

A.I.D.'s Investment in Basic Education



United States Agency for International Development
Bureau for Research and Development
Office of Education

A.I.D.'S INVESTMENT IN BASIC EDUCATION:

A Description of Current Activities

January 1993

**Prepared for the
Agency for International Development
Bureau for Research and Development
Office of Education
with the assistance of the
Social Sector Policy Analysis Project
Operated by the Academy for Educational Development
Contract No. PDC-0082-C-00-9080-00**

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
The Environment for Basic Education	2
Basic Education	2
The Rationale for Investment in Basic Education	2
Financial Support	4
A.I.D.'s Program for Basic Education	5
A Shared Agenda	6
Current Guidelines for A.I.D.'s Support	8
A.I.D. Objectives in Basic Education	9
Program Concentration	10
Strategic Focus: Criteria for Supporting Countries	11
Relating Country Focus and Program Concentration	16
High Need Countries	16
Medium Need Countries	18
Low Need Countries	19
Expertise and Capacity	21
Development of a National Action Plan	22
Indicators for Monitoring the Basic Education Program	25
ANNEX A: Selected International References	A-1
ANNEX B: A.I.D. Basic Education: Major Projects Active in FY 1992	B-1
ANNEX C: Database for Country Focus: Need and Policy Environment	C-1

INTRODUCTION

A growing body of research has persuasively established that wide participation in quality basic education is essential to economic and social well-being and the development of stable, democratic political institutions. A.I.D.'s central mission - to foster broad-based sustainable economic growth that improves people's lives - is well served by assistance programs that widen access to basic education, improve educational quality, and increase efficiency.

This paper presents the current rationale and framework for A.I.D.'s investment in basic education. Drawing on existing policy and basic education strategy statements, and recent analytic reviews of program experience, it describes A.I.D.'s on-going initiatives to support basic education. The description includes:

- A framework and criteria used to group countries for A.I.D. support;
- Program/project areas in which A.I.D. is concentrating, related to country needs and policy environment;
- Modalities for implementation that maximize impact; and
- Types of information needed to monitor basic education reform.

See **Annex A** for selected international references on education trends and assistance practices.

...I believe that the available evidence suggests that programs to raise the education of girls offer the best hope. When one takes into account all the benefits, educating girls quite possibly yields a higher rate of return than any other investment available in the developing world.

- Lawrence H. Summers

Investing in All the People, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper, May 1992

- 1'

THE ENVIRONMENT FOR BASIC EDUCATION

Basic education

Basic education provides the opportunity to acquire the essential skills, knowledge, and attitudes required to function in the modern world, and develop personal, intellectual and, social capacities. It is fundamental to the strengthening of higher levels of education, and includes early childhood development, the first levels of formal education, and continuing education for those out of school. This concept of basic education is consistent with the U.S. domestic agenda

for education reform, exemplified by the Education 2000 program, and it reflects an international consensus exemplified by the Education for All Framework for Action.



The Rationale for Investment in Basic Education

Education is increasingly recognized to be at the heart of the development process. Three dynamically interrelated factors are involved: the economic returns of education; the impact of education on population growth, health, and social well-being; and the relationship between education and

democratic society. Basic education is also the essential first stage in a system of national education, which includes interdependent activities at the primary, secondary, and tertiary levels and a commitment to lifelong learning.

There is now a large body of evidence from many countries demonstrating the direct linkage between education and economic growth. Whereas returns to investments in physical capital are considered excellent if they exceed 10%, basic education investments typically provide returns of over 20%. Educating girls yields a higher rate of return

than any other investment in the developing world. It is estimated that each additional year of schooling for men and women increases wages by between 10 to 20%, and farm output by up to 5%. Whereas a population with a low level of education has little or no capacity for increasing productivity, an educated labor force can make effective use of new technology, engage in entrepreneurial activity, and be responsive to market demands and changes.

Apart from the powerful direct economic benefits of investing in basic education, its indirect benefits to priority social goals of improving human welfare are also compelling. The relationship between the level of women's education level and population growth is dramatic. Women with more education have fewer children than uneducated women: an extra year of schooling reduces female fertility by as much as 5 to 10%. Those children who are born to an educated mother have a much better chance to survive and be healthy. The rate of child mortality is twice as high for uneducated mothers as compared to mothers with a basic education. The effects of improved education are cumulative over generations. Better educated mothers have healthier, better educated children, who themselves as parents are better prepared to nurture and educate their own children. Educated women are more likely to enter into stable marriages, and to be concerned with their personal and reproductive health. While not conclusive, data on urban Africa indicates that there is correlation between the level of female education and HIV prevalence.

In the United States it has been recognized, since Jefferson first articulated it, that a common and universal system of education is necessary for a democratic society to function properly. To participate with knowledge and understanding in policy issues requires literacy, knowledge of the world, and ability to think independently based on evidence.

Success in El Salvador:

Since 1982 USAID has worked with the government of El Salvador to restore primary education services ravaged by civil war and natural disasters. The projects have focused on increasing access to education and improving the Ministry of Education's administrative capacity. Achievements include constructing 400 new classrooms and rehabilitating 2,400 others; providing basic school equipment, furniture, and supplies to 3,800 classrooms; implementing a school maintenance program; and supplying tool kits to 3,200 communities. In addition 3.5 million textbooks for grades 1-6 were distributed, and more than 17,000 teachers were trained in the use of the new textbooks, utilizing three new regional training centers. The initial phase of establishing a management information system has begun at the Ministry of Education. This has been used with computer modeling to track educational indicators and determine resource allocation.

The impact of these inputs has been significant. The net enrollment ratio (obtained by dividing the enrollment of school-age children by the total school-age population) jumped from 58% in 1980 to 72% in 1988. Dropouts and repeaters declined significantly during this period, as indicated by a rise in the coefficient of efficiency from .15 to .57 (a coefficient of 1.0 is obtained when there is no repetition or dropout).

The full impact of education is found where sustained investments in people are accompanied by respect for individual human rights and participation in open market economies and democratic institutions. The effective functioning of labor markets is key to the contribution of education to economic growth and productivity.

Financial Support

Financial support for national plans to improve basic education requires substantial resources. Many developing countries, and especially the poorest, have underinvested in primary education. The harsh economic conditions of the last decade have reduced already inadequate per-pupil expenditures, and have led to a decline in enrollment rates in numerous African countries. It was estimated in 1990 that a global minimum of \$2 billion per year was needed in foreign assistance to reach a target of primary education for all by the year 2005; but this figure is probably low given the unforeseen needs of the newly independent nations of Europe and Asia. These countries will need external financing to prevent an erosion of progress made, let alone to embark on the necessary restructuring of their education systems.

Other donors' support for basic education is about 60% of the \$2 billion base estimate of need. The World Bank in 1991 invested \$2.25 billion in education of which \$717 million was for basic education, up from approximately \$250 million in 1990. A.I.D. direct support for basic education (EHR, DA/DFA, ESF funds) was \$174 million in FY 1991, \$116 million in FY 1992, and is projected to be at least \$135 million in FY 1993.

However, increasing aid is not simply a matter of readjusting policy and budget priorities. Much of the challenge in increasing resources for basic education is strengthening the policy environment and institutional capacity of those countries with the greatest need. A key priority for improving basic education is increasing national capacity to plan and manage education reforms, improvement and expansion. Experience has shown that local initiative and capacity are essential, but building that capacity takes time, and often slows implementation of reforms.

A.I.D.'s Program for Basic Education

A.I.D. is directly supporting basic education activities through bilateral assistance in twenty-four countries, eleven of which are in sub-Saharan Africa. A Congressional basic education earmark and Regional Bureaus' own initiatives since 1986 have more than doubled the number of countries aided. There has been an important shift in modality with this expansion. Prior to 1989 most assistance was provided through projects where A.I.D. would design, appraise, implement, supervise, and evaluate interventions. Projects provided specific inputs such as materials production or teacher training, directly under the control of A.I.D. The disadvantage of this approach is that it seldom results in the policy reforms and administrative restructuring necessary to sustain systematic improvements.

In 1990, A.I.D. developed a strategy for assistance to basic education which emphasizes policy dialogue with host country governments, based on a comprehensive approach to education reform and development. This strategy supports collaboration with other major donors, and provides receptive countries technical support to strengthen analytic and management capacities to more effectively mobilize, allocate, and manage resources in support of education policy reform.

The Africa Bureau of A.I.D. has, since 1990, initiated programs of non-project assistance (NPA) by which funds are disbursed to governments against conditions established through a plan of action jointly developed and supported by the host country government, A.I.D., and other donors. An important goal of these programs is to improve the quality of education and increase access by promoting governmental accountability capacity and mobilization of resources. This is done by disbursing funds on condition that specified, negotiated policy, institutional and budgetary reforms are undertaken by government on schedule. A.I.D. generally combines NPA with targeted project assistance, which provides technical



assistance and training to strengthen institutional capacity and to ensure the monitoring and evaluation of A.I.D. inputs.

A database of A.I.D. basic education programs is given in Annex B. There are presently eight countries receiving NPA combined with project assistance. Of the funds targeted for specific countries in 1992 and 1993, 70% are going to 13 of the 41 Low Income Countries, classified by the World Bank as having a per capita GNP below \$640.

The quality of recent A.I.D. basic education activities generally has received high marks. A report on U.S. foreign aid to basic education from the Results Education Fund argues that "A.I.D. has exhibited considerable expertise relating to basic education ..." and cites numerous cases of effective ongoing programs including Pakistan, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras.

In addition to direct bilateral assistance, centrally funded projects such as Improving the Efficiency of Educational Systems (IEES), Basic Research for Improving Education Systems (BRIDGES), Education and Human Resources Technical Services Project (EHRTS), Advancing Basic Education and Literacy Project (ABEL), Improving Education Quality Project (IEQ), and the newly established Health and Human Resources Analysis for Africa Project (HHRAA) have advanced technical capacity in education sector assessments, policy analysis, research, and management information systems. This technical capacity has been critical to support the local USAID missions engaged in policy dialogue and analysis with governments. The LEARNTECH project continues a successful interactive radio instruction technology which was developed over a 15 year period. Interactive radio provides an alternative, cost-effective way of improving basic education instruction and supporting education in remote areas. It is now being implemented in a number of countries, some of which are employing it independently of A.I.D. support.

A Shared Agenda

A.I.D.'s mission to promote sustainable economic growth and people's well-being is clearly served by the support it provides

to countries committed to improving basic education. The Agency has played an important and supporting role in defining an international consensus on the objectives and strategies for action. The landmark 1990 World Conference on Education for All (WCEFA) and the follow-up to that have stimulated an increased level of international assistance and the development of national plans of action supporting comprehensive strategies for achieving basic education objectives. The WCEFA has shifted the assistance debate from how best to use external resources for remedying local deficiencies, to how best to support national initiatives for major reform and renewal. This shared agenda for the donor community is well underway at A.I.D. It is:

- to support the development of effective national plans of action for achieving basic education objectives; and
- to augment and coordinate both local and international resources for implementing the plans.



CURRENT GUIDELINES FOR A.I.D. SUPPORT TO BASIC EDUCATION



- Work within the framework of **national action plans** for policy reform and educational development. Encourage a democratic process of public participation and review of education reforms. Work closely with other donors to identify joint strategies and complementary areas of support for national action plans. Seek to mobilize and leverage resources, in support of the national action plan, from government, NGOs, the private sector and other donors.
- Analyze the potential for supporting policy reform and administrative restructuring through non-project assistance. A key feature of program conditionality is the commitment of government to implement the national education action plan. This allocation may be supported by funds provided by donors for macroeconomic reforms. There is generally a need to support policy reform programs with technical assistance to strengthen institutional capacity.
- Strengthen national capacity to develop and utilize information on measurable objectives, standards and milestones to assist in monitoring the expansion of access (particularly for girls), improving efficiency and quality, and strengthening the management of education.
- Analyze the potential, within the framework of a national action plan, for the private sector and NGOs to play an important role in the delivery of basic education services, including early childhood care and development, formal schooling, and adult learning. Also, explore and utilize the potential of mass media and communications technologies to support basic education objectives.

A.I.D. OBJECTIVES IN BASIC EDUCATION

As discussed earlier under "The Environment for Basic Education" (pp. 2-3), an effective national program of basic education, by its direct impact on economic development and democratization, contributes to the overall A.I.D. objective to help countries become constructive partners in the global economy and active contributors to a stable and just global political system. Basic education for women contributes directly to quality of life through reducing high rates of childbearing and improving child survival, health and well-being. The investment in basic education is enhanced to the degree that there are concomitant developments in macroeconomic restructuring, market-based production of goods and services, labor market reform, administrative decentralization, fiscal reform, democratization, environmental protection, respect for human rights, family planning, and investments in health and other basic services.

A.I.D. is assisting countries committed to implementing significant reforms to strengthen their national capacity to provide basic education for all. This includes:

- improving access, equity, quality, and efficiency of primary and junior secondary school systems, with a priority on improving educational opportunities for girls;
- developing and implementing national plans of action, based on policy analysis and public dialogue, to mobilize, allocate, and manage resources more effectively;
- improving the learning capacity of children through support for early childhood development activities - including interventions to enhance nutritional status - so as to expand school access and reduce the number of early dropouts;
- supporting literacy and skills training related to productive enterprise and social needs for those, especially women, who have had limited access to basic education.

PROGRAM CONCENTRATION

A.I.D. has worked with American universities, institutes, organizations, and educators to develop capacity, and provide expertise in:

Educational Policy Analysis

- sector assessment
- modeling policy options
- educational research
- public participation in policy dialogue

Educational Planning and Managing Reform

- management information systems
- management and staff training
- decentralization
- finance

Instructional Systems

- curriculum design
- materials development and production
- training of school managers and teachers
- interactive radio
- communications technology
- instructional technology

Early Childhood Development

- nutrition
- cognitive and affective development

Evaluation, Assessments and Testing of Student Achievement

- criteria-reference testing
- monitoring and evaluation of classroom inputs and practice

A.I.D.'s approach builds on its field experience and its long-standing involvement with basic education in selected countries. A Mission presence provides access to and understanding of sector information and policy initiatives, the establishment of effective working relationships with key national institutions and leaders, and the knowledge of programs and plans in other sectors and of other major donors. Such knowledge and relationships are critically important in negotiating effective program support for large-scale educational policy reforms.

STRATEGIC FOCUS: CRITERIA FOR SUPPORTING COUNTRIES

Two general sets of judgments guide current A.I.D. programming assistance in support of basic education reform:

Quantitative Need and the Policy Environment. A fundamental consideration is a national commitment to those reforms necessary to provide quality basic education. The degree of this commitment is one of the factors determining the **Policy Environment**. The lack of national will to improve the education system generally precludes effective A.I.D. assistance.

The South African education system is rooted in the practice of apartheid with a majority of the population denied access to quality education because of race. The political transformation in South Africa towards an equitable multi-racial society requires profound changes in education. A.I.D. is working through non-governmental community-based organizations to redress education inequality. A.I.D.-financed technical assistance has provided policy analysis tools to key organizations working on South Africa's future education system. This assistance has had the effect of raising the level of policy dialogue beyond the exchange of political slogans to well-reasoned strategies for achieving substantive objectives. The rationale for A.I.D.'s assistance to South Africa is not based on economic need, but rather on support for the transformation to an open and democratic society.

Quantitative Need is defined in terms of the gap between a country's educational status and the provision of quality basic education for all. It is indicated by the levels of literacy, access, equity, and school quality. Need is also defined in terms of a country's technical capacity to plan and implement education reform. Although the domain of need is a continuum, countries are categorized here in three groups (high, medium, and low) to highlight assistance strategies.

1. **High Need** countries are indicated by widespread poverty, low literacy and enrollments, poor school quality, high rates of dropout and repetition, and weak institutional capacity. These countries need major technical and financial support, which can only be effective within a context of a national commitment for policy reform and institution building.

Benchmark criteria for this group are: a) low income (< \$640 per capita) or a high rate of infant mortality (>100 per 1000 births); b) low rates of female participation in basic education, with over 50% women's illiteracy or a gross enrolment rate of girls in primary school of less than 70%.

2. Countries in **Medium Need** category are typically in the low to lower-middle income category which are making progress toward self-sustaining development and improving educational conditions, but still have gaps and needs in areas such as access and retention of girls, educational efficiency, quality and institutional capacity for planning, and implementing reform.

Benchmark criteria for this group are: a) countries with a per capita GNP of less than \$2,000; b) women's illiteracy of more than 30% or less than 80% participation of females in primary school; or c) poor quality or efficiency as reflected by high pupil/teacher ratios (>50:1) or high rates of repetition and drop-out (>30%).

3. Countries in the **Low Need** category are making substantial progress toward the quantitative targets of universal basic education. A.I.D. support for education in these countries is based on the need for qualitative changes in the basic education system related to progress and/or structural reforms toward democratic governance and open market systems. In this group are those countries approaching an economic 'take off' stage such as Thailand, Indonesia and Jamaica; also South Africa in its transformation to an open society; and New Independent States and Eastern European countries.

Benchmark criteria for countries in the **Low Need** category are not formulated in quantitative terms, but rather are based on relative need for developing institutional capacity to design and implement education reforms. Countries considered in this category will typically have a per-capita income of less than \$2,500.

Within the second domain, the **Policy Environment**, three concerns guide country selection: stability, receptivity, and impact opportunity..

1. **Stability.** Countries must have a minimum level of civil order and political/economic stability for any development aid to be effective. Development help in systematic reform or capacity building in basic education for countries such as Somalia, Liberia, and Sudan must

await greater security and political stability, irrespective of need.

2. **Receptivity.** Countries must have a national commitment to education improvement and to work cooperatively with the U.S. and the international community toward mutually accepted policy objectives for the improvement of basic education. Criteria for receptivity are:



- Movement to democratization, public participation in governance;
 - Existence of international financial institutional support for macroeconomic reform;
 - Movement toward open economic markets, freer trade;
 - U.S./Country relations and A.I.D. presence (Mission or Representative);
 - Request of government for assistance with basic education;
 - Existence of multi-lateral, bilateral donors in education;
3. **Impact Opportunity.** Countries must offer the prospect that A.I.D. support for basic education will contribute to a significant, suitable improvement in access, efficiency and quality.

Criteria for impact opportunity are:

- Other A.I.D. programs in the HRD sector (health, nutrition, population, women in development);
- Government effectiveness and level of accountability;
- Government policy in support of education reform;

- Open, public participation in setting educational objectives;
- Institutional leadership and commitment to education reform;
- The profile of other donor support for basic education, and A.I.D.'s comparative advantage to meet a real need.

The three concerns of stability, receptivity and impact opportunity combine to characterize countries by groups within Policy Environments that are **Favorable, Possible, and Unfavorable**. The placement of a country in one of these groups cannot be triggered automatically by quantitative values. Rather, the criteria guide analysis and direct knowledge of country conditions by field Missions and the Regional Bureaus.

The data to support the criteria for placement of countries on the domains of **Quantitative Need and Policy Environment** are provided in **Annex C**, along with the summary database of countries in the low and lower-middle income categories. The analysis of that information suggests the following matrix:

COUNTRIES GROUPED BY QUANTITATIVE NEED AND POLICY ENVIRONMENT

LEVEL OF QUANTITATIVE NEED FOR BASIC EDUCATION REFORM

POLICY ENVIRONMENT	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
FAVORABLE:	Mali* Malawi* Niger Uganda* Benin* Bangladesh Ghana* Guinea*	Swaziland* Namibia* Bolivia* Pakistan* Egypt** Morocco Honduras* Guatemala* Lesotho* Dominican Rep.* El Salvador* Jordan Zimbabwe Botswana*	Indonesia* Mongolia Romania Thailand Jamaica* Eastern Caribbean Poland
POSSIBLE:	Mozambique Burkina Faso Ethiopia Nepal Rwanda Tanzania Burundi	Zambia Sri Lanka Madagascar Nigeria Cote d'Ivoire India Cameroon Togo Senegal Papua New Guinea Nicaragua* Tunisia Colombia	Most East European & New Independent States South Africa** Turkey Ecuador Paraguay Argentina Panama Mauritius Chile Costa Rica Malaysia
UNFAVORABLE	Sierra Leone Cambodia Angola Somalia Chad Yemen, Rep.* Bhutan Afghanistan* Mauritania Central African R. Liberia Sudan	Congo Kenya Lao PDR Myanmar Zaire Haiti* Syrian Arab Rep. Viet Nam	China Iran Peru Algeria Albania Lebanon

NOTES: * Countries which are receiving support for basic education.

** Countries receiving ESF funds for basic education.

Within each cell, countries are listed by rate of Infant Mortality, from high to low. The IMR is a robust measure of overall social-economic status, including educational attainment.

The country groupings are illustrative only, and do not necessarily reflect actual status or programming decisions. Some countries are not currently A.I.D. eligible. A country's quantitative needs and policy environment are assessed at the time sector assessment and strategic planning are done.

RELATING COUNTRY FOCUS AND PROGRAM CONCENTRATION

The placement of countries into nine groups by Quantitative Need and Policy Environment illustrates a spectrum rather than a fixed set of categories. Clearly, factors beyond need and policy environment affect assistance decisions. The matrix, however, reasonably illustrates the framework for A.I.D.'s current programming. Further, it highlights the need for varying levels and modalities of assistance reflecting thorough assessment of needs and policy dialogue in each country.



High Need Countries

Countries with the greatest educational needs are typically those with weak economies and weak institutional capacity. Twenty-one of the twenty-seven countries in this group are in sub-Saharan Africa. This group also has the highest number of countries with an Unfavorable policy environment, where it is virtually impossible to carry out sustainable education reforms. The first priority in those countries with a Favorable policy environment is the development of an educational strategy and action plan, and the mobilization

of financing to provide increased access of children to quality schooling. In these countries there are pressing needs for schools, teachers, instructional materials, and management systems.

Assistance to High Need countries is increasingly coordinated with the World Bank and/or other significant donors, and is conditioned on the implementation of scheduled institutional and policy reforms. Project support in the form of technical assistance and training is focused on specific components

related to the overall program, such as management and accounting support, information systems, curriculum and materials design, in-service training and supervision. Technical assistance can provide the expertise needed to help countries design and implement the policy reforms, provided the country is receptive. The modality of Non-Project Assistance (i.e. policy-conditioned budget support for basic education) is appropriate when institutional capacity for plan implementation is well developed and/or the national authorities are committed to the capacity improvements necessary to achieve the agreed institutional and policy reforms.

Recent research indicates that poor child health and nutrition are significant factors explaining low access, high dropout, and weak academic performance in primary schools. In High Need countries where children exhibit physical or cognitive retardation due to nutritional deficiency, pre-school and in-school dietary support programs are appropriate, in collaboration with the health and nutrition sectors.

The FY 1991/92 estimated expenditure of Agency basic education funds for High Need countries is \$81 million, or about 50% of the total support for basic education. Based on FY 1992/93 budget estimates, the trend is toward a stronger emphasis on the High Need countries, with approximately 62% of the total of new basic education programs. All High Need countries receiving A.I.D. support are in the Favorable policy environment category.

As High Need countries move toward more Favorable conditions, field Missions and Regional Bureaus may reexamine the potential for support to basic education. Such countries include Bangladesh, Mozambique and Ethiopia. The initial stages of assistance planning for such countries is to work with government and other major donors in carrying out sector assessments, policy analysis, and the development of national plans of action.

The overall budgetary requirements for implementing such plans are in most cases linked to macroeconomic support agreements. If teacher qualifications, salaries and conditions of service are to be improved as a part of the national education action plan, this must be consistent with the overall

fiscal policies and conditions in any macroeconomic structural adjustment program. Where there is agreement on an overall plan of action, A.I.D. and other donor support to basic education can help provide the technical assistance, training, and other inputs.

Medium Need Countries

Countries in the **Medium Need** group have significant problems of inefficiency and low quality, a backlog of illiteracy (particularly for females), and may need to consider basic administrative, logistic, and financing reforms. With assistance, most of these countries could achieve basic education for all by the year 2000.

A.I.D. currently supports basic education development in thirteen countries of this group (eleven of which have a **Favorable** policy environment) representing about 30% of total new basic education program costs. In many of these countries, previous assistance by A.I.D. and other donors has helped develop the institutional capacity for policy reform, planning, and management.

In the **Medium Need** countries with a **Favorable** or **Possible** policy environment that have developed national action plans with multi-donor support, A.I.D. assistance is targeted to specific technical needs identified by the plan. Such needs include strengthening institutional capacity for policy research, monitoring system performance, introducing innovative curriculum and instructional systems, developing student assessments, broadening participation of communities and the private sector, training for decentralization, and improving supervision and management.

These countries generally have sufficient private sector and NGO capacity to organize increased support for early childhood development and focused literacy work. In many cases, A.I.D. supports such initiatives in close collaboration with the other human resource sector offices (Health, Nutrition, Women in Development).

To achieve universal access to basic education, particularly for girls and disadvantaged populations (such as ethnic and linguistic minorities), requires special efforts involving field

research, creative programming, and the mobilization and training of appropriate personnel. Here also, the possibility of supporting increased efforts of NGOs to address these needs has been found to be an effective strategy.

In most **Medium Need** (and some **High Need**) countries, the infrastructure of mass media and communications technology for enhancing basic education is in place and provides options for overcoming the resource constraints and accelerating the expansion of basic education. The use of technologies such as interactive radio, and distance learning by radio or mass media, can be cost-effective means of improving the quality of instruction and for reaching remote, disadvantaged populations.

In those countries approaching quality universal primary education, the need for large scale Agency resource commitments to basic education may decline. In countries with a strong institutional management capacity in place, there can be alternative ways to finance basic education reform, such as macroeconomic financing agreements.

Low Need Countries

Countries in the **Low Need** group with a **Favorable** policy environment and that have largely met basic education quantitative objectives nevertheless may need administrative and qualitative reforms to support democratization and move toward a market economy. A.I.D.-supported technical assistance to countries such as Indonesia, Thailand, and Jamaica has focused on building institutional capacity for policy research, sector analysis, planning, and evaluation. This assistance has been cost-effective in support of educational development and reforms.



A.I.D. currently provides just under \$20 million, or 7.5% of its basic education funds to three countries in this category.

Countries such as those in Eastern Europe and the New Independent States (NIS), which are working to support political and economic transformation, and low need advanced developing countries in all parts of the world, can benefit from various modes of technical cooperation and institutional support for education reform. Even where A.I.D. does not intend to provide significant resources to implement the reforms, technical support for joint research, counterpart collaboration, and short-term technical exchange can be highly effective.

The education reforms being attempted in many developing



countries with Favorable policy environment, Low quantitative but strong qualitative needs have much in common with reform efforts in the United States. There is much potential for technical cooperation involving U.S. domestic institutions, professional associations, universities, research centers, and regional educational laboratories.

EXPERTISE AND CAPACITY

A.I.D. continues to move away from the direct provision of education inputs and large scale education infrastructure project financing toward a broader, comprehensive approach to education sector reform. These reforms require sustained attention to policy, budget, and administrative reforms by local authorities.

The work of education sector assessment, policy analysis, program design and monitoring, in collaboration with other donors, and the negotiations on policy issues with governments, require both technical expertise and management sophistication.

The Agency continues to review existing, and develop new modalities for accessing appropriate U.S. education expertise, e.g. regional educational laboratories, professional associations, universities, research centers, local school districts, and private educational organizations.

A.I.D. obtains much of its expertise and capacity through contracts. Long-term projects such as IEES, EHRTS, BRIDGES, ABEL, IEQ, and HHRAA provide essential technical services both for headquarters and field Missions. Such technical support will increasingly focus on support for education policy reform linked to the broader strategic development objectives of the Agency. The framework being developed by the Agency's Center for University Cooperation in Development provides an additional program model for such professional linkages.



DEVELOPMENT OF A NATIONAL ACTION PLAN

The current guidelines for A.I.D. support to basic education give priority to the development of national action plans. The

development of such Plans of Action, and the use of such plans as the framework for education sector assistance, was one of the key agreements reached at the World Conference on Education For All in 1990 and reflected in donor consultations since then.

In Egypt, the Basic Education Project (1981-1992) has made major contributions to the improvement of primary and preparatory education. The project was designed to support student access to, and increase the relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness of basic education. Project components included the design and construction of rural primary schools, the development and provision of instructional materials and equipment, and strengthening of educational planning, cost analysis, teacher education, curriculum design, and evaluation. The goal to increase access to females and rural youth was attained. A total of 1,950 rural schools were constructed, surpassing the planned target of 1,300. Female participation in rural primary education increased from 36 to 42 percent of total enrollment. In rural preparatory schools, girls' enrollment increased from 180,000 to over 700,000. The project expanded access to basic education by approximately 875,000 children at an average per-pupil capital cost of 143 L.E., which was very cost-effective.

The Project supported a government educational reform program driven by three new units: the Educational Planning and Information Division, the Center for Curriculum and Instructional Materials Development, and the National Council for Educational Examinations and Evaluations. The first products from the Curriculum Center were a curriculum, course materials, and teachers' guides for grades 1 to 3 in Environmental Studies, integrating science, social studies, health, and home economics. The materials set a high standard for stimulating pupils' critical thinking and problem solving skills focused on issues directly related to their environment and daily lives. The government has significantly increased resources for improving basic education in the current Five Year Plan (1992-1997). The Plan more than doubles the investment funds targeted from primary schools, to an average annual estimate of \$78 million.

Ensuring that education reforms are professionally sound is not an easy matter, particularly since our knowledge is imperfect concerning the most effective strategies for achieving educational objectives. Several features of effective planning can reduce the risk of introducing misguided reforms. One key to successful education reform appears to be wide social consensus on the goals and systematic monitoring progress against the goals. The following lessons, drawn from field experience, can help to achieve this:

- Plans must be based on **thorough sector knowledge**. This requires an education sector assessment, often accompanied by a number of specific studies. To gain support for reform, this work needs to involve those who will be affected by policy changes (such as teachers) in assessing the impact of proposed reforms.
- The preparation of a national action plan is the responsibility of national leaders and should be **conducted largely by nationals**. The appropriate role of

external consultants and specialists is to provide technical support.

This is important for at least three reasons:

- a) the analysis and the processes of national dialogue about education goals builds understanding and capacity among participants;
 - b) national leadership (private as well as public, local as well as national) is necessary to negotiate political and social options and reforms;
 - c) those directly involved in the analysis and formulation of the plan of action have an ownership of the reforms, and a responsibility to see them implemented.
- Policies that require significant budget and personnel restructuring need to be consistent with **macroeconomic and personnel policies**. This requires that work on a sector assessment and a national action plan involves the key agencies responsible for national financing, planning, and personnel. Education reform may be linked to macroeconomic reforms that have been negotiated and with other international agreements. These considerations are vital to a feasible, effective education sector reform policy.
 - The linkage with economic policies, job creation, and workforce productivity needs to be made explicit. This cannot be accomplished without the full participation of current and prospective employers and of officials concerned with economic, labor, and technology policies.
 - The importance of **effective national leadership and competent staff** can hardly be overemphasized. Many reform and budgetary adjustment measures are difficult and politically sensitive. Planning and managing these changes require significant breadth and depth of sector knowledge and the capacity to explore policy options through consultation with all stakeholders. Building consensus is the most important prerequisite for implementing educational policy reforms.

- **Improvement of the educational management information system (EMIS) is key to sustained education reform. This often involves work on developing and using indicators for such complex domains as pupil achievement (requiring applied research and development to design effective assessment systems), staff utilization and effectiveness, and educational financing.**
- **Ultimately, the most important influence on the quality of education is the complex interaction of the student with his/her peers, his/her family, his/her teachers and the headmaster. The nature of that social matrix determines whether the resources provided to support learning are used well or poorly. It is a significant misconception that educational planners at a regional or national level have much of an influence on these processes. The most useful conception of the role of central planning and policy is that it creates the conditions for potential outcomes at the class and school levels. The essence of basic education reform is to enhance the quality of learning in the classrooms, in the schools and in communities. This understanding should be reflected in the design and strategy for the planned reform. Sustained participation and monitoring, at all levels and among all stakeholders, is key to sustained reform.**



INDICATORS FOR MONITORING THE BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAM

Within A.I.D. there is considerable work underway on developing indicators to guide policy and monitor program interventions. The PRISM system of indicators being developed by the Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE) is intended to assist the Agency in monitoring progress on attaining strategic objectives in each major sector. In the Population and Health sectors there has been extensive and high quality work on developing systems for monitoring changes, and for supporting policy analysis at the country level. The Regional Bureaus have developed information systems to analyze countries' policy environments. These information systems are supporting performance-based country budget allocations.

The Africa Bureau is in the process of developing a comprehensive set of indicators to monitor qualitative (process) as well as quantitative improvements in access, equity, efficiency, quality, finance, design, and implementation. A draft instrument is now being field tested in a number of countries. The purpose of this exercise is to establish an information system to strengthen strategic and management decisions.

The Latin American and Caribbean Bureau has established a set of indicators to evaluate the policy environment for investing in basic education, and has made effective use of educational management information systems developed through BRIDGES.

The development of educational indicators is a key element in an EMIS. The design and operation of an EMIS involves several stages: needs identification; specification of data and indicators; data collection, processing and analysis; providing information; and utilizing information in decision-making.

The design of indicators for monitoring progress toward Agency objectives in basic education includes the following:

- Measures of access, equity, quality, and efficiency in primary and junior secondary school systems;

- Indicators of institutional capacity for developing and implementing national plans of action;
- Indicators of the quality of policy analysis and public participation in policy formation;
- Health and nutritional status of children at school entry age;
- Status of literacy for women and men.

The considerable experience and research literature within the U.S. on the development and use of indicators for monitoring progress in education suggests the following limitations:



- Multiple indicators are needed for building an accurate picture.
- Quantitative data are not a sufficient base of knowledge for understanding educational system behavior. The use of indicators must be informed by qualitative descriptions of teaching, learning, and the functioning of specific educational organizations.
- Policies must be based on a sound understanding of what motivates organizational change. Indicators can provide information on aspects of educational systems and student learning, but they cannot solve strategic questions of policy-making. To answer questions of how to stimulate real and sustainable improvements in a system requires different kinds of knowledge and understanding than can be provided by indicators.
- Indicators should be used to initiate further assessment and evaluation of a situation, not as automatic triggers for policy action.

These limitations do not reduce the importance of indicators for stimulating policy debate, suggesting new approaches, and deepening our understanding. The development and use of indicators for basic education is a priority area for Agency-supported research and technical assistance.

Guinea, formerly a French colonial state, moved, after its independence in 1958, to a socialist government with central planning and collectivization of agriculture. Political unrest from 1970 through the mid 1980s tightened the regime's tendency towards repression, finally leading to a military coup in 1984. Since that coup Guinea has undergone radical changes. The Government has moved in all sectors to restructure institutions toward a more open, liberal, and market-driven economy. In response to an urgent need for educational reform, the government has approved sweeping administrative and policy reforms known as the Education Sector Adjustment Program (Programme d'Adjustement du Secteur d'Education, or PASE).

The Government, together with A.I.D., the World Bank, the French Fonds d'Aide et Cooperation (FAC) and other donors have initiated a major effort to restructure the country's primary education system. The key elements of the PASE include increased Government budgetary allocations to education, particularly to primary education; a target to increase primary school enrollments from the low rate of 30% in 1990 to 58% by 2000; improved instructional quality by such measures as assigning excess secondary school teachers to primary schools, designing and distributing appropriate instructional materials; overall reorganization, improved communications from Ministry headquarters to the schools; renovation and expansion of school facilities. USAID has provided \$22.3 million in NPA and \$4.7 million in project assistance to support this major reform. The NPA is being used to reinforce the policy changes and ensure adequate funding for teaching and materials throughout the expansion and adjustment period of PASE. Project funds are used to provide technical assistance in procurement, policy research, and the design and management of monitoring and evaluation.

Although it is still early to see a significant quantitative impact on overall enrollment ratios and equity, USAID support, in close cooperation with the other donors, is clearly having a major positive institutional impact on the Ministry of Education and the development of a more adequate teaching force. By supporting national conferences, national, regional, and local workshops, the PASE philosophy, goals, and action plans have been disseminated and discussed at all levels of the system. A comprehensive system of school mapping has supported major school renovation and construction projects including community self-help efforts. A large scale program redeploying secondary teachers with retraining to primary schools is now underway. With the system of conditionalities set by USAID and the World Bank, and the technical assistance and training provided, the MOE institutional capacity to manage reform is being strengthened. Progress and performance by the Government has been commendable. In July 1992 all tasks laid out by the World Bank and USAID as conditions for the second tranche had been fulfilled. USAID support to basic education reform in Guinea has played a major role in establishing the institutional conditions necessary for sweeping reforms and the expansion of access to primary education.

ANNEX A

ANNEX A

SELECTED INTERNATIONAL REFERENCES

Fuller, B. & Habte, A. (Eds.). *Adjusting Educational Policies: Conserving Resources while Raising School Quality*. World Bank, 1992.

Lindblum, E. *Building on Basics. A Report on the Global Education Crisis and U.S. Foreign Aid to Basic Education*. Results Education Fund, September 1990.

Lockheed, M., Vespoor, A. *Improving Primary Education in Developing Countries*. Oxford: World Bank, Oxford University Press, 1991.

Lockheed, M. *World Bank Support for Capacity Building: The Challenge of Educational Assessment*. PHREE, May 1992.

Myers, R. *The Twelve Who Survive: Strengthening Programmes of Early Childhood Development in the Third World*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Summers, L. *Investing in All the People*. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper. May 1992: 5.

UNESCO. *World Education Report 1991*. UNESCO, 1991.

World Bank. *World Development Indicators 1992*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

World Bank/DAC. *From Good Intentions to Effective Action: Emerging Strategies for Expanding Assistance to Basic Education*. June 1992.

World Conference on Education for All. *Meeting Basic Learning Needs: A Vision for the 1990s*. April 1990.

World Conference on Education for All. *World Charter on Education for All and Framework for Action to Meet Basic Learning Needs*. March 1990.

ANNEX B

ANNEX B

BASIC EDUCATION PROJECTS DATABASE

A listing was developed which contains information on all Basic Education Programs.
This listing contains the following:

Country
Project Title
Project Number(s)
Starting Year
Years Duration
Total Funds Required
Non-project Funds

A.I.D. Basic Education
Major Projects Active in FY 1992

ANNEX B

Country	Project Title	Project Number	Start Date	Years Duration	Total Funds (\$000)	Of Which, Non-Project Funds (\$000)
Afghanistan	Ed.Sector Support (ESF)	306-0202	1986	6		
Benin	Children's Learning and Equity Foundation (CLEF)	680-0206	1991	6	57,500	50,000
Bolivia	Radio Education Project	511-0597	1988	4	1,908	
Botswana	Basic Education Consolidation (BEC)	633-0254	1991	6	12,600	
Dominican Rep.	Private Initiatives in Primary Education (PIPE)	517-0251	1990	6	5,500	
Egypt	Basic Education	263-0187	1992	3		
El Salvador	Strengthening Achievement in Basic Education (SABE)	519-0295	1990	7	37,600	
Ghana	Primary Education Program (PREP)	641-0119	1990	6	35,000	32,000
Guatemala	Basic Education Strengthening (BEST)	520-0374	1990	5	30,000	
Guinea	Education Sector Reform Program	675-0222/0223	1990	6	28,000	22,300
Haiti	Incentives to Improve Basic Education	521-0190	1986	8	15,000	
Honduras	Primary Education Efficiency	522-0273	1986	8	27,500	
Indonesia	Ed. Policy & Planning (TA)	497-0344				
Jamaica	Primary Education Assistance II	532-0155	1990	5	4,000	
Lesotho	Primary Education Project (PEP)	632-0230/0225	1991	7	25,000	18,600
Malawi	Girls Attainment in Basic Literacy & Ed. (GABLE)	612-0240/0237	1991	6	20,000	14,000
Mali	Basic Education Expansion Program (BEEP)	688-0258	1989	6	20,000	3,000
Namibia	Basic Education Reform Program (BERP)	673-0003/0006	1991	7	35,500	35,000
Nicaragua	Basic Education Sector Assessment	524-0329	1992	5	30,000	
Pakistan	Prim. Ed. Dev.(ESF)	391-0497	1989	2		
South Africa	Education Support and Training Project	674-0302	1990	4	19,500	
South Africa	South Africa Basic Ed Reconstruction Proj. (SABER)	647-0314	1992	6	20,000	
Swaziland	Education Policy, Management & Technology	645-0230	1989	5	6,900	
Uganda	Support for Uganda Primary Ed. Reform (SUPER)	617-0131/0132	1992	10	108,000	83,000
Yemen, Rep.	BE/WID literacy	279-0074	1987	8		

B-2

29

ANNEX C

-157

ANNEX C

CRITERIA AND DATABASE FOR COUNTRY FOCUS

The most current available data for this table were taken from the **World Development Indicators (1992)** and supplemented with **UNESCO's 1991 World Report on Education**. These data were used for grouping countries by level of Need for all countries in the Low and Low-Middle Income categories.

A database was constructed for 85 countries, containing the following fields from the **World Development Report**, and fields added from documentation available through Agency Sector Offices, Regional Bureaus, and the R&D/ED Office.

GENERAL SOCIAL/ECONOMIC INDICATORS

Population Size

Infant Mortality Rate (0-5 yrs deaths per 1000 births)

GNP per capita (\$)

Income Level (L < \$600, ML < \$2400)

GNP per capita growth rate from 1965-1990

Average Annual Rate of Inflation 1980-1990

% of Total Government Expenditure: Defense

% of Total Government Expenditure: Education

Overall surplus/deficit (% of GNP)

Population Annual Growth, 1990-2000

Age Structure of Population, (%) 0-14 yrs.

Urban Population (%)

BASIC EDUCATION INDICATORS

Adult illiteracy (%) female 15+yrs.

Primary School Enrollment, % of Age Group (GER), 1965

Primary Gross Enrollment Ratio (GER), 1989

Primary GER % annual change from 1965-89

Primary GER, girls, 1965

Primary GER, girls, 1989

Primary GER, girls, % annual change from 1965-89

Persistence to Grade 4 (%), girls

Persistence to Grade 4 (%), boys

Females per 100 males, primary school

Pupil/Teacher Ratio, primary school

Secondary School enrollment (% of age group), females

Tertiary enrollment (% of age group)

ANALYSIS OF DATA

To group countries into one of the three categories of need, the process of analysis used the methodology of examining two indicators of the same general concept so as to offset the absence or weakness of any single indicator for a given country. Thus, for participation of females in basic education, both the illiteracy rate and the gross enrollment rate of girls in primary school were examined. The process for grouping countries by need in basic education was as follows:

Countries were ranked by infant mortality rate, from high to low;

HIGH NEED countries were selected as follows:

For countries with a gross national product per capita (GNP/cap) of less than \$640 OR with an infant mortality rate of more than 100, and

Female illiteracy of greater than 50%, OR primary gross enrollment ratio (GER) for girls of less than 70%.

MEDIUM NEED countries were selected as follows:

Countries which were excluded from the High Need group, and yet are in the L(ow) or L(ow)M(iddle) income group, but have less than \$2,000 per capita GNP, and which have the following basic educational characteristics:

Female illiteracy of more than 30% OR less than 80% primary GER for girls,
OR

A low ratio of persistence of girls from grade 1 to grade 4 (less than 75%) - which is an indicator of efficiency,
OR

A high pupil/teacher ratio for primary schools (50:1) - which is an indicator of poor quality.

Countries placed in the **LOW NEED** group were selected from the L(ow)M(iddle) and Medium income categories from the Africa, LAC, and Asia regions. All countries selected had a per capita GNP of less than \$2,500. To this group were added, as categories, the East European Countries and the New Independent States.

The grouping of countries on Policy Environment used two sources of information. First, the Regional Bureau performance rating systems were used for information on the indicators of stability and receptivity, macroeconomic policy, democratization, and human rights. The Bureaus' overall rating of a country's general policy environment provided a general guide. Secondly, information was compiled on the level of A.I.D. activity in each country, including programs in population, health, nutrition, and

Women in Development. The experience of A.I.D. in education, and specifically basic education, in each country was recorded.

This information provided the designation of a country in one of the three categories of **Favorable, Possible and Unfavorable.**

The additional fields in the database reflect whether, for the country concerned, A.I.D. supports:

- a Mission or a Representative in country (M, R)
- other HRD Programs: Population, Health, Nutrition, WID
- a Basic Education Program

COUNTRY GROUPING

- Policy Environment Ranking (F=favorable, P=possible, UF=unfavorable)
- Need Status (1=High Need, 2=Medium Need, 3=Low Need).

AID BASIC EDUCATION
COUNTRIES GROUPED BY EDUCATION NEED & POLICY ENVIRONMENT

ANNEX C

Country	USMR	GNP/ cap	L	XFem Ill	GER Prim	GER pr/girl	G1-64 girl	Girls p/boys	Pup/ Tchr	AID	HRD Programs	BE Prog	Policy Env.	Group by Need
Mali	166	270	L	76	23	17	68	58	39	M	POP, H, NUT, W	1	F	1
Malawi	149	200	L		67	60	67	81		M	POP, H, NUT, W	1	F	1
Niger	128	310	L	83	28	20		57	41	M	POP, HLTH, NU		F	1
Uganda	117	220	L	65	77				35	M	POP, HLTH, NU	1	F	1
Benin	113	360	L	84	65	44		51	35	R	NUT	1	F	1
Bangladesh	105	210	L	78	70	64	40	78	60	M	POP, HLTH, NU		F	1
Ghana	101	390	L	49	75	67		81	27	M	POP, NUT, WID	1	F	1
Guinea	19	440	L	87	34	21	71	45	38	M	POP	1	F	1
Mozambique	137	80	L	79	68	59		78		M			M	1
Burkina Faso	134	330	L	91	35	27	87	61	55	R	POP, NUT		M	1
Ethiopia	132	120	L		38	30	45	64	43	R		1	M	1
Nepal	121	170	L	87	86	57		47	37	M	POP, HLTH, NU		M	1
Rwanda	120	310	L	63	69	68	82	99	57	M	POP		M	1
Tanzania	115	110	L		63	63	91	98	33	M	POP, NUT		M	1
Burundi	107	210	L	60	71	60	85	80	66	R	POP	1	M	1
Sierra Leone	147	240	L	89	53	40		62	32				UF	1
Cambodia	136		L	78						R			UF	1
Angola	130	610	L	72	94				33				UF	1
Somalia	126	120	L	86									UF	1
Chad	125	190	L	82	57	35	57	44	67	R	POP, HLTH		UF	1
Yemen D.R.	124		L	74	80				45	M	POP, H, NUT, W	1	UF	1
Bhutan	122	190	L	75	26	20	26	59	37				UF	1
Afghanistan	117		L	86	24	16				R/Pa		1	UF	1
Mauritania	93	500	L	79	51	42	83	69	49	R			UF	1
Central Africa	88	390	L	75	64	48	67	63	70				UF	1
Liberia	64		L	71						M/DC			UF	1
Sudan	42		L	88									UF	1
Swaziland	143	900	LM	34						M	POP, NUT	1	F	2
Namibia	100		LM		85			**		R	?	1	F	2
Bolivia	92	630	L	29	81	77		89	25	M	POP, HLTH, NU	1	F	2
Pakistan	85	380	L	79	38	27		50	41	M	POP, HLTH, NU	1	F	2
Egypt	68	600	L	66	97	89		81	24	M	POP, HLTH, NU	1	F	2
Morocco	67	950	LM	62	68	55	79	65	26	M	POP, HLTH, NU		F	2
Honduras	66	590	L	29	108	109	63	98		M	POP, HLTH, NU	1	F	2
Guatemala	62	900	LM	53	79				35	M	POP, HLTH, NU	1	F	2
Lesotho	61	530	L		110	119	85	**	56	M		1	F	2
Dominican Rep.	56	830	LM	18	95	96	52	98	47	M	POP, NUT	1	F	2
El Salvador	53	1110	LM	30	78	78		98	40	M	POP, NUT	1	F	2
Jordan	51	1240	LM	30	95		97	93	28	M	POP, NUT		F	2
Zimbabwe	49	640	L	40	125	126	83	98	38	M	POP, NUT		F	2
Botswana	38	2040	M	35	111	114	94	**	32	M	POP	1	F	2
Zambia	138	420	L	35	95	91		91	44	M	NUT		M	2
Sri Lanka	121	470	L	17	107	106	97	93	14	M			M	2
Madagascar	116	230	L	27	92	90		95	40	M	POP		M	2
Nigeria	98	290	L	61	70	63		82	37	R/Em	POP, HLTH, NU		M	2
Cote d'Ivoire	95	750	LM	60						M	POP		M	2
India	92	350	L	66	98	82		69	61	M	POP, HLTH, NU		M	2
Cameroon	88	960	LM	57	101	93	85	85	51	M	POP, BMUT		M	2
Togo	82	410	L	69	103	80	80	63	55	R	POP, NUT		M	2
Senegal	81	710	LM	75	58	49	91	72	58	M	POP, HLTH, NU		M	2
Papua New Guin	57	860	LM	62	73	67		79	32	M			M	2

31

AID BASIC EDUCATION

ANNEX C

COUNTRIES GROUPED BY EDUCATION NEED & POLICY ENVIRONMENT

Country	USMR	GNP/ cap	IL	%Fem Ill	GER Prim	GER pr/girl	G1-G4 girl	Girls p/boys	Pup/ T:hr	AID	HRD Programs	BE Prog	Policy Env.	Group by Need
Nicaragua	55		LM		99	104	62	**	32	M		1	M	2
Tunisia	44	1440	LM	44	115	107	90	83	30	M			M	2
Colombia	37	1260	LM	14	107	108	72	98	30	R	NUT		M	2
Congo	116	1010	LM	56			90	92	64				UF	2
Kenya	103	370	L	42	94	92	77	94	33	M	POP,HLTH,NU		UF	2
Lao PDR	103	200	L		111	98		77	28				UF	2
Myanmar	102		L	28	103	100		92	43				UF	2
Zaire	94	220	L	39	78	67	54	73		M/DC	Suspended	Sus.	UF	2
Haiti	67	370	L	53	84	81	40	93	35	M	Suspended	Sus.	UF	2
Syrian Arab Re	43	1000	LM	49	108	102	96	87	26				UF	2
Viet Nam	43		L	16								1	UF	2
Indonesia	64	570	L	32	118	115	83	93	23	M	POP,HLTH,NU	1	F	3
Mongolia	62		LM		98	100				R			F	3
Romania	27	1640	LM		95	95		95	21	R			F	3
Thailand	27	1420	LM	10	86				18	M	NUT		F	3
Jamaica	16	1500	LM	1	105	105		98	34	M	POP, NUT	1	F	3
Poland	16	1690	LM		99	99		95	16	R	NUT	1	F	3
South Africa	68	2470	M							M			M	3
Turkey	60	1630	LM	29	112	108	98	89	30				M	3
Ecuador	55	980	LM	16	118	117		96	31	M	POP, NUT	1	M	3
Paraguay	32	1110	LM	12	106	104	75	93	25	R			M	3
Argentina	29	2370	M	5	111	114		**	19	R			M	3
Panama	21	1830	LM	12	107	105	87	93	20	M			M	3
Mauritius	20	2250	M		103	104	98	97	24				M	3
Chile	17	1940	LM	7	100	99	96	95	29	R	NUT		M	3
Costa Rica	16	1900	LM	7	100	99	91	94	32	M	POP, NUT		M	3
Malaysia	16	2320	M	30	96	96		95	21				M	3
Bulgaria	14	2250	M		97	96	97	93	16	R			M	3
China	95	370	L	38	135	128	76	85	22				UF	3
Iran, Islamic	88	2490	M	57	109	101	89	84	24				UF	3
Peru	69	1160	LM	21	123				29	M	POP,HLTH,NU		UF	3
Algeria	67	2060	M	55	94	86	95	81	28				UF	3
Albania	28		LM		99	98		92	19	R			UF	3
Lebanon			LM	27									UF	3

NOTES: 1) All statistical data are from the World Development Indicators, 1992 and UNESCO's 1991 World Report on Education

2) USMR is Infant Mortality Rate (0-5 years per thousand births)

IL is income level: L=low income (under \$640 p/cap), LM=lower middle (under \$2000 p/cap)

GER is gross enrollment ratio (this does not take into account overage children in school (repetition))

AID: M=Mission, R=Representative

HRD Programs: AID programs in Population, Health, Nutrition and WID.

3) Policy Env.: F=Favorable, M=Possible, UF=Unfavorable

4) Need Group: 1='High Need', 2='Medium Need', 3='Low Need'

High Need=Low Income and/or USMR>100; Female Illiteracy>50% and/or Girls GER<70%.

Medium Need=GNP/cap <\$2000, Female Illiteracy>30% and/or Girls GER<80%, plus high pupil/teacher ration, and/or low G1/G4 ratio for girls.

Low Need=Criteria for 1 and 2, but LM income level

Photo Credits: Cover, John Isaac, UNICEF; pp. 2, 7, 8, 16, 19, 21, 24, AED; pp. 5, 13, 20, 26, Daphne White.

239

U. S. Agency for International Development
Bureau for Research and Development
Office of Education
SA - 18
Washington, D.C. 20523-1815
Phone: 703-875-4700 FAX: 703-875-4751