



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

2011 GLOBAL WORKSHOP ON EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT: FROM EVIDENCE TO ACTION

September 2011

This report was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development Office of Education. It was prepared under the Global Evaluation and Monitoring II BPA Number EDH-E-00-08-00002-00. It was prepared by the Aguirre Division of JBS International, Inc.

2011 GLOBAL WORKSHOP ON EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT: FROM EVIDENCE TO ACTION REPORT

Prepared by:

The Aguirre Division of JBS International, Inc.

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Plenary Session Summaries.....	2
General Topic Summaries	16
Early Grade Reading Session Summaries	20
Information and Communication Technologies Session Summaries.....	28
Crisis/Conflict Settings Session Summaries.....	33
Higher Education Session Summaries.....	37
Workforce Development Session Summaries.....	45
Youth Development Session Summaries	49
Finance Session Summaries	54
Capacity Building/Participant Training Session Summaries	60
2011 Global Education and Training Workshop Assessment and Feedback.....	63
Recommendations for Future Workshops and Challenges.....	64
Summary of Participant Feedback.....	66
USAID-only Sessions.....	70
General Sessions.....	71
ICT Demonstrations.....	72
Appendices: Daily Briefings	

Introduction

The 2011 Global Workshop on Education and Development brought together over 390 members of the international development community to share best practices and approaches that support the goals of USAID's new Education Strategy, including early grade reading, increasing access to higher education and vocational and technical education, and increasing access in conflict and crisis settings. Approximately 135 USAID education officers and program staff from 44 USAID supported countries and Washington, DC gathered in Arlington, Virginia for a four-day workshop from August 22-25, 2011.

Agency specialists from USAID Washington's Office of Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade (EGAT), Office of Education, Global Health (GH), Democracy and Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA), and the four regional bureaus were joined by representatives from other U.S. Government (USG) agencies such as the U.S. Department of State (DOS) and U.S. Department of Education, as well as representatives from the legislative branch. USAID and other USG were joined by approximately 255 implementing partners and multilateral donor agencies.

Each day of the workshop included two public plenary sessions and one or two sets of concurrent sessions. Participants were free to select the concurrent session of their choice, choosing from four to six concurrent sessions in each time slot. Participants also had the opportunity to explore an interactive ICT demonstration room where leading companies in education technology showcased their work and discussed applications in different regions around the world.

This report will provide one page summaries for each session of the workshop, highlighting key discussions and take away points in each section. The sessions are organized by education sub-sector and date and time of presentation. Following the session summaries, the results of the workshop evaluations are presented

Plenary Session Summaries

Welcome — Education: The Foundation of Social and Economic Transformation

August 22, 2011 — 10:15 a.m.

Presenters: Wendy Abt, USAID Bureau for Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade
Hilda “Bambi” Arellano, USAID Office of the Administrator
Eric Hanushek, Hoover Institute, Stanford University

Moderator: Richard W. Whelden, USAID Office of Education

Richard Whelden of USAID’s Office of Education welcomed participants to the *2011 Global Workshop on Education and Development: From Evidence to Action*. He noted that the workshop was designed to support implementation of the new USAID Education Strategy and that USAID leadership was actively seeking input from the participants. Describing education as the “unsung hero” of development, he noted its contributions to outcomes in other sectors such as health, democracy and governance, and economic growth.

Wendy Abt, who joined USAID in 2010 as the Deputy Administrator of EGAT, began her presentation by stating, “We all understand that acquiring basic skills is important. The collective success we have had in dramatically increasing access to education is testimony to the breadth and depth of understanding shared by parents, communities, countries and donors that demonstrates that education matters.” However, despite donor efforts, individual sacrifices by families, and government efforts, most pupils in low-income countries leave school without being able to read, write, or do basic math, leaving them poorly equipped to support themselves and their families even as their economies grow. The new USAID Education Strategy is a response to this crisis, focusing on selectivity and helping to better outcomes, to increase capacity building, to measure impact using cost-benefit analyses, and to use rigorous application of best practices, including evaluation.

Hilda Arellano remarked that the new Education Strategy has the objective of keeping USAID at the cutting edge of education programming. As it approaches its 50th anniversary, USAID still faces the same challenge of low public support for foreign assistance that President Kennedy noted at its outset. Nonetheless, Arellano stated that USAID is integral to the United State’s commitment to a better world. *USAID FORWARD* is the agency-wide effort to reform its practices whose overall goal is to increase local partnerships, accountability, and fiscal responsibility. This agency transformation has also spurred talent recruitment: by next summer, 70 percent of field officers will have joined USAID within the last three years.

Eric Hanushek from the Hoover Institute discussed his current research on education and economic growth. Using Latin America as an example, he explained that there is no correlation between years in school and economic growth rates. Rather, it is the knowledge gained and the skills developed through schooling that lead to economic growth. He also noted that it is not necessarily greater resources that lead to higher student achievement, but rather teacher quality. According to Hanushek, attaining higher teacher quality requires institutional reforms, including centralized examinations, accountability for results, decentralization and autonomy, and direct performance incentives.

Key take away points: The new Education Strategy and *USAID FORWARD* stress the importance of monitoring, evaluation, and measurable outcomes. Teacher quality is a main factor in achieving the types of development outcomes needed. Unless *learning* takes place in the classroom, access to education is insufficient for economic growth.

USAID's New Education Strategy August 22, 2011 — 11:30 a.m.

Presenters: David Barth, USAID Office of the Administrator
Suezan Lee, USAID Office of Education
Elizabeth Roen, USAID Office of Learning, Evaluation and Research
Mitch Kirby, USAID Bureau for the Middle East
Luba Fajfer, USAID Bureau for Europe and Eurasia
Pape Sow, USAID/Senegal

Members of the USAID Policy Task Team (PTT) were tasked to formulate a new agency-wide Education Strategy. The team was asked to address the challenges of increasing interest in global education, increasing USAID education budgets and a decentralized agency resulting in disjointed education outlays. The team's seven core members—chosen for their recognized expertise—created a framework of goals to guide programs and policies in the education sector and criteria for tracking outcomes.

The new education strategy supports broader foreign policy goals based on the hypothesis that quality education is a necessary prerequisite for broad-based economic and social-development. The new strategy is designed to be more selective than previously in choice of programs. The focus will be on programs that can (1) have a measurable impact on a national scale, and (2) address three measurable, sector-wide goals: (a) improving reading skills for 100 million children in primary grades by 2015, (b) improving the ability of tertiary and workforce development programs to produce a workforce with relevant skills to support the country's development, and (c) increasing equitable access to education in crisis and conflict environments for 15 million learners by 2015.

Program selectivity is intended to help USAID concentrate its resources on programs that carry a sound development hypothesis. New programs should either have pre-existing evidence of effectiveness or be built in metrics that can produce measurable results. Successful or unsuccessful results can then be shared as either effective practices or lessons learned. The emphasis should remain on sound analytics, on monitoring and evaluation research that can communicate the cost effectiveness of investments in education to Congress, taxpayers and other stakeholders. This implies focusing on a narrower set of programs that shows a measurable link between interventions and impact.

Key take away points: A critical element for future program design will be the strength of the link between a program intervention and its impact. An evidence-based strategic approach is needed to provide measurable outcomes and ensure accountability among stakeholders. For this purpose, USAID has developed a new Education Strategy Results Framework that lists illustrative activities indicating progress on a series of intermediate results. The intermediate results are linked directly to one of the three goals outlined in the new 2011 Education Strategy. These measures are designed to help USAID cement its leadership role in the education sector, with a focus on cutting-edge programming and design.

View from the Hill

August 24, 2011 – 12:30 p.m.

Presenters: Lori Rowley, Professional Staff, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Minority (Lugar, Ranking)
Robin Lerner, Professional Staff, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Majority (Kerry, Chair)

Robin Lerner and Lori Rowley, staff members for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee presented on the need to bridge the disconnect in communication between Congress and USAID/Washington and Mission staff. This disconnect makes it difficult for USAID staff and implementers to understand the reasoning behind the actions of Hill staff and vice versa. In order to close this gap, Lerner and Rowley provided information about how the Senate Foreign Relations Committee functions as well as how it relates to USAID's work and offered advice on how to prevent future problems given the current financial constraints on U.S.-funded programs.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has full jurisdiction over USAID and its programs in addition to treaties and nominations. The Committee also issues a State Department Authorization Bill every year indicating the programs and policies viewed as most important, under which many USAID activities fall. The greater emphasis given to these programs creates a higher priority for funding. While the Committee authorizes programs, it is the Appropriation Committee that appropriates funding. Lerner drew the distinction between the two committees to show the importance of her committee as well as its limitations vis-a-vis funding. She also discussed the difficulty of passing a bill that can be brought to the Hill only once a year.

The presenters addressed misperceptions between the field and Washington staff and ways their communication can be improved. The misconception of some program implementers that no one on the Hill cares about their programs may be a result of the way USAID functions, which "does not fit well" with Washington priorities and Hill needs which require immediate information from experts who are often out in the field. A lack of this information makes it very tough to justify support for programs on Capitol Hill. Lerner advocated that USAID staff and program implementers understand this and make sure their programs can be justified to avoid any future problems. She described the speed of communication among workers in Washington and the lag of communication with field officers. She noted that communication is often non-existent unless a program is threatened and suggested replacing crisis communication with continuous dialogue. When correspondence is delayed or unanswered, the Hill feels insecure and will take actions as a result.

The presenters were open about the pressures they face and their difficulty allocating funds for foreign assistance when many domestic issues remain unaddressed. They acknowledged that USAID is far more controlled than other agencies and that the reporting requirements can be difficult to manage along with programming. They clearly stated that only programs with demonstrable effectiveness will be eligible for funding. They also emphasized the importance of assessment and monitoring for reports on program effectiveness. Though it is critical for all programs to have clear goals, what comprises effectiveness will be determined on a case-to-case basis. Program evaluation results provide essential data to demonstrate effective and efficient investment of public funds. Lerner explained that the Hill would prefer to hear that program results show that a specific program did not work out the way it was originally intended, and therefore needs to be revamped. This shows that results are being used to inform decision making, and USAID staff should not be afraid to share these lessons learned. The presenters reiterated the need for regional staff to provide information on results and to prioritize regional projects when the Agency is faced with budget constraints. They encouraged regional office representatives to be proactive communicating their thoughts, ideas and problems. They acknowledge that staff in the field best

understand the key problems in the region and are better positioned to prioritize projects seeking USAID assistance. The use of low cost, innovative technologies that extend programs could be a cost-effective way to meet the larger goals of USAID's new education strategy. Efforts to develop and maintain stable governments in host countries that foster cordial relations aligns with the U.S. foreign policy that is the central guiding principle of the new education strategy.

Key take away points include the need for more open and regular communication between USAID and Congressional staff as that will help the Committee defend USAID programs. The importance of showing results was also reiterated as it is very difficult to pass bills on the floor in the current conditions. The better data we present on the effectiveness and efficiency of money spent in the field, the greater our chances of demonstrating the wise allocation of funds in the legislature.

Early Grade Reading: Summary of Evidence, Implications, and New Directions from Donors

August 23, 2011 — 10:15 a.m.

Presenters: Luis Crouch, Fast Track Initiative Secretariat
Robert Prouty, Fast Track Initiative Secretariat
Elizabeth King, World Bank
Gemma Wilson-Clark, Department for International Development (DFID)
Chloe O’Gara, William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

Moderator: Patrick Collins, USAID Office of Education

This plenary panel focused on early reading, presenting evidence of its importance, implications for programming, and the current collaboration of donors in making early reading the center of their policy framework in education. Luis Crouch reviewed the research to lay the evidence base for the current focus on the importance of early learning. In his summary of the evidence, he noted that education matters, quality of education is important, and education is life changing for those children who learn to read early and well. In measuring the returns from education, without exception, children who receive a quality education have more and better life attainments. Crouch emphasized the importance of: (a) delivering quality improvements in education based on evidence, (b) demanding accountability from educators, (c) on-going child assessment, and (d) making appropriate learning materials available.

Robert Prouty from the Fast Track Initiative (FTI) Secretariat noted the organization’s move from a focus on access to education to a focus on learning. Through FTI efforts, access has surged and the organization believes a similar surge in learning is possible with focused attention and resources. The organization has two new programmatic directions: (a) a Global and Regional Activities Program (GRA) that will develop stronger evidence in reading and learning instructions as a basis for bringing successful programs to scale, and (b) a results-based approach to learning that will be the basis for funding the next round of countries that demonstrate a built-in component for learning achievement.

Elizabeth King described the World Bank’s new education strategy that is based on the mantra “Invest early. Invest wisely. Invest cooperatively.” Invest Early will focus on early learning of children at home, with their family, and at school. Wise investment will center on assessment, accountability, and autonomy of assessment at the school level. Cooperative investment will support holistic system development so that all education levels work in coordination to improve learning. Gemma Wilson-Clark described DFID’s plan to provide a full cycle of primary and secondary education support, emphasizing research, to achieve evidence-based results. DFID support will center on basic literacy and numeracy skills, especially for girls in Africa and Asia. The agency is already in communication with USAID in several countries to map research interests and generate country-level data. DFID has identified the lack of practical in-country advice on what works as a gap in expanding the focus on early reading through donor coordination, information sharing, and agreement on joint indicators.

The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation works in six African countries with programmatic ties through a common strategy focusing on effective instruction and use of resources. Chloe O’Gara, the foundation’s representative, applauded the apparent alignment among donors on present progress and agreement on what still needs to be accomplished. She expanded on how her organization confirms the need and supports the creation of a common international learning indicator as the basis for collaborative research. She also noted the need to convene an international education group for research as a vehicle for identifying and sharing results on country-level learning.

Key take away points from the session included the identified need to move beyond a focus on access to a focus on early learning issues. The many benefits of early reading attainment on life-long achievement are well supported by the research. Accountability in program implementation is necessary, but early learning achievement should be driven by a host governments' recognition of the need to improve its own human resource base and not driven by a donor's agenda. Assessment is a key program component that needs to be used to support strengthened learning processes and future programming, not merely as a measure of current learning performance. There appears to be a growing consensus on the need to focus support efforts at the school and classroom level. At this level it can help improve direct education delivery, especially through more effective teacher preparation and delivery to improve early reading proficiency. The sense of collaboration and alignment of policy frameworks among all the present donors communicates the growing recognition of the importance of focusing on the quality of education.

Lunch Discussion: Comparative Education Strategies **August 23, 2011 – 12:30 p.m.**

Presenters: Richard Prouty, Fast Track Initiative (FTI)
Richard Arden, World Bank/Department for International Development (UK)
Elizabeth King, World Bank
David Barth, USAID

Moderator: Wendy Abt, WPA, Inc.

Wendy Abt, the moderator of this session, asked panelists a series of questions regarding the challenges their organizations have faced in developing an education strategy. Richard Prouty reported that one of FTI's greatest challenges is aligning development goals with national priorities. While countries work on their education objectives as whole, development organizations can often only focus on a particular sector, such as basic education, which can lead to a disconnect between what countries want and what development organizations can provide. When it comes to budget concerns, civil society groups within countries often feel organizations should increase their funding for social programs while governments intend to cut public spending in some of those same areas.

Richard Arden, a World Bank Senior Education Specialist, spoke of his experience with the UK's Department for International Development (DFID). He mentioned that the new government has stressed accountability and resource management. As a result, DFID intends to 'graduate' several countries from its aid program and focus more narrowly on providing technical expertise. In speaking about budgetary policy, Arden pointed out that while DFID is the only ministry in the UK that received increased funding from Parliament, it still seeks to cut costs by reducing headquarters staff and increasing the number of in-country advisors.

Elizabeth King underlined the importance of impact evaluation, which is a World Bank priority. She pointed out that because the World Bank serves countries with different development and education priorities it is difficult to have a narrow focus. Instead, it must focus on learning as a whole, rather than on individual sectors. King also mentioned the challenge of specifying indicators and standards across countries in a way that does not interfere with national sovereignty.

David Barth of USAID began by saying that while access to education receives a lot of attention, more development projects should focus on the quality of education. He mentioned the increasing importance of assessments and impact evaluations, especially in a time when governments want to see measurable results. Barth noted the challenge of focusing on reading when many countries want to focus on mathematics. Barth concluded that it can be challenging to reach the lofty goals that USAID sets for itself.

Key take away points: Government aid agencies and international organizations face different challenges and constraints in developing and implementing education strategies. There is, nevertheless, agreement that monitoring, evaluation, and impact assessments have become increasingly important. Partnership among aid agencies and international organizations, with emphasis on sharing best practices and lessons learned, will be key to ensuring aid effectiveness and not "reinventing the wheel."

Conflict, Crisis, and Education August 23, 2011 – 1:45 p.m.

Presenters: Marleen Wong, University of Southern California (USC)
Reuben Brigety II, U.S. Department of State
Nigel Roberts, World Bank

Moderator: Yolanda Miller-Grandvaux, USAID Office of Education

This session focused on the relationship among crisis, conflict, and education and presented three perspectives on this topic. The moderator, Yolanda Miller-Grandvaux from USAID's Office of Education, noted that the field of education and conflict is just six years old. Assessments in the field have recently been conducted and data are just emerging showing how inequalities in education contribute to increased violence. The internationally adopted paradigm that emerged from 2006-2008 seeks to answer to what extent education contributes to, and mitigates, conflict.

Reuben Brigety II from the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM) discussed PRM's experience in emergencies, the programs PRM supports, and the challenges of providing education in a crisis setting. He stressed that humanitarians and development actors must interact, develop coordination, and share information with each other.

Nigel Roberts from The World Bank presented the World Development Report 2011, which focuses on modern violence. He discussed how the violence of the Cold War has been replaced by another type - criminal violence - that is more intractable and less prone to resolution. Countries that have been able to break the cycle of violence have done so through recreating confidence in public and collective action, and reforming and strengthening their institutions, including security, justice, and livelihoods, which can take a generation or more. He noted that education in these settings has the power to change the psychology that is so dominant in creating violence, and that it has the power to move people out of the circumstances in which they find themselves.

Marleen Wong, Assistant Dean of USC, discussed the steps the U.S. Department of Education (ED) has taken to mitigate the impact on students of crises and conflict. Since the 1990s, ED has developed programs to deal with readiness and emergency management, among other programs. ED also has created a model that explains the four phases of emergency management: prevention-mitigation (identifying hazards that are present), preparation, response, and recovery. Wong also spoke of how schools are the first place parents, students and communities turn after a tragedy.

Key take away points included the fact that the field of conflict and its relationship to education is only six years old; the first series of research studies looking at this relationship is very recent. Institutional reform and recreating confidence in collective action are keys to breaking the cycle of violence, but can take a generation or longer.

Mobilizing Higher Education for Development Impact **August 24, 2011 — 10:15 a.m.**

Presenter: Susy Ndaruhutse, CfBT Education Trust

Moderator: Gary Bittner, USAID/Office of Education

This session addressed Goal 2 of the Education Strategy and provided insight into current research on the role of higher education and leadership development. Gary Bittner from USAID's Office of Education introduced the session by discussing the focus on outcomes in USAID's new policy on human and institutional capacity development (HICD). He noted that assessments of higher education institutions are critical in order to show program impact.

Susy Ndaruhutse of the CfBT Education Trust introduced her research into the role that higher education plays in the development of leaders. To date, she has completed Phase One of a three-phase study, including a cross-country data analysis mapping the gross enrollment ratios (GER) of 164 countries against worldwide governance indicators like rule of law, stability, and government effectiveness. Her research team found that there is no one clear purpose for higher education, but rather three broad purposes: (1) to prepare the workforce for the global knowledge economy, (2) to relay the norms, values, and attitudes that are highly influential in the development of civil society, and (3) to help in the creation of elite leaders who are part of a broad middle class of socially engaged individuals.

The length of time for leadership impact to be evident is indicated by findings that the development of leaders through higher education can take over twenty years. By controlling for this time lag, the research team was able to infer causation, rather than just correlation. The findings also show a positive correlation between tertiary GER and indicators of good governance, though other factors are involved. Ndaruhutse explained that higher education is a necessary, but insufficient condition for positive development outcomes, along with political, social, and economic conditions.

Ndaruhutse discussed ways that higher education has contributed to leadership for development, including creating a middle class that can hold leaders accountable and providing skills that allow individuals to become more responsible and adaptable. She noted that although the purpose of higher education institutions has evolved over time—from training the elite, to educating the masses, to providing universal higher education—most developing countries are still at the elite development stage. Donor support for higher education has also gone through cycles and the challenge now is to find the balance between support for basic education and support for higher education.

In Phases Two and Three, Ndaruhutse and her team will conduct further research on what forms of higher education are most influential in the development of leaders. This research will include case studies and lessons learned, and will be available on the CfBT website: www.dlprog.org.

Key take away points: Though it can take a generation or more, higher education has a significant role to play in the creation of development leadership. Higher education is a contributing factor in democratic processes and improved governance.

Participatory Roundtable: Who Says You Can't Have 21st Century Education in Low-Resource Settings?

August 24, 2011 — 1:45 p.m.

Presenters: Asha Kanwar, Commonwealth of Learning
Mathew Taylor, Intel
David Atchoarena, UNESCO
Gavin Dykes, Education World Forum
Wayan Vota, Inveneo
Steven Rothstein, Perkins School for the Blind
Sonia Derenoncourt, Peace Corps

Moderator: Anthony Bloome, USAID Office of Education

In this session presenters from both the public and private sector gave brief overviews of their involvement with ICT (Information and Communication Technology) in education. The moderator, Anthony Bloome, presented a context for ICT in education and asked, "Where can science and technology take us?"

Professor Asha Kanwar of Commonwealth of Learning (COL) guided the audience through the work that COL does in developing open education resource (OER) materials. In India and Malawi, among other countries, these materials provide quality content and are adaptable to local contexts. In addition, OER fosters teacher collaboration and helps to build capacity. David Atchoarena from UNESCO discussed the impact of the information economy on education and how this transformation is causing more education to occur outside of the classroom. Mathew Taylor, representing Intel, briefed the audience on a successful pilot project in Zambia that uses solar technology to power a computer lab for students. The lab has increased student enrollment and attendance at the school. By providing a range of for-profit services after school hours, the project is now recouping the money spent building the lab.

Gavin Dykes from Education World Forum discussed the importance of developing and following frameworks in ICT. Wayan Vota of Inveneo discussed the need to build human capacity and scale successful ICT projects with the help of local technology companies. Vota gave examples of Inveneo projects in Haiti and Tanzania that exemplify this model. Steven Rothstein from Perkins expanded the discussion to include assistive technology such as Braille writers that work without electricity, impactful mobile platforms using SMS that are accessible to the deaf, and the importance of distance education to the disabled. Lastly, Sonia Derenoncourt from Peace Corps described some of the many projects done by Peace Corps Volunteers around the world, including using Google Earth for developing eco-tourism and developing native-language blogs in Bulgaria. Audience members queried the panel on their experiences with funding in the constrained fiscal climate. Many of the presenters explained that local ownership and gaining community support develop capacity and sustainability, which in turn simplifies fiscal management. Richard Whelden (USAID) asked about the types of research done to demonstrate the efficacy and impact of these programs. As most of the programs are new, the available research consists only of preliminary evaluations. This will expand in the coming years.

Key take-away points stress that technology may not be the answer to educating those in low-resource settings, but it can support the spread and access to quality materials because of the lower costs and power requirements of modern technology. Technology in various forms can be used to further include people with disabilities and the new tech-savvy generation is now training others in new and creative uses for technology. The most successful pilots and interventions have great community investment and involvement; local ownership is a key to accomplishment.

Youth in the 21st Century **August 25, 2011 – 10:15 a.m.**

Presenters: Samantha Constant, Wolfensohn Family Foundation
Branka Minic, Manpower Group
Stephen Vetter, Partners of the Americas

Moderator: Ash Hartwell, University of Massachusetts

Rachael Blum of USAID opened the “Youth In the 21st Century” session with remarks pertaining to the new youth strategy and youth development. She noted the growing size of the youth population in the developing world and how this presents an opportunity for USAID to advance its goals.

The session’s moderator, Ash Hartwell of the University of Massachusetts, noted that youth is a cross-cutting issue of real importance, and one of the reasons for a session on youth was due to the success of the education sector in achieving Education for All. Dr. Hartwell highlighted the expressed need of youth to be involved in shaping their futures and the futures of their countries by sharing a story of frustrated Kenyan youths during the 2007-2008 post-election violence.

Samantha Constant of the Wolfensohn Family Foundation discussed youth demographics trends in the Middle East and North Africa, the transition from theory into practice in the education system, and strategies for moving forward. Ms. Constant noted that the two main challenges confronting youth today are the guarantee of equity of access and quality of education. She proposed an approach that focused on assisting youth by improving university admission policies, mentoring youth, partnering with the private sector, and including youth in the political process.

Branka Minic from Manpower discussed how youth employment is critical to sustainable economic growth and stability. She noted major trends affecting the work world, including demographic and economic shifts, the growth and power of individual choice, and the rapid change of technology. To better cope with these trends, she suggested ways to make youth programming more responsive to the job market, beginning with establishing the needs of employers in the local market, making training relevant to employment policy, and ensuring that the educational system focuses on the employability of young people. She also suggested creating an entrepreneurship-friendly environment in which youth could pursue self-employment opportunities, and encouraged stakeholders at all levels to cooperate for the benefit of youth development.

Stephen Vetter of Partners of the Americas spoke of the challenges facing youth in Latin America and began his remarks by discussing education reform protests and a national strike being led by young people in Chile. According to Mr. Vetter, many Latin American youth leave school without life and technical skills, thus limiting their opportunities, and many are being seduced by gangs, leading to problems within the community. He suggested that community organizations, NGOs, faith based associations, business leaders, and others should create networks to explore means to offer better prospects and opportunities for youths.

Key take away points: The youth bulge in developing nations presents many challenges---and opportunities--- for communities. Youth are currently lacking in life skills and job experience, putting them at a severe disadvantage in the job market.

Evaluation for the Education Sector: Applying the New Evaluation Policy August 25, 2011 — 1:45 p.m.

Presenter: Cynthia Clapp-Wincek, USAID Office of Learning, Evaluation, and Research

Moderator: Ron Raphael, USAID Office of Education

Cynthia Clapp-Wincek gave an overview of the evaluation and program cycle that outlines how the strategic planning, project design, and evaluation policies are applied. She noted that good evaluation is based on good project planning and cannot stand alone without being integrated into the program cycle.

USAID is issuing new guidance on how to integrate evaluation into the project cycle through the Country Development Cooperative Strategies (CDCS). The CDCS prioritize USAID assistance, inform annual budgets, and offer guidance on project implementation and design. As strategies with results frameworks are approved, Missions are mandated to follow the new guidance. Relevant ADS guidance is also being re-written to support implementation of the new policies.

The development of new CDCSs will be informed by country profiles and priorities and reflect principles of aid effectiveness related to donor and partner cooperation. All new country development strategies need to include the new USAID policies (i.e. education, evaluation) and need to be based on a sound development hypothesis, lessons learned, and evidence.

The new Evaluation Policy, developed in January 2011, will be used as an accountability measure and to systematically generate knowledge and performance outcomes that can inform new project implementation. The policy promotes the use of two types of evaluations: (1) performance evaluations which will constitute the majority of assessments, and (2) impact evaluations that will be conducted in about 10 percent of all projects. The stated evaluation standards emphasize the importance of: (1) systematic data collection based on indicators from the project design for both quantitative and qualitative data, (2) relevance to future decision-making, (3) reinforcement of local capacity to participate in evaluations, and (4) dedication of sufficient resources to ensure a thorough job.

Key take away points stress the priority that sound development of a project cycle requires the integration of an evaluation component. The Agency will provide extensive training and support on the new project design and procurement systems through service centers, websites, visiting TDY individuals, webinars, and online communities of practice. USAID staffs were encouraged to contribute suggestions or questions to the Agency Evaluation Agenda at <http://tiny.cc/evalagenda> and learn about other USAID reforms at <http://forward.usaid.gov/>.

Closing: The Way Forward for the Education Sector **August 25, 2011 — 2:45 p.m.**

Presenter: Richard W. Whelden, USAID Office of Education

In closing, Richard W. Whelden, the Director of the Office of Education, reviewed some of the key points made about education during the week. As he put it, education is the unsung hero of development because it is the basis for progress in all the other sectors. Quality education lays the critical foundation for growth for both the citizens and their country.

Whelden reminded the audience of some of the main issues presented through the focus on the eight thematic areas of the workshop: (a) early grade reading, (b) information and communication technology (ICT), (c) crisis and conflict settings, (d) workforce development, (e) youth (f) higher education, (g) access to finance, and (h) capacity building.

Programs need to measure success based on the quality of education and not just the 'number of seats filled.' A focus on girls' education is an on-going need in an effort for girls to attain the greatest return on investment in country development. In addressing education in conflict and crisis situations, the U.S. government has an important role to play in bridging the gap between military engagement and the advancement of development. Cross-sectoral programs are necessary to address the multiple needs of youth, not to 'fix' them, but to develop their potential. A focus on ICT will open minds to the advantages and opportunities of technology in preparing for the future and helping to meet the diverse learning needs of special populations.

Whelden reminded the audience of the fast approach of 2015, the deadline for the accomplishment of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). He urged the audience to emerge from the workshop energized and empowered to work toward new goals and accelerate activities that will enable attainment of the MDGs.

To move forward, USAID as a whole must work productively with partners and agency staff must bring to bear the best practices and lessons learned in the workshop to implement strategies intelligently in each program. In a nod to the increased Agency-wide emphasis on evaluation, he encouraged participants to learn from successes and failures, using evidence (such as the collection of baseline information in literacy and workforce development, for example) as the foundation for moving forward. The entire agency must respect the challenges of transitioning long-standing programs in the move to new goals.

Key take away points from this session include paving the way forward. Education undergirds development. It is necessary to keep in mind the eight thematic areas found throughout the workshop: early grade reading, information and communication technologies, crisis and conflict settings, work force development, youth, higher education, finance, and capacity building and participant training. With the 2015 deadline in sight, Whelden encouraged the audience to emerge from the workshop motivated and excited to reach the Millennium Development Goals.

General Topic Summaries

**Supporting the Evaluation Policy:
Improving the Quality of Evaluation Design**
August 22, 2011 - 1:45 p.m.

Presenters: Elizabeth Roen, USAID Office of Learning, Evaluation, and Research
Christine Beggs, USAID Knowledge Services Center
Roger Rasnake, JBS International, Inc.
Marcia Odell, JBS International, Inc.

Moderator: Ron Raphael, USAID Office of Education

This session addressed the ways in which evaluation designs can be improved in light of USAID's Evaluation Policy. Ron Raphael of the Office of Education and Elizabeth Roen of the Office of Learning, Evaluation and Research opened the session by noting that the new Evaluation Policy aims to address the decline in quality evaluations in recent years by placing new emphasis on the potential of performance and impact evaluations to increase accountability and learning, and demonstrate the outcomes of both large-scale and smaller innovative projects. The presenters contrasted the qualities of performance evaluations (90% of evaluations conducted) and impact evaluations (10% of evaluations conducted). They identified methods for improving evaluation quality, including ensuring sufficient resources (time, budget and human); limiting evaluation questions; using methods appropriate to answering those questions; allowing sufficient time for planning; refining the scope of work; providing deliverables that clearly outline methodology, limitations, sampling strategies, and instruments; and maintaining the independence of evaluators in order to limit bias.

Roger Rasnake and Marcia Odell of JBS International expanded upon this theme by providing recommendations for strengthening evaluation Statements of Work. These include careful definition of research questions, selection of appropriate evaluation methodologies, provision of adequate time to recruit and field an evaluation team, development of a sufficient timeframe for completion of fieldwork, and formulation of an appropriate budget. The presenters reviewed best practices in previously conducted evaluations.

Raphael addressed budgeting concerns in developing an evaluation Statement of Work, and Christine Beggs of USAID's Knowledge Services Center provided examples of reasonable expectations for different types of evaluations. They shared a number of forthcoming evaluation-related resources that will be available online shortly.

Key take away points focused on the fact that USAID's Evaluation Policy calls for a return to rigorous, high-quality evaluation. Guidance on how to improve the quality of the evaluation of education activities encompasses wide-ranging activities, from ensuring that sufficient resources are allocated for the evaluation, to maintaining evaluator independence. Points to remember in developing the evaluation Statement of Work include such core points as choosing realistic research questions, selecting appropriate evaluation methods, and allocating sufficient time and funding for the work to be undertaken. Resources currently being developed to assist education staff with evaluation activities will be available soon.

Gender Issues and the Education Strategy

August 22, 2011 - 3:00 p.m.

Presenter: Julie Hanson Swanson, USAID Bureau for Africa

This interactive session focused on integrating gender into efforts carried out under the new USAID Education Strategy. The Strategy states that USAID education programming should promote gender equality. The interactive session began with a discussion of how gender relates to The Strategy and what terms such as “gender integration” mean in this context. In order to ensure that everyone was on the same page, Julie Hanson Swanson of USAID’s Bureau for Africa elicited participants’ definitions of key terms such as “gender,” “equity,” “parity,” and “equality.” Gender was defined as “the roles and relationships of boys and girls as determined by society, what is masculine and feminine.” Participants felt that understanding different gender issues facing girls and boys and then integrating that knowledge into program planning, implementation and evaluation are essential to achieving educational goals and facilitating gender equity in society.

Participants felt that gender should undergird all work done in relation to the strategy. They repeatedly mentioned gender analysis as a key source of information for both developing strategies that promote gender equity and properly addressing gender issues in programming. Reaching gender equality in educational outcomes is seen as a process during which barriers that affect boys and girls are identified. This ensures the equality of initial and persistent access to formal and informal education, equality in the learning process, and working towards equality of educational outcomes. For example, analyzing the reasons both sexes do not go to school or patterns of classroom participation would aid in the design of programming which levels the playing field for girls and boys. The group noted that a strategy to achieve gender equality would probably involve different programmatic interventions for boys and girls.

Participants brainstormed about what gender integration could look like in relation to the strategy’s three goals. Goal One’s focus on reading outcomes encouraged participants to want sex-disaggregated data about learners and use that to analyze the ability of boys and girls in school to read. Participants linked Goal Two’s focus on tertiary and workforce development programming to equitable access to post-secondary education for boys and girls and to workforce development programs. The discussion of Goal Three focused upon properly defining soldiers so that all affected by being in fighting forces could have equitable access to education.

The presenter described gender-aware and gender-blind approaches to programming (integrating knowledge of gender issues vs. ignoring gender issues) and the continuum of approaches to gender integration in programming (i.e., programs fall along a scale of exploiting, accommodating, or transforming gender norms). The group described programming that fell into those categories. For example, an exploitative program sanctioned male stereotypes of promiscuity and increased condom use, as well as domestic violence. Secret girls’ schools in Afghanistan were seen as accommodating gender norms. A transformative intervention would be the development of reading materials that feature an equal number of males and females or men and women in non-traditional roles. The parents and community need to be involved to achieve a transformative effect.

Key take away points include the definition of gender as the roles and relationships of boys, girls, men and women, as determined by society – of what is masculine and what is feminine. Gender analysis is key to improving the outcomes of education programs. When possible, sex-disaggregated data should be collected. Equitable approaches that level the playing field for boys and girls will lead to equality. Gender norms should not be exploited by programming. While accommodating gender norms may be necessary, it is important to think about ways to transform gender norms—for example, to consider the depiction of men and women in learning materials.

Effective Principles of Inclusion and Disability Programming **August 22, 2011 — 1:45 p.m.**

Presenter: Judith Heumann, Special Advisor to the U.S Department of State, International Disability Rights

Moderator: Anthony Bloome, USAID Office of Education

Judith Heumann noted that in spite of the recent renewed focus of USAID and others on disability, programmers and implementers lack substantial information on how to move forward with inclusive education. The main issue is how to share knowledge about successful inclusive education as a guide that enables other countries to promote the effective practices necessary to meet the education needs of all children, including children with disabilities (CWD).

The World Health Organization estimates that fifteen percent of the world's children can be categorized as disabled. Heumann discussed the factors that need attention to make education for the disabled an essential part of the greater effort for universal education. Appropriately trained teachers are critical. However, special education teachers are not needed as much as regular classroom teachers with effective pre-service teacher development that prepares them to address the diverse range of learners. Persons with disabilities and parents that are driving forces for improved services for their children need to be supported in their advocacy efforts to influence social change. Effective inclusive education demands collaborative efforts of all donors and implementers. Physical accessibility of schools is a key factor that needs to be kept in mind when focusing on providing education. Technology that is accessible to persons with disabilities and improves their learning opportunities needs to be supported in development and expanded on a greater scale.

General discussion after the presentation focused on the possibility of future USAID funding for inclusion efforts when disability is not mentioned in the new education strategy. Responses from the presenter and others noted that disability can be included holistically in initiatives in other sectors, e.g. health, economic growth, and democracy and governance, thereby creating a space to identify and focus attention on disability issues. When stakeholders see the benefit of inclusive efforts in other sectors, the need to expand inclusive education gains prominence. The discussion stimulated participants to share examples of programming in the health and economic growth sectors that successfully involved persons with disabilities and led to an understanding of how practices can be expanded across sectors and into education.

Key take away points highlighted the collaborative efforts between donors and implementers needed for effective practices in inclusive education to be shared between countries. Thorough assessment is essential to collect baselines for the participation of the disabled. Objective information about effective inclusive practices on a country-level is needed to guide national scaling efforts and program expansion. Data on education of CWD, including academic performance scores, should be included at all reporting levels so teachers and schools are accountable for education of children with disabilities. Effective inclusive education needs to be based on the understanding that all children benefit from education and concentrated efforts in the sector should ensure that the learning needs of all children are being met.

Early Grade Reading Session Summaries

From Assessment to Action: Designing Reading Interventions to Reach Goal 1

August 22, 2011 — 3:45 p.m.

Presenters: David Bruns, USAID/Mali
Sylvia Linan-Thompson, RTI International

Moderator: Mitch Kirby, USAID Bureau for Asia and the Middle East

This session provided an overview of the key technical issues to consider when designing reading programs and aligning education programming with Goal 1 of the new 2011 USAID Education Strategy: Improved reading skills for 100 million children in primary grades by 2015. Mitch Kirby shared an anecdote from USAID/India to illustrate the challenges that arose when aligning a project to Goal 1 of the new strategy and to describe the process of designing an aligned program from the beginning. USAID/India's education program focused on teacher training, but did not provide for measuring students' learning outcomes until year eight of the program. In short, this meant that the program was not focused on student outcomes and therefore could not be considered in alignment with Goal 1. USAID/Washington and USAID/India decided to look into what an aligned program might look like if it were created from scratch.

Sylvia Linan-Thompson affirmed that knowing what constitutes effective classrooms and effective systems is essential to successful program design. She reviewed the key components of reading programs: (a) assessment and measurement; (b) teaching the teachers; (c) aligning standards, curriculum and materials; (d) school management, governance and accountability, and community participation; and (e) going to scale (making sure systems are in place to ensure sustainability). Linan-Thompson illustrated the steps for analyzing the type of evidence-based programming needed in a brief discussion of each of these components.

Programming elements include: (a) reliable data; (b) in-service and pre-service teacher training in pedagogy, assessment, and content; (c) management capacity and shared goals, distributive responsibilities, and accountability processes; (d) willingness within the system to change; (e) the time needed to teach reading; and (f) building experimentation into design. Key points for further consideration were: (a) renewed emphasis on analysis, evidence-based programming, and analytic rigor; (b) determination of the appropriate mix and sequence for reading interventions (curriculum, standards, materials in context); (c) analytic approach (including appropriate metrics to measure the right kinds of things at the right times); and (d) the identification of entry and exit points in country context in order to increase sustainability.

David Bruns provided a perspective from the field that confirmed the importance of the mix and sequence of reading interventions. He noted that the decision tree for a reading program in Mali touched on all of the aforementioned program elements. The program was eventually scaled up to the national level. Bruns also highlighted the importance of understanding the local context when training teachers. The teachers in Mali, for example, did not expect their children to read until the end of primary school. When teachers' classroom behavior did not change, USAID/Mali had to provide more training to change their attitudes.

Key take away points: Goal 1 programs focus on and measure success through learning outcomes. Emerging evidence shows that in effective classrooms, teachers: (a) are knowledgeable about how children learn and how to teach children to read, (b) have materials that support teaching and learning, (c) have adequate time to teach reading, and (d) use formative and summative assessment in making decisions. Effective systems: (a) use assessment data to identify strengths and areas for development, (b)

ensure that there is adequate time for teaching, (c) support teachers to continue to grow as professionals, and (d) commit resources. Measurement and evaluation should be considered from the start and there is a renewed emphasis on analysis, evidence-based programming and analytic rigor.

Teach the Teachers (and Their Supervisors): System Strengthening for Improving Teacher Effectiveness

August 23, 2011 — 3:45 p.m.

Presenters: Marcia Davidson, RTI International
Norma Evans, Education Development Center

Moderator: Penelope Bender, USAID Office of Education

Penelope Bender noted that teacher quality is the key factor in improving student learning outcomes in spite of the fact that teacher-training practice does not have a good track record in changing behaviors and improving learning performance. This session presented good practices that are showing a positive impact on improved student literacy outcomes in several country programs.

Using examples from the Liberia Teacher Training Project II, Marcia Davidson discussed effective classroom reading instruction which involves (a) adequate time for reading, (b) consistent instructional routines (especially for teachers with low reading levels and poor qualifications), and (c) availability of enough appropriate material for children to read independently. Face-to-face training is followed by structured opportunities for teachers to apply new practices and training coaches frequently visit teachers in their classrooms to observe, test students, and give feedback.

Norma Evans presented evidence from the Whole School Reading Program (WSRP) in the Philippines which works with teachers and students together to improve reading skills. She noted that effective teacher training needs to (a) be sustained over time, intensive, and connected to practice (b) be embedded in larger professional preparation, (c) use the same types of activities as students will use, and (d) deliver content knowledge appropriate to the needs of the classroom. Both presenters emphasized the need for continuous assessment of students' reading achievement to ensure that students are actually learning as a result of investments in teacher training.

Questions from the audience focused on bilingual instruction, minimum levels of teacher content knowledge needed, addressing learning disabilities, and scaling up materials development programs. Answers from the presenters invariably focused on the need for funders and decision-makers to understand the importance of teaching reading well and to provide for the requisite time and steps involved to thoroughly train teachers.

Key take away points included an emphasis on the use of prolonged, structured training to build consistent and accurate teaching routines that enable teachers to actually understand the necessary mechanics of teaching reading. Various types of on-going assessment are crucial, including continuous classroom assessment, progress monitoring of long-term goals, and evaluation of teacher training programs. Stakeholders, including teachers themselves, need to see that investments in training actually result in improved student performance. Stakeholders also need to understand that while time focused on early reading may detract from time spent on other subjects, children who learn early to read well will do better in all of their subsequent learning.

If You Print it, Will They Read? Aligning Standards, Curriculum, and Reading Material to Ensure Success

August 24, 2011 — 11:30 a.m.

Presenter: Stephanie Al-Otaiba, Florida State University

Commentators: Cory Heyman, Room to Read
Julia Richards, USAID/Liberia
Mary Spor, Alabama A&M University

Moderator: Catherine Powell Miles, USAID Bureau for Africa

This presentation focused on the development of reading materials. Stephanie Al-Otaiba emphasized that country reading standards, addressing all program components such as activities, curricula, and materials development, should guide program implementation to the end goal of reading proficiency. Core reading programs should follow a hierarchy of instruction, moving sequentially from the easiest skills to the final outcome of reading fluency. Materials should likewise align in timing, word recognition, etc. with classroom instruction to ensure a coordinated path towards the literacy outcomes.

Julia Richards, from USAID/Liberia, noted that standards for reading are rarely available in developing countries. The alignment of the curriculum with teacher training and materials development is extremely time intensive, requiring systemization of goals and outcomes that are relative to local context in sequence and appropriateness when developing the reading program. Teachers often do not use materials, and when they do, they are often not in synch with the sequence of learning objectives and tasks. She further noted the need for materials to be attractive to both children and parents so that children are motivated and encouraged to develop an interest in reading and practice what they learn outside of the classroom.

Based on experience with a program in Ethiopia, Mary Spor reiterated the importance of attractiveness. The program found that materials needed to be both appealing and embedded in teacher training so that teachers learned how to use them effectively with students. Cory Heyman noted that Room-to-Read works with governments to identify a country's reading standards, current gaps in children's knowledge, and ways to fill the knowledge gaps through development of appropriate materials.

During the following discussion, participants and presenters alike remarked on all of the factors involved and how expensive and time-consuming it is to teach literacy. Room-to-Read facilitates the growth of local publishing capacity in order to ensure development of appropriate, cost-effective materials. USAID will work selectively with countries that already have reading curricula in place but need assistance to jump-start programs.

Key take away points noted by all presenters were that children will use and learn from materials, but that materials have to be appropriate, sequenced, and linked to classroom instruction. Standards should guide content identification, materials development, and teacher training. Literacy efforts are very expensive, but the alternative—children who are unable to read—is unacceptable. Implementers need to base program execution on world-wide lessons learned to ensure efficient and timely programming.

Contributions of School Management, Governance and Accountability, and Community Participation to Children's Learning Outcomes: A Conversation
August 24, 2011 — 3:45 p.m.

Presenters: Mariam Britel-Swift, USAID/Morocco
Jean Beaumont, Juarez & Associates
John Collins, USAID/Malawi
Aabira Sher Afghan, USAID/Malawi
Claire Spence, USAID/Jamaica
Jennifer Spratt, RTI International
Muhammad Tariq Khan, USAID/Pakistan
Luis Tolley, USAID/Ghana
Mary Tyler Holmes, USAID/Zambia

Moderator: Rebecca Adams, USAID Bureau for Asia and the Middle East

This session discussed recent evidence and distilled key lessons learned on the effect of school management, governance and accountability, and community participation on children's learning outcomes. A diverse group of panelists shared their experiences from the field. To set the framework for the dialogue, the moderator began with a discussion of three development trends that have driven a resurgence in interest in the relevant factors that govern student performance: (a) school decentralization in the 1990s, (b) the conceptual convergence between the underlying elements that determine learning outcomes (Opportunities to Learn) and service delivery models, and (c) an increase in rigorous field studies on accountability.

Panelists explained how current and past projects to strengthen practices at the teacher, community, and national levels affected learning outcomes. Mariam Britel-Swift designed a component to train leaders in teacher support and developed new teacher training based on modules informed by best practices. Muhammad Tariq Khan spoke about an early childhood education program to retain girls in school that achieved a 95% retention rate through changes in pedagogical methods by targeting teachers, head teachers, and community members. In a similar vein, Claire Spence and Jean Beaumont targeted teachers to increase student proficiency in reading and mathematics. They developed instruments to assess proficiency in early grades and used the data to drive teacher training.

Aabira Sher Afghan's project in Malawi targeted the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MoEST) to improve efficiencies in the procurement system. Through this pilot, schools were able to gain some autonomy. Luis Tolley's project in Ghana aims to increase data-driven decisions at the local government level and increase community participation to improve accountability. ~~The last panelist,~~ Mary Tyler Holmes shared her projects in Zambia on community participation and information and communication technology (ICT) interventions to strengthen education management. The school water and sanitation facilities program, in which the community participates by supplying its own materials and labor, led to a greater retention rate of girls in schools. The ICT intervention resulted in personnel efficiencies by helping to computerize all paper-based files within the Ministry of Education.

Key take away points include the evidence and key lessons learned in school management, governance and accountability, and community participation shared in this session. Panelists described recent and current projects to strengthen practices at the teacher, community, and national level that affected learning outcomes.

Improving Literacy Instruction: Lessons Learned from Latin America **August 25, 2011 — 11:30 a.m.**

Presenters: Roger Rasnake, JBS International, Inc.
Kevin Roberts, USAID/Dominican Republic
Mirka Tvaruzkova, JBS International, Inc.

Moderator: Barbara Knox-Seith, USAID Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean

This session focused on lessons learned over a decade through the Centers for Excellence in Teacher Training (CETT)—a regional USAID program supporting innovation in teacher training in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC). The program was created to improve the pedagogical skills of teachers in the first, second, and third grades in economically disadvantaged communities in the region. Concepts and techniques used in the program were based on research in international best practices in teacher training and literacy instruction. Barbara Knox-Seith highlighted some of the key outcomes of the program: 35,095 teachers and administrators were trained in interactive methods of literacy instruction, and the program reached over 799,000 students in twenty-one countries. Teachers made significant changes in their performance in the classroom by adopting new teaching techniques. Student reading test scores over the course of the school year improved significantly. CETT was able to achieve its objectives through strong partnerships with the program's local implementers.

A series of white papers was created to document the lessons learned in over nine years of program implementation. The papers addressed key topics such as fostering a paradigm shift around literacy, and the challenges of measuring learning, sustainability, and cost-effectiveness in a regional initiative. In terms of fostering a paradigm shift around literacy, some of the key lessons learned were: (a) all stakeholders noted an immense change in their perception of the importance of teaching reading and writing in early grades; (b) teachers, principals, and parents gained a new understanding of the importance of their role in helping students learn to read and write; (c) CETT staff, trainers, and teachers noted the importance of principals' support in effecting change; (d) implementing institutions sustained CETT operations by becoming experts in teacher training and literacy; and (e) the CETTs had an important influence on how key stakeholders understand the importance of early grade reading and a "culture of literacy."

As a regional program, one of the challenges the program faced was getting multiple countries to work in unison. While program design took only one year, facilitating consensus and harmony among countries took from three to four years. CETT established three hubs which served as the headquarters for each sub-region: Central America and the Dominican Republic (CETT CA-RD) housed in Honduras, the Caribbean (C-CETT) located in Jamaica, and the Andes (CETT Andino) centered in Peru. Even though the program had many components, the countries learned to work well together. CETT faced challenges related to the variations in implementation and the ability of regional assessment efforts to accommodate differences between individual country cultures and education systems. Though the CETTs did not initially see the need to test students, standardized tests were ultimately created. The sustainability of the program was based on four factors. *Political sustainability* was ensured when implementing partners' strong relationship with ministries of education (MOEs) made it possible to withstand political turnovers and maintain relationships across the political spectrum. *Financial sustainability* was ensured when public-private partnerships created benefits for both partners in the program. *Institutional sustainability* was ensured when implementing institutions sustained CETT operations by becoming experts in teacher training and literacy. *Social sustainability* was ensured when CETT had an important influence on how key stakeholders understand the importance of early grade reading.

Kevin Roberts from USAID/Dominican Republic (DR) added a field perspective as he spoke about the experience of being part of CETT from the DR's point of view. The Dominican Republic is considered one of the most successful countries of the program since CETT became a national initiative. An extensive discussion took place following the formal presentations with contributions from a number of Mission staff from other CETT countries sharing their experiences and answering questions from the audience.

Key take away points: The Centers for Excellence in Teacher Training (CETT) were created to improve pedagogical skills of teachers in the first, second, and third grades in economically disadvantaged communities in Latin America and the Caribbean. Although there were some challenges, the CETTs enjoyed many successes: (a) reading test scores improved, (b) teachers adopted new teaching techniques and made significant changes in their classroom performance, (c) 35,095 teachers and administrators were trained in interactive methods of literacy instruction, and (d) the program reached over 799,000 students in twenty-one countries.

Information and Communication Technologies Session Summaries

(ICT) Leveraging Technology for Education in Complex and Challenging Environments

August 23, 2011 – 11:30 a.m.

Presenters: Mike Laffin, Education Development Center
David Yunger, Microsoft
Lou August, World Vision International
David Atchoarena, UNESCO

Moderator: Anthony Bloome, USAID Office of Education

Moderator Anthony Bloome introduced the session and set the following as a premise for the use and effectiveness of educational technology: devices and software can only be as good as their users, and must serve a learning outcome if they are to add value for education.

This theme was echoed by the presenters, each of whom highlighted the critical roles that community engagement and design iteration play in the success of educational technology programs. Mike Laffin of EDC pointed to his experiences delivering interactive radio instruction (IRI) at scale in the Sudan, a project seeking to address dire needs in basic education services. Laffin indicated that the use of formative evaluations for iterative improvements determines the success or failure of a project, particularly one attempting to deliver a full curriculum to large populations.

UNESCO's David Atchoarena also acknowledged the vital role that partnerships play in increasing the knowledge base of best practices in the ICT for Education field overall, and noted the ever-increasing importance of inter-organizational knowledge sharing. Lou August from World Vision International and David Yunger from Microsoft similarly identified the fruitful partnerships their organizations are involved in, ranging from local community organizations to international content and hardware providers. World Vision is currently working in several places to convert community centers into connected *telecenters*, though August noted that creating the right physical conditions and finding local and passionate people for success is often challenging.

Each of the presenters made it clear that their projects hinge on the support and alignment with host country governments' plans and goals. Microsoft's ongoing work in Haiti began with an "Envisioning Workshop" with the Ministry of Education, designed to ensure that project activities would be complementary to the Haitian Government's long-term strategy. Audience members asked whether lack of buy-in from teachers or students had hindered success in the presenters' work, however the panelists responded that buy-in from central level stakeholders was more frequently an issue, and that their concerns often centered around learning outcomes and cost.

"We know that, no matter what, it is *never* the learners' fault" said EDC's Mike Laffin, when asked about how to design successfully for scale. "We must ask, 'overall, are kids learning?' And if they are not, it is our job to find out why."

Key take away points: Technology can be a useful learning tool in complex and challenging environments. Telecenters around the world, IRI in Sudan, and the creation of partnership around the world, are all endeavors working to create conditions that are sustainable for learning through technology.

ICT for Public/Private Sector Partnership: Maximizing Opportunities for Scale and Impact

August 24, 2011 – 11:30 a.m.

Presenters: Julie Clugage, Intel Corporation
Carol Sakoian, Scholastic International
Gabriel Kahan, BrainPOP Latin America
James Bernard, Microsoft Corporation

Moderator: Lynn Nolan, International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE)

This session presented current examples of public/private sector partnerships and some of the ideas around which the programs are centered. Panelists discussed the scope, location, and impact of current education projects and the values and challenges in building public/private partnerships. Participants' questions focused on the scope, accessibility, and tensions over competing interests and differing budget cycles that may occur between the public and private sector.

James Bernard of Microsoft talked about the *Partners in Learning* program, a 10-year \$500 million program designed to help transform education systems around the world. Working in partnership with public sector entities at the national level and donors like USAID, the program is centered on a few key ideas: student-centered learning, support for innovative teachers and school leaders, and forward-looking schools. These support systems provide the mechanisms through which innovative teaching practices can be scaled up from the classroom to the education system. Julie Clugage from Intel gave examples of some of the roughly 200 education programs that Intel has rolled out in 80 countries. Intel has developed programs to address inadequacies in teacher training and advocated for progressive student skill development through the *Intel Learn Program* that helps students use technology to solve problems within their communities. Partnering with USAID, Intel implemented a higher education project to train faculty and update curriculum in major engineering colleges across Vietnam.

Gabriel Kahan from BrainPop Latin America discussed the scope of his company's work in Latin America. In partnership with ministries of education, BrainPOP develops online learning content for students and establishes rural community centers to improve access to these resources. BrainPop's material reaches over 10 million users worldwide in six languages. Carol Sakoian of Scholastic International emphasized the importance of reading in developing contexts. Scholastic has created a children's "Reading Bill of Rights" that is aligned with Goal 1 of USAID's new Education Strategy. To support this, Scholastic has implemented programs in both traditional print and digital formats such as DVDs, online content, and e-books.

Lynn Nolan discussed ISTE's role in developing international standards and providing professional development for educators. Nolan talked about the need for benchmarks and how the partnerships that ISTE has developed have been crucial in promoting standards that will take root and become useful tools for development.

Key take away points from this session highlight the current public/private sector partnerships of the presenters, and the experience that such partnerships can be valuable mechanisms for bringing programs to scale. Several of the panelists encouraged workshop participants to research existing, well-known public/private partnerships when they need to leverage program resources, as several partnership models are known to be beneficial and can serve as examples for future endeavors.

Open Educational Resources: Increasing Access While Improving Quality

August 24, 2011 — 3:45 p.m.

Presenters: Catherine M. Casserly, Creative Commons
Hal Plotkin, U.S. Department of Education
Asha Kanwar, Commonwealth of Learning
Fred Mednick, Teachers Without Borders
Catherine Ngugi, OER Africa

Moderators: Kathy Nicholson, The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation
Anthony Bloome, USAID Office of Education

This session focused on how Open Educational Resources (OER) can simultaneously improve access to educational content and improve educational quality by personalizing teaching and learning and aggregating resources. OER is a global movement concerned with improving access, quality, and usability of education content for teachers and students through the use of openly-licensed content and technology.

Members of the panel presented OER programs worldwide to illustrate how teaching, learning, and research content are digitized, made freely available in the public domain, and released under an intellectual property license that permits free use and repurposing by others. Panelists pointed out that in many instances the “remix and reuse” of OER has led to radically reduced material costs.

Kathy Nicholson from The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation emphasized five benefits of OER: (a) the ability to make continuous improvements to enhance learning, (b) the ability to localize content, (c) accessibility for all, (d) greater learning efficiencies, and (e) radically reduced costs. Nicholson stated that OER’s goals are to equalize knowledge and improve teacher learning. Catherine Ngugi of OER Africa shared some examples of OER best practices in Africa, where reading programs have been developed at both regional (80%) and national (20%) levels. Hal Plotkin from the U.S. Department of Education highlighted the Obama administration’s efforts to support OER since the beginning of its term and emphasized the national and worldwide importance of this initiative.

The panelists stressed the advantage to educational institutions of using OER and customizing the professional development courses they offer to their teachers. Embracing OER often provides educational institutions with frameworks, tools, and models that help teachers learn and adopt innovative, inquiry-based teaching methods. The increased breadth of educational resources also encourages improved critical analysis by students. This open learning environment raises the bar of education quality. Materials can now be downloaded and adapted to different needs. The panel ended the presentation by stating that it is necessary to increase awareness of the availability of OER because OER can help achieve education development goals in a scalable, practical, and cost-effective way. Agencies can encourage open licenses via grant-making programs, supportive infrastructure projects, and partnership development.

Key take away points stress that OERs can improve access to education by personalization of teaching and learning, and the proper aggregation of resources. The use of OER has five potential benefits: continuous improvements to enhance learning, localized content, accessibility for all, greater learning efficiencies, and reduced costs. The Obama administration supports the importance of OER nationally and internationally, and organizations such as OER Africa are using Open Educational Resources to develop reading programs.

Assistive Technology and Education

August 25, 2011 — 11:30 a.m.

Presenters: Steven Rothstein, Perkins School for the Blind
David Morrissey, United States International Council on Disability

Moderator: Anthony Bloome, USAID Office of Education

This panel, conducted as a roundtable discussion, focused on the needs of children with disabilities and some of the actions being taken from a policy and program perspective. Presenters highlighted both “high-tech” and “low-tech” methods for engaging children with disabilities in the classroom and international conventions designed to improve the lives of people with disabilities. Participants shared challenges and opportunities in working with parents and communities, approaching governments, and engaging media to further the cause of education for children with disabilities.

David Morrissey shared his organization’s experience as an advocate for ratification and implementation of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) and its effort to compile a Disability Rights Library with best practices and lessons learned from organizations and programs all over the world. The library is an especially important project because many countries do not have any civil rights legislation geared to persons with disabilities. Morrissey commented on the importance of media organizations and religious communities in de-stigmatizing disability and encouraging parental involvement. He emphasized the importance of highlighting the accomplishments of programs that focus on disability and education.

Steven Rothstein provided background information on the history and work of the Perkins School for the Blind, based on the idea that all children can learn, no matter what their disability. He demonstrated some of the “low-tech” objects that can be used in classrooms as teaching tools for children with visual or motor-skills impairments and described voice-guided computers and other “high-tech” instruments that can also be used to help children with disabilities learn. Rothstein also highlighted the importance of addressing children’s needs with both public policy and grassroots efforts, where governments are involved but individual schools, parent groups, and communities take the initiative to implement small-scale changes that can spread and create large-scale change.

Participant comments focused on advocacy—working with government ministries and the challenges of working in places where there is widespread discrimination. The discussion focused on how best to get the word out in those contexts. Participants also voiced their concerns about funding for disability-oriented programs that often do not fit the mold of a particular sector. The group indicated that some organizations in the field encounter the challenge of scaling up disability-oriented programs.

Key take away points: Development organizations face multiple challenges in providing access to quality education for children with disabilities. Monitoring and evaluation, cooperation, and sharing best practices and lessons learned among these organizations will be the key to empowering families and communities to provide the opportunity for the children who are capable of learning and thriving. Assistive technologies are not always high-tech or costly and affordable options are often available.

Crisis/Conflict Settings Session Summaries

Education and Conflict: What Do We Know? **August 23, 2011 – 11:30 a.m.**

Presenters: Yolande Miller-Grandvaux, USAID Office of Education
Dana Burde, New York University
Henrik Urdal, Harvard University

The presenters in this session discussed findings from recent qualitative and quantitative research regarding the relationship between education and conflict. Dana Burde of New York University and Henrik Urdal of Harvard University acknowledged that ‘education and conflict’ is a recent field of study that currently lacks data from past evidence-based studies. Both strongly supported the need for more research to understand the entire spectrum of the relationship between education and conflict. Drawing from limited data and recent studies, the presenters briefly highlighted key challenges, suggestions and a way forward. They established that past research does not indicate a direct causal relationship between education and conflict and/or conflict mitigation and that this relationship remains under-explored.

Research suggests that education may have the potential to mitigate conflict, depending on its content and quality, as well as on access. Education content that is inclusive, non-discriminatory and related to peace and reconciliation offers such promise since data show fewer conflicts when there is an increase in higher levels of education in general. Burde emphasized that messages sent to children in their formative years are critical and that education content must be designed to provide appropriate messages to lessen conflict. Reducing inequality in education is also important. There is some evidence that when any threat to education is reduced, both boys and girls are willing to go to school. Community education, activities that engage communities in a non-formal way, and initiatives to protect girls – having female school attendants or teaching assistants, for instance – have all shown some positive effect in providing safer access to education for all children, especially girls. These initiatives ensure that children have a safe way to commute to school and are not faced with sexual exploitation or abuse on school premises.

Quality in education benefits from teacher training, special interventions in conflict areas, and action based on evidence of what works; the presenters discussed these as some of the issues that differ between stable and conflict regions. For example, it is beneficial for an education system to acknowledge that the trauma faced by children in conflict and/or crisis areas may affect their learning. It is helpful to recognize the need to provide assistance to children to manage trauma better and thereby promote effective learning, rather than just provide access to education. For this reason, quality of education in conflict and post-conflict regions must be addressed differently from quality of education elsewhere.

As discussed above, Urdal pointed out that higher levels of education may have positive effects on mitigating conflict in a variety of situations. Yet actors or participants in terrorist activities are often more educated than the average person in the society. He emphasized that it is important to understand the interplay of education’s content, quality and access in order to reconcile such apparently contradictory realities.

Key take away points encompassed the importance of including education as part of a humanitarian response in conflict areas. Burde explained that the rise of education during emergencies shapes the way an education system evolves in the region. Both speakers supported the idea that providing education programs in areas where there is a stable government is different from providing these in regions that have an unstable government. People’s perception of the government affects the reception of programs offered by the government. The presenters proposed that more data from evidence-based education programs and an understanding of problems specific to conflict regions are areas that can help planning for both short-term and long-term approaches to development in these regions.

Integrating Preparedness and Recovery Planning into Education Programs

August 23, 2011 - 3:45 p.m.

Presenters: Marla Petal, Risk Reduction Education for Disasters (Risk RED)
Marleen Wong, University of Southern California (USC)

Moderator: Marion Pratt, USAID Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance

This session, moderated by Marion Pratt of USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, underlined the importance in school systems of preparedness and recovery from disasters or crises. Marla Petal of Risk RED, in focusing on preparedness, provided an overview about comprehensive school safety and 'disaster-proofing' in the education sector. Marleen Wong from the University of Southern California (USC) focused on the mental health aspect of recovery for children affected by a disaster or crisis.

Petal addressed the three key areas in disaster-proofing education programs – risk assessment and planning, physical and environmental protection, and response capacity development – by giving examples for each. She spoke briefly about the three goals of comprehensive school safety: 1) student and staff protection, 2) educational continuity, and 3) a culture of safety. An education system needs to establish an incident command response system, and drills and/or simulations need to be carried out. An incident command response will aid response and recovery operations that are appropriate for different levels of disaster or crisis. Petal suggested developing different scenarios for drills and simulations to make them as realistic as possible.

Marleen Wong of USC spoke about the challenges that school systems face regarding response and recovery during a disaster or crisis, since the mission of schools emphasizes academics and testing – even though during such an event it is critical to address immediately the emotional needs of students. The education system needs to stabilize students emotionally and schools need to provide psychological first aid to facilitate that process. Post-traumatic stress disorder has an emotional, cognitive, and neurological impact on an individual affected by disaster or crisis, and has serious implications for children between the ages of 1 to 5. Thus it is crucial that the mental health of children be addressed to enable children affected by a disaster or crisis to function and to regain their emotional well-being.

During the Question and Answer part of the session, Wong highlighted the importance of addressing the mental health of children; research has found a correlation between traumatized children and a lowering of IQ, engagement in high-risk behaviors, and experiencing higher rates of suspension and expulsion from schools; all of these affect learning outcomes. Similarly, Petal noted the importance of addressing loss and grief during a child's recovery, which is commonly overlooked until a later stage in a child's life.

Key take away points include the importance of establishing an incident command response system, including drills and/or simulations, to help prepare for a disaster in an academic institution or education program. It is equally important for the education system to respond quickly during the recovery phase to address children's emotional needs and to help reinstate children's emotional well-being.

Assessing Conflict for Improved Education Programs

August 24, 2011 – 3:45 p.m.

Presenters: Yolande Miller-Grandvaux, USAID Office of Education
Cynthia Irmer, U.S. Department of State
Christina Ciak, USAID Office of Military Affairs

This discussion centered on the problems with planning and implementing education programs in conflict zones. Presenters suggested that it is often hard to identify the many actors, circumstances and relationships in such areas. This makes it difficult to plan for programs that address the problems of conflict in education in an effective and culturally sensitive way.

Yolande Miller-Grandvaux of the USAID Office of Education opened the session by stressing the importance of monitoring and evaluation to ensure program effectiveness. When it comes to education in conflict areas, there are not many assessment frameworks to consider. Miller-Grandvaux indicated there are two assessment tools, one developed by the U.S. Department of State and one by USAID's Office of Military Affairs (OMA).

Cynthia Lerner of the U.S. Department of State introduced the first of these tools, the Interagency Conflict Assessment Framework (ICAF). The ICAF involves embassy staff going to the field to conduct interviews and "bring the words of the people" back with them. The ICAF seeks to understand sources of conflict and resiliency at the local, national and international levels, and stresses taking a systems approach to conflict and resilience that is more conflict-sensitive and less intrusive than that of some other models.

Christina Ciak of the Office of Military Affairs at USAID talked about the second tool, the District Stability Framework (DSF). The DSF seeks to delineate local populations and their environment, implement activities to address local concerns, and measure effectiveness in reducing and eliminating local concerns that could lead to conflict. This framework has been tested in Afghanistan, but since there was interest in applying it to other contexts as well, it has been piloted in Garissa, Kenya. The DSF can ultimately precede education programming by identifying sources of instability, encourage program officers/partners think about obstacles to implementing education programs in conflict areas, and help different organizations communicate with other stakeholders.

Key take away points were that the field of education in conflict will receive increased attention in the future and will need effective frameworks that identify sources of conflict and already-established resilience structures that can be incorporated into programming. While the frameworks presented are still evolving, they are a good first step. Monitoring and evaluation of education programs in conflict areas will be absolutely essential to identifying best practices and programming future activities.

Higher Education Session Summaries

Higher Education Institution Assessments August 22, 2011 - 1:45 p.m.

Presenters: Azra Nurkic, Higher Education for Development (HED)
Cornelia Flora, Iowa State University

Moderator: Gary Bittner, USAID Office of Education

Azra Nurkic and Cornelia Flora presented guidelines for building partnerships between U.S. and host country tertiary institutions. Nurkic opened the session with an overview of HED's work supporting higher education partnerships with USAID, and described how projects can show results with greater efficacy by developing results-oriented planning from project inception; implementing regular data collection; and monitoring project outcomes specifically for results. She then summarized USAID and HED's process of creating requests for applications (RFAs) for higher education institution partnerships, a rigorous, peer-reviewed process.

Flora, of Iowa State University, focused in greater detail on a performance-oriented approach through the example of the Higher Education for Africa Initiative (HEAI). This program utilized USAID's results-oriented approach and included a long term perspective, though this was difficult to do when results were expected after only 18 months. Flora explained some of the indicators that promote quality partnerships, such as a desire for human capacity development, a replacement and retention plan, and training for people already employed by the host institution. A successful participant in the program has work experience in the field, works at the partner institution, demonstrates leadership and innovation, and has a research plan derived from institutional priorities. A successful U.S. partner institution has a history of on-going involvement in Africa, rewards research and service in this area through promotion and tenure, is committed to working closely with the USAID mission, and is willing to leverage resources. Flora also stressed the importance of a U.S.-based advisor who has an interest in the area and who will work together to maintain ties past the end of the partnership.

Some participants were concerned that because U.S. institutions are not providing good workforce training, it is not effective for them to be instructing host country institutions in this area. Moderator Gary Bittner explained that the partnership allows both institutions to find new innovative results instead of one institution dictating to the other. A representative from American Councils for Education inquired about the presence of HED programs in Eastern Europe, specifically Ukraine, as there are many institutions there that could benefit from such a program. HED has four programs in Eastern Europe, and as the United State's interest shifts away from this area, there may be less in the coming years. Nurkic suggested that these universities look to the European Council (EC) for guidance in such areas, as the EC's interest in Eastern Europe is strengthening.

Key take-away points included the necessity of rigorous monitoring and evaluation with results in mind from the start. Successful partnerships occur between institutions that respect each other and view each other as peers, not those who take the teacher/student model. This session presented useful and detailed guidelines for building partnerships between U.S. and host country tertiary institutions.

Increasing Capacity for and Quality of Research in Higher Education August 22, 2011 – 3:45 p.m.

Presenters: Teshome Alemneh, Higher Education for Development (HED)
Dan Davidson, American Councils for International Education
Brian Darmody, University of Maryland
Marilyn Pifer, CRDF Global

Moderator: Luba Fajfer, USAID Bureau for Europe and Eurasia

This session focused on activities connected to Goal 2 of the new USAID Education Strategy: “Improved ability of *tertiary and workforce development* programs to produce a workforce with relevant skill to support country’s development goals.” Teshome Alemneh briefly explained the functions of HED as a grant managing institution and its role in implementing partnerships between U.S. universities and host country higher education institutions. Though varying according to demands from host countries, HED supports programs representing a range of disciplines such as business, agriculture, education, and health. These areas contribute to human and institutional capacity building in host countries and ultimately benefit the United States.

The speakers highlighted examples from initiatives in Africa and Russia, such as the Basic Research and Higher Education (BRHE) and Enhancing University Research and Entrepreneurial Capacity (EURECA) models, to elaborate on the importance of higher education in host countries. The panelists stated that research in universities has the potential to contribute towards development. In this context, they discussed the importance and benefits of partnering with universities in United States that share common research interests. Higher education (HE) was emphasized as a mechanism to address developmental challenges. Speakers briefly discussed ongoing partnerships with U.S. universities, the role of HED and its six sponsoring associations that are enhancing the scope for higher education in addressing developmental issues. HE partnerships were identified as cost-effective and sustainable mechanisms to solve problems, reach out to local communities, and result in long term mutual benefits.

All presenters expressed the view that the field of science and technology has the potential to bring about social and economic development. The common challenge faced by host countries (in this case, various African countries and Russia) was finding ways to attract more students to pursue science and technology courses and research. There has been an increase in the number of graduates in social sciences and humanities but not in science and technology related programs. Publishing, as identified as a research capacity indicator, is almost non-existent in Africa, with only about 48 researchers per million inhabitants.

All speakers stressed that USAID’s new Education Strategy strives to develop long-term relationships among stakeholders to ensure that programs are sustainable. Political support and private sector involvement were found to be critical for program sustainability.

Key take away points include the importance of higher education partnerships in contributing to human and institutional capacity building. These partnerships are often cost effective and offer a mutually beneficial relationships to help solve problems and address developmental challenges.

Application of Science and Technology for Development **August 23, 2011 — 3:45 p.m.**

Presenters: Marilyn Pifer, CDRF Global
Cathy Chan-Halbrendt, University of Hawaii
Tammo Steenhuis, Cornell University

Moderator: Gary Bittner, USAID Office of Education

The wide range of initiatives represented in this session shed light on the nature of innovation and partnership in development and the vital junction of science, technology and business that keeps an economy competitive. As CDRF Global's Marilyn Pifer said in the discussion that followed this session's presentations, "the links between research and business development are not always obvious, particularly to scientists and researchers."

Similarly, the conditions for nurturing relevant and cutting-edge research are not always present, as noted in the presentations on programs in Albania and Ethiopia by Cathy Chan-Halbrendt from the University of Hawaii and Tammo Steenhuis from Cornell University, respectively. In each of these cases, trust building emerged as a common theme and a critical role in developing a fruitful and respectful relationship between institutions, faculty, and leaders of both of the public and private sectors.

Tammo Steenhuis noted that a moderate level of funding was perhaps more likely to correspond with trust building and program flexibility, particularly in the beginning of a partnership between institutions of higher education. For Steenhuis, higher levels of funding tend to correspond with a more rigid program structure that is not often desirable for a budding institutional relationship still looking to further develop its own goals and structures. Cathy Chan-Halbrendt also noted that trust-building can be challenged by the need to quickly show program results and prove program worth to senior faculty. In the case of Albania, for example, in spite of persistent time and funding constraints, Chan-Halbrendt's partnership has shown steady, incremental success in developing a culture of quality research in the agricultural sciences.

In work implemented by CDRF Global, Technology Training Offices (TTOs) are established as meeting grounds where science, industry, and government rally around innovation for development. Working in Russia, the Maghreb, and the Middle East, the TTOs promote dialog, business mentoring, and occasional funding for promising innovators. The TTOs also encourage nuanced understandings of the roles that science and technology can play in wider discussions on growth and openness. Marilyn Pifer described the TTOs as "do-tanks," not "think-tanks," because they are action-oriented and encourage engagement in productive exchange with industry and public sector leaders.

Key take away points: Although these programs are not directly revenue-generating to any large extent, they all share a common conviction that in the long-term, a vibrant, well-supported science and technology research community will lead to sustained development. There is a strong and necessary link between science and technology and development. In developing a fruitful and respectful partnership between institutions, trust is one of the key elements for success.

Mobilizing Higher Education for Development Impact **August 24, 2011 — 10:15 a.m.**

Presenter: Susy Ndaruhutse, CfBT Education Trust

Moderator: Gary Bittner, USAID/Office of Education

This session addressed Goal 2 of the Education Strategy and provided insight into current research on the role of higher education and leadership development. Gary Bittner from USAID's Office of Education introduced the session by discussing the focus on outcomes in USAID's new policy on human and institutional capacity development (HICD). He noted that assessments of higher education institutions are critical in order to show program impact.

Susy Ndaruhutse of the CfBT Education Trust introduced her research into the role that higher education plays in the development of leaders. To date, she has completed Phase One of a three-phase study, including a cross-country data analysis mapping the gross enrollment ratios (GER) of 164 countries against worldwide governance indicators like rule of law, stability, and government effectiveness. Her research team found that there is no one clear purpose for higher education, but rather three broad purposes: (1) to prepare the workforce for the global knowledge economy, (2) to relay the norms, values, and attitudes that are highly influential in the development of civil society, and (3) to help in the creation of elite leaders who are part of a broad middle class of socially engaged individuals.

The length of time for leadership impact to be evident is indicated by findings that the development of leaders through higher education can take over twenty years. By controlling for this time lag, the research team was able to infer causation, rather than just correlation. The findings also show a positive correlation between tertiary GER and indicators of good governance, though other factors are involved. Ndaruhutse explained that higher education is a necessary, but insufficient condition for positive development outcomes, along with political, social, and economic conditions.

Ndaruhutse discussed ways that higher education has contributed to leadership for development, including creating a middle class that can hold leaders accountable and providing skills that allow individuals to become more responsible and adaptable. She noted that although the purpose of higher education institutions has evolved over time—from training the elite, to educating the masses, to providing universal higher education—most developing countries are still at the elite development stage. Donor support for higher education has also gone through cycles and the challenge now is to find the balance between support for basic education and support for higher education.

In Phases Two and Three, Ndaruhutse and her team will conduct further research on what forms of higher education are most influential in the development of leaders. This research will include case studies and lessons learned, and will be available on the CfBT website: www.dlprog.org.

Key take away points: Though it can take a generation or more, higher education has a significant role to play in the creation of development leadership. Higher education is a contributing factor in democratic processes and improved governance.

Increasing Equitable Access in Higher Education: Admissions and Distance Learning

August 24, 2011 - 11:30 a.m.

Presenters: Yarema Bachynsky, American Councils for International Education, USETI Legacy Alliance
Carol Fimmen, Alamo Colleges

Moderators: Roy Zimmermann, Higher Education for Development
Luba Fajfer, USAID Bureau for Europe and Eurasia

This session discussed obstacles to accessing higher education institutions in relationship to Goal 2 of the USAID Education Strategy. This session shared two examples of different types of efforts that aim to strengthen and create sustainable and equitable systems and policies that promote equitable access to higher education: standardized entrance tests in Ukraine and distance learning in Mexico.

Yarema Bachynsky discussed efforts by the Ukrainian Standardized External Testing Initiative (USETI), begun in 2006, to (1) provide assistance with developing and implementing testing and to (2) institutionalize a corruption-free testing system for all students wishing to study in Ukrainian higher education institutions. USETI's expected outcomes include: a testing center that could develop and implement secure tests that meet international standards; public legislative support for testing; partnerships between businesses, higher education, and policy makers; and a high-quality test-preparation industry. According to polls, public support has grown as students have experienced increasingly equitable access to higher education. Best practices include efficient and transparent admissions through public monitoring, adopting effective testing practices used in other countries, and strengthening the legal and regulatory base for testing. Difficulty achieving durable political consensus in Ukraine further increased the importance of alliance building. Partnerships created by the USCETI Alliance with higher education institutions and the private sector have protected the investments made in testing.

Carol Finmen discussed the Partnership to Improve Workforce Productivity of *Maquiladora* Workers along the Texas/Mexico NAFTA Corridor, through which U.S. and Mexican community and technical colleges located on the U.S.-Mexico border collaborated with the goal of providing Mexican youth the skills necessary to attract *maquiladoras* back to the region. Since the year 2000, over 500 *maquiladoras* have closed. Efforts to increase productivity through more sophisticated production processes left many workers without employment. Those most affected were in low-skill, low-wage positions.

Through this joint venture, U.S. partners intended to build the knowledge and teaching capacity of those who would train students, in addition to providing direct training to *maquiladora* workers in skills necessary to operate the enhanced technology. Since the effort began in 2010, ongoing and unpredictable violence led to a sustained ban on travel by U.S.-based university staff to the Mexican side of the border. It was therefore difficult to transmit the courses to six Mexican institutions and find the most effective technology. Owing to their persistence and flexibility, faculty members, lab technicians, and factory workers have participated in online training via NEFSIS web and video conferencing, BlackBoard and existing ESL software packages.

Key take away points show that when entry points to tertiary and workforce development training are eliminated by corrupt behavior or violence, the capacity of a country to develop its workforce is decreased. In conflict and crisis situations, flexibility and ingenuity are necessary to meet objectives. Admissions testing is very complex—it takes time to make sure that you can (1) test what you want to test, (2) have a relevant item bank, (3) ensure that students can train and learn how to take the test, and

(4) ensure the test's security from development to transmission to those administering the tests countrywide and that no one can corrupt the results.

Higher Education and Work Force Development: Transition to Entrepreneurship and Employment

August 25, 2011- 11:30 a.m.

Presenters: Robert McKinley, University of Texas – San Antonio
C. Howard Williams, American Institutes of Research

Moderator: Gary Bittner, USAID Office of Education

This session addressed Goal 2 of the Education Strategy as it pertains to small and medium enterprise (SME) and vocational education centers (VECs). Discussions during this session focused on lessons learned, government engagement, and sustainability of each program presented.

Robert McKinley from the University of Texas at San Antonio presented an overview of small business development centers (SBDCs) and the small and medium enterprises (SMEs) which they support in partnership with Higher Education for Development (HED). The SBDCs offer services in business training, management and technical assistance consulting, applied business research, and small and medium enterprise policy advocacy. The SBDCs also promote economic stability and growth for communities and regions through institutional and professional capacity building. There are currently 1,100 SBDCs established across the diverse marketplace in the United States. These centers are based on an extension model of co-investment where every dollar contributed by the U.S. Small Business Administration is matched by the program to reduce fragmentation, combine resources and promote partnerships with local stakeholders. This in turn creates transparency and accountability, which is sustainable long-term. Examples of successful case studies of SBDCs in Mexico, El Salvador, and the Dominican Republic were referenced.

Howard Williams from American Institutes of Research focused on a vocational education project (VEP) in Georgia. The project aimed to increase the supply of graduates in tourism and the construction trade from seven vocational education centers (VEC) in Georgia, secure employment for VEP graduates and improve the sustainability of the VECs through public-private partnerships. These VECs are fully supported by the government, though they are intended to eventually become fully autonomous and self-financed. The transition, however, is still incomplete as it is still government-financed and decentralization is moving at a slow pace. VEP accomplishments include: internships with prospective employers, new curriculum for vocational education, new admission requirements, and achieving an employment rate over 60% upon graduation. In addition, the VEP produced seven construction trade manuals as well as a tourism manual.

Key take away points include the importance of small business development centers which offer an array of services and promote economic stability and growth in many communities and regions through institutional and professional capacity building. Similarly, the small business development centers also foster transparency and accountability improving sustainability over time. Public-private partnerships played an important role in both projects.

Workforce Development Session Summaries

School-to-Work Transition: Linking Workforce Development with Entrepreneurship

August 23, 2011 – 11:30 a.m.

Presenters: Sibylle Schmutz, SwissContact
Cornelia Janke, Education Development Center
Tim Haskell, Education Development Center
David Rurangirwa, USAID/Rwanda

Representing a private sector organization, Sibylle Schmutz spoke about SwissContact, an organization which aims to promote workforce development through skills development, enterprise development, and ecology, focused on four key issues to ensure labor market orientation: target group(s) and access & outreach, relevance and quality, embedded support, and sustainability. Target groups can include school drop-outs and persons with special needs, among others. Training outcomes must be relevant and training quality must favor the relationship between labor market demands and the requirements to meet those demands. Embedded support encompasses inclusion services, basic education skills, and soft skills, all of which have proven beneficial in preparing persons to enter the workforce. Sustainability approaches and solutions are found at the macro (government) and meso (private) levels. The Donor Committee Enterprise Development (DCED) Standard is a monitoring and evaluation framework allowing programs in development to measure results according to best practices.

Cornelia Janke from Education Development Center (EDC) presented on youth entrepreneurship, stating that this type of work requires a systems view alongside target interventions. A systems approach requires both short and long-term investments that have an impact on important sectors. Janke spoke to the importance of identifying different ways of connecting youth to the opportunities needed to successfully enter the labor force.

Tim Haskell of EDC spoke about the characteristics that strong systems must encompass - individual needs as well as institutional development. System characteristics include a diverse range of opportunities, flexible entry and exit points, and multiple pathways between education and work experience. Flexible entry and exit points are pivotal to make sure youth can choose their own path opting for additional training if they so desire. System elements of sustainability include shared costs and shared interests among partners, strong local ownership, and ties to the international community.

David Rurangirwa from USAID/Rwanda gave a brief overview of the *Akazi Kanoze*, or *Job Well Done* project. This project, implemented by EDC, is currently in its second year. The project offers increased livelihood opportunities for youth in addition to providing a support system. *Akazi Kanoze* works with government agencies and private sector partners to offer training in workforce development, entrepreneurship, English, and technical fields. Rurangirwa concluded the presentation with statistical evidence on the success of the *Akazi Kanozi* project: 1,149 youth employed, 454 youth started cooperatives, and 646 university graduate interns were trained in workforce development.

Key take away points from the session included the need to look systematically at school-to-workforce transition programs. This view is essential in addressing the relationship between individual needs and local demands. Workforce Development programs identify labor market orientation through the identification of target groups, relevance and quality, extended support and sustainability. Identifying these issues ensures youth receive proper training to acquire hard and soft skills necessary to secure employment.

An Economist and an Education Specialist Get Off a Plane: Assessing Workforce Development Systems from Private Sector and Institutional Perspectives

August 24, 2011 — 3:45 p.m.

Presenters: Phil Psilos, RTI International
Joseph DeStefano, RTI International

This session unveiled contrasting views on workforce development and labor market assessment. The assessment models discussed explored both the demand (e.g., employers, growth sectors) and supply (e.g., workers, technical and vocational education and training (TVET) and workforce development providers) side of the equation. The presenters shared examples of such assessments, including recent experience in Yemen and the Philippines.

Phil Psilos discussed development approaches from an economist's point of view. He shared different stages of workforce assessment based on a Stylized Private Sector Approach: (1) the research that needs to be done before the assessment starts (i.e., before s/he gets off the plane in the country to be assessed), and (2) the work to be done in country (identifying key sectors; mapping national stakeholders from the private, public and voluntary sectors who will be key information sources; and identifying web-based job boards or recruiter websites. Both demand-side and supply side analyses are required for a full understanding of the issues and composing a complete picture of the labor market in the country being assessed. The primary intent of the private sector assessment is to be objective and useful rather than appearing fair or balanced. This approach calls for objectivity and candor concerning all actors, including the private sector. The main issues to consider are labor cost, workforce quality, and job availability.

Joseph DeStefano spoke from an education policy point of view. He presented three TVET delivery models: enterprise-based, institution-based, and program-based. DeStefano discussed the roles the public sector can play to ensure a match of skills with labor market needs. This can be done by (1) targeting resources via incentives, subsidies and direct funding of some programs, and (2) assuring the quality and relevance (i.e., standards) of TVET training programs and providers. The discussion also included the role of the private sector in TVET training delivery. In this model, the key considerations in assessment are access, quality and financing of TVET programs. The key education policy questions include: How can we match training to new workforce market demands? What role can the public sector play in making sure that training is delivered where there is a demand? What can the public sector do (e.g., provide incentives) to encourage private sector actors to provide training for their own workforce?

Key take-away points: Though the two assessment approaches discussed are different, they share a common focus on quality. The experience of developed countries in particular shows that while the private sector is involved in workforce development to some extent, the public sector plays the major role. In countries like the US, workforce development is one of the most efficient and competitive investments that can be made. Local governments are intimately involved in TVET training and work closely with their communities to create the programs that will provide the skilled labor that the market needs. What skills in the competency pyramid are most valued by the private sector (general vocational skills, soft skills, employer-specific technical skills, sector-specific technical skills, etc.) is a complex question whose answer depends on each country's system and market. When searching for skilled labor, companies know where to look, because of the strong, clear correlation between good education and employment. This in turn means companies use more qualified training/education providers when

recruiting. Any company that expects hired employees to possess company-specific skills is simply badly managed.

Youth Development Session Summaries

Youth Development, the Challenge of Complexity and Size: Cross-Sectoral and Systems Approaches to Programs

August 22, 2011 – 3:45 p.m.

Presenters: Claire Spence, USAID/ Jamaica
Bonnie Politz, FHI 360
Erik Butler, Education Development Center (EDC)

This session, moderated by Claire Spence (Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Development, USAID/Jamaica), provided the audience with a definition of the term youth development from a research and practice base: “the ongoing process in which all youth are engaged in attempting to: meet their basic personal and social needs to be safe, feel cared for, be valued, be useful, be spiritually grounded, and build skills and competencies that allow them to function and contribute in their daily lives.” The session also outlined core youth development principles, explained the continuum and effective characteristics of USAID youth-related programming approaches and presented Jamaica, Rwanda, and El Salvador as examples of how cross-sectoral and systems thinking can help achieve Mission and national objectives for youth.

The group addressed effective characteristics of youth-related programming, stating that youth development is happening everywhere, but a challenge exists regarding scale. Adults often work from a deficit or problem prevention mode. The result is that young people get clearer messages on what they *should not* do, think, or become, rather than messages on what they *should* do. The presenters emphasized the importance of developing and partnering with youth as an effective programming practice.

The presenters showed a video clip that portrayed youth development in the West Bank. The video highlighted the importance of listening to youth and acknowledging their strengths rather than their weaknesses. The presenters also discussed the *Ruwad* project which allowed youth to provide community service to a rather complicated community. When the youth were asked questions regarding their dreams, some of the responses were very limited due to their past experiences. The presenters also emphasized the importance of interpersonal skill building, which includes establishing caring relationships with others, a sense of family and connection, and participating in ways that were appropriate for where they are developmentally.

Lastly, the presenters discussed EQUIP3, a mechanism used to work within and across sectors. A cross-sectoral approach works to meet objectives from more than one sector; usually one sector is the primary lead and works to incorporate the others. The experiences that youth are having are increasingly cross-sectoral. The presenters also discussed the cross-sectoral youth program that is being implemented in El Salvador. It focuses on interventions at the system level, within and across sectors involving youth development, and can be viewed as a system of interacting parts. The presenters also discussed the Realizing Empowerment Activities for Developing Youth program, which was designed to support the Jamaican government and civil society to develop effective systems that ensure youth’s health, safety and success in school, work, family, and the community.

Key take away points include the importance of developing partnerships with youth. It is necessary to highlight not their weaknesses, but their strengths. Successful youth development can be achieved by building skills, establishing relationships, and encouraging participation in ways that can contribute to development. The EQUIP3 mechanism is a tool used to work across sectors to aid youth in the problems they are experiencing.

Innovative Evaluation Approaches for Youth Employment **August 23, 2011 - 3:45 p.m.**

Presenters: Kevin Hempel, World Bank
David Newhouse, World Bank
Mark Lynd, School-to-School International
Jeff Davis, School-to-School International

Moderator: Daniel Oliver, International Youth Foundation

This session discussed innovative evaluation approaches for youth employment programs. Participants were divided into “speed dating” discussion groups in which specific impact evaluation designs were discussed, and participants were given the opportunity to ask questions. Moderator Daniel Oliver provided a comprehensive introduction to impact evaluations and set the tone for the discussion at each table. Oliver noted that impact evaluation is a distinct methodology of evaluation. An approach quickly growing in popularity in the development world, impact evaluations have been implemented in the United States by agencies like the U.S. Department of Education. Impact evaluations are seen as the gold standard, and are now filtering more and more into the development world. The World Bank is one of the leading donors in their application, and interest is quickly growing within USAID to expand use of this evaluation method. Impact evaluations use a sophisticated set of statistics to determine impact and to verify how interventions are affecting beneficiaries. In sum, they provide the evidence as to what is working or not, and allow us to better judge what is successful and what is not.

Mark Lynd and Jeff Davis from School-to-School International discussed an impact evaluation being conducted on a life skills, ICT training and job placement project in Kenya: ICT Training for Young Women from Informal Settlements around Nairobi. This evaluation implements a randomized controlled study with a pre-test/ post-test model. The objective of the evaluation is to measure the effectiveness of the intervention and to determine whether the program leads to increased employability of the women benefiting from the program. Results of the study are not yet available as the evaluation is still in progress.

David Newhouse of The World Bank briefly presented on the methods of constructing control groups. While impact evaluations with control groups are growing, they are still rare. Three main criteria include credibility, comprehensiveness, and political acceptability; knowing that pure randomization is the gold standard. If pure randomization is not politically attainable, bronze and silver standard methods can be used; these include lottery, discontinuity, difference-in-differences, matching, random promotion, and random phase-in. Newhouse shared a sample design of an impact evaluation for an upcoming program in Papua New Guinea. The program will start in 2012, using a lottery method for intervention.

Kevin Hempel from The World Bank spoke further about impact evaluations, clarifying that not all evaluations need to be impact evaluations. Hempel pointed out the most important question is to ask, what do we want to learn from this evaluation? Depending on the answer to this question, there are different types of evaluation to use: descriptive, normative, cause-and-effect, or impact. Impact evaluations require more time, money and a favorable political context.

Key take away points from this session include the growing interest around impact evaluations in the developing world and the requirements in order to properly implement such an evaluation. Impact evaluations determine what is and what is not working and also provide better detail of what success means. Impact evaluations with proper control groups are still rare. Credibility, comprehensiveness, and political acceptability are favorable conditions for a successful impact evaluation.

Examining the Youth, Economic Engagement and Conflict Nexus: How Youth Economic Empowerment can Enhance Stability

August 24, 2011 – 11:30 a.m.

Presenters: Jon Kurtz, Mercy Corps
Tara Noronha, Mercy Corps
Rebecca Wolfe, Mercy Corps

The panel discussed new approaches to looking at the connection between youth unemployment and the motivation of youth to join violent movements or engage in violence. Presenters discussed research on the connection between youth and violence in Kenya and Liberia and examples of programs that Mercy Corps is implementing to address the problem of youth and violence in a holistic manner.

Rebecca Wolfe began by reviewing the three main factors that cause youth to resort to violence or join violent movements: Economic (income to cover basic needs or other financial incentives); Political (upset at system of corruption and nepotism, but lack the voice and opportunities for political engagement); and Cultural (seek connection or sense of belonging with larger group, but lack status in society). Wolfe went on to explain some of the problems with the link that many programs are eager to establish between unemployment and youth violence.

Jon Kurtz shared a study Mercy Corps did to test the hypothesis that if young people are meaningfully employed, they will be less likely to join violent movements for economic gain. The hypothesis was tested using program surveys, the Afrobarometer surveys, and qualitative research (focus groups and interviews) in Kenya and Liberia. The study revealed that social and political factors were more influential than economic factors in youth resorting to violence or joining violent movements. He concluded that job creation alone would not be enough to stop youth from engaging in violence or joining violent movements.

Tara Noronha shared three examples of holistic programming that Mercy Corps has engaged in: (1) Skills for Kosovo's Young Leaders Program, (2) Start-Up Kashmir Entrepreneur Development Project, and (3) Local Empowerment for Peace Plus Program in Kenya. These programs focus on improving youth livelihoods from an economic perspective and encourage community service, leadership, and entrepreneurship.

Key take away points stress that youth engage in violence or join violent movements for a variety of socio-political, economic and cultural reasons. By focusing narrowly on economic reasons and more specifically on jobs, many programs miss the larger picture and address only part of the problem. Development organizations need to implement (1) holistic programming that addresses all of the causes of youth violence and (2) ways to effectively monitor and evaluate these programs.

Experiences in Positive Youth Development

August 25, 2011 – 12:30 p.m.

Presenter: Rachel Surkin, IREX

Rachel Surkin discussed effective practices in Positive Youth Development (PYD) which helped provide the basis for the Youth Development Competencies Program (YDCP) IREX developed in Russia. IREX as an organization focuses on increasing youth civic engagement, rather than concentrating only on workforce preparedness. Surkin began the session by asking attendees at each table to discuss youth programs with which they have been involved, along with the programs' successes and failures. She then presented an adapted version of "The Ladder of Participation," a model developed by Sherry Arnstein and Roger Hart. This model depicts the range of youth involvement in programs developed for their benefit—ranging from youth-initiated programs to "manipulation" (i.e. adults forcing or coercing youth to participate).

Surkin proceeded to ask participants to locate where their program fell within this continuum. One participant from USAID/Washington noted that from a donor's perspective, youth-initiated programs appear very risky. An attendee from the International Youth Foundation added that increasing youth involvement in program implementation also means that the program will be focused on capacity building, and therefore more labor intensive because youth have less experience and require more guidance. Surkin responded that IREX initially developed YDCP as a youth-run program, but for those reasons (donor concerns and focus on capacity building) and others, adult involvement had to be increased.

Effective PYD involves five competencies and six basic needs that youth development programs should aim to meet. The five competencies are: health, social involvement, creativity, vocational skills, and citizenship. The six basic needs provide a sense of: safety/structure, belonging/membership, self-worth/contributing, independence, closeness/relationship, and competence/mastery. Surkin also noted that while this framework emphasizes sustained involvement in youth development, there are instances where a single interaction changes the course of a child's life.

Applying PYD, Surkin then spoke in greater detail about YDCP, a USAID-funded effort developed by IREX in Russia. YDCP recruited key members of successful youth projects throughout the country, identified best practices, and disseminated them across the nation. This program has helped youth find employment, address the basic needs of at-risk youth, and increase youth engagement in society. A YDCP impact evaluation found that nearly 98% of program participants reported involvement in community service, compared to only 50% in the comparison group. Furthermore, YDCP participants were two to four times more likely to have had interactions with local and regional government officials.

Key take away points focus on PYD meeting the basic needs and competencies that make long-term contributions to the lives of youth. Youth development programs can have many different structures; they can be entirely youth-initiated or they can be structured to force youth participation. Nevertheless, increasing youth involvement in programs helps to ensure sustainability. Overall, Surkin noted that youth development programs should "approach youth as a resource to be developed, not a problem to be solved."

Finance Session Summaries

Cost Effectiveness Analysis

August 22, 2011 – 3:45 p.m.

Presenters: Juan Belt, USAID Office of Economic Growth
Caitlin Tullock, J-PAL, MIT
Joseph DeStefano, RTI International

Moderator: Suezan Lee, USAID Office of Education

The purpose of this session was to discuss the importance of cost benefit and cost effectiveness analyses in education programs. Often the issue with cost benefit analysis of education programs lies in the challenge of monetizing program benefits, e.g., assigning value to program outcomes such as community participation in education. As an alternative, cost effectiveness analysis does not require estimating a monetary value of program outcomes, but rather measures a ratio of program outcomes to costs. The ratios for each of the interventions can then be compared. Presenters noted that both types of analysis are important. While cost benefit analysis measures returns, cost effectiveness analysis measures productivity.

Juan Belt of USAID's Office of Economic Growth emphasized that reliable cost effectiveness or cost benefit analysis at the beginning of a program can identify the variables that affect outcomes, and can set up valid monitoring measures for the program cycle. USAID's *Feed the Future Initiative* was discussed. About 90 percent of the programs in this initiative are production programs, meaning USAID will be able to perform cost benefit analyses and monetize program outcomes. For those outcomes that are not monetized, USAID will use cost effectiveness analysis. In any case, project analysis of any kind should include several types of analyses – including financial, beneficiary, institutional, and environmental analyses.

Joe DeStefano of RTI International discussed a cost effectiveness analysis done by RTI International comparing USAID community-based schools in Bangladesh, Mali, and Zambia, to public school programs funded by the Ministry of Education. DeStefano emphasized that it is important to measure *both* the outcomes and costs of a program, since these two variables make up the cost effectiveness ratio. It is necessary to consider that if a program is more expensive than the public model, then its effectiveness should offset the cost differences. On the other hand, one should be careful to analyze programs that are intentionally underfunded. Currently, USAID programs have gaps in the availability of cost and outcome data. USAID needs to focus, at an Agency level, on standardizing this process and the data that are collected.

Caitlin Tulloch of J-PAL, MIT, shared that cost effectiveness analysis can be used to compare possible education interventions. J-PAL is currently working on analysis to compare such interventions. One of the most important components of a cost effectiveness analysis requires reliable estimates of program impact. In order to determine this, program designers should build rigorous evaluation techniques into the program from its inception. An issue also to consider is the length of time available to gather longitudinal data.

Key take away points included the fact that cost effectiveness and cost benefit analyses are important policy decision-making tools. USAID needs to focus at an Agency level on standardizing cost and outcome data across education programs to do these types of analyses. Program designers should build rigorous evaluation techniques into a program from its inception.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Financing Modalities

August 23, 2011 – 11:30 a.m.

Presenters: Joseph DeStefano, RTI International
Meredith Fox, USAID/Ghana
Hala El Serafy, USAID/Egypt

Moderator: Suezan Lee, USAID Office of Education

This session focused on USAID's experience with projectized and non-projectized education funding assistance, specifically in Africa, Asia and the Middle East.

Joseph DeStefano of RTI International discussed the cons of non-projectized assistance (NPA). He stated that some think that large disbursements are an easier way to move funds and accordingly, providing NPA would be less of a management burden. However, monitoring and keeping track of funds can become an issue, particularly since the new USAID Education Strategy seeks tangible results for each project. In addition, the USAID Evaluation Policy is rigorous regarding monitoring performance and impact. Due to the issues that arise from providing NPA, it may not be the proper funding option for programs, especially because of the new 2011 Education Strategy.

Meredith Fox of USAID/Ghana discussed the benefits and lessons learned from funding education programs through implementation letters (ILs). ILs enabled USAID/Ghana to provide teacher training for every teacher in Ghana; using country systems allowed USAID to train many more teachers. The Ghana Mission saw ILs as an opportunity to build the capacity of the country while meeting specific objectives. Although the ILs allowed the Ghana education service to take the lead in program design, it gave The Mission an opportunity to work with the education service closely. When there is a high level of engagement, the potential for sustainability is increased since government counterparts are meaningfully involved from the beginning. Identifying active engaged partners from the start is key to program success. Requiring the host government to assign a project manager who has sufficient time to manage the project is important. Starting in small implementation phases is wise. Contracting a company such as Price Waterhouse Cooper to assist in financial management can be helpful. Financial reporting requirements should be as simple as possible and should follow government guidelines whenever possible.

Hala El Serafy of USAID/Egypt discussed the strengths, weaknesses and lessons learned from funding education programs in Egypt through the cash transfer mechanism. This mechanism enables the government to set its own reform priorities and assume greater responsibility for program design, implementation and management than most other mechanisms. In addition, it contributes to capacity building by allowing the Ministry to lead implementation, and thus the potential to sustain achievement is much higher. Weaknesses include the limited capacity of the Ministry of Education (MOE) regarding monitoring, documentation and report writing. Another weakness can come from a change of key Ministry of Education officials and the impact this can have on the order of reform priorities. El Serafy identified lessons learned: It is important to be clear about benchmarks; avoid using vague statements; and ensure that there is mutual understanding and clear expectations. In addition, regular follow up and documentation are necessary.

Key take away points included the need to look at different funding scenarios besides NPA because of the new Education Strategy. Implementation letters have allowed USAID/Ghana to provide teacher training for every teacher in Ghana. While MOE involvement presents some challenges, the key to success is to identify active engaged partners. USAID/Egypt implemented a cash transfer program which

also served to build capacity. However, when working directly with MOEs, it is important to build sustainability at multiple levels as changes in political power often result in staff turnover at MOEs.

Financing Education Services in Crisis and Conflict- Affected Situations

August 23, 2011 – 3:45 p.m.

Presenters: Katie Donohoe, USAID/Pakistan
Malcom Phelps, USAID Office of Afghanistan and Pakistan Affairs
Abdul Alim Ghafary, USAID/Afghanistan

Moderator: Suezan Lee, USAID Office of Education

Malcom Phelps of the USAID Office of Afghanistan and Pakistan Affairs, and Katie Donohoe of USAID/Pakistan presented the Government to Government (G2G) assistance model, which entails a bilateral relationship between USAID and Pakistan, and between USAID and Afghanistan. USAID has customized the G2G model to suit circumstances in each country. The development challenge faced in post-conflict regions where G2G is used has been government's low implementation capacity, a reflection of the fact that many government officials have moved or been displaced. In many cases, monitoring has been a challenge because of USAID's limited capacity to move about the region.

Donohoe pointed out that Pakistan has greater capacity to rebuild than does Afghanistan. She used the example of Malakand and explained how the G2G model was structured to suit the Pakistan situation. Since the host country did not have the capital to initiate the rebuilding process, USAID provided funds in advance. Agreements were signed with the provincial governors that USAID would provide fixed amounts to reimburse costs, releasing funds in intervals. These intervals were determined based on completion of sub-tasks within the larger development initiative. This was to ensure effective and efficient use of funds and to allow for program monitoring.

The funding mechanism of G2G in Afghanistan is different from Pakistan. Phelps established that Afghanistan is still in a transition phase, unlike Pakistan, and has less capacity for rebuilding than its neighbor. G2G is strongly advocated by the host country government to reestablish faith in the government among its citizens. Phelps explained the host country government's point of view that donors funding only the NGOs would diminish people's confidence in the government. USAID's overall goal in Afghanistan is to reinforce Afghanistan's Ministry of Education (MoE) to have enough capacity to lead the sector and make programs sustainable. The challenge remains, however, that international support contributes 91 percent of the GDP and most MoE positions are externally financed.

A key advantage of the G2G model in both Pakistan and Afghanistan is the opportunity it provides for USAID to work closely with the government. The government can then garner greater political support from citizens, which is required for program sustainability. At the same time, technical assistance for rebuilding efforts has involved many senior technical and management professionals from other countries such as the United States and Canada, and this adversely impacts the potential for program sustainability because Pakistanis or Afghans are not being mentored or trained to perform these functions. G2G has the advantage of being cheaper than having third-party independent contracts, but it also entails a time-consuming development and management process and rigorous assessment and evaluation prior to signing an agreement with the host country. There are ongoing efforts to help governments with capacity building, with program extension to different regions and with improving program sustainability.

Key take away points included the case studies of USAID/Pakistan and USAID/Afghanistan financing approaches. The G2G model varies since Afghanistan is still in a transition phase from violent conflict and Pakistan is not. Nonetheless, in both countries, the G2G model provides an opportunity to work with the host country government and generate support that can enhance sustainability.

Financing in Higher Education: Increasing Access

August 24, 2011 – 3:45 p.m.

Presenters: Bruce Johnstone, State University of New York, Buffalo
Garth Willis, USAID/Office of Education
Al Jaegar, Putera Sampoerna Foundation of Indonesia

Moderator: Suezan Lee, USAID/ Office of Education

Suezan Lee of USAID's Office of Education opened the session with a discussion of combining public and private financing in an effort to increase access to higher education in host countries. Bruce Johnstone from SUNY Buffalo presented an overview of the components of public financing and the changes that have recently occurred. He pointed out that financing in higher education has shifted from public financing to private financing and, essentially, the privatization of a public sector function. This emerged because of the increase in demand for higher education, accelerated by increases in enrollment, and an increase in youth cohorts and participation. The associated problem with this shift is the inability of the government to keep pace with increased demand as there are other competing priorities for the government, such as public health and public infrastructure. Johnstone briefly discussed a range of alternate financing sources, namely non-governmental revenues, philanthropic funding, and cost-sharing. Deferred payments, student loans and cost-sharing mechanisms were a few of the proposed means of increasing access to higher education.

Garth Willis, also from the Office of Education, shared an example from Kyrgyzstan where a student loans model was implemented successfully, receiving public support and recognition from the government and International community. The model recognized the importance of student loans and identified the problem faced by educational institution's lack of knowledge to process such loans. Lessons learned from past experience where student loans models failed to indicate that these loans were used as scholarships or grant money and did not have a well established repayment mechanism in place. The model in Kyrgyzstan includes a provision for external technical assistance to educational institutions for processing student loans. The Kyrgyz Investment and Credit Bank and the Financial Group Kompanion, two public Kyrgyz financial companies, are directly involved in the project. According to the agreement signed, the Bank is responsible for loans pertaining to Higher Education programs and the Kompanion for vocational programs. USAID also guaranteed 50% of the losses incurred through defaulted loans to the Bank. The initial skepticism about the model and the program led to high interest rates on student loans, which have since dropped considerably.

Al Jaeger, Placement and Partnership Director from Putera Sampoerna Foundation of Indonesia shared a success story of a project providing access to higher education. He explained how this model enables greater access to higher education based on merit. Indonesia's higher education institutions are generally exclusive and expensive. The Sampoerna Foundation's program established a cooperative for the brightest of disadvantaged students, which provides comprehensive support to students, including student loans and pre-negotiated provisional subsidized tuition fees in overseas universities. The Foundation has stringent review and selection processes for enrollment that have contributed to the success of this initiative.

Key take away points include the shift in financing higher education from the public sector to private individuals and organizations, brought on in part by increasing enrollment. Other financing sources including NGOs should be examined as possible funders. Two case studies, one featuring a student loan program and another, a student cooperative, presented alternative financing mechanisms based on merit.

Capacity Building/Participant Training Session Summaries

Capacity-Building: Models of Program Implementation

August 24, 2011 – 11:30 a.m.

Presenters: Steve Kowal, USAID Office of Education
David Dzebisashvili, USAID/Georgia

During this session, Steve Kowal offered a thorough explanation of the Human and Institutional Capacity Development (HICD) strategic approach of program design and implementation, noting the importance of designing programs with the goal of increasing organizational capacity development and expanding the knowledge of the various available models. Given the breadth of the HICD approach, Kowal walked through the seven steps of the model, detailing the importance of each component to the overall process. While looking at each piece individually, Kowal also pointed out that every component may not be necessary for every program.

Kowal identified the first task as locating host country partner organizations, which requires the establishment of criteria for participation (i.e. assessing ability to facilitate capacity building effort). This is followed by obtaining the commitment of selected partners. During this time, the partners collectively identify resources to be contributed, a timeframe for execution, and the expected results. A stakeholder group would then establish proponents of program efforts, in addition to identifying potential obstacles to program completion and efficacy.

Kowal spoke about the importance of assessing the performance of partner organizations, which should be done by a performance assessment team. This involves defining desired performance in measurable terms, identifying problems encountered, and analyzing the findings with stakeholders. As a part of the assessment process, the performance assessment team would then identify solutions to challenges and issues highlighted in the assessment. These solutions are subsequently implemented by the partner organization. It is also critical that changes in the performance of the partner organization be monitored over time.

David Dzebisashvili from the USAID Mission in Georgia presented an HICD case study. As a result of Georgia's history of ethnic and political conflict, the number of internally-displaced persons (IDPs) has grown to about 40,000 in recent years. The Georgian Ministry of Refugees and Accommodation (MRA) had been developing a plan to help reintegrate IDPs into society. In 2008 the MRA approached USAID for small-scale technical assistance to strengthen their efforts. Dzebisashvili explained how using the HICD approach helped yield more successful results: the MRA received recognition from the national government applauding the institution's efforts; and perhaps more importantly, the people who benefitted from these endeavors gave positive feedback noting the improved efficiency of services within MRA departments.

Key take away points focused on the HICD model as a comprehensive framework that maximizes capacity-building efforts. The HICD model also allows for the flexibility necessary to adjust to a wide variety of programs. As shown by the Georgian case study, the HICD approach produces positive, measurable outcomes.

Capacity Development: Exchange Visitor and Participant Training Policy and Procedures August 25, 2011 - 11:30 a.m.

Presenters: James Nindel, USAID Office of Education
Ethel Brooks, USAID Office of Education

This session provided participants with an overview of USAID policy and best-practice procedures regarding exchange visitors and participant training. James Nindel, Acting Team Leader of the Participant Training- HICD Team, discussed the modifications that will be made to the Automated Directive Systems (ADS) policies, including changes related to dependent travel and observers. Specifically explained were the ADS 252- Visa Compliance for Exchange Visitors and the ADS 253- Training for Development policies. ADS 252 relates to visa compliance for foreign nationals sponsored by USAID (using any amount of USAID funds) for all activities based in the United States, except training. ADS 253 focuses on all Participant Training activities for foreign nationals sponsored by USAID in both the United States and third countries, as long as the activity falls under USAID's definition of Participant Training. Nindel noted that the selection criteria will be modified, and although ADS 252 and 253 have different scopes and therefore slightly different selection criteria, the two chapters should still be aligned.

Nindel provided information regarding USAID policy modifications and discussed dependent travel criteria and how Missions should establish their own dependent travel policies. A dependent is the spouse or child of the selected participant and there are different rules for selecting dependents according to the location of activities. A new provision will be added to ADS 253 with regard to observers, which will define the appropriate role of an observer and include information on what is or is not allowable.

Linda Walker of USAID discussed the Health and Accidental Coverage (HAC) policy. She advised the session participants to be aware of the HAC related notices that will come out in October. Walker also provided information on allowance rates. A participant addressed his concerns with the required HAC medical exams, including fraud. Walker emphasized the importance of the medical exams and stated that USAID wants to ensure that participants are healthy and beneficial to the program.

Ethel Brooks, Field Technical Advisor/International Training Specialist for USAID's Office of Education, discussed some of the problems that occur regarding observers, citing her experience with a program called Community Connections. Sometimes a Mission will want an observer to come along with the group. The observer may be one of the stakeholders involved in the action plan, such as a technical assistance person. However, the involvement of observers has, in some cases, caused negative training experiences in the past.

Key take away points discussed were the modifications that will be made to the ADS policies including the changes related to dependent travel and observers. The selection criteria for ADS 252 (Visa Compliance for Exchange Visitors) and ADS 253 (Participant Training for Capacity Development) will be modified, including an additional provision in ADS 253 regarding observers.

2011 Global Education and Training Workshop Assessment and Feedback

Overall, the 2011 Global Education and Training Workshop was a success. Participants learned a great deal in many of the sessions, and the organization of the event was very solid as well. The new Education Strategy gave the event a coherence it had not had in past years. Topics were relevant and timely, and several sessions were overflowing with participants. Some participants liked being able to follow the themes, while others liked being able to jump from topic to topic. The sessions that were best liked and that session track coordinators thought were most productive were those that were structured to permit peer to peer discussion and learning. Keeping speakers to time worked well in the sessions in which that occurred, and enabling participants to ask questions or engage in other forms of participation was deemed successful.

There were a number of factors that complicated planning for the 2011 event, including the later than anticipated issuance of the Education Strategy and Operational Guidance, which formed a significant basis of the content to be included in the event. In addition, several team members took on session planning responsibilities without having been to all (or even many) of the meetings, and not everyone received the same information at the same time about deadlines, guidelines for presenters, or support available from JBS. The workforce development and youth concurrent sessions were selected differently than the other tracks. A call for proposals went out for these two areas, and that caused some concern among implementers who would have liked to propose sessions in other areas as well. Owing to these and other factors, session planning deadlines were not met, and there were a good number of last minute changes, which creating cascading logistical problems for the team. For example, there were several last minute requests for travel support for speakers, which resulted in higher transportation costs than might have been necessary. Presentations also were not received in a timely manner, so while everyone liked the idea of getting a USB drive with all the presentations, there were several sessions for which no presentations were on the drive.

JBS offered support for each session coordinator in setting up conference calls with presenters/panelists to discuss the goals of the session, answer their questions, and ensure that each session would flow and achieve its intended outcomes. Few session coordinators took advantage of those resources. Those who did found it to be helpful. The team also worked with a designated coordinator for the Petting Zoo. The Petting Zoo had greater participation in 2011 than in 2009, but there was insufficient attention to the placement of the demonstrators in the room and underutilization of the space in the hallways that might have been more heavily trafficked (though there was a concern about noise in the corridors during sessions).

Overall, there were few logistical concerns during the course of the workshop. The event was adequately staffed, and the hotel staff was responsive to needs and last minute requests. One of the bigger challenges was dealing with the space, however, since the event was originally envisioned with around 300 participants, and 390 registered participants attended (as did several more individuals who did not register and who exceeded their organizational limit of two per day excluding presenters).

Recommendations for Future Workshops and Challenges

The following recommendations emerged from the evaluation forms collected from participants, as well as an Education Sector Council Meeting immediately following the workshop that was dedicated to collecting information about EGAT/ED and Regional Bureau staff opinions on what went well and what could be improved in the future. While all of the recommendations are actionable, the JBS team has noted challenges to implementing each of these recommendations that should be taken into account in any future planning process.

1. **Planning.** In some cases, there was a sense among some of the Regional Bureau staff that future workshops need better advanced planning of sessions and clearer designation of who will be responsible for session design. Another area for improvement is meeting the deadlines to which the planning committee agrees at the beginning of the planning process. *Challenges: One issue was the later than expected release of the Strategy and Operational Guidance, which hindered some of the specifics of planning, but this may not be an issue again in the future. Meeting deadlines requires that the team be disciplined and that sufficient internal resources are dedicated to the planning process.*
2. **Program Structure.** The team recommended increasing the amount of USAID-only time, including either full mornings or a whole day without implementing partners and others. Another recommendation was to decrease the number of concurrent sessions to ensure that participants are able to attend all of the sessions that interest them. Finally, there was a recommendation to provide more break time to network and socialize. *Challenges: Increasing USAID-only time may not make sense with a smaller turn-out of USAID staff, particularly those from the field. Fewer concurrent sessions requires greater focus in the session topics, which may eliminate sessions in some programming areas that would be of interest to a minority of attendees. Finally, more break time can be scheduled, but it will be important to ensure that EGAT/ED can defend the agenda with more break time.*
3. **Program Content.** Session moderators should keep presenters on time and on track, ensuring that there is sufficient time for participatory content. Session coordinators should check the content of presentations in advance and make sure it is in line with what was intended. In addition, some participants wanted more structured group time like the professional development session or workshop-type sessions in which they can work on their scopes, M&E plans, etc. Finally, Participant Training needs its own track, and HICD/PT presentations should focus on the education sector. *Challenges: Coordinating sessions in advance has real benefits, but requires a time investment and clear communication with presenters that they must submit their materials in advance. In regard to the more intensive, workshop-type sessions, time becomes a very real constraint because a well designed session requires a time investment to ensure that it achieves its learning objectives. One option would be to hire a facilitator to work on a limited number of those sessions in the next round to balance the time required of Ed Sector staff and the needs of the participants.*
4. **Attendance.** The two person per organization per day rule is too limiting according to many participants and some of the Ed Sector staff, and they suggested allowing more people from each organization. Another recommendation was to invite more MOE representatives from USAID-assisted countries. *Challenges: Allowing more implementing partner participation increases the imbalance between USAID/non-USAID participants. Further, since the barriers to attending are very low, it increases the cost considerably (through higher numbers for catering and materials like the programs).*

One possibility would be to collect a registration fee from all non-USAID participants and allow their registrations to be transferable so they have greater incentive to cooperate with the system put in place.

5. **Location.** Many participants would have preferred a location in DC near a metro. In addition, there was a suggestion to obtain a larger space and plan for a larger group (see above). *Challenges: Larger space will come with a higher cost, but the larger challenge is that the number of sleeping rooms these events require is out of sync with conference space needed. Hotels have strict formulas they use to determine whether they will bid on an event since the majority of their revenue comes from the sleeping rooms rather than the event. For example, no hotels in DC were willing to bid on the 2011 event. One option would be to use a non-hotel venue, though those choices are limited as well because universities, for example, typically require a campus sponsor to reserve space and will not reserve space for outside groups more than six months in advance. Other than the Convention Center, there are very few options for conference space for 500 people in DC unless a significant number of sleeping rooms will be reserved as well.*

6. **Timing.** Several participants thought that August, and particularly late August, was not a good time for future events. One suggestion was to plan future events in October or November, while another was to plan it in the spring. *Challenges: Cost may be a major challenge in moving the event. August tends to be low time for conference use, so it is easier to find hotels willing to give us a large space with a limited number of sleeping rooms (see above). In addition, when Congress is in session, prices for lodging tend to rise, and certain nights are hard to reserve (typically Monday and Tuesday). One option would be the use of non-hotel venue, but that gives us less leverage in negotiating a group rate at a hotel. Further, USAID might consider the very end of September/beginning of October (i.e., Sept. 30-Oct. 3, 2013) rather than later to ensure that Mission staff can travel using last fiscal year funds, which may be more probable than obtaining approval to use new FY funds for workshop travel early in the fiscal year.*

Summary of Participant Feedback

The data shown here represent responses aggregated from the 53 Global Workshop participants who provided feedback. Of these 53 participants, 39 were USAID staff participants and 14 were non-USAID participants. Of the non-USAID participants who provided feedback, background affiliations included NGO, University, Private Sector, and independent consultancy.

Overall, feedback on the Global Workshop was positive and included constructive suggestions for future events. When asked their opinion on the overall usefulness of the Workshop’s general sessions, participants responded in the following manner:

Overall, how useful did you find the Workshop’s general sessions?	USAID Participants	Non-USAID Participants	Overall
<i>Very Useful</i>	28.5%	30.8%	29.2%
<i>Useful</i>	40.0%	46.2%	41.7%
<i>Somewhat Useful</i>	28.6%	23%	27%
<i>Not That Useful</i>	2.9%	--	2.1%
<i>Not Useful at All</i>	--	--	--

We received comparable feedback regarding the utility of USAID-only sessions, but without any difference between the Mission-based and Washington-base staff:

Overall, how useful did you find the Workshop’s USAID-only sessions?	USAID
<i>Very Useful</i>	32.4%
<i>Useful</i>	47.0%
<i>Somewhat Useful</i>	20.6%
<i>Not That Useful</i>	--
<i>Not Useful at All</i>	--

Participants were asked to identify the two sessions that they found most useful and their responses are in the table below.

Session Title	Number of Responses
Early Grade Reading: Summary of Evidence, Implications, and New Directions from Donors	8
Contributions of School Management, Governance and Accountability, and Community Participation to Children’s Learning Outcomes	7
Youth in the 21 st Century	7
View from the Hill	6
Improving Literacy Instruction: Lessons from Latin America	4
An Economist and an Education Specialist Get Off a Plane: Assessing Workforce Development Systems in Private Sector and Institutional Perspectives	4
USAID-only Professional Development	4
Evaluation for the Education Sector: Applying the New Evaluation Policy	4
Participatory Round-Table: “Who Says You Can’t Have 21 st Century Education in Low-Resource Settings?”	3
Examining the Youth, Economic Engagement, and Conflict Nexus: How Youth Economic Empowerment Can Enhance Stability	3
Assessment Approaches and Application: The Basics of Measurement and Assessment for Policy Dialogue and Action	3
Conflict, Crisis, and Education	3
From Assessment to Action: Designing Reading Implementation Activities for Reaching Goal 1	2
Introduction to Human and Institutional Capacity Development	2
Education: The Foundation of Social and Economic Transition	2
Innovative Evaluation Approaches for Youth Employment	2
Financing Higher Education: Increasing Access	2
Strengths and Weaknesses of Financing Modalities	1
Mobilizing Higher Education For Development	1
Cost Effectiveness Analysis	1
Teach the Teachers (and their supervisors): System Strengthening for Improving the Teacher Effectiveness	1
ICT4Public/Private Sector Partnerships: Maximizing Opportunities for Scale and Impact	1
Gender Issues and Education Strategy	1
USAID’s New Education Strategy	1
Leveraging Technology for Education in Complex and Challenging Environments	1
Open Educational Resources: Increasing Access While Improving Quality	1

Many participants noted that their preferred plenary sessions were those focused on **Early Grade Reading** and **Youth Development**; these were also the sessions more highly attended by USAID and non-USAID participants alike. In additional comments, several participants said they were interested by and found value in the “**View from the Hill**” lunch discussion.

Regarding the specific concepts or ideas provided by the Workshop that participants reported to be most valuable and most likely to be shared with their colleagues, common responses related to evidence-driven evaluation and program design, funding modalities, regional-specific program successes in teacher development. In these comments, it is also evident that at least a few USAID-staff left the Workshop feeling a sense of motivation, urgency and the need, as one participant put it, to “act now, not tomorrow.”

In the general feedback comments and suggestions that participants provided regarding future events, dominant themes evident were **applicability** and **interactivity**. Regarding applicability, many participants suggested that future workshops could devote more time to sessions specifically focused on the practicalities of implementing the new Education Sector Strategy in the field. When respondents provided specific areas of expertise in this regard, suggestions included a heavier focus on pragmatic project design methods and monitoring and evaluation techniques.

Several respondents also suggested that more time be set aside for networking and focused **interactive** sessions, particularly during breakout sessions. Comments in this vein stated that some of the breakout sessions were too theoretical and more typical of a conference setting than of a workshop. Others suggested smaller group work sessions and more opportunities for spontaneous group discussions around identified themes or geographic region of interest.

Please see the following tables for more detailed responses on the Global Workshop sessions.

How would you rate the Leadership and Priority sessions?	USAID Participants	Non-USAID Participants	Overall
<i>Excellent</i>	18.2%	--	18.2%
<i>Good</i>	45.5%	--	45.5%
<i>Fair</i>	27.3%	--	27.3%
<i>Not Good</i>	9.1%	--	9.1%
<i>Poor</i>	0.0%	--	0.0%

Among USAID respondents, there was a statistically significant difference among those who had been at the Agency for varying lengths of time. The staff who had been with the Agency eight years or more were evenly split between finding the sessions good and excellent. The staff who have been with the Agency four to seven years all found these sessions less useful, unanimously rating them fair. The newest staff, who reported being with the Agency three years or less, were less unified in their responses; 71.4 percent found the sessions to be good, while 14.3 percent each found them to be fair and not very good, respectively.

How would you rate the Early Grade Reading sessions?	USAID Participants	Non-USAID Participants	Overall
<i>Excellent</i>	31.3%	--	27%
<i>Good</i>	46.9%	80%	51.4%
<i>Fair</i>	15.6%	20%	16.2%
<i>Not Good</i>	3.1%	--	2.7%
<i>Poor</i>	3.1%	--	2.7%

How would you rate the Crisis/Conflict Settings sessions?	USAID Participants	Non-USAID Participants	Overall
<i>Excellent</i>	32%	25%	31%
<i>Good</i>	20%	25%	20.7%
<i>Fair</i>	32%	50%	34.5%
<i>Not Good</i>	12%	--	10.3%
<i>Poor</i>	4%	--	3.4%

How would you rate the ICT sessions?	USAID Participants	Non-USAID Participants	Overall
<i>Excellent</i>	19.2%	20%	19.4%
<i>Good</i>	46.2%	60%	48.4%
<i>Fair</i>	30.8%	20%	29%
<i>Not Good</i>	3.8%	--	3.2%
<i>Poor</i>	--	--	--

How would you rate the Higher Education sessions?	USAID Participants	Non-USAID Participants	Overall
<i>Excellent</i>	12.5%	--	10%
<i>Good</i>	50%	50%	50%
<i>Fair</i>	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
<i>Not Good</i>	4.2%	16.7%	6.7%
<i>Poor</i>	--	--	--

How would you rate the Workforce Development sessions?	USAID Participants	Non-USAID Participants	Overall
<i>Excellent</i>	19.2%	25%	20.6%
<i>Good</i>	46.2%	62.5%	50%
<i>Fair</i>	26.9%	12.5%	23.5%
<i>Not Good</i>	3.8%	--	2.9%
<i>Poor</i>	3.8%	--	2.9%

How would you rate the Finance sessions?	USAID Participants	Non-USAID Participants	Overall
<i>Excellent</i>	35.7%	--	31.3%
<i>Good</i>	35.7%	50%	37.5%
<i>Fair</i>	14.3%	50%	18.8%
<i>Not Good</i>	14.3%	--	12.5%
<i>Poor</i>	--	--	--

How would you rate the Youth sessions?	USAID Participants	Non-USAID Participants	Overall
<i>Excellent</i>	16.7%	11.1%	15.4%
<i>Good</i>	56.7%	66.7%	59%
<i>Fair</i>	23.3%	22.2%	23.1%
<i>Not Good</i>	3.3%	--	2.6%
<i>Poor</i>	--	--	--

How would you rate the Capacity Building & Participant Training sessions?	USAID Participants	Non-USAID Participants	Overall
<i>Excellent</i>	27.3%	--	18.8%
<i>Good</i>	18.2%	60%	31.3%
<i>Fair</i>	27.3%	40%	31.3%
<i>Not Good</i>	18.2%	--	12.5%
<i>Poor</i>	9.1%	--	6.3%

USAID-only Sessions

How useful were the USAID only sessions in relation to whether they addressed the questions you had?	USAID
<i>Very Useful</i>	31.3%
<i>Useful</i>	43.8%
<i>Somewhat Useful</i>	21.9%
<i>Not That Useful</i>	3.1%
<i>Not Useful at All</i>	--

The responses to this question were statistically significantly different based on the length of time respondents had been with the Agency. More of those with the Agency longest (8 years or longer) found these sessions to be very useful (58.3%) than those with three years or less (21.4%) or four to seven years (0.0%). When combined, most participants in all categories found the sessions useful or very useful (66.6% of respondents with 8 or more years; 83.3% of respondents with 4-7 years; and 78.5% of respondents with 3 years or fewer). All the participants who found that these sessions were not that useful were those in the three years or fewer category.

How useful were the USAID only sessions in relation to whether they enabled you to participate actively?	USAID
<i>Very Useful</i>	30.3%
<i>Useful</i>	21.2%
<i>Somewhat Useful</i>	30.3%
<i>Not That Useful</i>	18.2%
<i>Not Useful at All</i>	--

How useful were the USAID only sessions in relation to whether they exposed you to approaches to strategy alignment?	USAID
<i>Very Useful</i>	37.5%
<i>Useful</i>	43.8%
<i>Somewhat Useful</i>	15.6%
<i>Not That Useful</i>	3.1%
<i>Not Useful at All</i>	--

General Sessions

How useful were the general sessions in relation to its general relevance to your work?	USAID Participants	Non-USAID Participants	Overall
<i>Very Useful</i>	40%	38.5%	39.6%
<i>Useful</i>	37.1%	38.5%	37.5%
<i>Somewhat Useful</i>	20%	23%	20.8%
<i>Not That Useful</i>	2.9%	--	2.1%
<i>Not Useful at All</i>	--	--	--

Among the USAID participants, there was a significant difference between the Washington-based staff and the Mission-based staff in terms of the general relevance to their work. Eighty percent of the Washington-based staff found the general sessions very useful, while only 30% of Mission-based staff did. None of the comments provided on the evaluation forms given any indication as to why this dichotomy emerged.

How useful were the general sessions in relation to whether they exposed you to new ideas and approaches?	USAID Participants	Non-USAID Participants	Overall
<i>Very Useful</i>	34.3%	46.2%	37.5%
<i>Useful</i>	40%	30.8%	37.5%
<i>Somewhat Useful</i>	17.1%	23.1%	18.8%
<i>Not That Useful</i>	8.6%	--	6.3%
<i>Not Useful at All</i>	--	--	--

How useful were the general sessions in relation to whether they enabled you to apply selected ideas to your job?	USAID Participants	Non-USAID Participants	Overall
<i>Very Useful</i>	29.4%	23.1%	27.7%
<i>Useful</i>	26.5%	38.5%	29.8%
<i>Somewhat Useful</i>	35.3%	38.5%	36.2%
<i>Not That Useful</i>	5.9%	--	4.3%
<i>Not Useful at All</i>	2.9%	--	2.1%

ICT Demonstrations

Did you attend the ICT demonstrations?	USAID Participants	Non-USAID Participants	Overall
<i>Yes</i>	54.3%	38.5%	50%
<i>No</i>	45.7%	61.5%	50%

If you did attend the ICT demonstrations, how useful did you find them?	USAID Participants	Non-USAID Participants	Overall
<i>Very Useful</i>	22.2%	20%	21.7%
<i>Useful</i>	50%	60%	52.2%
<i>Somewhat Useful</i>	11.1%	20%	13%
<i>Not That Useful</i>	16.7%	--	13%
<i>Not Useful at All</i>	--	--	--

Appendices

Daily Briefings Provided at the Workshop

MONDAY, AUGUST 22

MORNING SESSION

Education: the Foundation of Social and Economic Transformation

Office of Education Director Richard Whelden welcomed participants to the workshop emphasizing that upcoming sessions would focus on supporting implementation of the new Education Strategy, and that leadership is actively seeking input from participants. He described education as the “unsung hero” of development given its importance to outcomes in other sectors. Wendy Abt discussed USAID Forward and noted that change is initially sparked by an idea and then bolstered by understanding evidence of what works. She spoke of the importance of building partnerships and the need to rely on country systems, as well as the need for programs to be designed and redesigned in order to meet country needs. The Education Strategy will attempt to achieve better outcomes through capacity building and rigorous evaluation. Hilda Arellano noted that many countries that have graduated from USAID had education programming that was integrated into that of other sectors. She spoke of the importance of expanding partnerships to work with other donors and local partners in order to achieve USAID goals. Eric Hanushek of Stanford University discussed the correlation between education and economic growth. Drawing on the case of Latin America, he argued that it is the knowledge gained and the skills developed during years of schooling (and not school attendance alone) that leads to growth. He noted that countries’ policies can influence how well students do. However, there is little evidence that greater government expenditures translate into higher achievement; rather it is teacher quality that is key. To attain higher teacher quality, institutional reforms are needed, including centralized examinations, accountability for results, autonomy, and direct performance incentives.

USAID’s New Education Strategy

During this session, members of the USAID Policy Task Team (PTT) presented the purpose and the composition of the PTT, and the guiding principles that drove the formulation of the new Education Strategy. The PTT was developed to create an agency-wide Education Strategy, a framework with goals that guide programs and policy in the education sector, and the criteria for tracking outcomes. The new Education Strategy is aligned with broader foreign policy goals given the underlying assumption that quality education is a necessary prerequisite to broad based economic and social-development. Parsing out specific focus areas, the new strategy is designed to increase program selectivity by focusing on programs that can have a measurable impact on a national scale, programs that address the three cost-effective primary goals (improved early grade reading, improved tertiary and workforce development programs that lead to a workforce with relevant skills, and increased equitable access to education in crisis and conflict environments), sustainable programs that involve local stake holders, and programs that can show a strong link between the intervention and the program’s impact. These measures are designed to elevate USAID leadership in the education sector.

EARLY AFTERNOON SESSIONS

Supporting the Evaluation Policy: Improving the Quality of Education Design

This session addressed the ways in which evaluation designs can be improved in light of USAID’s Evaluation Policy. Ron Raphael of the Office of Education and Elizabeth Roen of the Office of Learning, Evaluation and Research opened the session with an overview of how performance and impact evaluations can be utilized to gather information key to increasing learning and accountability. Roger Rasnake and Marcia Odell from JBS International presented recommendations for strengthening

evaluation scopes of work. Among the issues addressed were selection of appropriate evaluation methodologies, the need for well-focused research questions, and the amount of time required to recruit and field an appropriate evaluation team, engage in a fruitful collaborative process of evaluation design, and conduct fieldwork. Best practices from previously conducted evaluations were reviewed. Ron Raphael addressed budgeting concerns in the process of developing an evaluation, and Christine Beggs of the Knowledge Services Center provided examples of reasonable expectations for sample evaluations.

Gender Issues and the Education Strategy

Julie Hanson Swanson led this discussion of how USAID can integrate gender considerations into activities carried out under the Education Strategy. The session began with a discussion of how gender relates to the education strategy and what terms such as ‘gender integration’ mean in the context of the strategy. Participants felt that gender should undergird all work done in relation to the strategy, but were worried that it would get lost during implementation. Participants also noted that understanding gender issues was essential to achieving educational goals and facilitating gender equity in society. Gender analysis was mentioned by participants as a key requirement for effective planning, implementation, and evaluation of programming. Leveling the playing field for boys and girls was seen as key to programmatic success, and reaching gender equality in educational outcomes was viewed as a process of identifying barriers or constraints that affect boys and girls, ensuring equality of access to formal and informal education as well as equality in the learning process, and working towards equality of educational outcomes. Participants brainstormed ways in which gender might relate to the Education Strategy’s three goals and identified key entry points: the use of gender analysis, the collection of sex-disaggregated data, the depiction of men and women and men in reading materials (i.e. avoiding stereotypes), not underestimating changes in gender roles that have occurred in a society since the last time materials were updated, and placing a priority on understanding and gender issues’ relationship with changes occurring in post-conflict, conflict, or crisis situations.

Effective Principles of Inclusion and Disability Programming

Given the recent renewed focus by USAID on disability, this session focused on programming to effectively include children with disabilities in mainstream education efforts. In the US and other countries, inclusion efforts have been very successful to the point where often no separation exists between ‘regular’ education and special education; rather provision is becoming general education. An important issue is how to make the best practices and lessons learned in these countries more accessible to others. As parents recognize that children with disabilities can benefit from participation in quality mainstream education, they become stronger advocates for improved education provision. Teachers need to become better equipped, through training, to accommodate all children with diverse learning skills. Physical accessibility to schools needs to remain a focus of disability efforts, as does technology which supports successful strategies for improving learning of special needs children. In response to inquiries from participants about future USAID funding of inclusion efforts when no mention is made in the new education strategy of disability, it was noted that disability can be included as a smaller component of other sector initiatives, e.g. health, economic growth, and democracy and governance, thereby creating a space to articulate and focus attention on disability issues. As parents, communities, and governments see the benefits of inclusion efforts in other sectors, the need to expand education efforts to include disability gains prominence.

Higher Education Institution Assessments

This session outlined the role of HED in conjunction with USAID in forming successful Higher Education Institution partnerships between US Institutions and host country institutions. Azra Nurkic of HED outlined the general process of designing programs and partnerships that would ensure results by formulating data-collection driven RFAs and results-oriented interventions. She clarified the process in which a US higher education institution and host country higher education institution form a partnership and receive funding from USAID and HED. Cornelia Flora of Iowa State University gave specific evidence of this process in the context of the African Higher Education for Development Initiative. She outlined the indicators of successful relationships between US and host-country higher education partnerships, the factors that make good partner universities, and those that create sustainable ties between these institutions.

Introduction to Human and Institutional Capacity Development

This session focused on Human and Institutional Capacity Development (HICD), and how USAID has developed the HICD policy, model, and means to integrate HICD into strategic planning and design of development activities. Presenter Julian Selb of USAID's Office of Education emphasized the importance of HICD policy to promote effective and sustainable U.S. foreign assistance and the HICD model to identify and address performance gaps through a wide array of solutions. The integration of HICD into strategic planning and design of development activities was addressed.

LATE AFTERNOON SESSIONS

From Assessment to Action: Designing Reading Interventions to Reach Goal I

Led by Mitch Kirby, this session provided an overview of the key technical issues to consider when designing reading programs that would be covered in later sessions. In the context of aligning education programs to the strategy, the need for evidence-based programming and steps for analyzing the type of programming needed were previewed. The focus of a program targeted toward Goal I should be on reading outcomes and challenges which may arise when doing so were noted. The key components of a reading program were noted as assessment and measurement; teaching the teachers; aligning standards, curriculum and materials; school management, governance and accountability and community participation, and; going to scale—making sure systems are in place to ensure sustainability. Elements discussed were reliable data; in-service and pre-service teacher training in pedagogy, assessment, and content; management capacity--shared goals, distributive responsibilities, and accountability processes; willingness within the system to change; the time needed to teach reading; and building experimentation into design. Key points for further thought were: (a) a renewed emphasis on analysis and evidence-based programming and analytic rigor, (b) determination of the appropriate mix and sequence for reading interventions—curriculum, standards, materials in context; (c) a measured approach—the inclusion of appropriate metrics to measure the right kinds of things at the right times, and (d) the identification of entry and exit points in country context in order to increase sustainability.

Increasing Capacity for and Quality of Research in Higher Education

The focus of this session was primarily on activities related to Goal 2 of the Education Strategy, 'improved ability of *tertiary and workforce development* programs to produce a workforce with relevant skill to support country's development goals.' Higher education was emphasized as a mechanism to address development challenges. Presenters used examples of initiatives in Africa and Russia, such as the Basic Research and Higher Education (BRHE) model, and Enhancing University Research and

Entrepreneurial Capacity (EURECA) project to illustrate the importance of higher education in host countries. University research with the potential to contribute to development was identified, and the benefits of partnering with universities in the U.S. that share common research interests was highlighted. Teshome Alemneh from HED, Dan Davidson from American Councils for International Education, Brian Darmody from University of Maryland and Marilyn Pifer from CDRF Global stressed that the new Education Strategy strives to develop long term relationships among stakeholders to ensure that the programs are sustainable. Political support and private sector involvement were found to be critical for program sustainability. Presenters agreed that science and technology fields have particularly great potential to bring about social and economic development.

Youth Development, the Challenge of Complexity and Size: Cross-Sectoral and Systems Approaches to Programs

This session focused on youth development, specifically addressing cross-sectoral and systems approaches to youth programs. The session was moderated by USAID/Jamaica representative Claire Spence and the presenters were Bonnie Politz, Vice President and Senior Technical Expert at FHI 360, and Erik Butler, Director of International Youth, Workforce, and Economic Growth Programs at Education Development Center. The presenters defined the term youth development, described core youth development principles, explained the continuum and effective characteristics of USAID youth-related programming approaches and considered Jamaica, Rwanda and El Salvador as examples of how cross-sectoral systems thinking can help achieve Mission and country objectives for youth. The speakers emphasized the importance of creating age-appropriate youth development programs and listening to youth without pre-judging them. In addition, the presenters stated that many programs focus on “fixing” youth, but it is important to concentrate on their strengths rather than identifying their weaknesses. The presenters discussed the usefulness of EQUIP3, for working within and across sectors. They stated that evaluating the outcomes of programs is important, not just observing the outputs. Lastly, presenters emphasized the benefits of using a cross-sectoral approach.

Cost Effectiveness Analysis

This session addressed the importance of cost benefit and cost effectiveness analyses in education programs. The three presenters discussed themes related to measuring cost effectiveness of USAID programs. Juan Belt emphasized that reliable cost effectiveness or cost benefit analysis at the beginning of the program can identify the variables that affect the final outcomes, and can set up valid and reliable monitoring measures for the program cycle. A project analysis of any kind should include many different types of analyses, including financial, beneficiary, institutional, and environmental analysis. Joe DeStefano discussed a program comparison done by RTI International to measure the cost effectiveness of programs related to community-based schools. The USAID programs were compared to public school programs funded by the Ministry of Education. Caitlin Tulloch emphasized that cost effectiveness analysis can be efficiently used to compare various education interventions. If a program is to increase student attendance, for example, myriad program options are available: cash transfers, deworming programs, school construction, etc. J-PAL is working on several different analyses related to education outcomes. One of the most important components of a cost effectiveness analysis requires rigorous estimates of impact in order to measure the cost effectiveness ratio. In order to do this, program officers should build rigorous evaluation techniques into the research design.

TUESDAY, AUGUST 23

MORNING SESSION

Early Grade Reading: Summary of Evidence, Implications, and New Directions from Donors

This plenary session presented current evidence to support an increased focus on early grade reading and learning strategies. Donor organizations, including the EFA/FTI Secretariat, USAID, the World Bank, DIFD, and Hewlett Foundation, share a similar perspective on the need to re-focus policy from access to quality issues. The panel highlighted the importance of research, the evidence base, and best practices to indicate what has worked and how efforts focused on early learning efforts are effective in improving student achievement. Investment in reading in the early stages has a high rate of return, as children have a better base on which to continue learning, and teaching children to read well is less expensive than teaching adults to read later. Speakers identified remaining gaps in research and implementation that donors will need to address in individual strategies. Some of the issues addressed included: the need to promote an environment of assessment and accountability, the need to focus on equity that ensures the poorest children have access to quality learning opportunities, improved teacher skill beyond rote learning methods, promotion of accountability and understanding by school-level staff to focus on early learning, building capacity and understanding of host governments to take the lead in early reading improvement efforts, and ongoing assessment of students. The need for continual research and dissemination of findings was reiterated by all presenters, as was their common strong support for global improvements in quality of education.

Assessment Approaches and Application: The Basics of Measurement and Assessment for Policy Dialogue and Action

In this session, Annie Duflo, from Innovations for Poverty Action, shared their experience with the Teacher Community Assistant Initiative in Ghana, and the effective use of impact evaluations to determine how to spend limited resources, and learn how to improve programs and their delivery. Luis Crouch, from Education for All Fast Track Initiative Secretariat, spoke about measurement and assessment in early literacy programs. He provided four reasons to measure: to motivate; to monitor and manage; to report; and to prove impact. He noted that in some countries there is a need to motivate governments to engage in such measurement trials. Measurement is also important as a management and monitoring tool; essential for reporting on results; and a way to prove programs are having the impact they are intended to have. Emmanuel Mensah-Ackman from USAID/Ghana spoke about the National Literacy Acceleration Program (NALAP) in Ghana, a national program in mother tongue literacy instruction. While it is too early to assess results, the program has been well received. Support from the government for this program has been key, though an increased level of effort will be needed for mother tongue programs given the prevalence and preference in the country for English instruction. Aabira Sher Afghan, USAID/Malawi, presented the findings of the first application of EGRA in Malawi, which was done under the Malawi Teacher Professional Development Support Activity. Findings showed very low scores across all sub-tests. The program is currently in a process of dialogue with the government given that results of this study were disputed and have not yet been released. A participant aptly noted that while much emphasis has been put on rigorous evaluation and measurement, there is so much yet to learn about policy constraints. The work needs to focus on how to use this knowledge and results to learn, and more effort need to be put into exploring ways in which we can use M&E in the policy environment we are working in.

EARLY AFTERNOON SESSIONS

Leveraging Technology for Education in Complex and Challenging Environments

From South Sudan to the Congo to Port-au-Prince, technology is playing a role in the delivery of valuable educational content in the world's most difficult and constrained environments. Mike Laffin (EDC) reported on the methods and successes of interactive radio instruction (IRI) in the Sudan, where strife and conflict have made the consistent delivery of quality education nearly impossible. In Haiti, where 86% of university graduates leave the country to work abroad, Microsoft (represented by David Yunger) and World Vision International (represented by Lou August) are building partnerships to deliver quality education at scale and to promote rooted entrepreneurialism for sustained growth. UNESCO's David Atchoarena similarly reported that partnership development is crucial for using technology productively in the places where it can have the most impact: environments with extremely low resources and those with ongoing conflict. USAID's Anthony Bloome echoed the sentiment expressed by this session's skilled panel: the value of technology lies in the quality of its use, much like a piece of chalk on a blackboard.

Education and Conflict: What Do We Know?

Findings on the relationship between education and conflict from recent qualitative and quantitative research were discussed during this session. Dana Burde (NYU) and Henrik Urdal (Harvard) acknowledged that 'education and conflict' is a recent field of study and currently lacks data from past research and other evidence based studies. Both strongly support the need for more research to understand the entire spectrum of the relationship between education and conflict. Drawing from the limited data and the recent research studies, the presenters briefly highlighted the key challenges, suggestions and way forward. Research indicates that education may have the potential to mitigate conflict depending on content, access to education and quality of education provided. Educational content that is inclusive, non-discriminatory and related to peace and reconciliation has the potential to aid in conflict mitigation, as data shows lesser conflicts with increase in higher levels of education in general. Reducing inequality in education was also considered important in mitigating conflict. There is some evidence that when the threat to education is reduced, both boys and girls are willing to go to school. Community education, activities that engage communities in a non-formal way and use women for education assistance in schools have shown some positive effect in providing safer access to education for all children, especially girls. Teacher training, special interventions in conflict areas, and evidence of what works differs from regions that are stable, and thus 'quality of education' in conflict and post conflict regions needs to be addressed differently. Another key point was the importance of including education as part of humanitarian response in conflict areas. More data on evidence-based education programs and an understanding of problems specific to conflict regions were proposed as areas that can benefit in planning for short term and long term approaches to development in these regions.

School-to-Work Transition: Linking Workforce Development with Entrepreneurship

This presentation highlighted the systemic view required to understand the link between workforce development and entrepreneurship. Presenters Sibylle Schmutz of SwissContact, Cornelia Janke of EDC, Tim Haskall of EDC, and David Rurangirwa of USAID/Rwanda focused discussion on the definition of market orientation; improving entrepreneurship skills, and assessing the impact of these interventions. The USAID funded, Education Development Center (EDC) 'Akazi Kanoze' project was showcased.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Financing Modalities

Suezan Lee led this session which focused on USAID's experience with projectized and non-projectized education funding assistance, specifically in Africa and the Asia and Middle East countries. The presenters were Joe DeStefano, Senior Education Specialist at RTI International, Meredith Fox, USAID/Ghana Education Officer, and Hala El Serafy, USAID/Egypt Senior Education Specialist. Mr. DeStefano discussed the historical context of non-projectized assistance. He stated that some officials thought that non-projectized assistance would provide an easier management burden, but in fact, a larger management burden occurred and the monitoring and keeping track of funds became an issue. In addition, he stated that many organizations think that more non-projectized assistance should be provided, however, the new USAID education strategy seeks tangible results, and due to the issues that arise from providing non-projectized assistance, it may not be the proper funding modality. Ms. Fox discussed her experience in Ghana and the use of implementation letters to fund education programs. She saw implementation letters as an opportunity to build the capacity of the country while meeting USAID/Ghana's specific objectives. In addition, she implied that the potential for sustainability is increased when there is a high level of ministry involvement from the beginning. Ms. El Serafy discussed the cash transfer mechanism that is being implemented in Egypt, which allows the Government of Egypt to receive reimbursement upon achieving established objectives. She stated that the cash transfer mechanism enabled the government to set its own reform priorities and enabled the capacity building of the Ministry of Egypt.

Discussion: Comparative Education Strategies

During this working lunch, panelists representing four organizations were asked to identify their organization's comparative advantage in the field of education, as well as challenges to developing an education strategy. Highlighted comparative advantages included: partnerships and stakeholder alignment (FTI), education expertise in every country (DFID), knowledge and policy (World Bank), and field presence and innovation (USAID). Panelists then identified the major challenges to developing an education strategy, which included fitting development goals with national priorities and emphasizing financial accountability and resource management. While the institutions differ in their structures, the representatives collectively agreed that measuring outcomes and impact will be increasingly important. Participants concluded by underlining the need to disseminate best practices across organizations and strengthen partnerships.

LATE AFTERNOON SESSIONS

Conflict, Crisis, and Education

This session presented three perspectives of conflict and education. The moderator, Yolanda Miller-Grandvaux from USAID's Office of Education, noted that the field of education and conflict is just six years old. The internationally adopted paradigm that emerged from 2006-2008 seeks to answer to what extent education contributes to, and mitigates, conflict. Reuben Brigety II from the Department of State's Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM) discussed PRM's experience in emergencies and the programs they support, as well as the challenges of providing education in a crisis setting. He stressed that humanitarians and development actors must interact, develop coordination, and share information with each other. Nigel Roberts from the World Bank presented the World Development Report 2011 which focused on modern violence. He discussed how the violence of the Cold War was replaced by another type that is more intractable and less prone to resolution. Countries that have been able to break the cycle of violence have done so through reforming and strengthening their institutions, which can take a generation or more. He noted that education in these settings has the power to change psychology that is so dominant in creating violence, and has the power to move people out of the circumstances that they find themselves in. Marleen Wong, the Assistant Dean of USC, discussed the steps the Department of Education has taken to mitigate the impact of crises and conflict on

students. Since the 1990s, programs have been developed to deal with readiness and emergency management, among others. The Department of Education also created a model that discussed the four phases of emergency management: prevention-mitigation (identify hazards that are present), preparation, response, and a recovery. She also spoke of how schools are the first place parents, students, and communities turn after a tragedy.

Teach the Teachers (and Their Supervisors): System Strengthening for Improving Teacher Effectiveness

The session presented effective practices for teacher training programs that will lead to increased student reading levels. Practices presented were gleaned from current research on teacher training as well as reading programs implemented in Mali, Liberia, and the Philippines. Effective reading instruction involves allowing adequate time for reading to be built into classroom instruction time, consistent instructional routines especially for teachers with low levels of reading themselves, and availability of appropriate and sufficient materials that children can read independently. Determinates in changing teachers behaviors include sustained training over time, training that is imbedded in larger professional preparation, and training that's appropriate to what's needed for classrooms. A minimal level of teachers' content knowledge that is the same as is needed for classroom level instruction is necessary. Teachers need to be taught using the same types of activities as students need to use to learn. Continuous student assessment is required as is research on programs that are not showing improved student learning in order make changes in programming. Investments in teacher training programs are only effective if children are learning.

Integrating Preparedness and Recovery Planning into Education Programs

This session underlined the importance of preparedness and recovery from disasters or crises in school systems. Marla Petal from Risk Red focused on prevention by giving an overview of comprehensive school safety, disaster-proofing in the education sector. In her presentation, she addressed the three key areas of risk assessment and planning, physical and environmental protection, as well as response capacity development in disaster-proofing education programs. Dr. Petal also spoke briefly about the three goals of comprehensive school safety, 1) student and staff protection, 2) educational continuity, and 3) culture of safety. To better prepare, an incident command response system needs to be created and drills and/or simulations need to be carried out. An incident command response will aid response and recovery as differing levels of disaster or crisis would require different actions. Dr. Petal suggests adding in different scenarios to make drills and simulations as realistic as possible. Dr. Marleen Wong from University of Southern California focused on the mental health aspect of recovery for children affected by disaster or crisis. She spoke about challenges that school systems faced with regards to response and recovery during a disaster or crisis as the mission creed of schools emphasizes academics and testing although it is critical to first address the emotional needs of students during such an event. Post-traumatic stress disorder, PTSD has an emotional, cognitive, and neurological impact on an individual affected by disaster or crisis and has serious implications on children between the ages of 1 to 5. Thus, it is crucial that the mental health of children is being addressed through psychological first aid in order to enable children affected by a disaster or crisis to function and reinstate their emotional well-being.

Financing Education Services in Crisis and Conflict-Affected Situations

Malcom Phelps of USAID/Afghanistan and Pakistan Affairs and Katie Donohoe USAID/Pakistan presented on a different financing approach, Government to Government (G2G) assistance model, a bi-lateral relationship with USAID and Pakistan, and USAID and Afghanistan. G2G model is practiced

differently in each of these countries to suit the country situation. In Afghanistan, the agreement is between the Ministry of Administration, Afghanistan and USAID is yet to be signed. Ms. Donohue pointed out that Pakistan has greater capacity to rebuild than Afghanistan. The key attribute in both cases is working closely with the Government at the host country and thereby getting greater political support which is required for program sustainability. On the other hand, Technical assistance for rebuilding efforts have involved many senior technical and management professionals from countries such as the U.S. and Canada and this adversely impacts the potential for program sustainability. The reason being, Pakistanis or Afghans are not being mentored or trained to perform the same function. G2G has the advantage of being cheaper than having other independent contracts, but also comes with a time consuming process and rigorous assessment and evaluation prior to signing the agreement with the host countries. There are ongoing efforts to help government with capacity building, program extension to different regions and improving program sustainability.

Application of Science and Technology for Development

This session explored the ways by which support for Science and Technology programs can align with development goals. Cathy Chan-Halbrendt (University of Hawaii) and Tammo Steenhuis (Cornell University) reported on their fruitful partnerships with universities in Albania and Ethiopia, respectively. These partnerships balance the need for building trusting relationships across diverse faculty and disciplines with the need for delivering productive outcomes within short timeframes and with limited means. Marilyn Pifer (CDRF Global) discussed her work in establishing Technology Training Offices as bridges between research and industry. The session's discussion focused on the need to ensure that innovation, critical thinking and leadership are qualities embedded in higher education development broadly speaking. In many instances, promoting these developments involves extensive partnership and trust building. The results can be dramatically positive for the promotion of shared value between the university or institute and the domestic economy which benefits from increased skill and increased productivity.

Innovative Evaluation Approaches for Youth Employment

This session brought to the table innovative evaluation approaches for youth employment. Accordingly, the session format was also innovative. After a short introduction to the topic by Kevin Hempel and David Newhouse from the World Bank, and Mark Lynd and Jeff Davis from School-To-School, participants were divided up into "speed dating" discussion groups in which specific impact evaluation designs were discussed, as well as specific questions from participants. At the start of the session, moderator Daniel Oliver from the International Youth Foundation provided a comprehensive introduction to impact evaluations and set the tone for the discussion that followed in each table. Oliver noted that impact evaluation is a distinct method of evaluation and that emphasis on this approach is new to the development world. It has been used in the US for a while, in particular by the US Department of Education. Impact evaluation is seen as the gold standard, and it is now filtering into the development world bolstered by donor demand. The World Bank has been a leading donor in this respect, and a growing interest exists within USAID to further use this evaluation method. He noted that impact evaluations use a sophisticated set of statistics to determine impact, that is, to verify how interventions are affecting beneficiaries. In sum, they provide the evidence as to what is working or not, and allow us to better judge what is successful and what is not.

Managing Activities to Minimize Vulnerabilities and Maximize Accountability

This session discussed a range of project management issues, in the context of audits and fraud awareness. The discussion included useful tips on monitoring project activities and tracking results in

geographically and politically challenging environments. It described the steps taken when OIG audits a program. Joseph Farinella of USAID/OIG noted that the main criteria utilized in a performance audit is contained in the scope of work or project's objectives. He added that looking at results is not about measuring outputs or metrics but impact and outcomes. A project is successful when it achieves the goals proposed in its design. When financial management presents challenges, OIG provides recommendations to improve its performance. Though implementers are considered partners in a project's execution, the presenter highlighted the critical monitoring responsibility of USAID. Joseph pointed out that when evidence of implementation problems in geographically and politically challenging environments are raising doubts the situation should be disclosed. During the discussion participants shared their past experience with OIG, emphasizing its effective intervention providing them with financial internal control.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 24

MORNING SESSION

Mobilizing Higher Education for Development Impact

This session addressed Goal 2 of the Education Strategy and provided insight into current research on the role of higher education and leadership development. Gary Bittner from USAID/Office of Education introduced the session by discussing USAID's focus on outcomes with its new policy on Human and Institutional Capacity Development. He noted that assessments of higher education institutions are critical if programs are to have an impact. Susy Ndaruhutse of the CfBT Education Trust introduced her research that seeks to answer what role higher education plays in the development of leaders. To date, she has completed Phase One of a three phase study, mapping the GER of 164 countries against worldwide governance indicators and conducting a literature review. The findings highlight the different purposes of higher education and indicate that the development of leaders through higher education can take 20+ years. The findings also show a positive correlation between tertiary GER and indicators of good governance, though other factors are in play. Ndaruhutse noted that the purpose of higher education institutions has evolved over time, from training the elite, to educating the masses, to providing universal higher education; however, most developing countries are still at the elite development stage. Donor support for higher education has also gone through cycles and the challenge now is to find the balance between supporting basic education and higher education. In Phases Two and Three, she and her team will conduct further research and case studies and develop lessons learned. This research is available on the CfBT website.

If You Print It, Will They Read? Aligning Standards, Curriculum, and Reading Materials to Ensure Success

Stefanie Al-Otaiba of Florida State University opened this session with an overview of necessary inclusions in reading curricula and standards that should be in place as the foundation for development of appropriate reading support materials. Core reading programs should follow a hierarchy of instructions progressing from the easiest, simplest skills sequentially towards the final outcome of producing fluent readers. Standards need to align with the goals and tools that will be used in assessments, for example, with the EGRA. Thereafter, several other presenters gave an overview of the experiences and lessons learned in materials development for literacy reform from several individual country programs. Julia Richards from USAID/Liberia noted that standards for reading in curricula of developing countries are rarely found: therefore, the process is extremely time-consuming but necessary to put in place initial reading curricula and standards that will guide materials development and teacher training. For many reasons, materials are not useful or even used unless they are aligned specifically with the instructional process. From the USAID Ethiopia program, the presenter noted that materials need to be contextually appropriate and appealing to children so they benefit from them. Cory Heyman from Room to Read reinforced several points given by previous presenters, noting that children often don't use books because they can't read or are not interested in reading. Room to Read successfully uses local authors, illustrators, and publishers to ensure materials produced are context appropriate and cost effective. All presenters noted that materials need to be appropriately sequenced and linked to classroom instruction, teachers need to be taught how to use new materials effectively, and that literacy efforts are expensive and involve the input of many actors, but are highly successful in aiding early reading initiatives.

EARLY AFTERNOON SESSIONS

The View from the Hill

In this session, presenters Robin Lerner and Lori Riley addressed communication gaps between USAID Washington and program implementers which inhibit mutual understanding. In order to bridge the divide, the speakers emphasized the need for regional staff to provide information on results and prioritize regional projects as the Agency is faced with budget constraints. Acknowledgement of these constraints by implementers will allow them to exercise some control over which programs will be cut and which will be maintained. They also suggested that implementers should think about how they can enhance program productivity. The presenters were open about the pressures faced from constituencies and difficulties faced by allocating funds for foreign assistance with many domestic issues yet to be addressed. They indicated that programs that can demonstrate effectiveness and are directly linked to the new USAID strategies will be those funded, and acknowledged that there will be conflicting priorities in cases where education initiatives are a means of bolstering national security.

ICT4 Public/Private Sector Partnerships: Maximizing Opportunities for Scale and Impact

Senior representatives from private sector companies working in international education presented some of their current programming and the principles that shaped them. Representatives from Microsoft, Intel, Brainpop-Latin America, ISTE, and Scholastic International discussed the scope, location, and impact of current education projects and the extent with which they've partnered with USAID. James Bernard from Microsoft articulated the principles that guided their programming based on their research, such as emphasizing student-centered learning and innovative teaching practices, and facilitating the adaptation of innovative instruction from individual classrooms to the education system as a whole. Lynn Nolan suggested that standards from ISTE can help increase the quality of ICT education in partner countries. The question and answer section covered issues specifically related to the private sector's programming in international education and the scope of the work they do. Issues addressed included managing the gap between corporate, NGO and USAID budget timing cycles, and the tension between proprietary and open source technology. Participants asked the representatives the extent to which their companies addressed higher education programming and accessibility for people with disabilities. The balance between spending resources on testing new innovative approaches and scaling programs nationally was also explored.

Increasing Equitable Access in Higher Education: Admissions and Distance Learning

Luba Fajfer and Roy Zimmerman moderated this discussion on obstacles to accessing higher education institutions (Goal 2 of the new Education Strategy), such as barriers to gaining entrance to universities, and to enrollment. Efforts to strengthen and create sustainable and equitable systems and policies that promote participation in higher education were highlighted. Yarema Bachynsky, Ukrainian Standardized External Testing Initiative (USETI), described the creation and implementation of a standardized entrance exam for all students wishing to study in Ukrainian higher education institutions. This action was taken in response to corruption in admissions. Since 2008, students have experienced increasingly equitable access to higher education. Carol Finmen, of Alamo Colleges discussed a University of Texas-El Paso partnership with Universidad Autonoma, a technical university located on the U.S.-Mexico border which provides Mexican youth with appropriate skills in order to attract maquiladoras back to the region. Ongoing and unpredictable violence led to a ban on travel by U.S.-based university staff to the region. Therefore, the team turned to distance learning to bridge the gap. Owing to their persistence and flexibility, faculty members and lab technicians have participated in online training via NEFSIS web and video conferencing, BlackBoard and existing ESL software packages to learn to develop new teaching competencies.

Examining the Youth, Economic Engagement, and Conflict Nexus: How Youth Economic Empowerment Can Enhance Stability

In this session Jon Kurtz, Rebecca Wolfe and Tara Noronha of Mercy Corps presented on some of the reasons youth join violent movements and how programs can address them in a holistic manner. Rebecca Wolfe divided reasons for why youth engage in violence or participate in violent movements into three categories: Economic, Political and Community/Social. Programs tend to focus on the economic reasons (financial incentives, coverage of basic needs) but there are problems with viewing youth and conflict through this purely economic lens. Youth do not necessarily make economically rational choices or do cost-benefit analyses prior to joining violent movements, and not all countries with high numbers of youth and high unemployment rates see conflict. Jon Kurtz presented research aimed at identifying predictors of youth engagement in violence and the hypothesis Mercy Corps tested: if youth are meaningfully employed, they are less likely to join violent movements for economic gains. Jon Kurtz shared about studies in Liberia and Kenya where qualitative and quantitative methods were used to test the hypothesis. The study concluded that the reasons for why youth engage in violent behavior or join violent movements are varied and job creation on its own is not enough. Rather, it is important to create avenues for youth participation and engagement and create a national identity that supersedes ethnic or group-specific classification. Examples of holistic programs shared by Taha Noronha included the Skills for Kosovo's Young Leaders program, Start-up Kashmir Entrepreneur Development Project, and Local Empowerment for Peace Plus program in Kenya. Questions from the group included scaling these or similar programs and long-term evaluations and impact.

Capacity-Building: Models of Implementation

During this session, Steve Kowal from the USAID Office of Education offered a comprehensive explanation of the HICD (Human and Institutional Capacity Development) strategic approach to program design and implementation, providing a step-by-step guide to the model, beginning with identifying partner organizations and ending with developing action plans flowing from project assessment. Although the approach is very structured, it was noted that ultimately there is no linear process in project design and implementation. In fact, looking at individual components allows for easier application, because there are instances when certain features of the model may not necessarily apply. David Dzebisashvili of USAID/Georgia presented an HICD case study, illustrating how the Georgian

Ministry of Refugees and Accommodation (MRA) implemented the approach to improve services provided for internally-displaced persons (IDPs). With the number of Georgian IDPs growing to about 140,000 in recent decades due to various conflicts, MRA approached USAID for small-scale technical assistance, which utilized the HICD approach. The model yielded successful results, which included recognition from the national government and positive feedback from IDPs concerning the efficiency of services within MRA departments.

Participatory Round-Table: “Who Says You Can’t Have 21st Century Education in Low-Resource Settings?”

In this plenary, presenters from the public and private sectors gave brief overviews of their work with ICT in education. The moderator, Anthony Bloome, presented the context of ICT in education and asked, “Where can science and technology take us?” Professor Asha Kanwar of Commonwealth of Learning (COL) guided the audience through the work that COL does in developing open education resource (OER) materials, and how these are improving the quality of education in India and Malawi by providing quality materials that are adaptable to local contexts. David Atchoarena of UNESCO discussed education transformation in the ICT context, and how new technology demands new skill sets of learners. Mathew Taylor briefed the audience on a successful pilot in Zambia using solar technology to create a computer lab for students. Presenters also discussed Inveneo’s work around the world, frameworks for using ICT in education, and applications of technology for learners with disabilities, as well as work done by the Peace Corps, in conjunction with USAID in the ICT sector.

LATE AFTERNOON SESSIONS

Contributions of School Management, Governance and Accountability, and Community Participation to Children’s Learning Outcomes: A Conversation

In this session, panelists shared recent evidence, exchanged field experiences, and distilled key lessons and practices in the areas of school management, governance and accountability as well as community participation in children’s learning outcomes. Jennifer Spratt gave a brief overview of educational decentralizations in the 1990s, as well as the various mechanisms designed to ensure accountability, and the linkages between the issues impacting student learning outcomes: teaching and classroom practices, opportunity to learn, school management, and accountability and governance. She then gave country examples which used experimental and non-experimental methods to generate evidence of best practices and lessons learned in school management, governance and accountability, and community participation. The moderator, Rebecca Adams, then called on the eight panelists, Claire Spence, Jean Beaumont, Luis Tolley, Aabira Sher Afghan, John Collins, Mariam Britel-Swift, Muhammad Tariq Khan, and Mary Tyler Holmes to share their field experiences and key lessons learned from their projects in the various mechanisms of accountability such as top-down performance control, school report cards and self-assessment tools, school improvement plans and grants, school-based management, and community participation.

Open Educational Resources: Increasing Access While Improving Quality

This session focused on how Open Educational Resources (OER) can improve access to educational content and quality of education, through the personalization of teaching and learning, and the aggregation of resources. Members of the panel described OER as a global movement aimed at improving access, quality, and usability of education content for teachers and students around the world through use of openly-licensed content and technology. Teaching, learning, and research content are digitized, made freely available in the public domain, and released under an intellectual property license

that permits its free use and repurposing by others. Kathy Nicholson claimed that OER has 5 benefits: (1) the ability to make continuous improvements to enhance learning; (2) the ability to localize content; (3) accessibility for all; (4) greater learning efficiencies; and (5) radically reduced costs. She highlighted that OER's goals are to equalize knowledge and improve teacher learning. Catherine Ngugi shared several examples of OER best practices throughout Africa and Hal Plotkin highlighted the Obama administration's efforts to support OER and emphasized the importance of this initiative nation and worldwide. The panel ended the presentation by stating that Open Educational Resources can be used to help achieve education development goals in a scalable, practical, and cost-effective way but it is necessary to increase awareness that resources exist and that they are freely available. They added that to integrate OER into the mainstream, agencies could encourage open licenses via grant-making programs, support infrastructure projects, and engage in partnerships.

Assessing Conflict for Improved Education Programs

Yolande Miller-Grandveaux began the session by stressing the importance of monitoring and evaluation to ensure program effectiveness. However, when speaking of education in conflict, there are not many assessment frameworks available. The presentation stressed two assessment tools, one developed by the State Department and one by USAID's Office of Military Affairs (OMA). Cynthia Lerner of the US Department of State introduced the Interagency Conflict Assessment Framework (ICAF), which has people from the embassy out in the field conducting interviews and "bringing the words of the people" back with them. The ICAF seeks to understand what the sources not only of conflict but of resiliency are at the local, national and international level. Taking a systems approach can help agencies see where resilience is present and can be used to mitigate conflict in a way that is non-intrusive and culturally sensitive. Christina Ciak of the Office of Military Affairs at USAID discussed the District Stability Framework (DSF). The purpose of this tool is to understand local populations and their environment, implement activities to address local concerns, and then measure effectiveness in reducing and eliminating local concerns that could lead to conflict. This tool has already been used in Afghanistan, but the OMA decided to pilot this tool in Garissa, Kenya as well to see if it would work in a different environment. The team created a local perceptions survey asking people about the population of their Bulla (neighborhood), the most important problems facing their Bulla, and who people trust or go to when trying to solve a problem. Responses indicated people were concerned about jobs and land disputes and that the local/national government was seen as the institution that should solve problems. Youth were many times perceived as contributing to the resolution of disputes. The DSK can ultimately help as a pre-step in education programming by identifying sources of instability, getting program officers/ partners thinking about obstacles to implementing education programs in conflict areas and facilitating communications between organizations. Miller-Grandveaux concluded by saying education in conflict zones is a new field that will be increasingly relevant and where there is plenty of room for cooperation and analysis to ensure effectiveness.

Financing Higher Education: Increasing Access

Suezan Lee of the USAID/Office of Education opened the session with a discussion of combining public and private financing to increase access to higher education in host countries. Bruce Johnstone from the State University of New York, Buffalo presented a range of financing sources, namely non-governmental revenues, philanthropic funding and cost sharing. Deferred payments, student loans and cost sharing mechanisms were a few of the proposed means of facilitating pursuit of higher education. In this context, Garth Willis, USAID/Office of Education shared an example from Kyrgyzstan in which a student loans model worked by providing external technical assistance to educational institutions for processing student loans. Al Jaeger from Putera Sampoerna Foundation of Indonesia shared a success story of a project providing access to higher education based on merit, in contrast to Indonesia's status quo, that is

exclusive and expensive. Student loans and pre-negotiated provisional subsidized tuition fees in overseas universities along with stringent review and selection processes for enrollment have contributed to the success of this initiative. In countries such as Vietnam, where the culture of borrowing is not popular, it was suggested that insurance or savings schemes appear to have greater potential than credit schemes. In conclusion, panelists emphasized that though these initiatives were successful, they were also faced with challenges (e.g. expanding and sustaining this model and creating job opportunities for graduates in home countries) which will need to be addressed in the future.

An Economist and an Education Specialist Get Off a Plane: Assessing Workforce Development Systems for Private Sector and Institutional Perspectives

This session unveiled contrasting views of workforce development/labor market assessments. Examples of such assessments were shared, in particular recent experience in Yemen and the Philippines. Phil Psilos from RTI International, discussed the economist's approach. The different stages of assessing workforce based on a Stylized Private Sector Approach was shared with participants, including the research that needs to be done before the assessment starts, to the work to be done in country, including identifying key sectors, mapping out national stakeholders from the private, public and voluntary sectors (both demand and supply sides) who will be source of key information, as well as learning about web-based job boards or recruiter websites. A demand-side analysis is carried out, as well as an assessment of the supply side to understand the issues and to compose an accurate picture of the country's labor market. In this approach, the main issues to consider are cost, quality and availability. Joseph DeStefano, also from RTI, spoke from an education policy perspective. He presented three TVET delivery models, and discussed in particular the roles the public sector can play to ensure a match of skills with labor market needs. This can be done by targeting resources via incentives, subsidies and direct funding of some programs, as well as assuring quality and relevance (i.e., standards) of TVET training programs/providers. The role of the private sector was also discussed. In this model, key policy considerations in TVET assessments are access, quality and financing. Although different, these two assessment approaches do share a common focus on quality.

Presentations for all sessions and session summaries will be posted on the Workshop Website (www.usaideducationworkshop.com) shortly after the close of the workshop.