THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF GLOBAL EDUCATION POLICY:

PAST LESSONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Washington, D.C.

Thursday, May 13, 2010

PARTICIPANTS:

Introduction and Moderator:

REBECCA WINTHROP
Fellow and Co-Director
Center for Universal Education
The Brookings Institution

Speakers:

STEVEN KLEES
Professor, International Education Policy
University of Maryland

JOEL SAMOFF
Professor, African Studies
Stanford University

GITA STEINER-KHAMSI
Professor of Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. WINTHROP: It's a drizzly day, but we're going to have an exciting conversation this morning about education in the developing world. I'm Rebecca Winthrop, co-director for the Center for Universal Education here at Brookings. I'm really, really pleased to have the three speakers with us today.

At the Center we focus on education in the developing world broadly, both processes and content as well as looking at possibilities and limitations of where education fits in the problems of today, whether it be climate change or global security or health problems, et cetera. And we're really so pleased to have Steve, Gita, and Joel with us, three great minds academically, but all three of them have also spent considerable time working on education issues in a range of countries. You have their complete bios, right? So you can read every last thing about them.

But, in brief, our first speaker will be Steve Klees, professor of International Education Policy at the University of Maryland, who has work extensively in Latin America, particularly Brazil.

Second will be Gita Steiner-Khamsi, who's professor of Comparative and International Education at Teachers College at Columbia University, who's also worked extensively around Europe, former Soviet Union, and Mongolia.

And, lastly, Joel Samoff, professor of African Studies at Stanford University, who, not surprisingly, has worked extensively in Africa on issues of African education.

So I will not take up any more time and turn it over to them. After they give their initial comments, we'll open it up and have a good time for discussion and questions.

So, Steve, I leave it to you.

MR. KLEES: Good morning.

It's an education audience. It's -- let me start by talking about a major shift, literally a sea change in global education policy. In the 1960s and 1970s, education was seen as a public good to be supplied and paid for by governments. Education -- the emphasis was placed on improved access and quality for all levels and all types of education. And to pay for it the idea was to establish uniform and progressive income taxes as well as increased transfers from rich countries to poor countries.

In the 1980s, '90s, and 2000s, all of that changed. Education was still talked about as a public good, but it's private good nature was emphasized leading to the privatization of control and finance. There has been an emphasis on primary education over all other levels and types of schooling and cost recovery from beneficiaries was emphasized as user fees get charged even for primary schools.

My general argument is that this shift did not and does not have valid evidence to support it and was instead based on a political shift from an era dominated by liberals to one dominated by conservatives or neoliberals. I see this shift as a great experiment with our social, political, and economic lives, and I find these great experiment policies to have generally been a failure. Privatization has not resolved any of our educational problems and always creates greater inequalities. Our emphasis on primary education has led to expanded access, the primary school quality has worsened, and we have neglected important investments in other levels of education. And cost recovery policies from primary to higher education have harmed disadvantaged groups.

In the little time I have, I will suggest why I have reached these conclusions by focusing on primary education, since that has been the emphasis for three decades. Following that, I conclude by looking broadly at what we might do to turn things around. I do not mean to say that we have made no progress over the last three decades. We continue to make progress on access at all levels, albeit slow.

Let me turn now to primary education and begin with the education for all and millennium development goals. Another area of educational progress in recent decades is the establishment of EFA goals and the MDGs, which are global accords that recognize the imperative for

educational improvement. Their mere existence represents progress. Unfortunately, their implementation leaves much to be desired. EFA goals were narrowed in 2000 in Dakar, and the MDGs narrowed these goals further still, leading to a focus on universal primary education instead of basic education and the needs of youth and adults as well as children.

While EFA and MDGs are unique in some way, they are part of a long history of international accords to achieve UPE since the 1960s, all of which have been failures. While some progress has been made, EFA and the MDGs will be another failure. The original goal of 2000 was postponed to 2015, and 2015 will have to be postponed again. Estimates are that in 2015, 56 million children will still not be in primary school. The shortfall is huge and the prognosis is worse. A UNDP study said at present rates Sub-Saharan Africa will take 200 years to achieve UPE.

Let me turn to teachers. The great experiment has taken a dim view of teachers and most especially of teachers unions. Teachers are blamed for educational failure. The teacher ethos today is punitive and insulting. There are studies of teacher effort, as if teachers don't make an effort. There's actual surveillance of teachers with video cameras. There have been World Bank documents that featured drunk teachers or rioting teachers. The current policy push is to hire untrained, barely educated teachers, parallel or contract teachers. This is not quality EFA.

In the 1960s and 1970s, the issue was how to get qualified teachers in the classroom. Teachers' salaries have also been a target of the great experiment. Some absurd analyses have been done comparing them to GDP per capita. This has no basis in economics. We're seeing teachers are paid too little or too much. You could only say too much or too little with respect to goals. We are paying teachers too little to get qualified teachers. We are paying too little to get -- to eliminate teacher absenteeism.

Lastly, teacher incentive schemes are called for with no evidence they work and with clear evidence it is impossible to link test scores to particular teachers.

Let me turn to privatization of finance and control. In the 1980s, the policy of user fees for primary school forced many poor parents to keep their children out of school. This policy was reversed in the 1990s, but only half-heartedly and fees are still widespread. The great experiment has also argued for expanding private schooling through vouchers and other policies supportive of privatization, yet there is no evidence to support the superiority of private schools over public when they are working with similar students.

Testing. One of the most recent policies of the great experiment is intensive and extensive testing of students. In the U.S., we have had No Child Left Behind, and this is now being exported. However,

NCOB has been a failure in improving student achievement. Massive testing strategies are being sold as a way to focus on learning, but that is problematic for a number of reasons. Schools are supposed to do a lot more than teach low-level cognitive skills, which are what tests are directed to. Problem-solving, high order of thinking, citizenship skills, communication skills, teamwork, attitudes, values are all important.

Portfolios of student achievement were popular and successful in the U.S. before the great experiment and should be again. Testing regimes, teach for the test, and that has resulted in a significant narrowing of the U.S. curriculum. If testing is needed for most purposes, testing on a small sample of children suffices. And countries that are very successful on testing often have no testing regimes, like Finland or Cuba.

My analysis of primary school implies needed changes in policy. EFA needs to be financed, teachers need to be treated professionally, education needs reemphasis as a public good with less and less degrees of privatization, and student achievement needs to be looked at more broadly.

Let me conclude by talking more generally about what needs to be done to turn things around. I have five conclusions.

First, all levels and types of education need to be expanded and improved. Early childhood and lower secondary education of

fundamental parts of basic education both are essential to the right to education. Non-formal education is essential to the needs of youth and adults and also to fulfill their right to education. And public higher education has been curtailed for three decades for erroneous reasons. The expansion of private education has been poorly regulated and is often of low quality. The great experiment's overemphasis on primary education has cut people out of quality higher education and has made developing countries less competitive by restricting the formation of skilled labor.

Two, education needs must be considered jointly with other development needs. Education in developing countries is in crisis, but there are other important interrelated crises of poverty, health care, water, economics, debt, peace in conflict, climate, food, and security. Education policy is not independent of these contexts; we should not treat it in isolation.

Three, education needs to be treated as a right. There are a number of U.N. declarations and conventions that education is a right. This has slowly made its way into development policy -- in development agency policy. The right to education now forms the basis for UNESCO and UNICEF policy. Yet the World Bank, the major formulator of global education policy, and the IMF barely recognize the right to education. Such recognition would transform their policies as education no longer becomes focused only on the instrumental logic of its effects on things like income and

GNP, but instead education is a required end in itself.

Four, much more money is needed for education and development. In today's world, it has become fashionable to say don't throw money at education and other social problems, that money is not the main issue, that better management and stronger accountability is what is needed to fix the problem. This mentality has been an excuse for inaction. It is estimated that an additional $16 billion a year is needed to achieve UPE, and this is an underestimate. Yet the FTI -- Fast Track Initiative -- is only giving about $300 million a year. Improvements in other levels and types of education add to what is needed and, of course, the other MDGs and the interrelated crises above add more.

All needs cannot be fully met, but there is an ethos that we have been generous with foreign aid. However, we haven't been throwing money at our social problems. Instead we've been miserly. Adding up the foreign aid of all countries for all sectors, total overseas development assistance per capita comes to about $10. What kind of development do we think we can buy for $10 per head per year?

Rich countries spend less that 1 percent of their GDP on ODA. They are unwilling to even come close to the .7 percent goal that they set for themselves. In this unfair and vastly unequal world what kind of development do we think we can buy for less than a measly 1 percent of

GDP? It is worth noting that the Marshall Plan for reconstruction after World War II spent about eight times as much on Europe on a per capita annual basis than the rich countries do on annual ODA to all developing countries.

And for Europe, the development problem was much easier than the next phase by developing countries today. Europe was already industrialized with an educated workforce; it basically needed to rebuild the physical infrastructure that was destroyed by the war. Developing countries need a much more intense effort than the Marshall Plan.

And fifth and finally, since all needs cannot be, can never be fully met, the key question becomes how to make tradeoffs. The only legitimate answer I see is to rely more on more participatory forms of democracy. The answer is not to confide in social rates of return and other flawed research that have been prominent in the justification of some aspects of the great experiment. Such social rate of return measures are inaccurate, biased, and fly in the face of common sense. There is no way of resolving the tradeoffs between, for example, primary and higher education or education and health care other than through the legitimacy of some political choice process.

As many authors who write about strong, deliberative, and participatory democracy argue, there's a need to go beyond representative

democracy and to find a third way, one that gives space for substantial participation by civil society in public decision-making; for example, an innovative approach-led participatory budgeting.

To conclude, we need a new global aid architecture, one that improves upon the current bilateral and multilateral mechanisms which are too often chaotic and ideologically based. Proposals, for example, for a new global fund for education modeled on the global fund for AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria are a step in that direction.

Thank you. (Applause)

MS. STEINER-KHAMSI: It is a great honor to speak for me in the company of great colleagues and experts in the field, and I see many experts also in this room. Since I do projects and I teach development in education, and I do projects for all kinds of institutions -- NGOs starting with source foundation, but also banks and bilateral and multilateral aid -- let me talk more on issues that I find at the strategic level and operational level. And I think that will complement Steve's point that were much bigger issues that he addressed.

The six points that I would like to address that I find some of them are unintended consequences, some of them are based on wrong assumptions, some of them are met, and these are six points that I would like to address, are the following: One is the whole issue of cost-

effectiveness. I find the term in itself a problem. The second one is targeting strategies. The third one, sustainability. Fourth one, results-based aid. And fifth one, the hidden cost of transfer. And the sixth one, the unruly donors. And I will end with the unruly donors.

Let me start at cost-effectiveness. When I say the term itself is flawed, it's a term that has been floating around since structural adjustment for the last 20, 30 years, but when we look at it what it means in practice, it often means a shift of costs. It's not reducing costs, it's a shift of cost from the state to private households, or a shift of cost intended to be from the central government to local government. But because local government doesn't have a tax revenue, it ends up being parents. So as a result of cost-effectiveness studies and approaches in aid, private cost of education has surged tremendously.

And I work in a region where the private cost of education was zero in the former Soviet Union, so I can really see how, by having aid in that region, by having cost-effectiveness measures, we are creating dropouts, we are creating non-enrollment.

So this cost-effectiveness discussion has, of course, different angles. One of them is reducing cost, but it's also generating cost by encouraging private education, privatization of education, revenue streams, reducing leakages. I think what we need to do is look at the bigger level and

really critically evaluate that approach to aid which very much -- and I'm not talking only about the World Bank and the regional banks -- but for most donors cost-effectiveness is such a central part of the institutional logic, and the argument -- I can't understand the argument.

The argument is we can do more with little money. And the governments are poor; they could be doing more with little money. But I think we have to evaluate in-country what it really meant. Where -- did the costs really get smaller or were they shifted to private households? And, inadvertently, we -- talking about AIDS people, AIDS workers, we inadvertently create actually poverty and dropout and noninvolvement.

The one program that I'm doing right now in Mongolia, it's called Education for the Poor. And the terms of references they were looking -- and I didn't know it exists as a profession -- they were looking for people, as they usually say, 5 and more years of experience or 10 of more years of experience, people that are called "textbook cost-reduction specialists," "uniform cost-reduction specialists," "textbook distribution specialists."

So this is all like 10 years, 15 years after introducing textbook fees; 10, 15 years after introducing uniforms; 10, 15 years introducing tuition for special classes. Obviously, something didn't work. Obviously, there is a niche big enough for professions to emerge because all these fee-charging

services in education have created a huge problem.

Some of the problem is implementation: How do you reach those that cannot -- that would need support? A lot of it is implementation, but implementation is a big one in the countries we work in.

The second one is the definition of "all." There's a lot of talk and lecture on with the World Bank Group, this consultation. Even if we change it from "education for all" to "learning for all," and we have an emphasis on student outcomes, the question is always still "all." Who is the "all?" When do we move on to lower secondary education, or upper secondary education, and say the "all" has been reached?

In other words -- and we had this big discussion within the USAID strategy group, and the very interesting discussion on hard-to-reach and difficult-to-reach groups.

Aren't governments sometimes giving up too fast on that last percentage, because for some countries that last percentage is 15 percent, or 2 percent for some. And for some countries 2 percent is too much, and for others they are ready to give up on the 15 percent and move on to higher levels of education.

What I like a lot is what the University of Sussex, the Create Group does around Keith Lewin. They look into zones of vulnerability, zones of exclusion, and it's a much more targeted and specific way of

looking at groups that need attention that -- within the country, looking at vulnerable groups that are at risk of not enrolling, dropping out during lower secondary, et cetera.

So I think that's the question of who do we target, not only in terms of countries, which in itself is like a big decision, but within aid -- and I'm talking now at the operational level -- I think we should be discussing this more. It's a big issue whether we target -- whether the right people are the beneficiaries in country.

I find it very interesting what the colleagues produced in the NEA group, or Education and Fragility group, or Education and Emergency group that terms or aid favoritism, that very often, again, I would say inadvertently or maybe -- well, it's just because the way bilateral, multilateral aid works. They have to work with governments and sometimes the same groups get aid, and sometimes groups that don't need aid, and sometimes groups that are closer to capital, sometimes group or provinces that are within easy reach. So again, aid becomes a mean of inadvertently reproducing inequality in a country.

I liked that essay that I think Mark Summers wrote about it always raining in the same place. And that's how it feels with aid that I think targeting is not enough studied, and we are too ready accepting whatever governments tell us where money should flow.

The third issue is sustainability, and, again, it was a very interesting discussion we had within USAID, and I'm sure Mark can follow up on that in more depth. It has become somehow unfashionable to talk about sustainability. It used to be a big issue 10, 15 years, but nobody likes to talk about it. And claims are made that even if the project ends after three or five years, if it reached a critical mass that's good enough.

The question is, is that good enough? I have doubts. What I see in the region I work is that donors put in a lot of money, actually, but they absorb local capacity dealing with their projects rather than running the main project of running an education system; so, for instance, in Kyrgyzstan, all the projects, even the ones by the big donors, like World Bank and FTI and ADB.

Except for textbook publishing, all projects are pilot projects. After three or five years they end. They never get scaled up. They are wonderful projects, and because they are so expensive they are wonderful. They are not replicable by no means. You cannot scale them up. And the reason why they are so wonderful and so expensive is because donors themselves are accountable to their own structures. They want the projects to succeed, but it has no impact on the country. In fact, I would say it has a negative impact on the country because governments are busy pleasing the donors to help them implement their projects, and some of the projects are

not needed even. They are like replications of whatever exists.

One of the big issues, there is a lot technical reports one after the other complaining about fragmented and crowded curriculum. Part of the fragmentation and the crowding has to do that governments in that part of the world I work in pleased the donors, and they just add new subjects, but the don't take away subjects. They don't take away hours. So as long as the funding is there, they teach whatever donors want them to teach, and it's like a business. And then once the money dries up, it's not sustainable. It's not sustained.

Results-based aid, fourth point. FTI reports 2007 itself is skeptical whether it's really possible to implement results-based aid or working for mutual results, as the Paris Declaration would say. They bring one figure that there's 3 percent in the 36 Education Section Reviews that were analyzed. They noticed that there's a 3 to 20 percent gap in enrollment figures. That's huge.

So why are we supposed to believe exactly that statistics are reliable, a good tool for planning purposes in aid? Why, exactly, are we to believe baseline data and benchmarks? I'm very critical about these tools, how they are functioning in reality. It's almost like forcing governments to lie and to scandalize their own system and to create the crisis which then can be remedied by project and programs and reform packages that donors offer

to them.

The sixth point, the hidden cost of transfer, the McKenzie Report that you all know, the 2007 report, is also read a lot in developing countries, and there is now this preoccupation with teacher quality, I think for good reasons. I think that's really at the heart, actually, of quality of education, but the consequences that are drawn are completely different.

You may recall Finland and Singapore are referred a lot in that report. But we don't have that luxury of having, selecting 10 out of hundreds that apply for teacher education to become teachers. We don't have that luxury in developing countries. It's more that we have to twist the arm of people to become teachers because nobody wants to become teachers: the salaries are bad, the work conditions are bad, the prestige is bad. Yet the same measures and the same reforms on teacher accountability are -- Steven referred to -- that surveyance, are transferred from the First World to the Third World, in context where schools do not have the luxury of being selective on teachers and where there is a drastic shortage of teachers.

So I think what's needed is almost like I don't want to invite more economists to our field. I think we are overcrowded with them, but we need the calculation on what is the real cause of all these ill-adopted transfer and reforms that are made from First World to Third World countries.

Sixth point, unruly donors. And we have new donors coming,

and I think this is going to be interesting times. I was invited to -- there will be like a workshop actually funded and organized by the World Bank for Russia as a new donor, end of June. Russia is reemerging as a new donor. China reemerged as a donor, but I'm also thinking of celebrity donors and businesses.

We have so many agencies and actors in aid. They don't care about Paris Declaration. They don't care about the indicators for effective aid, yet they have -- they again absorb a lot of local capacity and attention. They don't even care to come to the CIES conferences, Comparative and International Education Society. They are not part of our community, and I'm sure they're not here. And I think we have not done enough to reach out to the new donors. I would call them unruly, because all the other donors, on paper at least, there is an agreement or a discussion on how effective -- aid should look like, even if it's not implemented or if it's difficult to implement. But I think we have to enlarge that audience.

And this was also at the same time an invitation to come to CIES, May 2010, in Montreal. (Applause)

MR. SAMOFF: Good morning.

GROUP: Good morning.

MR. SAMOFF: I am pleased to join with colleagues both on the platform and those of you in the audience for this discussion this

morning. Since my work is focused heavily on Africa since most of the poorest countries in the world are in Africa, since most of the countries least likely to achieve the education for all objectives are in Africa, it makes sense to talk about Africa. I think we can learn a good deal from Africa's experiences.

Africa came to independence with very high aspirations for what education was to achieve both for individuals and for society. And there was indeed extraordinary progress, initially, in access, expanding access to education, but also in innovation in education. Indeed, if you're interested in innovations in education experimentation, go to Africa at the primary level, at the secondary level in thinking about teaching science and thinking about working with adults, and thinking about linking communities to schools, and thinking about enabling teachers to learn from each other. Lots of things have happened in Africa that are exciting and promising.

But, unfortunately, very few of them have persisted. Most have withered. And hardly any has become a national overall part of the education system in contemporary Africa. Now why is that?

An inclination, I think, is to look for explanations within individual countries. Here are some problems in Kenya; look in Kenya for why that is. Here, even the same problems in Mozambique; look in Mozambique for why that is. And we need to get beyond that. We need to

recognize that the problems that we're encountering have a much broader base. I don't like medical analogies, but try one.

You're now traveling on a cruise ship and a few people you encounter have -- are nauseous and have diarrhea, and you express your sympathy and suggest I get up on the deck and get some fresh air and perhaps take some Dramamine. But if a thousand people get sick, then you get worried about what's happening in the kitchen. Then you get worried about the cleanliness and contamination in many places on the ship. It's not a problem of a few individuals, it's something that's institutional, something that's structural, something that's not local. And it seems to me that needs to inform our thinking about what's going on in the contemporary era in education in Africa and in the aid world. And, therefore, the title of my talk, the real title, is "More of the Same Will Not Do."

Now, when I was asked to make these comments, I looked at the overall charge, and I thought what would be useful would be to make a series of observations, explain the observation, suggest the implications, and then move on. And I stopped when I got to 19. And since clearly in my 12 minutes, some of which are now gone, I can't deal with the 19 observations.

What I thought I'd do is just pick out five or six and offer them to you in a pretty provocative format, challenging format, and invite you to

challenge me either on those or on others that I haven't had a chance to talk about. What I'm trying to do is go a bit along with what Steve and Gita challenged me to do, in a cliché "think outside the box." I think we need to go further. We need to redo the box. We need to be thinking enough outside the box to say that the box within which we're thinking is itself a problem, and that we can't solve the bigger issues unless we rethink the box.

Okay, let me pick up on a couple of the themes. Steve talked about teaches, Gita talked about teachers. What we find in Africa is two problematic ways of dealing with teachers. One is to bypass them, and that simply can't work. In an earlier era, there was a major effort to use television in East Africa and to recruit what were intended to be the strongest of the teachers, get them to do the programs, and all the other teachers would show the programs to the children, and that was clearly not viable. Ultimately, learning is a face-to-face interaction, and that's where it happens.

In the current era, it's now computers rather than televisions, but the efforts to teacher-proof the curriculum, even to teacher-proof the pedagogy are always self-limiting, are always going to lead to an outcome that is far short of learning for all.

And the second thing that is happening with teachers in Africa, as Steve mentioned, is this effort to recruit low-wage teachers, that is, driven

by the cost of paying teachers. The salaries of teachers are the largest, by far, portion of all the spending on education. How to hold that down will get some teachers to work for lower wages. How do you get teachers to work for lower wages? Well, you recruit people who are -- don't have much teacher preparation or much professional background, and that, ultimately, is clearly very shortsighted. In the short term, it works, but overall longer term, eventually the communities come around and say, hey, stop sending us half-baked kids who didn't succeed. Send us real teachers. We want the same kind of teachers that are teaching in what are regarded as the strong schools of the country.

Second observation. Formal education systems can't possibly meet the needs of the large number of adults in Africa who don't read or write very well and certainly can't address the challenges that are now becoming increasingly clear of dealing with the importance of the learning that happens in the earliest years of children's lives. This grand focus on the schools is itself a problem, and everybody says that sooner or later, but if you look at where it matters, that is in budget allocations, you don't see it. And until we have a clearer sense of education as a broad system that has to deal with people who are not in schools, who were never in schools, who were not yet in schools, then we can't achieve learning significantly for the population.

The third observation, think about education as the interconnected system. Here, too, everybody agrees in principle. When you ask people, everybody will say yes, education is an interconnected system with multiple parts, and yet what we've seen over 20 years now is the continuing effort to starve one part in order to feed another.

Now here's the crude analogy: You're preparing to run the marathon, and you go to an expert coach and say, "What can I do to be really excellent in running the marathon?"

And the coach says, "Oh, I got a great idea for you. We're going to amputate one of your legs so the other one can be a whole lot stronger."

That's not a real good recipe for winning a marathon. It's a dramatic example, it's facetious, but it really does make the point that it's not possible to strengthen one part of the education system by weakening some other part of the education system.

Here's a more prosaic example: Improve quality in basic education. Well, how do you do that? You need better teachers. Well, how do you get better teachers? Well, then you need a teacher education system that prepared teachers. Well, how do you do that? Well, you need competent teacher educators. Well, how do you do that? Well, you need universities that are capable of preparing competent teacher educators.

Well, how do you do that? Well, you need strong universities the hallmark of which is research. That's what distinguishes a university from other kinds of higher-level institutions, and so the implication there is one that has been hard to get people to accept, but it's pretty clear unless we're spending money on enabling universities to be strong and to do research, including research on learning and child development in teaching, then we can't improve basic education. And we certainly can't improve basic education by starving universities in the expectation that money can be redirected in one way or another.

If we mean it to take seriously that education is an interconnected system, then we have to nourish all of the parts of the system, and we have to nourish their interconnections rather than pretending their interconnections are a problem.

Fourth observation. Africa came to its independence with an education system, with education systems that were inherited from a colonial past whose main structure and orientation were to educate a small part of the population. Colonial rule wasn't interested in mass education. Colonial rule didn't set out to say, here, all these people who are part of the colony, let's make sure they get into schools and carry on in schools. The structure of the system was an elitist system designed to prepare a small subset of those who entered into the education system.

And if you look at education in contemporary Africa, that's still the case. The structure of the education system is still heavily oriented toward a notion of what all of you who work in education know familiarly as the education pyramid, right? There are fewer at the top, more at the bottom. What's happened over time in recent years is the bottom has gotten a bit wider, in a few countries the top has gotten a bit wider, but it still looks like a pyramid. But education for all wouldn't look like a pyramid, right?

If the goal is that everyone who starts in the first year gets to the seventh or eighth or ninth year, whatever is the end of the basic education cycle, it should look like a rectangle. And then schools should spend a whole lot less time trying to figure out how to track and sort and sift and winnow and push people out, and spend a whole lot more time trying to figure out how to get people in and keep them in and enable them to stay in until they complete the system.

Example: In 1997, Uganda eliminated primary school fees. As many of you are aware, there was a great rush to the doorway to fill up the schools, and ask the question now -- Uganda has a seven-year primary school cycle -- ask the question in 2004, how many of those who entered in 1997 were still there? Twenty-two percent.

Schools are organized around sifting, sorting, and pushing people out. I don't have time to spend a lot of -- offer a lot of examples, but

think about how that would be different if schools set as their primary criterion getting people in and keeping people in, they spend less time on selection and more time on inclusion.

Examinations, for example, which in Africa as elsewhere are heavily focused on individual achievement, would be used much more to assess the pedagogy, much more to assess the curriculum, much more to assess what schools' teachers in school systems are doing. Failure would not be understood as an individual consequence but as a system problem, as an education problem. There would be far less attention to tracking and sifting and sorting, and far more efforts to use heterogeneous groups, and certainly far more imagine focused on peer-assisted learning of one sort or another to deal with what are and are likely to continue to be very large classes.

I've been focusing on Africa. Let me step outside Africa for a couple of more observations in the time I have left.

You all know about all the grand conferences that have focused on education for all and Thailand in 1990, Dakar and Senegal in 2004, the world gets together and agrees to make a high priority -- set a high priority on education for all. But as Katarina Tomasevski, who was very eloquent in thinking about this issue, pointed out to us, what happens there is a dilution of responsibility, not a focusing.

When governments are responsible for education, people who are unhappy about what's going on know where to go to take their complaints. When governments are responsible for education, those whose children are not doing well, they're not well-served in school, at least in principle have a place to go to complain.

When all of us in the world are responsible for education, no one is. When all of us in the world are responsible for education -- we don't really do that, but that's when all of us in the world say we're responsible for education, then the governments of the countries where education has problems can look straight at parents who come to complain and say, oh, no, no, it's not our fault. The aid that was promised hasn't come as quickly as we needed it. The aid that was promised didn't come in the form that we needed it. The textbooks that were promised haven't arrived yet. The textbooks that were to be delivered are not the ones that we need.

Sixth observation. The international system spends its time trying to look around the world identifying what our best practices, and then telling everybody else what they should be doing. And that box is really fundamentally flawed. That's certainly not a reasonable role for the outsiders, but it's even more problematic because education, of all of the things that we do, ultimately is exquisitely a very local process.

What matters in the end is the face-to-face interaction.

Education everywhere is contingent on that local setting. Education is everywhere negotiated and renegotiated and renegotiated. It's in that sense that there are no universal best practices; the best practices are always local practices, and the effort to find best practices and, worse, the effort to use best practices and spend our time telling people what they should be doing leads us to stop paying attention to -- or pay less attention to how can we reasonably learn from each other? How can we reasonably learn from what people somewhere else have done and then figure out what that means in local terms in order to integrate it into a particular setting and a particular place?

Final observation. Education in Africa has become significantly aid-dependent. It used to be the case that foreign aid was a very small percentage of total spending on education and it was aid-dependent even then. It has become a whole lot worse. The figures for Mozambique in 2007 are that -- or 2008 are that 56 percent of the total recurrent budget of Mozambique was coming from foreign assistance. Fifty-six percent. That's a big percentage, right? That's more than half of the total recurrent budget. That is more than the budget of education and health put together is coming from foreign aid.

So what we see for Africa is what crudely I've called in another session, or in a session at the CIES, the fast-track to plan dependence,

because nobody is talking about how this is going to end. In 5 years, 10 years, 12 years, what's this going to look like? This is surely not sustainable, but even worse it's not really a good idea. If education matters, then -- and everybody agrees that it does, then it's surely not a reasonable scheme to say that those who provide the funds should have such a dominating role in talking about what is to be done and how it's to be done.

To conclude, then, my general point is that the obstacles to education for all in the world are institutional and structural, and they're both local and global. That is, the way we do things, the constructs that we use, the ideas that we offer to explain and to remedy things are themselves problems, not solutions. And those obstacles must be addressed as such, and that means that we need to be rethinking big issues. We need to challenge things that seem clear and that we take for granted. We need indeed not only to be thinking outside the box but to be reorganizing the box. And, as I said a few minutes ago, more of the same simply will not do.

Thank you. (Applause)

MS. WINTHROP: Thank you so much, everybody.

Thank you all three for very provocative questions. I think now we should throw it open to the audience for questions. Maybe we'll take a couple of questions at a time. I see one and I see two. Yes? So go ahead, the first two questions.

MR. DOWELL: I'm Frank Dowell, a CIES member and all the rest of it. I just got back from Palestine, actually, eight weeks in Palestine, very interesting. Most of what you're saying here applies to what we were looking at, which is teacher training in Palestine, particularly the last set of issues that were addressed about teacher training, but about the structural and other issues, and local issues.

But go back to this issue of pockets of vulnerability, which is, I think, a terrifically important issue and one that we face every time we go to the field to look at things critically. The problem with the whole issue of pockets of vulnerability which I think is where it's at, is that the data that we have and that we're often given isn't adequate to that task because people at the national level are not looking at it in that way; they're looking at datas and an aggregate set of numbers that cut across everything and really hide everything.

I was wondering whether you could talk a little more about that and the implications of that for evaluation, assessment, and programming, because I think it will have profound implications. It will force us also to look at the box in a different way and probably undress at least three sides of the box. We might leave one side up there.

But I think that's an important issue and it needs to be elaborated on, and I'm wondering whether somebody could do that for us.

Thank you.

MS. WINTHROP: Thanks, Frank.

MS. LIMAGE: Thank you. My name is Leslie Limage. I'm recently retired from a career with UNESCO, and all of the speakers are old friends so they will accept some provocative questions from me.

Steve, my question for you is, most of the arguments you presented I've heard over the years from you, but you concluded with a call for the global fund for education. Would you describe what you think would be different in the aid architecture through that process?

My question to you, Gita, you described many problems associated with the functioning primarily of USAID. Are you part of the problem or part of the solution, when you're actually implementing these projects? And could you give me an example of how you transform working with the structures that exist?

And, secondly, do you have any suggestions how we can indeed incorporate and work with the new donors? This is certainly an extraordinarily large problem with fragile organizations like UNESCO.

For you, Joel, you started off by saying that context was probably of little significance in the beginning, and then you concluded with how important it is. And I have to agree more with your conclusion than with your opening remark. Can you say anything about how we can, in our

international work, encourage more respect for local solutions to local problems? This is an ongoing theme for many years.

Thank you.

MS. WINTHROP: Thank you very much. So from two questions we actually got six questions, I think. So why don't you just each take a stab at the various parts you want to answer? Why don't we start with you, Steve?

MR. KLEES: Can you hear me okay?

MS. LIMAGE: Oh, yes.

MR. KLEES: Good. Let me start with Leslie's question, which is a huge one. What do we do with global aid architecture? How bad are things? How far do we need to go? Where do we start over? And I've got a very critical stance towards that. The global fund for education is a minimal step for me, and as for me we need to rethink Bretton Woods.

We need to rethink our Bretton Woods institutions. The Bank and the Fund are ideological institutions in clear ways for the last three decades. You could argue there were ideological institutions before as well, but this is a particular ideology that has not helped us overall in many ways.

I think that's a rough battle and that's a longer-term issue. I think in the shorter term we can do things like replace the Fast Track Initiative which -- with, for example, some sort of global fund for education,

which there's lots of people talking about now and lots written about it. I think the Fast Track Initiative treated aid as a technical issue for the most part. It used benchmarks to qualify countries, and those benchmarks had no basis in -- they were not reasonable benchmarks. They were benchmarks on teachers' salaries. They were benchmarks on class size. We have no business making those benchmarks on any technical basis.

A global fund for education would be much more of a fund that was run with a political orientation. It would have representation by donors. It would have representation by civil society groups. It would have representation by developing countries. And, the FTI is being asked to reform in those directions. So, there may be a meeting of the minds in that way, but I think FTI is too technical and too ideological an institution. I think we need to do something very different, and I think the global fund for AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria is doing something different and would be useful to go along with that.

I agree with Frank's point about the data being inadequate. We don't know -- I think that the 72 million estimate of children who are out of school now in EFA is probably way off, and there are other estimates. UNESCO has 100 million child estimate. I think we're a long ways from getting good data on a lot of our issues.

MS. WINTHROP: Thank you, Steve.

MS. STEINER-KHAMSI: Maybe if I can just add also on Frank's point, the statistical issue. I think part of the problem is that it's essentially collected rather than at the school level. It's collected from the district education authority to the regional, to the central. And every level manufactures the data in its own way. And I can see the huge difference, for example, in Mongolia. The dropout rate totally different, depending on whom you ask within the government. If you ask the non-formal education, the dropout numbers are huge; but if you ask the ones in charge of basic education, it's very little, and this is even within the government. If you ask NGOs, again, you get other numbers.

So I think what's really needed is -- and that's what I mean the problem with economists is that they really rely on this data and they rely on central level of data. They don't speak with the people. They don't go to schools. They don't do qualitative studies. They don't do surveys or interviews. And that leads to a lot of wrong decisions.

I would like to bring that example, the question with statistics, and link it with Leslie's point on, did I ever do anything good in Asia, basically? I hope so. I'm still doing it. Just one example that I find really a useful study, right now we are doing a UNICEF study, and actually we are doing it also now at Teachers College, my university

MS. STEINER-KHAMSI: And the issue came up when I did

strategic planning with -- for the European Commission in Kyrgyzstan. We noticed everyone is talking about the crisis of the teaching professions, the crisis of teaching cadre. But then when you look at the statistic, it was only 2 percent. And I said, why is everyone talking about the lack of teachers and the crisis? Statistically, there is no shortage in Kyrgyzstan until we went to the school level.

When we went to the school level we say, okay, the person who teaches math is not really a math teacher. It's the accountant from the local office. The person who teaches music, there is no music teacher for the last five years. There is no English teacher. So this is a lot of redistribution of hours going on between the regionals that are not teachers. And parents are very educated in that region and in many parts of the world, and they don't accept that. They don't accept teachers that don't have a background, and they shouldn't accept it.

So when once you go to the school level, you really get a different kind of data. So what we started to do -- and this is an example of, I think, a useful concept – was try to show to the ministry, hey, it's not 2 percent. Count every teacher who's a substitute teacher. Count every university student who is there. Count every retired teacher who the principal begged to stay in school. Count every teacher who teaches more the one and a half staff teaching loads, more than 30 hours. If you count all

of that, it's more like 30 to 40 percent teacher shortage.

So that's why we called that study it's like "10 Plus 1 Indicators for Teacher Shortage." That plus-1 is the one that the economists look at. That is like the national statistics, but the other 10 indicators, everyone knows them, you just have to talk to them. You have to go to the school level, you have to talk with teachers with parents. And they tell you that problem is these 10 different kinds of teachers that we have that's filling the gap.

So I believe in aid, actually. I believe, but the architecture is a problem, and part of the problem is this deeply unequal relationship. But unequal relationship in life are the norms, not the exception, and I think that it's just a challenge to work under these conditions.

MS. WINTHROP: Thank you, Gita.

MR. SAMOFF: Lots of neat things to follow up. Very quickly on the question about error margins in the data, I wrote about this years ago, and I keep going back to that work to see what it looks like and it really hasn't improved.

So one quick answer to the question is, start with large error margins in your mind and then start with the notion that unless there's been a change of 5 percent or 8 percent or 10 percent, we don't really know whether anything's happened. And that's a bit how to deal with these very

large differences in estimates about what's happening in teacher effort or what's happening in children in schools, and so on.

Second, it seems to me we need a supplement, but that by insisting that those who would like to work with that approach to things costs the invisibles. Steve reminded me earlier that Hank Levin did this years ago. What's it cost to the society to fail to educate girls? What's it cost to the society when you count in the projected lifetime earnings of children who graduate from one -- or finish one cycle of schooling or another, girls who are effectively excluded from science streams?

And if we being to cost the invisibles, and the ways in which environment scientists are now beginning to cost the invisibles and tell us what the real cost is of one alternative versus another, I think we'll come out with very different notions of what the alternatives look like.

On the funding for education, I think Steve is right that there's a need for some fundamental rethinking about how to transfer funds in education. And I think certainly a model of a global fund for education is going to be way far ahead of where we are now. There's also risk, however, in tinkering with the details, and that loses sight of what the big issues are.

And so we'll end up, I guess -- my guess is with lots of discussions about whether the governing board should have six people from poor countries, or seven or eight, or whether the decision should have three

levels or four, or whether the review should go start here and go there, or start there and go here. And all of those are in their own terms important, but if we end up spending all of our time doing that, then we lose sight of the big issue. And the big issue is ultimately whether or not we can reconceptualize -- see, I told you I wanted us to rethink the box -- reconceptualize aid as a redistributive mechanism in funding for education in the same way that we do within countries.

All right, if you think about funding for education in France, an affluent taxpayer in Paris agrees that it's reasonable to use a portion of those taxes to pay for schooling for a poor child in Marseilles. It's in that sense that education funding is redistributed. In the U.S., it's primarily property taxes. But let me take as a resident of California, I agree that my state taxes -- even though I sit in an affluent community, Palo Alto, in Northern California -- that the taxes that I pay to California, part of them will be used for poor children in education communities all over the state.

There's not a whole lot of state taxation for education, but whatever little bit there is I agree that it's reasonable as a taxpayer, that it's my responsibility to pay for the education of children in poor communities. My children are out of school. I don't have any children in school anymore, and it is my responsibility to pay for poor children, to pay for the education of children, poorer children elsewhere, children who don't pay any taxes at all.

What we have to get to is the point where me and people like me agree that it's not only my responsibility to pay for the education of children elsewhere in California or in Mississippi or in Alabama or in Washington or somewhere else, but also Bangladesh, also in Tanzania, also in Senegal.

That is, that we think of education as a -- if we take seriously education for all, if we take seriously the commitment at these conferences, if we take seriously this promise that the funding agencies made that no country will be prevented from achieving education for all for a lack of funds, then we have to agree that educating all of the children in the world is all of our responsibility, and that means we have to pay for it, and we have to have mechanisms that will enable us to pay for it.

Leslie, you asked about taking seriously locally generated ideas and strategies and solutions. There's lots of talk in the aid community about dialogue, and we have to rethink the notion of dialogue. The important dialogue is the dialogue that's happening between governments and local communities, between governments and NGOs in communities within their countries, between one NGO and another, between one community and another. That's the dialogue that needs to be strengthened. And how do we do that?

We need to move the discussion off that other sort of dialogue

which is important, but not as important at that dialogue. And we need to think about that. What that means is to rethinking the roles of the outsiders. And the roles of the outsiders have to be rethought in the same way that if you're thinking about how does teacher-centered education become classroom-centered education; and the role of the teacher has to be rethought, how does aid-centered education becomes development-centered education? Then the roles of the aid people have to be rethought.

MS. WINTHROP: Thanks, Joel. I liked that reconceptualizing education. We work a lot on trying to push the idea of education of the global public good here at Brookings.

So, yes, one, two, and three.

MR. OAFF: Hi, Byron Oaff, CIES in Indiana University. Since I'll be participating in the roundtable this afternoon, I'll confine my question to one major issue, which is the language issue. It's particularly salient in Africa, but also in the countries in which Gita and Steven have worked. And that is that the language of instruction is the colonial language or the former language of the empire. Students come to school. The first experiences they don't understand what's being said, what the language of instruction is.

If you're talking about retention, the foreign language becomes increasingly important as the test to go into higher and higher levels. So do aid policies continue to reinforce this problem or are they helping to

overcome the language issue problem?

MS. WINTHROP: So language. The second question was back -- we had three already lined up. There is the second one, yes. Go ahead.

SPEAKER: My question is for Professor Samoff, but it's kind of for everybody as well. You talked a lot about the disparity between focusing on primary education, but we also need to support universities because how are you going to get teachers if there's no universities?

But then, at the same time to treat them as equals you have a lot of practical problems that nobody seems to be addressing. The fact that I go to the school in Oslo, and I had friends that wanted to come to CIES, but they couldn't get visas to come. It's too complicated to get a visa, or it's too expensive, but they come from Bangladesh and Tanzania and Senegal, so those are the dialogues we should be having as academics.

And then similar problems that these countries aren't involved in large international surveys. I focus on civics education, so the IAEA civics studies both in 2000 -- or '99 and then the current one that they're doing now don't involve African nations. And, it's a financial issue, but with all the money that we throw around in aid, these countries could be involved very easily. We could give them support, financially, and the infrastructure is there academically, they have these researchers. So, just kind of how to

address these very simple problems.

MS. WINTHROP: Okay, great. Thanks. And then the third question, yes.

MR. WEILL: Yeah, the panel talked a bit about teachers, talked a bit about universities -- I'm sorry, Jim Weill from AED. But I didn't hear anybody talk about the role of the education infrastructure, the ministries of education, the regional bureaus of education, the district-level administration. Are these people the solution? Are they the problem to improving education? And I wonder if any of you in any of your experience has a success story that you could share about where our leaders in these countries have made a terrific progress over the past 30 years at improving the education administration.

MS. WINTHROP: Okay, great. Now if you can restrain yourself in one way or another to answer maybe one of the questions we'll go back for a third round. We'll have time. So, yeah, feel free.

MS. STEINER-KHAMSI: I would actually look at exactly I had the same question, and I was looking for a successful government person. Maybe because I worked myself 10 years for government before I came to TC, and I found one person. And that person, everyone talked about him in Georgia. His name is Simon. Because curriculum reform really works in Georgia, and it's not like this whole discrepancy between textbook revision,

curriculum, all donor-funded, and teacher education, but it goes hand in hand. And I wanted to understand why does it work. This is like what Fran always looks like, why does something work, like that approach.

And I found the answer was one person who stayed in place in the same institution for 10 years. There was no political change, despite all the political changes in government, administrative changes, there was continuity in people staying in the leadership position. And I think that's a huge issue. And some of it is like we contribute the corrupt people by aid, by money, by salaries, by all that, and they leave. As soon as they embellish their portfolio, they leave, and not only in the countries we're working in, but also here, the headquarters.

So this continuity of human resources is a condition we do not have very frequently. And from what I see, this is almost like something that we don't give enough attention to as a success criteria for project. It's really the people what work in projects over a period of time.

I don't know how you would translate that into a strategy or anything, but I think it's something we don't take seriously enough, and how what aid does by pumping money into a system, and I don't quite agree that more money alone is a solution. I think a lot of money like that example of Mozambique -- it can corrupt government. It corrupts government and it corrupts education reform, also. It can.

MS. WINTHROP: Thanks. Steve or Joel, one of the other questions? You can arm wrestle.

MR. SAMOFF: Okay. A quick question, in reverse order. In your question about does anyone have an example, yes. We shouldn't romanticize local level, so there are problems at the local level as there are anywhere else. But even Libya in Africa is an excellent example of a country where there was a systematic effort to reorganize the infrastructure of education with dramatic consequences.

In that case, the new minister came to office in 1990 and said that the teachers were to be the bearers of the education reform. His focus, then, was on the teacher education system, and that was the driving wedge of what was to be different, and he reorganized the infrastructure to pay attention to that. He was criticized a lot for leaving some things alone, but understood the importance of the infrastructural change and the length of time it would take for that to have some consequences. And we're not yet there in that system. But, yes, I think there are examples. But we shouldn't reemphasize the local level.

On the issue of language, Bob, it seems to me you point to two problems, and they're supposed to be different ones. The language of instruction one issue is how do researchers talk with everybody else? And I say it as a Californian because the State of California had a referendum on

bilingual education in a state which really had an outstanding record for bilingual education, and the voters of the California voted against it. So bilingual education is now illegal in the state of California.

There are many reasons for that. Basically, in that setting, there were parents for whom English was not the first language, largely Hispanic parents, Hispanic language parents, who knew that their own life chances were reduced by their lack of command of English and said I don't want that for my children. I don't want that for my children.

And we're never persuaded by the researchers or by the research evidence that is really unequivocal that children who start learning in the language that's spoken at home learn better in all subjects, including English. And so it's a clear case of whether researchers were talking to each other. And the researchers were occasionally talking to some policymakers, but they weren't ever talking to parents. And in the end, it was parents who voted, and they voted down the researchers, and it seems to me it's an absolute failure of researchers in that respect.

But there's a second issue that's worth mentioning, and it had to do with the constant use of tasks as the measure of learning outcomes. And one of the things we've learned over time, certainly in Africa, is that many tests are really a measure of competence in the language of the task, not in the subject of the task.

A dramatic example was the World Bank effort in the mid-1980s to see whether or not money spent on vocationalizing secondary education was well spent, and they concluded it wasn't. And part of that rested on a comparison of scores on specialized tests in the vocationalized subjects. And what they found was -- not surprisingly -- that students who did very well in an academic stream scored better on the agricultural test than the students who were in the agricultural stream.

Surprise, surprise. The students who could understand the questions got better scores. And so there's a second kind of problem that has to do with language and the dominance of this language, and it corrupts our measure of achievement. And, therefore, we need to have a very healthy skepticism about what our -- the standard measure of achievement is actually measuring. And is it, in fact, measuring all these other things or a command of language?

I can't help you very much on visas to the U.S. A lot of things I work on, but I haven't worked on that one, and I'm not sure there's a real good solution any time in the short run.

On the other hand, on your question about supporting research in higher education, it seems to me there is a clear implication here, and that is that the research support needs heavily to be directed there rather than here. That is, that what the development system needs if

significant research close to the site of the subject of the research. And that means there needs to be a significant investment in research institutes, research centers, researchers, research possibilities around the world.

And since many of you are involved in research, you know what that means: That's a community investment. You can't have research by paying one researcher and providing a bit of funds. A research environment means not only research institutes, but it means conferences, it means professional journals. It means opportunities for people to interact with each other and to travel to visit, and it's that what needs some attention.

So then think about this: I don't know what's going to happen in the British ledgers in the current government, but up until the recent moment DFID, which is the British aid agency, has budgeted, starting two years ago, a billion pounds. A billion, a big number, right? A billion pounds for development research over the next five years. Now, no other agency that I know of has anywhere near that commitment to development research nor that notion that development research is essential to reasonable development aid. It's not an alternative to development aid, it's not a distraction from development aid; it's a court input to development aid.

MS. WINTHROP: Thanks, Joel.

Steve, any last few things to pitch in there?

MR. KLEES: Three quick points. I think there are lots of

examples around the world, small scale, that are having interesting educational administration. Reforms in Brazil, if you look at the citizen school movement which is spreading, that involves a change in the role of school inspectors and school administrators, a much more participative governance structure, and very interesting, very interesting results.

Language of instruction issues, I think we've been making some progress. I think that there's more of a push now to teach in first language. I think it needs to go further. There's no reason that we do first language for three or four years, and then switch to English or French or whatever the national language or ex-colonial language is. It's a practical question. You can't do all local languages, but you can do some. And you can do them all the way through the university just like we have the developed world, in the rich world. We have our own languages all the way through the university. That should be the goal that we set forth.

And my last comment, quickly, on yours, Gita, that more money alone won't make a difference, I agree completely. And more money has problems associated with it: corruption being one and sovereignty being another. But more money is desperately needed. We are nowhere near the EFA, and we are so far from what is needed monetarily through CDFA or any of the other goals that we've got a long, long ways to go.

MS. WINTHROP: You guys want to hang in there for another

five minutes? Yeah, sure, nods. Okay, we'll do one last round. Maybe we'll do four. That's the first one, then Zanti, three, and then here. Okay.

MR. WILLIAMS: Hi, good morning. My name is Deidre Williams. I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Maryland. This question would mostly be relevant for Gita and Joel. Steve, please forgive me. It has to do with the question of sustainability that you mentioned, Gita.

What is the practical solution to sustaining efforts that are started, especially if we consider the role of many of these aid agencies going in as being planting a seed than removing yourself and allowing that tree to grow?

MS. WINTHROP: So we -- we're going to take a big group, so, Zanti, at the back right there. Wave your arms, Zanti.

MS. ACKERMAN: Hi, my name is Zanti Ackerman, EEJ Africa. I wanted to point out two sets of competing ideas and just ask you to dig a little bit deeper in how you can see them being reconciled.

The first is -- and I think Professor Klees just began to touch on the idea of education as a global good that we need to push for more resources to support versus the concern raised by Professor Samoff that in Mozambique it's -- we're supporting over 50 percent of the budget through aid. How is that reconciled? How can we work against the dilution of responsibility that was alluded to just as we recognize that much more

money is needed in order to get quality?

And, secondly, I was intrigued by the idea that aid within country could be allocated through a more political process as opposed to social returns analysis. But my concern is that I think education both in the U.S. and globally through EFA mechanisms, et cetera, and locally is both resource-based and political, just taking the local examples before elections, deciding where a school should be based, based on what votes you might get up to presidential elections where policy about education is put out just as a candidate is looking to gather votes.

And that works very much against our concern about social exclusion whereby people who really need attention paid to them are not properly represented, don't have the resources, they're always overlooked. So how do we reconcile those two ideas?

MS. WINTHROP: Great, thanks. And then there's -- we're going to get three more here, all in a big -- right there, right there, beautiful turquoise necklace. Yes, okay.

MS. MULLEN: Yes. My name is Mary Mullen, and I was a former teacher in several countries, one of which was Kenya. And I was going to ask Mr. Samoff about Deng Shade, when I was there, built an institute for teachers of the handicapped. And my ex-husband was teaching teachers of the blind. And I was wondering if Mr. Samoff would know much

about that and how successful it was, and how it can possibly be done in other countries.

MS. WINTHROP: Great, thanks. And then Amber, and then this woman here. I hope you guys are taking good notes.

DR. GOVE: Amber Gove, Research Triangle Institute.

All of you are responsible for training the next generation, myself included, of hopefully critical development professionals. Yet many of us -- and certainly I sympathize with colleagues at the Bank and USAID are very much constrained by the institutions with whom we work and which in we work.

What suggestions do you have for breaking that box, as Joel seems to be suggesting? Is there hope or should we all quit? And if it's so broken, should you stop preparing the next generation? And I am a CIES member, Gita.

MS. WINTHROP: And here's the last question.

MS. YUAN: I am Yun Mao Yuan, Foundation for Empowerment, formerly World Bank for 20 years, an economist.

MS. YUAN: I was a task manager for many social area projects, not only education projects in East Africa in 1991 to 1999.

So you are talking about this education structure inherited from

the colonial period that exists in Africa. And I'm not actually trying to defend the World Bank ranking matter. I think the World Bank should be -- Bretton Woods institutions should be reformed, there's no doubt about it. But what my concern is there seems to be a lot of the compounding factors here, like when the -- this cost-effectiveness or all these things happen.

What happened is that basically because of the 60 percent or 70 percent of the budget, education budget, went to the 1 percent to education of higher education, and then 10 percent only went to the time of the education to actually correct that kind of a colonial infrastructure where the older ministers of education and finance in East Africa went to the Meharry University. They were both thinking that when they went to Meharry University in the pre-colonial period, they were actually served with a real sabre, a cutlass. So that the needs are to actually change that kind of a system, how to really reduce boarding school system for high school and there's a student stipend for the higher education, all these things.

Of course, in the implementation process everything was smothered through, so the thing is that they -- World Bank or others pushed things to really get the outcome. But the issue here, is what we can do as outsiders. I think there was a day the ownership, real true ownership, of the country, not only government, but their country seems to be at stake, but I don't hear that much how to really be -- give -- how to really encourage and

then promote and facilitate their ownership.

MS. WINTHROP: So now your task for four great questions, is to be brief.

MR. KLEES: Two, okay. The political allocation issue. I mean, in a way we're in a world where decision-making is permeated with interests, with class interest, gender interest, ethnicity interest, and that's whether its technical decision-making or political decision-making. We have world in which ideologies dominate, and we have dominant ideologies in this world. And this connects to Amber's question, too.

I feel a lot of hope for change. I see change in political decision-making and in technical decision-making structures that are more participative, that involve more of those who are disadvantaged and marginalized whether it's in experimental school systems where even in global processes, at least the rhetoric of PRSPs, the Poverty Reduction Strategy Processes, and what they're supposed to involve. And so we're moving towards a different form of decision-making, both political and technical.

And I'm very hopeful. I think that there is contestation in every institution. There are differences of opinion, there are struggles, there are changes happening, and what I tell my students is that you have to decide your own perspective on things and then try and live with it.

I struggle with this my whole life of what do I do on an aid question project, or World Bank project or UNESCO or UNICEF or working for an NGO? All of those involve choices. And they're not -- our work is not technologically or technically prescribed. There's lots of room in that work in terms of how we operationalize it, what we do, who we work with, who we talk to, what kind of research we do.

And I've been very encouraged in my work around the world of meeting so many people with such a critical view in mainstream institutions, struggling to try and do something different. I'm a very strong critic, but I'm also an optimist about it.

MS. WINTHROP: Thanks. Gita, last word from you.

MS. STEINER-KHAMSI: The sustainability issue. For me, this is really at the heart of the problem, that it has become a nonissue. And I think if it would be an issue, we wouldn't have fragmented as we have that much, because there is no way that one could expect a government to fund and scale up donor-funded projects with this current fragmented aid situation.

That idea that that illusion, or that donors know better what's good for a country, and they show the government in the form of pilot projects and then the government takes it up, that's so arrogant. So arrogant and so wrong that it drains the resources, the capacity of

government and civil society and experts in the country, that I find the sustainability issue really an important issue. And I dare to disagree that the project, if it benefitted for the three to five years, a group of people in one region, I disagree that this is enough for aid. And, in fact, I think that we have to be very critical to see whether it even harms the reform endeavors that are there in the country.

And it would really resolve the issue that donors sometimes just implement projects only because they are good at it and they believe in it. And that has to do with the ownership issue, also.

So if would be up to me, I would insist as a donor that every project has an exit strategy, a handover strategy, a scaling up strategy as part of the sustainability. And that would be for me really important.

On the issue of higher education, it's a hot issue. Students at Teachers College, they sometime complain that they come here filled with enthusiasm and then we talk about aid like this. Everything becomes like a quotation mark, development like this. And so they are a little bit tired of just hearing how everything is negative and hypercritical. So I think one thing that I think they have to learn that this, the challenges of this totally unequal relationship that exists in aid, but they have a right to learn skills of how to do things, professionally and effectively.

MR. SAMOFF: Brief word, two questions to take up. Let me

comment a bit on the comment that Gita was making on the question about higher education, because it is the case that there is often that phenomenon. You pointed out that in your work you recognized that it was a very large expenditure on higher education, much smaller than the expenditure on basic education and elsewhere, and what to do about that.

And my response to that is, well, wait a minute. Whose problem is that? Why is that a World Bank to solve or a USAID problem to solve or a European Union problem to solve? The question then has to become: Who in Kenya is concerned about that? And how do I identify with whom to work in Kenya so that there are people in Kenya who are pushing for a reallocation? Because in the absence of that, it's not sustainable. In the absence of that, it's simply not going to happen.

And so my notion of rethinking the way we go about things is to get us out of the business of saying here's what's wrong with education somewhere else, then let's -- what are we going to do about it? But rather, maybe our analysis tells us here's a problem. Next step, find out who there is concerned about it and with whom can we work to deal with it. And if we can't find anybody to work with, to deal with it, then it's probably not time to work on it, because even if we start, we can't get very far down that path.

So my response there is it's a question of whose issue is this? And I offer that a bit because, in fact, some of you may have seen there was

a recent meeting of the finance ministers of Africa. And some of them in very angry tones denounced the EFA and the MDG goals and insisted that they were going -- led in this case in the first instance by the finance ministers in South Africa and Rwanda -- that they were going back to their governments to tell them to reject the goals and to effectively just grand scheme, right, in which all the people of the world got together and signed onto these goals and those goals and the other goals. And here the finance ministers are saying it's a terrible idea, it was a terrible mistake, we never should have done that, and we should not do that anymore. Egypt and I think two others joined in immediately; a few others resisted.

But I think it's an important observation that after 25 years -- no, closer to 30 years now of effort to say this is somehow or other a global effort stimulated by the large agencies in the world, still there are significant portions of the Third World who say this is your effort, not ours. And as long as they're saying this is your effort, not ours, they're not moving on it in a way that will enable them to achieve the result.

Now, Amber, your question troubles me all the time, that is, why am I doing this? Why do I spend time? And I feel like I still have a little energy left, and so the answer, it seems to me, is we have the responsibility as people who are able to develop some expertise into these issues to use that expertise. And a major task, then, is to identify colleagues in the

countries in which we work and on which we work who are involved in these issues and become enabling agents for them, and to move out of the mode of thinking that I'm going to solve this problem, and I and my institution are going to solve this problem. But that if I'm successful, then some others will take the lead in solving this problem.

And then to come back to the very beginning of all of the discussion, we live -- and Gita highlighted it -- we live in an unequal and in many ways unjust world. And I wish that weren't so, but I can't see that not being so tomorrow. And, therefore, I must have a longer term time horizon about the process of change and, therefore, what can be done in the short term versus what needs to be done over the -- not "versus," along with what needs to be done over the longer term. And through all of that I have to be prepared to say every now and then, first, I'm going to push the limits. So whatever institution I'm in, I want it to move beyond where it is now. Wherever they think they're comfortable, I have to make them a bit uncomfortable so that I can try to get them to go a bit further.

And second, I have occasionally to be able to say no, this is not worth pursuing. And if I can't persuade you that it's not worth pursuing, carry on, but it's not a place for me. But I remain, in the end, absolutely an optimist about change and about the world. Thank you.

MS. WINTHROP: A great note to end on. Thanks to all of you

for hanging in there. (Applause)

Thanks to all of the panelists.

SPEAKER: That was a great discussion.

MS. WINTHROP: And we'll see you again next time.

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

/s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2012