THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ALL CHILDREN READING:
AN INTERNATIONAL LITERACY DAY EVENT

Washington, D.C.
Thursday, September 8, 2011

PARTICIPANTS:

SESSION 3: THOUGHT LEADERSHIP FOR STRATEGIES ON READING

Moderator:

STEVEN J. KLEES
Harold R. W. Benjamin Professor of International and Comparative Education
University of Maryland

Panelists:

PATRICK COLLINS
Acting Head of Basic Education
U.S. Agency for International Development

KEVIN WATKINS
Nonresident Senior Fellow
The Brookings Institution

LUIS CROUCH
Lead Education Specialist
Coordinator, Global Good Practices Team
Education for All Fast-Track Initiative Secretariat

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. BONNELL: Well, thank you all very much for coming today. My name is Alexis Bonnell, and I've been working with Coley from MTI and Robin from Brookings to organize today. And we just wanted to say how excited we are to have all of you.

I have a wonderful job. I have the best job in the world. My job is Chief of Engagement, and what that really means is my job is to get people excited about education, interested in education and really make that a priority in USAID and to work with all our partners.

So we're really happy. We wanted to show you a quick video that we actually received from NASA.

MR. GARAN: Hi, I'm NASA Astronaut Ron Garan, along with my crewmate Mike Fossum, the new commander of the International Space Station. And we are talking to you from our home 220 miles above the Earth.

First off, we'd like to say hello to our friends and colleagues at USAID, and thank you for the amazing, positive impact you're making on our world -- and also congratulate you on your new education strategy.

(Applause)

USAID's efforts to improve worldwide literacy (inaudible) of NASA's goal of engaging students in STEM -- science, technology, engineering and match.

MR. FOSSUM: Strong skills in both reading and STEM helped pave the way for us to become astronauts. From our unique vantage point on this laboratory, our home planet is beautiful, peaceful, full of promise.

MR. GARAN: By embarking on this education journey together, NASA and USAID are equipping future generations with the skills necessary to ensure a bright tomorrow for the citizens of our world.

To all of you, Mike and I and our other crewmates wish you nothing but a bright future.

Thank you.

(Applause)

MS. BONNELL: Well, with that, we'd like to go ahead and introduce the three principals

of the day to talk a little bit about how our agencies are working toward literacy. And hopefully you'll have some really tough questions for us at the end of that.

So I'd like to welcome the next panel up.

MR. KLEES: Hi. Welcome to our afternoon session. I'm Steve Klees from the University of Maryland.

We have a very distinguished panel -- three distinguished leaders in thinking about literacy and engaging in literacy practices.

I will follow Karen Cator's lead and not give you the whole bio since you have them in your program, but let me just introduce them briefly and tell you what each is engaged in at the moment.

I wasn't quite sure what -- wanted to introduce people -- the order in the program is not linear so I -- but Kevin Watkins will be starting us off.

And Kevin is a nonresident senior fellow with the Center for Universal Education at Brookings Institution.

Kevin will be followed by Patrick Collins. Patrick is the Acting Director of the Office of Education in the Bureau of Economic Growth and Training at USAID.

And closing out the panel will be Luis Crouch. Luis recently joined the Secretariat of the Education for All Fast Track Initiative as head of its Global Good Practice Team.

Each will speak for about 10 minutes. We'll open for audience questions and then I'll have a few concluding remarks.

So without further ado, Kevin.

MR. WATKINS: Thank you, Steven, and good afternoon, everyone. It's a really great pleasure to be here.

I was actually reflecting while I was listening to some of the presentations this morning on the Narnia tales -- which I guess all of you who are parents who've read copiously to your children.

The author of those books, C.S. Lewis, once said a single sentence which I think captures so much about what we've been talking about today. And the sentence is -- he said, "Reading is how we discover we're not alone."

And actually, I think that is a very profound way of thinking about reading -- not just in the

obvious sense, that it's an activity that can take us into other worlds and other people's lives, other universes -- but also to something really fundamental about reading, in terms of our own development as individuals.

It's one of those really basic foundational skills which all of us in this room -- let's face it -- take for granted. It's the foundation that we've built our lives and our careers on, and it's something that is denied as a human right to so many people.

It strikes me also that we're really dealing with twin crises in education. There's a crisis in access that we still have 67 million children who are out of school and millions who are dropping out every year.

So there's a crisis of getting children into school, but there's an equally profound crisis when measured in terms of what children are getting out of school. And we've heard some of the numbers on that, which are pretty shocking, and I'll come back to in a moment.

But I think we always need to keep in mind both sides of this problem. We haven't solved the access issue and we have simultaneously solved that with the crisis in learning.

This session is headed "Thought Leadership," and I can't really claim to be a thought leader in this area. My colleagues in Brooking who produced the Global Compact on Learning, I think, can claim to be thought leaders and other people on this panel as well.

But I think also, we need to reflect on how do we go from thought to action for achieving change is what our colleagues this morning were talking about. And in that endeavor, it seems to me there are three really fundamental parts of the equation we have to get right.

The first is to communicate the scale of the problem, which may be apparent to everyone in this room but I assure you it's not beyond this room -- to communicate the scale of the problem and its consequences.

The second thing that we need to do is to identify and communicate the underlying causes, and set out an agenda for change that is both practical and achievable and compelling, that can galvanize political action and public support.

And thirdly, we need to forge coalitions for change. Change doesn't happen because a group of experts identify a problem. It happens because people get together to change it, and that's what

I want to talk about a little bit here now.

Let's start with the scale of the problem. And you've heard some of the headline numbers on this. There are two or three that I just want to mention.

In Pakistan, 1/2 of all of the children covered in a nationally representative survey sample of rural schools -- 1/2 of children in grade three were unable to form a single sentence using the word "school." These are children who have spent three years in their country's education system.

In India, only around 1/2 of grade five children could read a grade two text. And in the recent Awayflow survey in Kenya, only one in three children at grade four could read a standard two level text.

Now those numbers are pretty shocking, pretty distressing, but actually, they only tell half the story because if you think about the inequalities in those education systems, India is a country that produces world class scientists and information and communication technology engineers that -- let's face it -- scare the hell out of the job market in the United States. And yet 1/2 of the children in the rural schools in that country are educated so poorly that they can't read a single word. That is a shocking state of affairs.

When we think about the consequences of those hard numbers and we ask the question, "Who carries the burden?" Well, most obviously the burden is carried by the children themselves because they are suffering a very profound restriction in their future life chances.

These are children who have been earmarked for future poverty by an education system that is failing. These are young girls who have been denied opportunities for basic healthcare because they're being denied literacy skills that can give them a voice in their relationship with health providers. These are children who are destined for lives of low productivity and lives in poverty.

But it's also a shocking misuse of a country's resources, and these countries are just spending five percent of GDP on educational systems that are not even passing the most basic test of efficiency and equity. There are educational systems actually that are gearing whole countries onto a trajectory of slow growth and poverty.

To turn to the second area -- identifying the underlying problems and practical strategies for change. Well, of course there are many problems and some of them are country-specific, but I want to

just give you in bullet point terms what I see as five of the most critical.

The first is the neglect of early childhood. By the time many of these children get into school, they're already carrying a massive handicap or disadvantage because of illiteracy in their own homes.

Secondly, the millennium development goals, I think, have geared the development community towards easy measureable quantitative goals -- getting children into school -- and have deflected our attention from the critical question of what children are getting out of school -- that is to say, learning.

Thirdly, there are too many teachers who aren't where they're supposed to be, which is in the classroom. We have teacher governance systems which are failing.

Fourth, educational systems have really neglected the challenge of putting quality as their core priority. We don't have the assessment systems in place. We don't have the effective teacher training systems in place and I think this was acknowledged by the presentations this morning from people who are trying to change all that.

And last but not least, we're talking about systems that are desperately under-resourced in many cases -- partly because the international aid community has systematically reneged on the commitments that it made to expand financing for education in the poorest countries.

We also hear that the absorptive capacity is the problem in developing countries. All of our speakers this morning set out practical measures which could be supported by the international learning community, and I think one of the key lessons on this Literacy Day for aid donors is that when you make promises to children, you don't break them.

The last point I want to make is about forging coalitions for change. One coalition has been forged already around the Global Compact for Learning, which I think has been a very fruitful and instructive exercise. It pulls together, I think, the ingredients of a coherent strategy that has been developed on a consensus basis across a wide group of actors.

And I think the next stage is to turn that strategy into a program for change.

Because I can see the one minute sign has just appeared, I'm going to be even more short than I have been so far and say, first of all, we need to go beyond the current millennium developing

goal targets to some qualitative learning targets.

How about halving the share of children in every education system in the world who are unable to read a basic reading standard after two years in school as a first step towards the ultimate goal, which has to be that all children after four years in school come out equipped with basic literacy and basic numeracy skills?

We need to work together with the business community, which I believe could be doing far more in this area.

We need to work cooperatively with donors whilst holding them to account for the commitments that they've made.

So I'll leave it there. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. KLEES: Our next speaker is Patrick Collins.

MR. COLLINS: Good afternoon. It's a pleasure to be here.

Also, an apology. I had an old bio. I'm actually Acting Team Leader for Basic Education for the EGAD Office of Education.

We've heard an awful lot of information this morning about the learning crisis. So I wanted to take a few minutes just to address how USAID is responding to this.

You've heard this morning from our Administrator that we have a bold new educational strategy that's unprecedented. It was driven by a presidential policy directive, as our Administrator stated, and also principals of USAID, which emphasized focus, selectivity, division of labor and evidence-based decision making, among other issues.

And as he noted, quite honestly in the budget environment that we and the U.S. government are going into, but also globally, it was increasingly important for us to look at a more focused strategy, but also one that could demonstrate results that we could use to justify our expenditures in this environment.

Following these principles, the strategy is unprecedented not only in its focus but in its inclusion of time-bound targets.

The first target called for an increase -- for 100 million students to have increased reading

ability by 2015.

The second goal calls for improvements in higher education in the workforce.

And the third goal calls for increased access for 15 million students in crisis and conflict-affected environments by 2015.

It's important for us to note also that with goal one, which is most germane to our topic today, one of the key things that we're looking at in order to focus our programming but also look forward in a harmonized way is to harmonize our indicators around those of the Fast Track Initiative, and we did that last year and we recently included that specifically in our new F indicators.

We're extremely excited that this represents what had been years of work trying to find quality indicators -- and yet now we have specific indicators that we as a global education community can rally around.

For goal one, you've heard a lot of information about the information of leading. And we in USAID have taken the conscious step of emphasizing early grade reading because we know it's foundational to all future achievement.

What we're doing now, given that we've got a time-bound target, is we currently have 56 countries that have basic education projects. So all of us in Washington and our colleagues in the regional bureaus and all of our colleagues in missions between now and 2013 are working furiously to review our current portfolios, our projects, our commitments to our host country government partners and others, and identify how we can best and most logically and efficiently look at revising our programming in order to directly support achievement of the targets that we've set forth.

We wanted to mention a couple things in relation to this, though. Do these targets mean that USAID no longer cares about access or gender equity? Absolutely not. It's been years of hard work to make the strides in access that have happened in the preceding decades, and we don't want to diminish what an accomplishment that was.

And for access, we believe that in stable countries, improved quality will actually lead to increased access beyond the achievements that have been made today -- and for goal three countries, access is the explicit target.

Also, gender equality remains front and center in terms of all the education efforts we'll

support.

Also, does this mean that USAID is not interested in broader quality issues, such as early childhood education or transition to secondary math, science? Again, absolutely not. The issue is that we're just one of many players and in an era of likely diminishing resources, we felt that the issue of early grade reading in particular is so core that it's worth investing all in on this effort, in order to try to make a significant global change in partnership with all our other colleagues.

On the issue of working with other stakeholders, I wanted to speak briefly on the issue of how that plays out. I think what you see represented here -- not just on this panel, but throughout today -- is an example of the division of labor. There's a remarkable synergy in terms of the numbers of organizations that are interested in supporting early reading, and yet we all play a very different role -- and a supporting role.

For example, FTI -- well, first and foremost, the countries themselves. It's important for us to emphasize and all realize that it's their countries, their citizenry, their ministries, their families, their laws, their curriculum that we're all here to support.

In terms of other organizations, FTI is a partnership and the possibilities that we've already seen in terms of improved coordination and communication are really noteworthy. It is extremely important that we have this opportunity for greater information sharing and coordination.

Brookings Institution, for example, are one of our co-hosts today -- plays a very important role in terms of information dissemination and also advocacy -- something that we in the U.S. government can't be engaged in directly. Universities play a very important role in terms of developing new research that helps us all program according to the best available evidence.

Bilaterals such as USAID, DFID and others -- by virtue of the nature of our in-country presence, oftentimes we can be the organization -- certainly with and through our partner organizations, the direct line implementation organizations. And there's also much we can do in terms of supporting innovation, applied research and increasingly looking at focusing on moving programs in early grade reading to national scale and sustainability.

Going forward, we know that there are enormous challenges. And for us in USAID, one of the things that comes to mind most acutely is the realization that even though we've made a great

amount of progress recently, ultimately to move the needle globally and in countries in terms of increased literacy, it doesn't come easy, it doesn't come quickly and you're talking about an enormous (inaudible) of behavior change on the part of all the students who are eager to learn but not necessarily having the time to spend or the access to the materials or the literacy environment at home.

The parents that are concerned about how they can best support improved learning by their children, all the teachers and administrators that are looking for ways that they can better use their time to improve the lives of their citizenry -- but personally and on behalf of USAID, I must say that the coordination that has taken place around early reading in recent years is probably the most encouraging and rewarding thing that we've seen in a number of years.

Again, absolutely not to belittle anything that's come before us but one of the advantages of focus is that it's much easier to bore down on particular issues -- and in particular, what are the implementation strategies that we know work and then how can we look at refining those particular country contexts?

I think the key is through this focus and through events like this, we can learn from each other. We had a large global USAID education conference two weeks ago and we're committed to working with FDI, with Brookings and a wide variety of other organizations to continue to support events such as this so we can compare notes and better learn from each other, especially, as our Administrator said, my own children went back to school this week and, boy, when you have your own kids and worry about their education, it's a very humbling experience. It reminds us that we're all standing on the shoulders of those that came before us.

But I think this really is a unique moment in time and it's our time to put our own shoulders to the wheel of change, and USAID are confident that in coordination with all of our partners now and going forward, that we can indeed make a significant difference going forward.

Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. KLEES: Thank you, Patrick.

Our next speaker is Luis Crouch.

MR. CROUCH: Well, it's lovely to be on the panel.

As I think Steve or Kevin said: we're being called thought leaders when there are actually thought leaders in the room. I'm myself more of an action leader -- maybe a thinking action leader.

There are thought leaders -- I think -- I don't know if Ben's still around, but one of his books is coming out so I don't want to pretend to be a thought leader when there are people actually writing books about literacy in the room. So I think there were some copies of the book. It's an FDI publication, co-published with the IIEP in Paris, which (inaudible) so a bit of a plug to some of the real thought leaders in the room.

So as kind of more of an action leader perhaps, let me start with a positive message because we've heard a lot of doom and gloom about how little kids are learning.

And what I would like to say -- and on this, I agree with my colleague Bob Prouty, who has been saying that, is that we're about to see a revolution in quality. The quality is dismal. The learning is dismal, but we're about to see a revolution.

And I'm -- to personalize it a bit, I'm betting the rest of my professional life on it. This is what I'm going to do, is work on this revolution. And part of the reason I think this revolution can happen is because of the kind of people that are sitting in this row right here -- Minister Ibrahim, Minister Kpangbai, Mr. Assis and Guillermo Lopes -- I don't know where he went.

Because of people like that, I think we're about to see a revolution in the next four or five years that will do for quality what has been done for access in the last 10 or 15. It's going to take a lot of work, and that's why people have to commit their lives to it. And that's why I'm willing to do that the rest of my professional life, on that.

But I'm completely sure it's doable. The question is how. What are the action steps that are needed?

And I said I'm not a doom and gloom guy. I'm going to give one gloomy statistic, though, because I think even those professionals that have been working on development often fail to realize just how dire the situation is -- and this is a very nerdy statistic. And every time I use it or I convey it to somebody to use, they say, "No, that's too nerdy," but I'll try to explain it anyway.

And it is that the median child in the poor countries achieves at the level of the fifth percentile of the rich countries. The average kid in developing countries is achieving at the level of the

fifth percentile in the rich countries -- which means that the average child in the developed world would almost be a special needs child in the rich world. And that is just morally unacceptable and it's terrible for economic growth.

It highlights that we need to work on the real basics because it's not a matter of putting a sort of spin on the higher order skills, it's a matter of getting some of the most skills right.

So what are we doing, now that I can sort of depersonalize it and go back to speaking as an institution? Well, the Global Partnership for Education, which is what we will be called starting soon -- in fact, at the general assembly, we'll be making a formal pronouncement as to our name change.

We are a small group. We're a partnership. We don't ourselves have huge staff and so on, but we do look to intermediate funding. We look to replenish to the tune of $1.75 to $2.5 billion at our national replenishment event, and I hope the bilaterals contribute to this and the governments -- with two specific goals.

First, the access goal is not solved. So we hope to reduce the 67 million kids that are out of school by at least 25 million kids. So we hope for the next few years to cut by 2/3 the number of kids at our school -- and in line with what Kevin was saying, we have set as a goal for that replenishment halving -- cutting by half -- in 20 countries the number of kids that are not reaching basic skills.

So we think those kinds of goals can motivate action and galvanize the people who will be funding our replenishment, and of course continuing with their own bilateral programs as we move along.

And our name change is very reflective of the fact that it truly is a partnership -- and again, I want to harp on the partnership issue. For example -- and only as examples -- the Brookings fantastic global campaign on learning, which they've asked us to participate and we have been participating. And maybe we'll participate some more and if I answer their emails -- because I know that they're after me with one particular commitment that I am so far hesitant to make, but we're good friends in spite of my occasional negligence.

They're absolutely key to a kind of (inaudible) that we ourselves -- and official bodies often cannot do. USAID, DFID, (inaudible) are frontline implementers, along with the NGOs. And they bring that to the partnership.

And we have representatives of NGOs. We heard brilliant NGOs this morning and we'll hear some more later on. They also bring something to the effort. And of course the countries, as we've gone on.

So what do we bring as a partnership? Let me just enumerate.

First of all, we'll continue to broker knowledge. I think we're in a good position to broker these kinds of events, further information exchanges that are perhaps longer and more technical. We're very open to that and we have in our work plan the budget and the facilities to do that so that we build things that -- the Minister from Liberia only had 10 minutes to explain, maybe less time -- we can have a whole session on that, exactly what you're doing and have the countries learn from each other in a deeper way.

This is just a celebration. We want depth of exchange going forward -- and like I said, we have the work plan and the plan funded to sponsor such events.

Now what would be the exchange about? What would be some of the technical themes that we think should be pushed forward? We've highlighted them but let me just quickly hit on them again.

Pushing on the issue of mother tongue -- we've heard almost every country or maybe every country talk about mother tongue, but we need more technical results. We need to push, push, push on sort of finding out the optimal points. How quickly it can be done, how well it can be done.

My hypothesis is that it's less technically daunting than we have felt in the past. We have at FTI an effort -- and again, beyond, we're trying to get a program up and running in a year -- a tough, big challenge. It's a pilot program, but if it can be done, we're going to break the barrier of fear that has existed around mother tongue -- which I think is mostly a matter of fear rather than a true technical challenge. I think the fact that we're challenged can be an assessment.

We're ready to finance and sponsor exchanges of information around assessment issues -- how to tie oral assessments in the early grades to written assessments, both in the early grades and later on, as a way of benchmarking? The kind of results that Kevin has talked about and Patrick as well -- how do we measure whether we're achieving these goals?

Third technology -- we've heard some wonderful presentations on technology this

morning. The ministers showed interest. I don't know if Tony's still here. I think we need to help each do the kinds of things Tony was talking about, such as developing rigorous evaluations around the technological issues.

Books -- if you want to call books a technology, let's include them, but books are a very basic technology. Libraries locally stores materials that are culturally appropriate and so on -- above that, are scientifically sound.

So how do we do that? How do we do things that are locally sourced but scientifically very sound and very inexpensive? That's something we need to work on -- and again, we have the funds and we have the structure to work that.

When I keep saying we have the funds and the structure, we're concretely structuring a program called the Global and Regional Activities Program -- or window, if you will -- within our fund that is going to maximize collaboration with the likes of UNICEF, UNESCO, the bilaterals in a structured program to sponsor research, knowledge sharing and even scalable pilot activities.

That's a structured fund that we're going to set up -- and I know it's the end of my life, but actually I have two more points to make quickly.

One is the one area that I think is a little bit missing -- and I completely agree with Kevin here -- is popularizing these goals. So far these kinds of goals are being sponsored and talked about by Brookings, by us, by USAID, by DFID. It's not to get multilateral.

And in that location, we're back to the Brookings idea of getting some of these expressed in the millennium developmental architecture so that it's not just a few people adopting these goals but the international community in a very official way.

Lastly, some of the research and knowledge development that we plan to sponsor is around the whole issue of communities. Wonderful to hear the Nicaraguans talking about community accountability, shared accountability. The contests, the reading contests other countries -- sort of how to evolve the community effectively is an area of potential work.

Of course there's world partnership. All this happens through the countries, through the local education groups. We're just a small bunch of people sitting there on the corner of 19th and I. We're not implementers. This has to happen with the countries and with our partner bilaterals and

multilaterals.

Sorry, I took about an extra minute there.

Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. KLEES: Thank you, Luis. I'm going to take three to four questions and then come back to the panel so the panel will take notes. Don't have to answer all -- respond to all the ones that you feel you can address, and if the questions -- we'll keep their questions or comments short, and the panelists will keep their responses short, we can go maybe two rounds.

So questions, comments?

Yes. Please say your name and --

FRANKLIN: Yep. Franklin -- I work independently.

For Patrick, I heard you say that AID continues to be interested in early childhood development and a number of other education objectives, but that decisions were made to go only on the early grade reading. Could you elaborate on that? It sounds like a contradiction to me and I don't entirely understand why it's necessary to go all in at the expense of other objectives to bring onto the table.

MR. KLEES: Thank you. Other questions, comment?

Right there.

MS. FINESTONE: I'm Jean Finestone. Several people have mentioned the role of business and industry in education. And Mr. Watkins, you brought that up specifically. After money, which is -- the business has it all -- what are the key things that business can do in those contexts in terms of educational development?

MR. KLEES: Thank you. One or two more.

Over here.

MS. SWAVER: Hi, Lisa Swaver, National Education Association. Up until now, the United States has not given its fair share to the FTI or the Global Partnership Fund -- the new name -- so I just would like to hear some thoughts on where are we at in building that political will even in our own country?

MR. KLEES: Let's take one more.

MS. ROSENBLATT: Leeann Rosenblatt, D.C. Public Library. How do you intend to support publishing in the home languages?

MR. KLEES: Thank you. Go back to our panel now and start with Kevin. Which do you choose to respond to?

MR. WATKINS: Well, maybe on a couple of things. On the role of the business community, it seems to me that -- just as an observation -- if you make a simple comparison with the health sector -- I know there are many differences so I don't know if it would be an analogy -- but if I'm not mistaken, the number is, on a sort of dollar for dollar ratio, the corporate investment or support for aid to health is running at something like eight or nine times the equivalent that's going into education. So there's a big difference in financing.

But in many ways, I think what business can really bring to the table is not so much the money, actually -- it's the technologies and the innovation on which modern learning systems depend.

And we've had a lot of discussion today from our colleagues actually, from Liberia and Ethiopia and so on, which has really emphasized the importance of good quality teacher training. And I think that so much of it can be achieved through in-service teacher training, provided that the trainers, the teachers have got access to the appropriate materials and teaching technologies.

Now these are often not available in a physical sense in countries. There aren't books and teaching manuals and so on. But they can be made available through IT systems.

For example, New York University and other universities in the U.S. have run a big program in this area, and I think they could be scaled up.

And as my colleagues on the Fast Track Initiative will know -- because I often complain to them about this -- I think that in contrast to initiatives and frameworks like the Global Fund, the HIV, AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria and (inaudible), we don't have a specific window for corporate engagement through an arrangement -- Fast Track Initiative.

Now I think that could be done, and I think that's a window -- could very strongly support precisely the sort of innovations that Luis was outlining.

On the political will question -- I mean, this is the magic ingredient that we all speak about and desire -- don't quite know how to generate. But I do think it's the case that there are many individual

donors that are doing great things in education, and I would include USAID in that.

I was recently in South Sudan and USAID is rolling out teacher training programs in some of the most difficult parts of the country, which are making a real difference.

But if I'm speaking bluntly, which I believe I can do now since I left the U.N. last week, we have suffered for a very long time from an acute lack of political leadership in education. We just don't see the same level of leadership -- and I'm talking about high level global leadership here in education -- that we do in other sections. That's why education is actually no longer on the (inaudible) agenda. It wasn't even mentioned last year.

And I think if this is an area over and above the aid program, where the U.S. could make a huge difference. I think Secretary of State Clinton is a key player in this. So anything that can be done to galvanize the Secretary of State to play an even more prominent role I think would be very much welcome.

Thank you.

MR. KLEES: Patrick?

MR. COLLINS: First, Franklin, your question. I apologize if I misspoke. What I meant to say is that in the areas of early childhood development, secondary math, science, does USAID feel that they're not important? Absolutely not.

Are they part of the strategy for goal one? No. And this was very, very tough. I mean, these were tough deliberations, but honestly, among ourselves and with the Administrator, there was a real push to focus and concentrate, and honestly, he would push us to identify, "Okay, what are you not going to do?" Taking things off the table.

And as painful as it is, when you think about it, when you look at a number of projects across countries over the years, a lot of times what you would tend to see is the inevitable kind of Christmas tree approach, where you've got kind of a lot of teacher professional development and maybe a little bit of this, a little bit of that, and all of a sudden, you've got maybe seven or eight sprinkles of things, and it's very difficult to manage how much of it really went to scale.

It was well-intentioned, but honestly, from what we're seeing, that's not the M.O. of country engagement anymore. Increasingly, whether it's joint sector reviews or round tables with our

ministry colleagues and the other donors, the issue is, “Let’s get serious.”

All right, if you’re going to get into a subsector, then do the whole thing to scale -- otherwise, let’s quit wasting each others’ time. We’ve got too many things to manage here without having to talk to the latest group of consultants that are coming in, and they do this and they talk to everybody, and they do a couple of schools and it dies, and then everybody’s doing similar things.

So it’s very much -- it’s, we felt, in the spirit of the current engagement. Honestly, for USAID, we’re not doing basket funding for the most part, although that’s changing also. But it’s much more if you’re in the (inaudible) particular area and try to make a real difference.

So yes, it’s very tough. It was tough for all of us, but yes, that’s the logic. And when you think about it, it’s hard to argue with. We know that there’s a lot of giving up, but we’re just one donor. We’re not saying they’re not important.

But certainly between countries’ own budgets and all the other donors and NGOs and private sector; we’re not saying it’s not important -- just not what we at USAID will do for the five years of this strategy.

Five years from now, we’ll look and see what the situation is and do something else.

In terms of the FTI question, good question. We actually are giving money now, although I’m not sure if it’s signed yet. It’s been kind of gummed up with the lawyers between USAID and World Bank for a couple of months.

And we’re directly supporting implementation of some of the recommendations that came out of the midterm evaluation. There are other discussions that have taken place within the U.S. government on what we would do in the future and I can’t -- at this point, it’s not something that we can talk about publically, but I guess I would just say we are extremely encouraged by the relationship with FTI and also the projects that’s been made in recent years.

MR. KLEES: Thank you. Luis?

MR. CROUCH: Yeah, okay. Just quickly, in the interest of allowing more time for questions if there’s a second round -- in the private sector, I think the funding is important, essential.

But I think it behooves the international community and maybe even the think tanks like Brookings to assist the private sector in key countries, especially emerging market countries that are on

the road to becoming donors themselves, such as India, the Gulf countries -- to progress also toward helping to support financially the international education efforts -- but also what I would call sort of advocacy and policy support.

If you look at how the private sector in the country has evolved in their support to education, there seem to be certain three steps.

One is the private sector does adopt a school kind of things. Let's paint some school. You can brand it. You can feel proud you helped those schools. Slightly more sophisticated form of intervention is what I call the program interventions, where the private sector starts supporting, let's say, a better testing program or better scholarships for them.

The most sophisticated private sector will frequently endow a research foundation such as Brookings or something like that to then do ongoing advocacy because they've come to the conclusion that that's the most highly leveraged form of intervention that you can make in the education sector -- and you need all three. You need private sector doing much more to things, programs and policy, and I don't know exactly how one gets the private sector to do those things.

I think the donors themselves can help. The northern think tanks can help the private sector evolve in that direction -- and it has nothing to do with wealth.

I know that, for example, El Salvador has a very active private sector in the policy sense, but it's a poorer country than Peru. Peru, the private sector only has sort of very limited adopt a school kind of things. Okay, so that's on the private sector.

On the home languages, I think the issue of home language publishing could possibly be a natural marriage with some of the technology issues. And I think that's something we certainly would like to encourage -- again, and using perhaps some of the structures and funding that I've talked about -- because you can think of very creative things -- not necessarily e-readers, although you could do those, but you can think of software ways to codify the creation of readers in home languages.

And because you've codified it in a software structure, you can assure that the textbook that turns out is reasonable high quality -- because the software sort of forces you to follow certain rules of design pedagogy in the design of the book -- possibly. I'm just -- this is a hypothesis. People like room to read. People like some of the panelists this morning could certainly play a role in helping the

multilaterals come up with creative solutions for these things.