples, Poverty and Human Development in Latin America*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 106–49.

Thapa, R. 2010 *Subsidising education: are school vouchers the solution?* 3ie Enduring Questions Brief Number 16, http://www.3ieimpact.org/media/filer/2012/05/07/Vouchers_EQ_16_July_1.pdf.

Tooley, J. 2005 *Is private education good for the poor?* EG West Centre Working Paper, Newcastle University.

Tooley, J. 2007 *Educating Amaretch: private schools for the poor and the new frontier for investors*, Oxford: Institute of Economic Affairs/Blackwell Publishing.

UIS 2012 *Reaching Out-of-School Children Is Crucial for Development*, UIS Fact Sheet No. 18, http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Documents/fs-18-OOSC-2.pdf.

UNESCO 1994 *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education*, Adopted by the World Conference on Special Needs Education: Access and Quality, Salamanca, Spain, 7-10 June 1994.

UNESCO 2000 *The Dakar Framework for Action. Education For All: Meeting Our Collective Commitments,* World Education Forum, Dakar, Senegal, 26-28 April 2000.

UNESCO 2003 *Education in a Multilingual World,* Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO 2004 *Teacher Education Resource Pack,* Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

UNESCO 2004b *Embracing Diversity: Toolkit for Creating Inclusive, Learning-Friendly Environments – Booklet 1,* Bangkok: UNESCO.

UNESCO 2006 *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2007,* Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO 2008 *Education for All by 2015: will we make it? EFA Global Monitoring Report,* Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO 2009 *Teaching Children with Disabilities in Inclusive Settings,* Bangkok: UNESCO.

UNESCO 2010 *Reaching the Marginalized: EFA Global Monitoring Report,* Oxford/Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO 2010b *Implementing the Right to Education: a compendium of practical examples,* Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO 2011 *The hidden crisis: Armed conflict and education EFA Global Monitoring Report,* Oxford/Paris: UNESCO.

UNICEF 2005 *State of the World's Children 2006: Excluded and Invisible*, New York: UNICEF.

UNICEF 2009 *Child Friendly Schools Manual*, New York: UNICEF.

United Nations 2011 *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2011,* New York: United Nations.

Unterhalter, E. 2010 *Partnership, participation and power for gender equality in education*, http://www.e4conference.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/SituationAnalysis_EN.pdf.

Watkins, K. 2012 'Holding out for the super-voucher: Kevin Watkins responds to Justin Sandefur on private v public education', http://www.oxfamblogs.org/fp2p/?p=11064.

WHO 2011 *World Report on Disability,* Geneva: World Health Organisation/World Bank.

World Bank 2007 *People with Disabilities in India: From Commitments to Outcomes,* World Bank Human Development Unit, South East Asia Region.

World Vision 2007 *Education's Missing Millions including disabled children in education through EFA FTI processes and national sector plans*, Milton Keynes: World Vision.

Appendix A

Summary of the results of the keyword search of 14 of DFID's Operational Plans

Keyword	Total number of general references	Total number of specific references related to education	Details of operational strategy related to education
Disabled	0	0	
Disability	2	0	Nepal: 'Nepal suffers chronic poverty entrenched by a complex set of interrelated factors including: gender; caste; ethnicity; age; religion; disability; language; and geography' South Africa: 'In the areas of wealth creation and health, we have demonstrated strong value-for-money cases on the basis of units costs (such as cost of a job created and Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALY).'
Ethnic	12	4	Burma: 'Burma is ethnically diverse. It has struggled since independence in 1948 to find peaceful way to manage this diversity. Ethnic tensions continue to be a source of conflict…' 'overarching figures may mask differences between different geographical areas, income groups, ethnic groups' 'Schools run by monasteries and faith groups, communities, and by ethnic minority administrations provide services to the poorest, in rural and urban areas'. 'We will improve targeting of the poorest boys and girls through our programmes to non-Government schools, particularly in ethnic minority states, and to those already missing out on school.' India: Discrimination on the basis of gender, caste, ethnicity and religion remains a concern: Scheduled Tribes and Schedule Castes live in the kind of poverty experienced by the general population 10 or even 20 years ago. Nepal: 'Education quality remains a challenge and national statistics mask disparities between regions and between caste and ethnic groups'. Vietnam: 'Government's new poverty line identified over 12 million people as poor as of 2010 and half of ethnic minority households live below this poverty line.'

Keyword	Total number of general references	Total number of specific references related to education	Details of operational strategy related to education
Ethnic (continued)	12	4	'A sizable part of the population – mainly ethnic minority and other vulnerable groups – risk stagnating in poverty without access to basic services' 'increase the share of ethnic minority children completing primary education from 83% to 91%.' 'translating … [published information] … into local languages (Vietnamese or ethnic minority languages)' Burundi: 2 references to ethnic violence Nigeria: 'Ethnic competition, extreme inequalities and regional tensions have also created grievances.' 'help address the causes of fragility – in the Delta, between ethnic groups,' Uganda: 'The drivers of past conflict persist: further violence resulting from poor governance, ethnic divisions or unequal regional development would have a rapid and damaging impact on economic progress' Ethiopia: 'Ethnic nationalism and underdevelopment … threatening the delivery of Ethiopia's development objectives.'
Ethnicity	1	0	Nepal: as disability
Religion	2	0	India: as ethnic Nepal: as disability
Religious	0	0	
Faith	0	1	Burma: Schools run by monasteries and faith groups, communities, and by ethnic minority administrations provide services to the poorest, in rural and urban areas
Language	9	0	Burma. Summary: Sections of the Operational Plan and project materials may be translated into Burmese and other languages spoken where there is a need to reach a particular target group. Nepal: as disability Vietnam, as above Burundi, as above Kenya, as above Rwanda, as above Uganda, as above Ethiopia, as above Nigeria as above
Street Children	0	0	

Keyword	Total number of general references	Total number of specific references related to education	Details of operational strategy related to education
Linguistic	0	0	
Slum	0	2	Kenya: Page 3: 'education: supporting schools in hard-to-reach slums and arid lands' Page 5: 'In education, we plan to re-focus on the arid lands and low cost private schooling in slums'
Informal	0	0	
Rural	4	2	Bangladesh: DFID Bangladesh will target the poorest 10% of the population, those living on less than 30 pence a day, in both urban and rural areas.' Burma: 'The rural population on average is less literate and has considerably less access to education services' 'Schools run by monasteries and faith groups, communities, and by ethnic minority administrations provide services to the poorest, in rural and urban areas.' Burundi: term rural used in reference to translation of materials Uganda: 'In the north, 46% of the population still lives in poverty; nationally, rural areas remain much poorer than towns.' Tanzania: The overwhelming majority of Tanzanians still live in rural areas'
Remote	0	1	Vietnam: 'Support achievement of the MDGs, particularly those that Vietnam is struggling with … as well as primary education in remote areas.'
Nomadic	0	0	

Appendix B

Details of the references to each keyword in the search of 14 of DFID's Operational Plans

'Disabled'/'Disability'
There were no references to the term 'disabled' and only 2 references to the term 'disability'. In the Nepalese plan, the use of the term was linked with chronic poverty. In the South African operational plan, the use of the term was not related to education.

'Ethnic'/'Ethnicity'
The greatest number of references in the operational plans was to the term 'ethnic', with 16 references overall in the operational plans (for Burma, India, Nepal, Vietnam, Burundi, Ethiopia, Nigeria, and Uganda specifically). Most of these references contributed to an overall contextual analysis of the country in question: 5 referred to ethnic conflict or tensions; 5 referred directly to ethnic discrimination or inequality; and 4 references related to the poverty experienced by ethnic minorities. Only 2 references, in Burma and Vietnam, were clearly linked to strategic educational planning with the aim of increasing representation of ethnic minority children in education. There was only one reference to 'ethnicity' (in Nepal), and this appeared in relation to poverty.

'Religion'/'Religious'/'Faith'
There were 2 references to the term 'religion', which related to discrimination in India and poverty in Nepal. There was 1 reference to 'faith', in Burma; this appeared in the situation analysis in relation to education. There were no references to the terms 'religious' in any of the operational plans.

'Language'/'Linguistic'
There were 9 references to the term 'language', 8 of which occurred in the Transparency section of the operational plan. In Burma, Vietnam, Burundi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda, DFID has undertaken to ensure that sections of the plan and/or project materials are made available in different languages. In Nepal, the use of the term was linked to poverty. In Bangladesh, there is 1 reference to 'language' which refers to English language teaching, which does not qualify for the purposes of this research. There were 0 references to the term 'linguistic'.

'Street Children'/'Slum'/'Informal'
There were 2 references to the term 'slum', both in the Kenyan operational plan. These related to supporting schools in hard-to-reach slums and a strategy to re-focus on low-cost private schooling in slums. There were no references to the terms 'street children' or 'informal'.

'Rural'
There were 6 references to the term 'rural', in Bangladesh, Burma, Burundi, Uganda and Tanzania. In Burma, 'rural' appeared twice, on both occasions in relation to education, but in the context of a more general situation analysis. In 2 cases, Bangladesh and Uganda, 'rural' was linked to poverty. In Tanzania, the term referred to the fact that the majority of the population still live in rural areas. In Burundi, the term was used in reference to the translation of materials.

'Remote'/'Nomadic'
There was 1 reference to the term 'remote', in Vietnam, where it was used in relation to supporting achievements of the MDGs, specifying 'primary education in remote areas'. There were no references to the term 'nomadic'.

Appendix C

Evaluation and review documentation for DFID's six largest education programmes

Country	Relevant Evaluation or Review Documents Available
Bangladesh	1. Evaluation of DFID Country Programmes – Country Study: Bangladesh 2000-2005 2. DFID Country Programme Evaluations Synthesis of 2005/2006 Evaluation
Ethiopia	1. Synthesis of country programme evaluations conducted in fragile states, 2010 2. Country Programme Evaluation: Ethiopia 2009 3. Country Programme Evaluation: Ethiopia 2003-8
India	1. Annual Review: Universal Elementary Education (SSA) 2012 2. Evaluation of DFID Country Programmes West Bengal State Programme 2000-2006 3. Evaluation of DFID's India Programme 2000-2005
Nigeria	1. The Independent Monitoring and Evaluation Project for the State Level Programmes Mid Term Review of the Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria 2011
Pakistan	1. Synthesis of country programme evaluations conducted in fragile states, 2010 2. Evaluation of DFID Country Programmes: Pakistan 2008
Tanzania	1. Joint Irish Aid and DFID Country Programme Evaluation: Tanzania 2004/05-2009/10

The Global Campaign for Education (GCE) is an international coalition of non-government, development and children's rights organisations, and education unions. In the UK the Campaign undertakes a range of activities designed to increase community awareness of the state of education internationally and generate the political will necessary to ensure the UK plays an active and effective part in efforts to secure education for all. For more information about the campaign in the UK, visit **www.sendmyfriend.org**

The Campaign's UK members are:

ActionAid UK	NASUWT
Action on Disability and Development	NIACE
Association of Teachers and Lecturers	NUT
CAFOD	Oxfam GB
CAMFED	Plan UK
Christian Aid	RESULTS UK
City & Guilds Centre for Skills Development	Save the Children UK
Consortium for Street Children	Sightsavers
Comic Relief	Steve Sinnott Foundation
Deaf Child Worldwide	Toybox
Handicap International UK	Voluntary Service Overseas
Leonard Cheshire Disability	War Child
Link Community Development	READ Foundation

GLOBAL CAMPAIGN FOR
EDUCATION