THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

FALK AUDITORIUM

GETTING MILLIONS TO LEARN: WHAT WILL IT TAKE TO ACCELERATE PROGRESS ON MEETING THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS?

Washington, D.C.

Monday, April 18, 2016

PARTICIPANTS:

Strategies and Initiatives for Meeting the Education Sustainable Development Goal: Reflections From Global Actors:

Opening Remarks and Moderator:

JOHN McARTHUR
Senior Fellow, Global Economy and Development Program
The Brookings Institution

Panelists:

JULIA GILLARD
Chair of the Board
Global Partnership for Education

JUSTIN VAN FLEET
Director
International Commission on Financing Global Education Opportunity

REBECCA WINTHROP
Senior Fellow and Director, Center for Universal Education
The Brookings Institution

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. McARTHUR: Good morning, everyone. Welcome. We have a sold-out crowd here. Over-subscribed. My name is John McArthur. I'm a senior fellow here at the Brookings Institution, and I just want to issue a warm welcome.

We have a terrific star-studded panel. We actually have a star-studded room. Many people who are here. And we are here today to do two things, really. One is to kick off a two-day event on Global Education, and it's kind of pre-launch for the new Millions Learning Report, which will be formally launched tomorrow. The microphone -- oh, if I lean it. Okay. Excuse me.

So we're here to do two things. Lean into your mikes everyone. And the first is to kick off this two-day colloquium of sorts on Global Education, including watching this report, "Millions Learning," which is about "Scaling up Quality Education in Developing countries," co-authored by our Brookings colleagues. And the other, which I hope we can really dig into today, as part of that is talk about how to achieve the new global goal, or sustainable development goal for universal education, which was set in September at the United National by all countries for all countries.

And we really couldn't ask for a better panel than we have today to think about how to do that. This is an online webcast presentation, so it's all in public, but just to share some points up front, we have a hashtag, Millions Learning, for those on Twitter who want to contribute to the conversation on the digital forum. If we're lucky, we'll see if we can take some questions via Twitter, but we'll see how it goes.

But we really want to make this as interactive a discussion as possible after we hear from our distinguished panelists.

So let me just introduce them: We have to my left, my immediate left, Julia Gillard, who is, of course, the Right Honorable Julia Gillard, who was the Prime Minister of Australia from 2010 to 2013. She's also the chair of the Global Partnership for Education, and we're very honored that she's a distinguished fellow here at the Brookings at the Center for Universal Education.

And if I can add, having gotten to know Julia in the past couple of years, my favorite, non-Canadian prime minister at a minimum. As the Canadian, I have to have -- you know, there are

boundaries to what I can say, but this is one of the world's greats in terms of policy leadership and innovation, and we're so thrilled that you're here.

And I should add that Alice Albright, the CO of the Global Partnership for Education is also here. We're very honored. So we have just one of the many leaders in the room.

Justin Van Fleet, who has many hits. Perhaps most importantly this year for all of us is director of the International Commission on Financing Global Education Opportunity, aka, the ICFGEO, for those who don't know the acronyms. But he has also been chief of staff for many years to the United Nations Special Envoy for Global Education, also known as former U.K. Prime Minister, Gordon Brown. And we are very honored that he's a former Fellow here at Bookings. So you don't have to lead a global commission or be a prime minister to be affiliated with Brookings, but apparently it helps. But we're very honored that you're both here.

And Carolyn Miles -- oh, sorry. Rebecca. Rebecca I'll gone next. Rebecca Winthrop next to Justin is senior fellow and Director of the Center for Universal Education here at Brookings. She is former head of education at the International Rescue Committee. She's a co-author of this report, and also with our colleague Gene Sperling, the major report on what works in girls' education, which has been a bestseller in this field. And I should also add she's my day-to-day teacher on all things global education. So she really does provide extraordinary leadership for us and for the world, I would say, in understanding these issue and figure out how to move forward better.

Last but certainly not least, we have Carolyn Miles, who is the president and CEO of Save the Children. She has been with that organization since 1998 in a variety of roles and CEO for the past five years. She brings a very accomplished career in the private sector in entrepreneurship and many board, including U.S. Global Leadership Coalition, modernizing for an assistance network.

I think also very importantly is truly on the front lines of working with affected communities around the world with her colleagues around the world, and looking forward to hearing her insights today.

Before we hear from our panelists, I should -- I've been asked to share a couple of remarks, and I'll do so, as someone who is not an education specialist, and maybe just to show a bit of ignorant perspective, but maybe a semi-informed one of the types of questions that I hope we can get into today.

In 1992, in January of 2992, a World Bank official gave a speech in Islamabad, Pakistan where he outlined that investing in girls' education was probably the single best investment that can be made in development dollars. That was January, 1992.

That official, of course, was Larry Summers in one of the most cited insights of development literature in the past 20 years. Twenty years after that, a young Pakistani girl was shot for trying to advance girls' education. Two years after that, she won the Nobel Peace Prize, Malala Yousafzai, of course, with her colleague from India for their work in bringing together the attention around education.

Today in 2016, just last week, the World Bank announced a major commitment for girls' education. It's on the front page of many newspapers around the world, $2.5 billion over the next five years. And that was a major effort. Everyone who is involved deserves great credit for sure.

But as an economist, I also look at these numbers and I say, ha, what does that mean? And I did some quick math last night, and I said, well, $2.5 billion is $500,000 a year. So you work it out, works out to about 3 percent of IDA budget, and to me that doesn't jibe with the single most important investment we can make.

So just to be clear, I'm not criticizing that investment. It's something to celebrate. But we haven't yes moved from that insight to that practice. We haven't yet moved from understanding what I would get most people in the room, and most people around the world would undoubtedly agree with, we need to be investing in education.

It's pretty hard to find someone who thinks we shouldn't do that, but we're not yet doing it at the right scale. And so in between these periods, we've had the educations for all goals set in Dakar in 2000. It's really galvanized the global community. We had the Millennium Development Goal for Education and the Gender Equality Goal for Girls' Education. Those provided some success. But they provided not enough success most people would say. But they did provide learning about learning. They provided learning about the fact that we need to not just focus on enrollment and completion, but, actually, what do people get out of this. What do people learn?

And we've also seen that, of course, learning has to go well beyond the primary objective of primary school that was in the Millennium Development Goad, and the Sustainable Development Goal

has, of course, called for not just universal primary learning, but early childhood development before that, secondary learning beyond that, and lifelong learning for everyone.

And crucially, it's not just for developing countries, but for all countries. So we really are in a new era in 2016 of universal learning for universal application. And I hope that's what we can start to think about today.

In April, 2016, just later this week on Thursday, the president of the General Assembly at the U.N. is convening the first check-in event on implementation of these goals. But I'm of the view that the Sustainable Development Goals, we're still having trouble getting our head around because it's just so big.

What I just described for education is that's a big agency. Well multiply that by 17. There are 17 goals reflexive of 17 sets of issues that the world thinks are important enough that we must take on over the coming generation.

So the best analogy I've come up with so far -- don' worry. I won't talk about agriculture yet-- is we need the world's biggest convention center we've ever seen. We need it to have 17 conference rooms where each of get together on our issues. The specialists have a role to play to figure out how to move forward.

But then we need to keep coming back in plenary because all these issues are interconnected, the health, the agriculture, the nutrition, the infrastructure, the IT, the inequality, the jobs. And then we need to talk a lot in the coffee breaks. We need the informal collaboration that will spark the new ideas that will lead to the entrepreneurship that will create the magic of the unplanned insight. That can only happen when people actually get together to talk about how do we crack these problems.

So that's why a session like this one I think can be so important and so helpful is because we have big questions to take on, but we also have a lot to talk about together on how each of us can contribute to the achievement of these goals.

So with that as preface, I'd love to turn to Julia Gillard, who brings to this question not just the perspective of a multilateral organization board chair, but also a pioneering political and policy leader

within her own country, but also I think someone who has had to deal with the realities of budgets, and managing a country's economy during a fiscal crisis, and all of these hard questions that we need to also get through in order to get the breakthrough that we want to see.

So with that, Julia.

MS. GILLARD: Thank you very much, John, for that introduction, and I'm very honored to be here with John and with the fellow panelists what I think is an important conversation.

John and I have spent a lot of time talking about education, and one of the important things I think that is happening in the global education community is we are moving beyond talking to ourselves to talking to experts from other areas and to achieve the education goal, let alone the full Sustainable Development Goal agenda. We certainly need to do that, and so, John, thank you for your leadership on all of that.

John does occasionally unusual comparisons between education and agriculture, but he might treat you to one of those unusual comparisons later. I couldn't possibly try and summarize it.

I'm here with my colleagues from the Global Partnership for Education led by Alice Albright to contribute to this discussions. I also get to serve on the Financing Commission, but Justin will speak very directly on that.

But whether it's at the Global Partnership for Education in the course of our strategic planning process, or whether it's at the Financing Commission, I think we can say to ourselves we are now bearing down on exactly the right issues to spark major change.

I do have a sense of optimism that the education community is now at a liftoff point, and perhaps 20 odd years later than it should have been. But I do feel that there is the kind of energy around which was associated with the global health movement in the early years after the adoption of the Millennium Development Goals, and that if we work our way through this period right, we can see a step change in what we are doing to change lives, and to provide education for girls and boys around the world.

At the Global Partnership for Education, we have just worked very hard and thoughtfully through a strategic planning process to guide us from now until the end of 2020, GPA 2020. And in it, we had to distill what do we do, how does it make a difference, and what are the big challenges in front of us?

And one of the pieces of paper I'd really like it if you picked up today and took with you is this small brochure which is a distillation of what we do at the Global Partnership for Education, and really the insight out of it, and it's an insight that flows too from the Millions Learning report when you get access to that when it is formally launched is that if you are going to make a difference in scale, then you've got to change whole systems.

Many people are doing important work through projects and through targeted interventions. But if we are going to make a change for all of the children who need that change, then we have to move whole systems. And that is what the Global Partnership for Education has been created to do to improve equity and learning through strengthening education systems.

And in the course of thinking about our own work, we have addressed many of the issues I know will come up today. Everybody will say that the single biggest source of finance is domestic resource mobilization. What can we do to enhance domestic resource mobilization?

Now in part, that's a tax question. In part, it's a real economy. You have a big real economies questions. But it's also a leverage question. And so our way working now is a clearly leveraged model with the monies that flow from the Global Partnership for Education only flow if we see an increase in domestic resource mobilization.

I'm sure today we will all say too it is about equity, and it's about learning, and it's about the information, the data that we have at our disposal. About equity we know despite Larry's insight, despite Malala's courage, we know that we need to do so much more if it isn't going to be the girls from the most disadvantaged background who are the ones left furthest behind. Equity has to be at the core of the agenda, and it's got to be the subject of special focus.

And so only way of working is one where when we provide grant funding, having seen a nation increase its domestic resources, and seen a nation work with us to have a robust education plan. When we do those things, we actually say 30 percent of this is contingent on agreed progress on equity. Making sure the girls, the children with disabilities, the children who live beyond the reaches of major cities are not left behind.

And that results-based money also flows for the learning piece. The lesson we have from the Millennium Development Goals is, yes, it's about access. We want to see children in schools. But we want to see children in schools for the purposes of learning. And if we don't have learning improvement strategies, then children will sit in schools, but the outcomes will be far too low, and far to disappointing to make a difference for their lives.

And then we will all say to each other, we need more information, and one of the wonderful things that happens here at Brookings, and I feel privileged to be a part of it, is Brookings makes such a difference with the information that's available on what's happening. But we need that information systematically, and around the world in much closer to real time.

So once again, this results-based money is also focused on agreed targets about information, about data, about what is flowing so we can all better understand what we need to do to enhance learning and equity.

I do feel that on this journey, there is a lot to be energized around, and to have a sense of enthusiasm about. One of the reasons I do feel that sense of enthusiasm is I am very confident having the ability as a finance commissioner to work with Elizabeth, and Justin, and the team, and my fellow commissioners, and, of course, Gordon Brown, I do have a very strong sense that when this report is available in September, it will create new momentum and new energy around the debate because it is of such quality.

So, John, with those words, I hope I've done the right thing to open the discussion, and to open the discussion for Justin.

MR. McARTHUR: As always. Thank you. Thank you, Julia. And one of the great privileges of being here is really been able to connect with this interface between the policy discussion, the academic discussion, the practitioner discussion. And there's this nexus of issues that I think we're all seeing momentum around and so the question is how to galvanize it, harness it, multiply it. And so thank you for your leadership on that. It's been absolutely instrumental.

Justin. Where's the money going to come from? What's it going to be for? And when do we need it by?

MR. VAN FLEET: You will have to wait until September to find out. But, no, thanks, John, and thanks Julia. No pressure for the Financing Commission's next iteration.

And just to sort of build off what Julia was saying, what John was talking about, I think we're at this moment where there is tremendous opportunity and the sense of energy. But at the same time I think in 2016 we have what could be the biggest danger to our sector if we fail to get this right over the next 365 days or less because we're already in April, which is we've entered the SDG era with ambitious goals that are far beyond anything we've put on paper before, yet no credible plan yet on how we're going to deliver these goals in reality.

And I think that's where I get excited because we're seeing all of these new players come together, and all of this action and energy looking at new strategic plans for multilateral institutions, the Financing Commission, all of the various sectors that are now getting more and more play. Early childhood is rising up the agenda. There's all of this excitement.

But unless we're able to pool this together in some type of credible plan moving forward, we run the risk of again 2015 and 2030 where we make some progress, but we're still far below the goals that we set for ourselves. And we fall back and say, well, we did a pretty good job and we should be happy with what we did, but young people are still missing out. There's still, there's a generation that we failed once again.

And so I think there's a real opportunity here to get this right for the education sector. And so I thought coming off last week, (inaudible) yesterday what I could focus on. I said maybe I'll just

report back a little bit on some of the things that happened last week while they're fresh in my mind while I was going over my notes making sure I didn't forget anything that happened.

So I think there are three areas. So one being the Finance Commission itself, and remembering where this came from with the announcement last year at the Oslo Summit. It came off the back of a Norwegian government saying we've been focused on health a lot. We've been focused on education. But we think both are important, and we are actually going to double our investment in global education while maintaining all of our other foreign aid investments.

And I think that was a huge statement for a country to make, and I think what we can do now is look at how others can make similar types of bold statements because it will take more than just one country to make the difference.

We look -- right now we have a former prime ministers, former Ministers of Finance, Defense, Education, several business CEOs, civil society leaders all sitting around the table asking the question of how can we mobilize the resources. How can we create a new investment case for education that's compelling, that brings people together, and can really brings the resources in and deliver the results that we need.

And so that's the exciting piece. It's also a daunting challenge because with this, we have to come up with something that's exciting, but also something that's realistic. And I won't forget last week when we went around the table with the current draft we have of some of these papers for the Financing Commission, one of the commissioners said this is all great. We don't disagree with any of this, but I read it, and I didn't jump out, jump out of my chair.

And I think what we really need to do is make sure that they jump out of their chairs. Gordon said to me, well, at least he didn't jump out the window after she read it which I think is also a good point.

But we need to make sure that we're coming up with something as well working together on this that makes people literally jump out of their chair and get excited about what we're putting forward.

And it's this tension between making sure we're acknowledging the best practice in a room of people like this, and that we all see ourselves in this document, but at the same we're pushing ourselves forward. And I think that's the biggest challenge is to actually feel a little bit uncomfortable with what we're putting forward. That we're pushing ourselves to limits.

And so that's a big piece that we're focused on, because, let's face it, if we continue where we're at, in 2086, we'll finally get to somewhere near universal primary education sometime in the 22nd century where the secondary education in 2050 will have five, six, seven percent of young people at most in Sub-Saharan African countries completing post-secondary education compared to 60, 70, 80 percent in upper, middle income in industrialized countries. That's a recipe for disaster. It's a recipe for inequality. It's a recipe for young people to be frustrated because of all the technology and be able to look around and see what they have compared to what others have around the world. I mean, this is really what we need to address.

There are two other pieces from last week I thought I would just highlight. One being the work on educational emergencies, which is really moving forward with a broad group of donor countries, institutions from GPE, UNICEF, UNESCO, UNESIA all recognizing that less than two percent of humanitarian aid to education is completely and totally inadequate. We need a better way of coordinating the work that we're doing. We need a better way of delivering immediate finance. We need a better way of developing longer medium-term strategies for delivering education at the onset of a crisis.

So I'm really excited and proud that we've agreed last week that the World Humanitarian Summit will launching this new platform. We have donors that are starting to come forward with new money for this, and we're on a seeking, search for new money that can be complimentary in the system, that's not supplementing or taking away from other prospects, building at a more comprehensive education response, by pulling in new resources.

And two weeks ago we saw the EU commissioner quadruple, not doubled, quadruple of the percentage of education funding out of the humanitarian budget to four percent, which is sort of the

norm that all the advocates have been pushing for. But when I looked at the number it's actually not that large so the advocates need to push a little bit harder moving last week.

The last piece when we met last week and it may have been I think one of the least exciting meetings of the week, but we met with ministers of finance to look at what we could do to leverage domestic resources with international resources, and new innovative ways of doing business.

It's a nascent discussion, but I think one that we really need to advance over the coming weeks as we look at what the Financing Commission can out with, because it really is something that we have to so, is how can we make sure governments are incentivized to invest in increased investments, especially in countries where they are not putting up as much as they should compared to other sectors. How can we get the best use of the international dollars that are going into the system, and how can we really leverage this up in some type of combined financing model.

So I'll wait for the discussion, and you call can tell me how to do that, and take copious notes and take it back to the Commission.

But those are a few things sort of top of mind right now, I think, as we sort of go into this, into 2016. I think we either have a recipe for disaster, or we have a really big opportunity to replicate what Health did in 2000. And with that I think comes radical change, and advocates that aren't afraid to sort of put their neck on the line in ways that they haven't done before, and I think we can't do it without that advocacy and campaigning piece also ratcheting up a bit as well.

So I'll leave it at that for now. Thank you.

MR. McARTHUR: Thank you, Justin. We won't tell the finance ministers that they weren't funny. We need them on board.

But in all seriousness, on the notion of the humanitarian side in particular, maybe I can jump to Carolyn because your organization is on the front lines of that, but, you know, writ large, how are you seeing these issues, and I think this question of how do we move from business as usual to a shift as you see it?

MS. MILES: Great. Well, first of all, thank you, and it's great to be with this wonderful panel this morning. So thank you. Be here at Brookings.

You know, when Save the Children thinks about this, and it goes back to some things that you said earlier, this frame of equity I think is the frame that we all have to use no matter which (inaudible) we're really talking about. If we don't get to this issue of inequality, well then we have no shot at ever getting to any of these goals.

So for Save the Children, that's the frame actually for the next 15 years that we'll be using for all of our work whether we're talking about health, or education, or protection, or crisis, or development. So I think that frame is really, really important.

I want to talk about three things. One is specifically around education and this issue of all children learning. And we would say, you know, you really need to think about every last child learning. And if we think about it that way, it will force us do things really differently than we're doing them now.

So I want to talk a little bit about the who, and then about the what, and then about the how, because I think that's important when we try to get all of this down to the ground of where children actually live, and where we're actually trying to change the future for those kinds.

So on the who, again, it really is about this issue of equity, and I think when we look at the MDGs, we had great success in terms of access, so we did a really good job in many countries. In many developing countries, we actually got access way up into the nineties, which is great.

But what you find when you go into those schools and you sit in those schools, first all, there are still a lot of inequity in terms of who kind of gets through that system, and then the learning capabilities for those kids, a lot of kids 5th or 6th grade is it. So if they don't learn to read and write and do math, they never will by the time they -- if they don't learn it by 5th grade, then you're done.

So really looking at learning outcomes is incredibly important. And when you kind of peel back the layer so we looked, for example, in Sudan, and we looked at the difference, one of the key striking differences, we talked about it before, is girls.

So 70 percent of boys were getting through primary school, 33 percent of girls were getting through primary school. Now that doesn't even talk about learning. That's even still just on the access piece.

When you look at conflict affected states, so, actually, we're going backwards. So we looked at conflict affected states, and we looked at the proportion of out-of-school kids in those countries, and it went from 30 percent of school kids in 1999 to 36 percent in 2012. So we're actually going backwards in terms of conflict affected states.

So this push on education and emergencies not only is it critical and is the right thing to do, but we don't do it, we will find ourselves actually sliding backwards. We'll never get to those numbers that we all have out there.

A particular thing that's very fresh in my mind. I just got back from Nicaragua on Friday night. And this question of middle income countries I think is going to be really important, because these are countries that we've all a global community have said they're okay. They're doing all right. They're going to be doing fine. And donor governments are not giving money into those countries anymore. But when I was there and sitting in the classrooms, and looking at, first of all, again, the inequities between -- I was in rural areas

-- between just kids getting through school, and one striking question I asked, we had a group of 5th graders, and I asked them how many of them were -- they had gotten almost through primary school, primary school there is 6th grade, but I asked them now of them wanted to go on to higher education, and every single child in the room -- there were probably 50 kids in the room -- they raised their hand.

Then I asked our staff, well, what's the average percentage of kids that actually in this area actually get to secondary school? 30 percent? Right? So we've got to match the desire, right, of children to learn with the capability for them to actually do it.

And that -- again, middle income countries are ones where that's going to be really challenging. And it goes back to some of the what we need do and how we need to do it, and I'll get to financing in a minute.

I think in terms of the way -- again, I've talked about measuring learning outcome, but we do have to do it in frame, again, of saying we want to get to that last child. We want to get to that hardest-to-reach child. So have we set up data systems to actually be able to measure learning outcomes for those children that are not left out? I don't think so. So we've got to focus on that. If we want this to be about equity, we actually have to set up systems that will measure whether we're getting equity or we're not. And so I think we've got a lot of things, work to do there.

It's also not going to be kind of one size fits all, so there are many program where -- two examples that I can give you. One is where there are multiple languages, and most of the countries where work, you know, Ethiopia, there are 30 languages in Ethiopia. So kinds are learning a language at home, instruction -- Amharic is the national language, but kids don't know how to speak Amharic, so are we looking at things like second language, and how are we teaching kids to actually read, and write, and learn in those kinds of situations?

Disabled children. Huge, huge problem all around the world. I was in China a couple years ago. Seeing the quality of education for disabled children was shocking. Shocking. And it still is a system where kids are left at home, and the feeling is they can't learn. These children will never learn, and therefore, we just shut them away. And that's something we have to change.

And then finally, making sure that when we think about education, we're thinking about it at a country level as a team sport. Right? It's not just about teachers. It's not just about parents. It's not just about students. It's not just about facilities. It's actually bringing all of those things together to bear for students in terms of their education.

And again, I go back to Nicaragua, and probably a high point was sitting in a classroom with the teachers, the parents, the student, who were helping, younger students, the Ministry of Education and Save the Children, and a local partner.

And everybody was there for the same reason. They were there because they want these kids to succeed, and we've got to set up says for this to really be inclusive or it won't work on the

ground. It's not good enough for just the ministry, or just NGOs, or for local partners. It's got to be everybody.

Finally, on the how. So, financing. Really, really -- I think the finance minister meetings are incredibly exciting because we're not going to get there unless we have this financing. And, certainly, at the domestic resource level, really important again for us to push on countries being, looking at an equitable lens.

So you go to countries and you look at where the domestic resources are used in the capital cities, in the politically important zones in the country, not in the places where kids are the furthest behind. So how do we use our global power, and our global financing to drive financing at the country level that actually gets to the kids who need it most and set up ways to do that? That's going to be really important for this to be successful.

I think we need courage, and I think the word was used earlier. I think we need courage to say that there are children that really are being left behind. Malala is, obviously, a fantastic spokesperson in terms of saying it's really about, wasn't really about her. It was about the girls in her country who were really missing out. She was one of the luckier girls. And so we have to have that courage.

And finally, we've got to have the political will, and the ability to drive that political will. And we have, I think, a lot of great systemic things that we're trying to do, whether it's financing, or quality, or measurement, and we have to bring those things together and drive that through as a key critical element of what we do going forward.

So that's just a little bit of the view from how we match these things up at this level down to where they actually get implemented. Thank you.

MR. McARTHUR: Thank you, Carolyn. And on that note, Rebecca, we've now got a wonderfully articulated future agenda. And I think it's a very common reaction of how do we make sense of this in terms of what's possible. You spend a lot of time as the neutral voice, what's possible. How do you see these issues?

MS. WINTHROP: Thanks, John. It's really a hard and fun questions at the same time, and I think the way that I've been thinking about them, and we've been beginning to talk about them as the (inaudible). This as, John, you and I have talked about, is that it's really time that we're shifting from a global education movement to a global learning movement. And a couple of points about what I mean by global learning movement, and why that, in my opinion, is a good idea.

So the first point is really around framing and frameworks. In some ways, the SDGs are going back to our global education community roots, and the MDG was the exception. So the SDGs are much more in line with the vision of learning for everybody, lifelong learning, that were in Junking, that was articulated in Dakar, and it's now in the SDGs, and in some ways the focus on sort of primary schooling although important for spreading and kind of a first step, I think everyone recognizes it got seen as sort of the end goal rather than the first rung on the ladder.

So that's sort of the framing that I think we're beginning to talk about, and we're beginning to talk about to globally, not just for the poorest countries. We were talking, actually, in the, in the greenroom before, Carolyn and I, about just the huge disparities in middle income countries like Nicaragua. And as middle income countries are graduating and donor aid is becoming less available or more targeted, what really is our plan for reaching everybody?

So that's sort of my second point which is around sort of changing global landscape and where does education fit? So one is this really around sort of the needs of the SDG and positioning our education SDG towards sort of the needs that are happening outside the education sector.

So whether it's thinking more broadly about where disadvantaged kids are in the world, low income countries, middle income countries, heck, right here in Washington, D.C., there's other needs that education has to take into account that I think a global learning movement would be well suited for. There's a lot of discussion around the future of jobs, and the future of work, not to say that education is only for that, but that's an importance piece of the discussion that is in many countries around the world, and as automation takes over an technology spreads, and more and more jobs are being replaced by technology, there's a need for sort of a broader sweep of skills.

And you see that the sustainable development goals in education talks about lifelong learning, and it talks about it right from early childhood. It talks about foundational skills like literacy and numeracy, and it talks about a range of other skills that are important to be sort of adapted, adaptable citizens in the 21st Century.

And some people criticize that piece as it's a little fuzzy, and they don't know how to measure it, which is true, but it doesn't mean it's not important, and this is a chance to really grapple with what are the breadth of skills that kids really need to survive for the future.

The other piece that I think actually -- I'm very harden to see everybody from the Global Partnership for Education, from the Financing Commission, Save the Children, and many organizations like them addressing as the equity angle.

More and more -- there was a comment by Fareed Zakaria talking about we're living in a two-track world. So more and more we're living in a two-track world where if you have access to high levels of education no matter where you are in the world, whether it's in Lagos or Silicon Valley, and you have access to some capital, you're going to be doing better than your parents could ever dream of.

You'll travel the world. You'll have big impact. You'll see many things. If you don't have access to high levels of education, and what we mean is good learning and good skills, or access to capital and supports, your life is probably going to be getting worse than your parents.

So how does that -- so having a deep focus on equity, I think, is really important, and that everything my co-panelists are doing is essential for that.

The third sort of point there if you think about, okay, a global learning movement, the frame, sort of how that's an important position for sort of changes in the world, and the third point is really sort of what are the asset we have an education to deploy towards this vision of a global learning movement, or towards the SDG?

And I think that there are a range of things. I think that there are a lot of new models emerging. Some of the research that we are doing at the Center for the Financing Commission actually builds on an ongoing question really around how to cultivate these broad sets of skills, and there is great

example that we are actually culling a huge data base of them building off of many of our colleagues' work around the world.

A bunch -- very successful new models for doing this.

I'll give one or two examples. There's a program called eLearning Sudan, which is -- or Child Holland in Sudan, and it's for kids who are out of school who are displaced who are not going to get a chance through the normal sort of service delivery options, and it's really literacy and numeracy through tablets. And it's locally relevant. It's all sort of -- the curriculum is made with folks in the community, but it's actually quite effective. And that's a group that a normal sort of traditional education system hasn't quite known how to reach.

There's other examples. It does have to be through technology. There's examples in Uganda, in Jordan where a big priority is really cultivating entrepreneurship skills. And instead of asking teachers to add a whole other subject on an already very overburdened schedule, teachers work with entrepreneurs in the community and experts to come in.

So those are some examples. We're seeing -- I think the areas where there's probably great -- both innovation and effective models, and great potential to move forward in terms of new models is really thinking about changing the teaching or learning dynamic, that's Hands-on Minds-on Learning, this interactive learning piece. A second area is really the this idea -- that's sort of the eLearning Sudan example -- this idea of really trying to elevate teachers and unburden them. They have a huge, massive amount of work they have to do, and it's overwhelming.

A third area is really about administrative efficiencies. And a fourth area of this idea of it's a team port, really activating all the pieces of the community to move forward.

So I think we have a lot we can do. I think the main thing we'll need to do to sort of leverage those assets, and respond to sort of the shifting dynamics and the world outside education is something that we call for in our Millions Learning report with my co-author Jenny Perlman Robinson, and Eileen McGivney, and you'll hear lots about it tomorrow, but ultimately our main takeaway from two years

of scaling up learning improvements reach is that what we really need is inclusive and adaptive education ego systems.

With this idea of being a team, education being a team sport and being global, there's going to be a lot of other actors out there, and the government's role is absolutely crucial, and we need to figure out how to strengthen it and make it more important, but it's by no means the only actor anymore.

There needs to be sort of well functioning education ego system with a whole bunch of actors getting into the game.

MR. McARTHUR: Thank you, Rebecca, and thanks to everyone. Want to move to the rest of the room in a moment, but I'm just going to ask a couple of questions, so please think about what you'd like to raise from the room.

Maybe just by way of quick comments because these notions about global health and history (off mic) Commission on Macroeconomics and Health in 2001 which played potentially an analogous role in framing some of these questions, and if I were to --

SPEAKER: You're too tall, John.

MR. McARTHUR: That's good. I was just saying I was involved with the Commission on Macroeconomics many years ago in 2000-2001 which was right around that kind of pivot moment for global health, and if I were to summarize in course terms what contributed to the breakthrough, it was really three things, and it was in interaction with the finance ministries crucially. It was macroeconomics and health. It wasn't just health, and it had many finance ministers from around the world. And many leaders of the economics profession, but the first there was a clear sense that it was good for the economy, and that was actually a case that needed on that moment to be made.
Interesting, I don't think is needs to be made so much for education. Everyone believes that already.

The second was that there was a clear sense that there are things to do. That was actually a huge amount of work to clarify that this is an actionable proposition, not just an abstract one. So there was a lot of time spent articulating what does a health system mean. What do basic health services mean? What are the interventions that go into that? What's the staffing requirement? What's

the -- all of the different aspects of how do you define this term. This was before the (inaudible) were even referenced. So it was about trying to do stuff, but through specific actions.

The third was -- so I just want to say -- getting the specificity on what to do is huge because it feeds into the third, which is the advocacy. And the advocacy around the health issues. And this is, I think, a little bit different from the education we talked about this last week. The advocacy around issues of life and death are actually, in my experience, qualitatively different. And we're a bit illogical about this as a species.

So it made sense to keep people alive no matter what. I'm a deep believer in that. But there's this notion of what goes into life and quality of life that we're actually not as good at mobilizing around. And so I was yesterday with, met with Bill Gates and other ministers about nutrition. You know, maybe the first thousand days of life fundamental imput to learning outcomes for a lifetime. How can it be that we're not investing in this across the board? It's not logical, but it's less of a life-and-death issue. It's more of a what-does-life- mean issue.

And I think that this goes to the crux of what are we advocating around at a technical level, and I've asked the question how does one boil down not to disrespect the complexity because there's tremendous complexity, but how does one boil down so that broad constituencies can understand these issues.

So what are our 101 metrics for literacy and numeracy? How do we start with that. In this whole huge indicator debate of all the things that go into measuring learning outcomes, how do we at least have our core that we all agree is the sine qua non of everything else?

And so I think we need to have our respect for the layers of complexity that are needed in public conversations. The experts will have one type of conversation; the finance ministers will have another. And interestingly, we saw this huge boost of enrollments in the early 2000s. My take on that was that was actually linked to the finance ministers initiating debt relief so that the Hipic process heavily indebted poor countries, low income countries got debt relief on the agreement that people would spend, the countries would spend on either education or health.

Well, at the time, education was actually much cheaper than health for primary education so more countries invested in education than health. And it was only over time once the global health community got up and running over the 2000s that we saw the bigger scale up of health spending. And then the education flatlined.

So our finance ministers have actually been quite helpful on this. But we need to give them some more ammunition, I would say, on the arguments, and we need to give them some more of what to do, and we need to help them, you know, get political coverage to do more, because I work on the assumption of one who believes in this.

So on that, I do want to ask Julia and Justin, especially, there was a big conversation a few years ago, and even last year on how to scale up the GPE, or something else, have a proper global instrument for financing education.

We haven't really seen it get over a threshold. We have all these debates on should it be multilateral, should it be bilateral, all of the above. I'm curious, what are the arguments, and as a former prime minister, who used to be on the receiving end of these, what are the arguments that you think people in this room need to be equipped with to make the case, and what are maybe some arguments that you would suggest people not try to make because they don't work so well?

Do you have a sense of where is the debate, and how can we move these things forward to kind of learn from these recent really quite active and intense discussions in the community?

MS. GILLARD: That's a pretty complex question, but I'm going to do my best. First, I would say you're right. The case for change in education and economic growth, I think that is intuitively and deeply believed, so we don't have to invest too much in that. We've got to keep making the argument, but I think we already got enough an open door there.

What I think we also need to do though at this time of global politics is make the case about how pivotal education needs for a series of other areas, and we're on our way in health. We've more to do. And the evidence is very clear and stark. I think we need to make that case increasingly on national security, and on people movement. Why? Obviously, people move and are displaced for a

variety of reasons, but one reason that people move and keep moving is that they are looking for a better education for their children.

So reach out to the national security community, the political leaders who are faced with this issue very squarely and thinking about it, and very keen to act on it.

And on climate change, I think given the role of education, educated women will choose to have fewer children. The correlation between climate change impacts the environmental impacts, and (inaudible) global populations. So all of those things are there.

I think there's that on the comparison with health, I think that there are a couple of things we can learn, and a couple of things we shouldn't talk ourselves into just to be more like health.

One thing we should definitely learn is the power of the metrics, and having a single galvanizing metric I think is debate that we have to have and resolve. Now whether it can be one metric, ten-year-olds reading, you know, people can discuss, or whether it can be a number which actually has lying behind it a series of individual metrics that are being put into and funneled up into the number I've got an open mind about, and we should discuss.

But what I can certainly say is if we look at climate change, everybody knew climate change negotiations of less 2 degree good, over 2 degrees bad. Very few people who could unpack all of the cites in the two degrees, but there was a galvanizing metric.

The stock market, the Dow Jones, how do they put it together? Does everybody understand that? I doubt it. But, you know, when you hear the stock market report, up is good, sharply down is bad.

Health. You've got disability adjusted life years. You've got some simple counts. You're either dead or you're not. You're vaccinated or you're not. You've got AIDS or you haven't. Those things are countable. We do need to find something that has got that kind of galvanizing appeal. So I think we need to do that.

What we shouldn't talk ourselves into because I simply don't believe its right, and I think actually health is moving further from this too, is that vertical interventions will fix the whole. That isn't

true in health, and the health community knows that. Vertical interventions can do some important things, but you do need health systems to be able to respond.

Look at Bola. A health system needs to respond. And in education whilst there are some vertical things I think we can do, and I think a lot around global knowledge, technical expertise, provision of inputs to education at a cheaper price point, at the end of the day, the system must be planned with a galvanizing plan for the whole team to use the language that's been used by the panel and the system has to be planned so the ecosystem that millions learning will talk about, can strive against a knowable backdrop.

And that's what we bring to the table, GPE, that planning piece, and we've thought about it very clearly with both ambition and practicality in our strategic planning process. So we shouldn't in any way throw away the insight that you can't have equity in learning without a system that's functioning to try and (inaudible) of some of the things in health.

MR. McARTHUR: Of all people in the world, who can give a crisp answer to a complex question? (inaudible) in safe hands.

But Justin, you also have a lot of battle scars, if I may, from watching from a distance, you know, just having been in the trenches trying to move these debates forward. And now it's come up. I think these are important moments where these debates often are fought through so hard, and then they have their moment in the sun.

But the debates have been taking shape for a long time, and so now we're hopefully seeing a moment in the sun. So what are the lessons that you see as engage like Julia?

MR. VAN FLEET: I think one potential challenged we have is that sometimes we are our own worst enemies in the educations sector. And I say that being an education person.

And I think we always have to be thinking through what are unintending, unintended consequences that we need to make sure we're avoiding? What are the things that could go wrong? How do we make sure we're including everyone? How do we make sure that education is not just an

output for the economy, but also an output of people coming together and building societies and furthering humanity?

We all agree with all of those things, but sometimes I think we let the perfect be the enemy of the good, and we need to stop being I think afraid of taking risks. Sometimes things may go wrong and will course correct, but without that, I think we really could be on this business-as-usual trajectory for another generation.

So I think looking at results, are there some things that we actually can be somewhat comfortable saying out loud that we agree with in terms of results that we want? Can we start to be more comfortable when they're saying, you know, what education is central to any social or economic reform any government wants to undertake whether it's a defense, whether it's a security reform, whether it's a health reform, whether it's climate. Can we actually be more confident when we're putting out there what we're saying about education so that no finance minister or politician will disagree with that, and they'll actually start their statement by looking at what they c can do with education?

Can we think more boldly about what other investments actually help us further education in the 21st Century? Let's look at infrastructure. I mean, there are things -- I look at -- we had an example in January where Jack Ma, who runs Alibaba in China, said in 60 years, Walmart was on this course to go to every rural village in China and actually deliver goods and services, and bricks and mortar schools. But in eight years, we actually leapfrogged by using e-commerce.

So not saying that there's a direct parallel in education, but we need to just think differently about the changing world, and how we actually react and interact with what the reality is, and can we think forward?

And I think looking at innovation, we need to not be afraid of innovation. This came up during a dinner last week which I thought was really interesting. Would you go into an emergency room or an operating room, and have a surgery in an operating room that looked like the operating room of a hundred years ago?

Probably not if you had the option to go into a 21st Century operating room, or one of 2016. Yet, everyday, we're sending children to have brain surgery in the most unreformed institution of the last century. The classrooms of today look like the classroom of a hundred a years ago, so we need to actually think a little bit differently because it really is brain surgery. It's cognitive development. It's trying to bring young people up to be proactive and active members of our society, and we just need to be thinking more boldly and differently about that. So I think we need to challenge each other to sort of get outside of our comfort zone if we're going to sort of take this next big leap forward.

MR. McARTHUR: On that note, getting out of our comfort zone, one of the big questions Carolyn is -- we haven't talked a lot about is the private sector side of this. And there's a lot of hot debates on the role of the private sector and education, but you're at the interface in many ways, and come from earlier in your career that aspect.

How do you see -- and it goes to, I think, Justin's question around leapfrogging and new mindsets, new approaches, and technologies. How does that fit into this equation?

MR. MILES: Great question. And I think you start with why the private sector would be interested. And so that's where we usually start those discussions. And the private sector is really interested because when you think about their future, and their markets, and where they are seeing the growth, it is in a lot of developing countries.

And so in an education population in those countries is going to be better for them from a business standpoint. And I think we have to go into it thinking about why would the private sector care about this. Yes, they should care about it from the standpoint of this is a right that every person should have, but they also are going to care about it because it's a business imperative.

And so I think thinking about it from that perspective. You know, I'll give you one good example. We work with Excenter, which is a big global consulting firm, and they take a very long-term view. A lot of their business is really growing in developing markets. The Philippines they have like 100,000 people, you know, that they work for and with in the Philippines, and so they look at this as a long-term investment, and they're saying if we're getting, if we're going to get a better educated

population in the countries where we're going to want our services to be bought, and where we need employees that are going to be educated, we're going to invest this for the long term.

So I think we really have to think about how do we make that case for the business community. I mean, the NGO community, I'd say, was way over the kind of worrying about the corporation as a big, evil thing, and really thinking about how do we leverage corporations to get a win-win between what we want and what they want.

I think what companies can bring to the table is, and we talked little bit about the leapfrogging piece. Obviously, capabilities far beyond what we all have, and what are available, locally are available to companies, so how do we leverage that? Whether that's logistics, whether that's technology, whether that's infrastructure, there's a lot that can be done.

It's also one of the things that we've done with companies is engage them in that advocacy at a country level. Right? So they can get access to the minister of education when maybe the rest of us it's not quite so easy, and because they'll get it through the minister of finance, and the prime minister.

And so going and getting people to the table at a higher level than we might get by bringing along that corporate presence is something that we've done to try to really drive that.

So I think again we didn't talk much about the private sector in terms of the coalitions that have to be built, but they're really incredibly important. And I do think that education, maybe not more than health, but for many it's a broader scepter of companies that are interested in their future employee base, and their future consumer base.

And so it's an argument that actually almost every company does understand that argument. And they also – most large companies, multinational companies are, certainly seeing that that's where their business is growing. Their business is not growing in the traditional mature markets. It's growing in these developing countries.

So I think there's a lot to be done for the corporate sector.

MR. McARTHUR: Thank you. This notion of leapfrogging, and what are we trying to leapfrog on, and even galvanizing metric, I think it's a very nice term, Rebecca, for those who don't know, really spearheaded this global effort on common benchmarks and metrics for education.

So for all of us who need to learn, Rebecca, what are our best bets for galvanizing metrics from the technical vantage point?

MS. WINTHROP: You're going to put me on the spot, so I should say it was us with the UNESCO Institute of Statistic co-galvanizing , co-chairing, and a lot of people including many in this room.

So I'm going to punt on this question, because I think when -- and you're referring to this learning metrics task force that has been going for the last four years and just finished up in February, and we're doing the final wrap-up. And really four years ago when we started, the idea was that we really think we should have a shared conversation across everybody inside the education community from the big donors, to civil society, to the unions, to the education ministers, et cetera, about the global, future global education agenda, and that learning should probably be a part of it. And, clearly, that has happened.

I would say when we starter, there were big arguments that we're really only going to get one metric. And people said, well, why? Why are we only going to get one metric? We said, well, because of the past. Because of the MDGs.

Turns out, we have many learning metrics in the SDGs. And, in fact, that was sort of the push of the learning metrics task force was sort of this step, sort of stepping-stone pattern. So really thinking about early childhood, there's been a ton of work on how to have a metric around early childhood development. This is a huge push in the SDGs, and it's not just nutrition and stunting, which is an incredibly important input, but there's a whole effort of a community with UNICEF and World Bank, and us at the Center for Universal Education, and others to look at cognitive development, social/emotional development, and most importantly in metric.

This is all sort of one set of tools that looks at the quality of the interaction between the caregiver and the child. And that sounds like a lot of pieces, but it's a great tool that could be used by whomever wants to use it around the world to really get a good snapshot about what is the quality of early childhood. So that's an important stepping stone.

Then you would go to, obviously, literacy numeracy. That's essential. You can't leave that out. And then there is the sort of to be determined, sort of higher order skills around citizenship, and a lot of that will come in around critical thinking, I would imagine, problem solving, as well as sort of learning about, caring about our world. You know, environment, et cetera, human rights. That is more fuzzy.

Now those are sort of three stepping-stone pieces. And it is not one galvanizing metric. I think you probably could come up with something that for early childhood in literacy and numeracy pretty quickly. So the question is really is two okay? And then we will probably have to work on some of the others.

And there's folks in place. There's the UIS has its Global Alliance on Learning to really try to suss out what those metrics could be. There is this idea out there that will be considered or discuss around the board of the Global Partnership for Education down the line around what's called an Assessment for Learning which is it's fine to have the metrics. The other problem is how are you going to collect the data if you don't have learning assessment systems?

We can develop one beautiful metric, and if countries do not have learning assessment systems to actually collect the data in a way that helps them, teachers on up, in addition to feeding the global community, the exercise is all for naught.

MR. McARTHUR: Its super interesting because there are so many types of galvanizing that are needed. Of course, there's the technical community. There's the policy community. There's the political community as well. And we need to have maybe a integrated set that works across, but each one has its first breath. And so I think that's a really importing thing to keep in mind because, for example, I was at the -- there's a global health conference in San Francisco last week, academic

researchers, and there's a Professor Margaret Crook, who has been very active in the maternal health efforts around the world, and we were on a panel together, and hard to argue with the political attention that the maternal health movement has got in the past five or seven years. It's been extraordinary takeoff, but incredibly complicated underneath.

And she actually said, and you might be surprised. She thought the health community could learn a lot from the education community where the education community has been looking a lot at the quality metrics. And in the health world they're so used to looking at the complexity of usage and things, they're less used to thinking about, in her argument, the quality measures that go into it.

But there's this single galvanizing measure of maternal death and mortality, which actually for those of you who don't know, is really hard to measure onto itself because the sources of causality for when you die and what caused that, if it was something else a year after the child was born, it's very tricky.

So it's not a trivial undertaking but has a political attention to create the space for the technical attention. And I think that's part of what we're seeing here is the need to --how to created political space for technical discussions in a way that's integrated.

I would love to hear from the room. We have about 20 minutes. I'm going to try an experiment, if you'll indulge me, because I think we've had such a huge number of topics come up, and I'm sure everyone in the room has about five to ten questions they want to ask, and we're not going to be able to do everyone. So Twitter is our friend, and we can follow-up.

But I just want to do an experiment and take 30 seconds, if you'll indulge me, and I really ask that we keep it to 30 seconds, and just so everyone has a chance to process an hour of expertise, just grab the person next to you and say what's the number one question on your mind right now. Just take 30 seconds. What's one thing that you're just kind of boiling to know, or to raise, or to argue about? Thirty seconds. Go for it.

(OFF THE RECORD)

MR. McARTHUR: Okay. We created a monster. Raise your hand if you can hear me. Keep your hand up if you can hear me. Awesome. And if you -- the person next to you might want to raise their hand too. Maybe tap them. Okay. If could all bring it back, please. Awesome 30 seconds. Great job room.

So now, clearly, everyone's got on their mind which I was expecting. So we'd love to hear from the room, if we have some questions. And I'm going to ask, please, to respect the rest of the room, and make sure your question ends with a question mark, and try to keep it as brief as possible so we can hear from a bunch of people, and get an interactive discussion. So, please, limit the soliloquies. Not that anyone's going to, but maybe in the front first. We'll go around and get a few. Please. And introduce yourself. Do we have mikes? I think we have a mike. Thank you. Up here. Sorry. Up front. We'll come to you next.

MR. TYSON: Thank you very much. My name is Jeff Tyson. I'm a reporter with Devex here in Washington. I think Andres Schleicher of OACD put the question of the common metric maybe a little differently last month. He said there's no common language to talk about education the way there is for physics, and we talked about health. And it sounds like there's a lot being done to find that common language more than I had realized.

But I wonder how close are we? And maybe from a broader perspective, what else is being done to get to that common language for education?

MR. McARTHUR: Thank you. Let's take a few, and then we'll ask the panel to -- the gentleman in the blue jacket is next, and then I'm going to ask two women because I'm all for gender balance. So, please.

SPEAKER: Chris (inaudible). Next week I'm accompanying some young Chinese ladies to Bangladesh to talk to the founding family of BRAC. I think many of you may know that BRAC having distributed (inaudible) three quarters of a million village children has just recently been asked to put all of its content onto a short of digital learning nation platform.

So my question is what do you think of that idea, and is Bangladesh ahead in that, or how does a digital learning nation work?

MS. GO: Thank you and good morning. Amber Go from the Research Triangle Institute. I completely agree with the idea of having galvanizing metrics. I think we have that, or at least a start of it on SDG for Plant 1 with the percentage of children reaching minimum proficiency in reading and math. But I think our community needs to borrow Justin's phrasing and is definitely letting the perfect (inaudible). I mean, it's frankly been resistant and reactive to this because they perceive the risk of the narrowing of the curriculum.

So how can we do a better job of using metrics for advocacy without necessarily risking the narrowing of the curriculum?

MR. McARTHUR: Let's take one more in this batch.
Up here in the purple. So up front here.

SPEAKER: Good morning. This is Dema Vivi from Jordan. I run a nonprofit organization that works for children and youth empowerment through the education system.

And my question is have we done, or have countries done impact assessments on schools who are built in rural areas and the underprivileged areas? Have we done impact assessment to measure the return on investment for access to education because my own experience in that (inaudible), in many countries, and I have had the privilege of working with the education system in many Arab countries.

My conclusion was access to education equals access to the poor education, and it usually comes on the expense of quality education for the fewer. So we're graduating more people with less qualified people. Thank you.

MR. McARTHUR: Thank you. So let's maybe take this batch, and we switch the order. I don't know if anyone wants to jump on it. Carolyn, do you want to go first on any pieces?

MS. MILES: Sure. And I can talk a little bit on the last question having seen and Save the Children being very involved in investment in rural area. I think if you don't do the quality piece, you

can get exactly what you've said. You can get access. Lot and lots of kids getting into school. But when you go to actually assess those children at the end of primary school, they haven't learned to read. They haven't learned to write. They haven't done basic numeracy.

But I think the community for the last ten years has really been focused on the quality piece, and on looking at making sure that those children are actually getting out of those schools and actually do have the basic skills that they need.

So I think it can be that way, but I think the community has really -- I mean, part of what drove this was actually the BDGs, because we said it's about, you know, kid getting into school. It was really a lot of it was about access. And so that led to this big push on access.

I think it also it highlights the debate that we're having on metrics. That there can be unintended consequences of metrics. And so if we finding that metric that doesn't, to the point that was made on the other question, narrow what we focus on, is going to be very tricky.

I do think if we got to some kind of metric around a quality, basic education which included these things, and we actually could assess the delivery of those skills, it would -- you know, I wouldn't worry as a huge proponent of ECD, for example. Save the Children totally believes that ECD is one of the best investments we can make in education, but if people are driven to this goal, they would start investing in ECD because every investment, every dollar that you put into ECD drives much more return for the learning in primary school.

So I have faith that we could actually come up with something that includes all of the elements of what we want to happen, but also gives us that galvanizing metric which I do really think that we need. So, good points.

MR. McARTHUR: Just a time check. So we have about ten minutes left. So maybe we can get some quick answers and one or two more questions.

But Rebecca, this notion of the metrics 4.1.1, you know, how close are we?

MS. WINTHROP: Well, actually, it was in the 30-seconds talk to yourself there's a question that Carolyn and I were grappling with grappling with the galvanizing metric.

I think -- I agree with Carolyn. I think that you -- if we message it right, and I think that's been the difficulty, is, you know, okay, we have a galvanizing metric. In some countries because they're global, the SDGs, that metric might already have been met, right, if you pick literacy and numeracy.

So you have to -- I think we could have a galvanizing metric, but we need to work really carefully around sort of the narrative, and, you know, what is it used for? You know, are we really just focusing on low income countries? Are we really focusing -- or not low income countries. Low learning communities? I mean, we've got Baltimore. You know, school in Baltimore, they probably couldn't meet some of the SDGs either. So is that the way the world wants to go? Okay. Maybe let's do that and then think about different ways of capturing that data.

My favorite metric that came out of the learning metrics task force that never really took off and is being possibly still worked on in the halls of very busy UNESCO Institute of Statistics folks was this idea of a quote/unquote, learning for all indicator that was intended to be sort of this galvanizing metric that was -- looked at literacy -- it was both completion rates and learning rates combined into one, which was, basically at the end of a primary cycle, how many kids in your country make it through knowing how to read well?

So that was one idea that possibly could still be put back on the table.

MR. McARTHUR: Justin.

MR. VAN FLEET: Just on the piece of the metrics, I know that that there are really two dangers. One, the narrowing of the curriculum which no one wants to happen. The sort of pseudo metric. And the other I think that we haven't talked about who is to blame if the metrics come out wrong, and I think is everybody across the board, and I think there's this notion that people tend to blame teachers, but there's also one of the imputs from the family. What are the nutrition imputs? What's the poverty imput of the child when they walk into this? Everything has happened outside before they go in the door, and how do we take all of that into account? What's the accountability of the system itself, and how much are they actually putting into teachers, and the schools, and the quality of learning?

So there's a whole host of people that play out in the system, so I think we can't let metrics also be a notion to sort of blame individuals, but there's more of a thermometer, a barometer on the entire system.

But that said, I think there are things we can all agree on. We agree that young people should be able to read. We agree that young people should be able to work clarity and solve relevant problems. I mean, I think that's really what education is all about, and I don't know what the metric is about that. Maybe we get too hung up on the metrics when we're actually trying to come up with -- I mean, we want people to be able to be employed, and I think that's actually one of the most important metrics of a education system is whether young people have some type of relevant training for the societies and the communes in which they live in.

On the technology point, I don't know enough about the BRAC piece of know if that's the right answer, but I do know that myself personally, I learn more informally on line than I do in a classroom these days. And so there's something to be said for how people are learning and the 21st Century, and we have to be able to respond to that.

MR. McARTHUR: Julia.

MS. GILLARD: Just briefly on this metrics piece. I just think we have to get on with it and solve it. And we could talk until the end of time, but if we do, Justin, I think pointed out the sort of two futures scenario at the start of this discussion. That we seize this moment now, or we let it slip away. I think you can definitely say we will let it slip away if this conversation that we're having metrics needs to be replicated in rooms with Prime Minister Cameron and Chancellor Merkel, and President Obama, and the sorts of people who need to be persuaded to give this global push real uplift. And you can't sit in rooms with people like that going let me talk you through. We've had this task force, and there are seven domains, and, oh, you've got to go to the situation room. Oh, sorry about that.

You need to be able to say this is what we're going to do. This is how we're going to measure it, and this is what success looks like. And I think in a lot of this debate -- sorry, I get worked

about this. Worked up about metrics. And this more Julia Gillard speaking on the Global Partnership for Education.

I actually think we are taking a lot of our domestic education debates from places like the Unites States and pushing them into contexts where they don't apply. I've never had anybody in a developing country when I've visited a school rush up to me and say, you know, my biggest drama is whether or not there's going to be the bricks of the curriculum or too much focus on literacy and numeracy.

If anybody has had that discussion in Rwanda, or Mali, or, you know, Yemen, please let me know, but I don't think people do. I think people want their kids to go to school and learn, and they measure that learning by whether their kids can read, and write, and count. And we know how to measure those things so why don't we just do it?

And I'd love to live in a world where we are having global meetings about the crowded curriculum problem in Mali because the education system has got so sophisticated that that is actually an issue no. But we're years, years, and years, and years away from that, so let's just focus on it and get it done, and galvanize global support around it?

(Applause).

MR. McARTHUR: We have -- that said, we could end there perfectly, but we do have just a couple more minutes. So I just want to get two more -- for the sake of the room two more questions. The very active hand in the back, and then one up front. And then I'm going to ask for some final thoughts from the panelist in answer to a couple of those. In the back.

SPEAKER: I thought Rebecca's comments about moving from learning education systems to learning systems was very exciting. It would be interesting to hear from the panelists what appetite you see, what appetite you have to bring in learning that will equip young people to earn their livelihood when they come out of school.

And picking up on the recent comment, do you see that parents are interested in if their children can read, write, and do arithmetic, and earn a livelihood? Do we need to be responsive to that?

MR. McARTHUR: I'm sorry. Introduce yourself.

MS. MACAULEY: Fiona Macauley, Making Sense International.

MR. McARTHUR: Great. And the gentleman in front.

MR. GINSBURG: Yes, Marc Ginsburg from FHI 360. Surprise no refers to global tax for education. We talk about changing the system. It seems the big (inaudible) in the room that nobody wants to talk about is the one that creates many of these inequalities that we seem to be so concerned about.

The global tax system I'm interested to see whether you see that as a potential step in the right direction.

MR. McARTHUR: I'm going to stop there. We need to hear from the panelists. And I want to ask you to maybe integrate that, those two questions, literacy, numeracy, jobs, you know. One question is can you have a good job without literacy and numeracy. So there's lot of embedded pieces there. And then the other one on tax, which is a major debate, of course. Hot button in many places. Tax cooperation writ large, I would say, not just global tax. But maybe actually just go from the end to this end. If I could just ask you to give 30 second, and in that, if you're up for it, we all need to support everyone on the panel who is pushing on this.

There's 150 people in the room. Many, many more watching online. What's one takeaway? If you could just leave one takeaway with the audience, what would you like it to be each of you?

MS. MILES: Okay. So first all of, I would say that my one takeaway is -- so I'll start with that, and then I'll go back to the questions. We talked about it at the very beginning that there is this moment in time, and it is right now. And if we collectively don't seize that moment and put education at the top of the agenda, it's not gonna get there.

I think the metrics piece is really important, but I think more than that is getting the team sport piece right, and getting people that are driving all of the elements of this whether it's on the ground, whether it's at the highest political levels, whether it's through the teacher piece, all of the pieces have to

actually come together. So I think the most important take way for me is now is the time, and we've got to get on with it.

I think the livelihoods piece; I think there's two things that have to happen. First of all, huge proponent that livelihoods is an important outcome of what we're doing in education, and parents do care about that. Very much so. But you do need these two things to happen. One is you need an educated or a trained group of young people and citizens. And the other is you need economic growth so that they actually have jobs at the end of this.

And one of the things that Save the Children tries to do is make sure that whatever we're training people for, there' are actually opportunities for kids to take those jobs, and that's really important because I think sometimes we think, well, we'll just give kids the best education we can and magically somehow the jobs that they can take will appear, and it doesn't always work that day. So how do we match those things?

MR. McARTHUR: Thank you. Sorry, Carolyn. We have to wrap up.

MS. MILES: Yep.

MR. McARTHUR: Thank you so much. Rebecca.

MS. WINTHROP: Yeah. I think -- I actually have the same sort of big takeaway with a twist, which is this idea, I love the term team sports. We've been talking about it here at Brookings around sort of crowding in community, community being everybody from libraries to, you know, entrepreneurs, to parents, et cetera, but I like the team sport piece.

And I think that is going to be crucial if we really are going to switch to a global learning movement. And where we really do have sort of ecosystem, an education ecosystem where the government is pivotal, but laying the ground work for lots of other people to play a role in improving children's learning.

MR. McARTHUR: Justin.

MR. VAN FLEET: And with the Commission right now, I think we really need to hear from everybody and have these tough conversations. We're doing a broad civil society, global

consultations right now. Imputs are coming in from all over the world. We have young people submitting videos to us that we're listening to. We have 25-plus research institutions giving us research to draw upon. We're having conversations like this. It's sort of like the primaries. We need to push ourselves and really see how far we can go, but at the end of the day get behind what we come out with as a team.

And so I think we need to keep over the next few months really pushing each other and these issues like global tax, domestic tax, all of which are pieces we're looking at with the Commission, or bringing in Commissioned research on those exact issues to see how far we can push ourselves. We really need to draw on that, and link it up to employability as you say. Without that, you will sort of lose generations of young people produced for what, and you start to see the rate of return on education at the family level.

So all of these issues we have to deal with, but I think let's keep pushing ourselves, but let's get behind each other at the end of the day and really take advantage of the opportunity we have.

MS. GILLARD: Justin has just made me feel incredibly anxious by comparing the Financing Commission to the primaries. Heavens.

(Laughter).

MS. GILLARD: I'd just conclude by saying a great discussion. There will be in the immediate terms three important moments for us to come together and to mobilize around. One is coming very quickly which is the humanitarian conference in Istanbul where, hopefully, the world will take a step forward on children in emergencies and crisis in their education, And we said earlier, if we don't solve that problem then we're never gonna get to the SDG outcome that we seek for all children. Certainly, at GPE, we know that given 50 percent of what we do is in fragile and conflicted affected place. So a moment to mobilize around Istanbul.

Then when the Financial Commission report comes out in September, I'm absolutely confident it will be a high quality report because of the work of Justin and others. But it will need to be mobilized around. Otherwise, it will be another of those meritorious reports that ends up on paper

shelves, and there are people delving into it and using it, but it actually hasn't changed policy. So a mobilization moment there.

And then in the course of the next year or into 2017, the Global Partnership will be looking to replenish around the new strategic plan, and we will need your help to do that. So plenty of conversations to have, but a lot to do in the forthcoming period.

MR. McARTHUR: Thank you. And thanks to everyone whose comment contributed to this. I think the bottom line metric is in a universal agenda, of universal learning, we are all part of the team. And it's not an us versus them. It's an all of us together.

And I want to thank everyone here who by showing up has declared themselves part of the team, self voting with your feet today, but also we have leaders from international institutions. I know we have a Masai community leader from Kenya. We have many other leaders from around the world in this room today, and there are so many levels to this.

So I just want to end with three thanks. One is I want to thank all of you for coming today. Two, I want to ask you to please join me in thanking our panel for sharing so much of their wisdom. And third, I want to really thank everyone for committing so much of their lives to solving this problem because we have in 2016 this moment to galvanize the team, to galvanize around metrics, and it'll only happen if we all do it together.

So thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. McARTHUR: And I invite -- everyone is invited to join for coffee and refreshments outside for those who want to continue the conversation. Thank you.

* * * * *

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.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2016