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A note on this report

This report has been prepared by ADRA International on behalf of the Adventist Church as part of *Every child. Everywhere. In School.* Focused on ensuring every child, everywhere, attends school and completes their education so they can fulfill their God-given potential, it is a global, Adventist led movement.

With 20 million members globally, and the second largest private education system in the world, ADRA believes the Adventist Church has both the unique opportunity, as well as the moral responsibility, to spur progress on towards Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4) and ensure that every child receives a quality education. We recognize our significant place in the global education system, along with our capacity to influence positive change.

Respectively, faith-based education accounts for 14% and 11% of primary and secondary education across Sub-Saharan Africa. And faith-based schools report higher parent satisfaction than their public-school counterparts. Not only is this an important contribution to the quality education of children, everywhere, it also gives us valuable networks and insights which can be used to advocate for further progress and to enhance policy.

This report is divided into five sections—an executive summary and four thematic areas, including Financing Education; Inclusion in Education; Education Quality and Retention; and Education and Crisis. Each section outlines the major barriers to education within that thematic area, a range of the suggested solutions and concludes with a concise summary of those discussed solutions as recommendations for policy makers.

ADRA recognizes the significant place of the Adventist Church in the global education system, along with our capacity to influence positive change.
In the last three decades the world has experienced an extraordinary period of progress. Child mortality has plummeted from 12.5 million to 5.3 million children per year. Life expectancy has increased from 64 years to 73 years and Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita has increased by 50%. And despite increasing inequality, the poor have not been left out. Extreme poverty has fallen from 36% of the world's population to just 10%, while the largest gains in life expectancy and child mortality have been made by low-income countries.

Such results have been coupled with (and propelled by) a global education revolution. As the societal and individual benefits of education have been increasingly recognized, government financing and household demand for education have expanded, rapidly. Universal education, first pioneered by today's high-income countries, became a global priority after World War II, supported heavily by government investments.

The Millennium Development Goals and the subsequent global effort released, saw progress accelerate for many low and middle-income countries (LMICs). The amount of out-of-school children (OOSC) has fallen dramatically from 372 million in 1990, to 258 million in 2018. Illiteracy has fallen over the same period, from one out of every four people, globally, to less than one out of every seven. The number of girls out of school has fallen by half, eliminating the disparity between girls and boys on this front. And for many LMICs, mean years of education has increased, dramatically. Iran and India for example, saw mean years of schooling more than double. Jumping from 4.2 and 3.0 years, to 9.8 and 6.4 years, respectively.

The number of girls out of school has fallen by half, eliminating the disparity between girls and boys.
Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) estimated that in order to achieve universal secondary education, lower-middle income countries and low-income countries would need to more than double their overall education spending from $149 billion USD in 2012, to $340 billion USD in 2030—that’s 6.3% of their GDP. But even with this increase in domestic resources, a significant finance gap remains. To this end, the report estimates that global aid donors will have to increase their funding to these countries to by $39.5 billion USD per annum (from 2015 to 2030)—representing an almost threefold increase of the 2018 aid levels.

But a lasting impact of pandemic on the global economy is the tightening of government budgets. Education aid is set to drop by $2 billion USD (from 2018 to 2022), representing a 12% reduction on its record high in 2018. And pre-pandemic levels of aid are not set to recover until 2024. This will compound the heightened pressure on LMICs that are facing the dual challenges of skyrocketing needs and decreased economic resources.

The current situation in Africa is illustrative. The cohort of children and adolescents is expanding, rapidly. In order to provide a quality education, an additional 5.8 million trained teachers will be needed by 2030. It will be no small challenge to find motivated and capable individuals, allocate enough funds to train and hire them, while managing the economic, health and societal impacts of COVID-19.

Given these economic pressures, accelerating efforts to increase tax revenues and household finance will be crucial.

Tax revenues could be bolstered by addressing the tax dodging practices of high net wealth individuals and large multinational corporations. On multinational tax dodging alone, low income
countries lose an estimated $200 billion in tax revenue\(^1\). An amount that is significantly greater than the global aid budget ($149 billion USD), and represents finance that could be crucially utilized to provide essential services like education.

Remittances have become one of the most significant sources of capital flows between countries. In 2019, remittances hit a record high of $554 billion USD, overtaking foreign direct investment\(^2\). Families that receive remittances significantly increase their household spending on education, leading to children (especially girls) having higher school attendance, enrolment rates and more years in school\(^3\). However, remittance flows remain hampered by high transaction costs when remitting funds. Efforts to lower transaction cost and increase remittances will help ease the pressures faced by families on education finance.

**Inclusion in education**

Beyond finance, other barriers must also be overcome. The children most likely to be excluded from education come from families experiencing disadvantage due to poverty, language, location, gender and ethnicity.

The diagram on page 7 examines the completion rates for students in LMICs, breaking it down by poverty (poorest 20% of learners), rural students and girls. Promisingly, gender disparities have disappeared. However, gaps between the poorest and wealthiest students and rural and urban students, persist.\(^4\) The poorest students are less than half as likely to complete secondary education when compared to the average, and less than one fifth as likely when compared to the richest students. Living in a rural area also substantially diminishes the prospect of completion at every education level, with the impact being most acute at secondary education. Just 32% of rural students complete upper secondary in LMICs, a full 12 percentage points less than the average.\(^5\)

Poverty is clearly a significant barrier to education, but conversely, there is a positive relationship between tackling poverty and the acceleration of education efforts. Families with higher incomes can afford to invest more in education and overcome barriers related to school fees, tuition, textbooks, uniform costs, transport, technology and other learning materials. They are also less likely to be malnourished which strengthens their cognitive development and capacity to focus, in turn improving learning outcomes and school retention\(^6\).

Similarly, education is one of the strongest drivers for development and poverty reduction. Education is a cornerstone to unlocking potential. It fuels tolerance and understanding\(^7\), leads to better health, and provides skills for future employment prospects, while schools provide safety, nutrition and create space for guardians to join the workforce\(^8\).

The dual impact of COVID-19 on both poverty and educational systems means that achieving universal quality education and sustainable development will require a redoubling of global effort.

While it’s widely acknowledged that living with disability or being a member of a religious or ethnic community is often connected to poorer educational outcomes, data is patchy. These groups are often neglected at the point of data collection and, therefore, implicitly (and sometimes explicitly) by governmental policy responses to education.

In middle- and high-income countries, where reliable data is more readily available, students taught in a language other than their mother tongue scored more than 30% lower on reading tests. And in a selection of ten LMICs where data is available\(^9\), children living with disability are 19% less likely to achieve minimum proficiency than other students.\(^10\)

**Conclusion**

Education is one of the strongest drivers for development and poverty reduction. Education is a cornerstone to unlocking potential.
Education quality and retention

While the progress on increasing school attendance has been remarkable (up to 2007 at least), quality of student learning in many areas remains low. 53% of children in LMICs are not able to read and comprehend a short story by the time they finish primary school. And an estimated 274 million children attending school are not learning the basic skills necessary to lead productive and healthy lives. Half of primary school children are not learning basic foundational skills, like literacy and numeracy, and three-quarters of secondary school students are not learning basic secondary level skills. The problem is compounded, as when education quality is low, drop out rates rise.

Children that don’t learn how to read by age 10, or at least by the end of their primary schooling, are unlikely to learn to read later. The lack of foundational skills like basic literacy diminish an individual’s employment prospects, their capacity to contribute to a flourishing economy or to nurture a healthy family. Furthermore, students who complete their schooling and master reading earn 38% more than those with no schooling.

The problems with education quality may give way to the concern that access has been prioritized at its expense. However, being in school matters. Even in the context of low-quality learning. Despite limited research, there is evidence to suggest that simply being in school will still lead to better learning outcomes, even given the challenge of low-quality education. In Sierra Leone, children between the ages of 7 and 14 still had better outcomes than their out-of-school peers, regardless of education quality. Furthermore, children who attended school and who possess poor foundational skills, still earn 6% more than their out-of-school counterparts when they join the workforce.

There is significant overlap between learning quality and the drivers for school drop out. Factors that will need to be addressed for both include:

- Children who are prepared, motivated and given the freedom to learn. Includes ensuring that children are not suffering from illness or malnutrition, that households value education and that child marriage, child labor and early pregnancy is avoided. Preparation for learning may also be assisted by pre-primary education.

- Teachers at all levels are effective and valued. Includes ensuring that teachers are engaged, motivated, effectively trained, remunerated fairly and treated well.

- Classrooms are equipped for learning. Ensuring adequate teaching resources including textbooks, activities, teaching aides and the appropriate use of technology.

- Schools are safe and inclusive places. Includes ensuring that resources are available in native languages, all students are welcomed and catered for and that there is access to adequate sanitation and clean water. Learning environments are safe.

- Education systems and schools are well-managed. Ensuring a sound policy direction and goals that prioritize learning, competent school and education leadership, effective hiring, good financial management, reasonable classroom size and a strong learning culture.

It is worth noting that pre-primary education is particularly effective in boosting learning outcomes and, consequently, school retention. Students with pre-primary education demonstrate stronger foundational abilities in reading and mathematics and better long-term learning outcomes. They are also less likely to drop out of school.
In spite of this, education has thus far been a very low priority in humanitarian aid to countries in crisis, with only 2.7% of global humanitarian assistance allocated to education in 2016.

Prior to the pandemic, 104 million children aged 5 to 17 were deprived of education due to these crises. COVID-19 has seen this number rise exponentially. 1.6 billion learners have been impacted including 99% of all students in lower- and middle-income countries. But as COVID-19 began to spread, this number has risen, exponentially. Since the beginning of the crisis, 1.6 billion learners have been impacted, including 99% of all students in LMICs.

A note on the overlap of issues impacting education

While this report categorizes the challenges to achieving a quality education for all children, the demarcations between issues are often blurry and contain significant overlap. The challenge of educating girls provides a clear example of the intersectionality that exists. Being in school is particularly important for girls (inclusion), girls are also more likely to be adversely affected by an imbalance of male and female teachers in the classroom (quality), they are more likely to be forced to drop out of school as a result of child marriage or early pregnancy (retention) and they are twice as likely to be out of school during a crisis situation (education in crisis). And of course, one of the crucial pillars in providing access to quality education for girls, addressing social and cultural change through policy and legislation, depends on adequate financial resource for implementation (finance).

Education and crisis

Crisis-affected regions often face the destruction of school infrastructure, disruption of education provisions and even the loss of student and teacher lives. Children living through crisis may also experience many obstacles over the course of their schooling—consecutive displacements, severe illness as a result of inadequate living conditions and traumatic episodes such as the loss of family members due to conflict or disease. Such experiences negatively impact on social and emotional health, attention in class and, ultimately, learning outcomes and attendance. And where children stop going to school in such contexts, many fail to complete their education altogether.
1) FINANCING EDUCATION

Increased domestic resource mobilization for education

- Where countries are on track to achieve universal completion of quality secondary education, ensure spending meets minimum financing benchmarks: 4% of GDP and 15% of government expenditure.
- Where countries are not on track, lift spending to at or above upper benchmarks: 6% of GDP and 20% of government expenditure.

Increased aid for education

- Lift aid to 0.7% of Gross National Income (GNI) and dedicate at least 10% to education.
- Allocate a minimum of 50% of education aid to low-income countries.
- Scale up the focus on basic education. Align funding with recipient nation needs and government priorities.

Reduce remittance costs to increase household expenditure on education

- Accelerate global efforts to reduce remittance costs to 3% and ensure that there is no destination with higher than 5% costs.

Curtail tax dodging by large multinationals and high net wealth individuals to increase available domestic resources for education

- Implement public country-by-country reporting measures for all reasonably sized multinational companies.
- Mandate public registers of beneficial ownerships for all companies and trusts.

2) INCLUSION IN EDUCATION

Challenge social norms and behaviors through:

- Local and global advocacy addressing participation in education as well as tackling negative attitudes, stigma and violence.
- Promoting gender-responsive education planning.

3) EDUCATION QUALITY AND RETENTION

Improve learning outcomes through:

- Instruction: implement participatory teaching and learning techniques.
- Training: Increasing the quality and quantity of teachers.
- Assessment: Implement better tools to measure learning outcomes.
- Curricula: Engage teachers in effective policy dialogue.

Improve retention and completion by:

- Improving learning outcomes
- Improving school infrastructure
- Improving inclusion

4) EDUCATION AND CRISIS

Respond to crisis by ensuring:

- Countries prone to disaster and affected by conflict should factor crisis into their long-term education planning.
- Refugee children be included in national education systems.
- Education is not the first casualty of crisis. Donor countries should provide flexible and accelerated funding in times of crisis, designated for education.
- As governments formulate their plans to reopen schools, safety for all and inclusion should be incontrovertible considerations.
FINANCING EDUCATION

BARRIERS

It comes as no surprise that one of the greatest barriers to providing quality education is the amount of finance available to train and pay for teachers, build facilities, provide inclusive infrastructure, keep education affordable, fund campaigns to break down social barriers and provide other supportive services. This is especially true for those countries that currently have the poorest learning outcomes and rates of OOSC.

Seeing every child, everywhere, in school by 2030, will not be achieved without additional financial resources.

UNESCO estimates that in order to achieve universal secondary education and SDG 4, lower-middle income countries and low-income countries would need to more than double their overall education spending from $149 billion USD in 2012, to $340 billion USD in 2030. That’s 6.3% of their GDP. But even with this increase in domestic resources, there remains a significant finance gap. And the same report estimates that global aid donors will have to increase their funding to these countries to $39.5 billion USD per annum (from 2015 to 2030)**, representing an almost threefold increase of the 2017 aid levels.

Not only is more funding needed, but ensuring those funds are well targeted and efficiently spent is just as crucial. Many countries with the same relative education spending per student, achieve highly divergent outcomes in terms of quality, enrolment and retention. For example, Colombia and Mexico, with a similar spend to Taiwan...
on education (per student adjusted for purchasing power parity), score far worse on Programme for International Student Assessment reading scores (PISA). And Luxembourg, with the highest spend per student in the world in 2012, scores similar PISA reading scores as the Slovak Republic or Croatia, which spent a quarter of the amount.\(^9\)

The financial barriers to education are significant. Additional sources of finance may help ease some of these pressures, including curtailing multinational tax dodging, reducing remittance costs and appropriately mobilizing (well regulated) private sector investments.

### Education finance amidst COVID-19

Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, 75 million children globally were in need of emergency education support. The pandemic will only compound this shortfall, making access to aid, education and other public services harder. The number of children who need emergency education support will grow, exponentially. Nearly 1.6 billion learners have been impacted by school closures across 190 countries, representing 94% of the world’s learners – up to 99% in LMICs.\(^2\)

While other crucial services such as health, water and sanitation are receiving a significant response in this time of COVID-19, as with other humanitarian emergencies, education is at significant risk of being under prioritized.

Education receives just 2% of humanitarian aid during emergencies. Prior to the current pandemic, Save the Children estimated that there was already an emergency education shortfall of $2.4 billion USD.\(^3\) And with budgets now squeezed by the secondary impact of economic shutdown, pressure on education financing is even greater.

Domestic governments with an increased need to invest in health and safety nets, are at risk of crowding out education spending. Initial estimates by UNESCO suggest that even if governments maintain their current allocations to education as a percentage of GDP, available resources will decrease by $210 billion USD in 2020, due to the pandemic. Should the GDP share of spending be cut by 5%, education expenditure losses will rise to $337 billion.\(^4\)

So, the COVID-19 pandemic, while initially a health crisis, has also evolved into a major education crisis.

If the pattern of the 2007 Global Financial Crisis is to be repeated, aid budgets are likely to fall as a result of the downturn. However, the Director of the Global Education Monitoring Report, Manos Antoninis, has flagged that while this is likely, it is not inevitable. Antoninis has called for an increase in education’s share of aid allocations, more donor flexibility and efforts to align aid with national needs.\(^5\)

Meeting the finance requirements of the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic will be one of the greatest challenges to achieving the current global education goals. The financing decisions made in the coming months will have long lasting impacts for millions of learners, globally.
Financing an increase in resources for education could be achieved through a growth in government spending and aid, increased remittances to support household spending on education, and the elimination of multinational and high net worth individual tax dodging.

**SOLUTIONS**

**Aid vs in-country resources**

The vast majority of the financing to achieve these education goals will come from domestic resource mobilization. 99.75% of the current $4.67 trillion USD spend on education, globally, comes from households and government. Just 0.25% comes as aid from donors.\(^4\)

However, aid, while a relatively small source of finance for low-income and lower-middle-income countries, is a vastly important one. Aid makes up 3% of funding to these groups—12.3% for low income and 2.3% for lower-middle-income countries\(^5\).

If the ambitious education goals are to be achieved by 2030, the role of aid will need to increase. This is particularly true for low-income countries. Even after increasing their share of domestic resources to focus on education, low-income countries will still have a significant shortfall. UNESCO estimates global aid will have to rise from its current level of $2.7 billion USD per annum, to $21 billion USD. An almost eightfold increase that will represent 41% of total education finance for this group\(^6\).

The charts to the right show the breakdown of finance, by source, for each of the different income groups. The first in USD million and the second by percentage share. Domestic government expenditure accounts for most education finance, followed by households and, finally, by donors. Donor aid is most important to low-income countries (12% of finance).

**Source of education finance for countries in different income groups**

**Percentage share of education finance by source for countries in different income groups**

Given the need is greatest in this income group, with 18.5% of all children out of school, further increases in education spending as a proportion of government spending will be necessary. And even more important will be measures targeted at increasing taxation as a proportion of GDP.

The table on page 22 indicates, that of the 24 countries with an OOSC rate greater than 20% (for which data is available):

- Two meet the upper target of both financing benchmarks for education (20% of G and 6% of GDP) — Marshall Islands and Burkina Faso.
- Two more meet the upper target for at least one benchmark — Puerto Rico and Senegal.
- A further three, meet both minimum financing targets — Afghanistan, Niger and Djibouti.
- Four more meet at least the minimum 15% of G benchmark — Mali, Guinea Bissau, Chad and The Bahamas.
- This leaves 13 countries — or just over half — meeting neither benchmark. Six of which have OOSC rates greater than 40% — Somalia, Democratic Republic of Congo, South Sudan, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea and Haiti.

As a proportion of GDP allocated to education finance, however, the story changes. High-income countries allocate the most at 5.11%, with low-income countries second from the bottom amongst regional groupings at 3.87% (which is below the minimum benchmark).

As a proportion of GDP allocated to education finance, however, the story changes. High-income countries allocate the most at 5.11%, with low-income countries second from the bottom amongst regional groupings at 3.87% (which is below the minimum benchmark).

The inference is, that relative to other income groups, low-income country governments are not failing to prioritize education finance. They are however struggling to raise sufficient taxes as a proportion of their GDP to ensure adequate financing.
Four countries that have not achieved the minimum benchmark for education spending as a percentage of G—Cambodia, Guinea, Uganda and Democratic Republic of Congo—made pledges to increase their allocations at the 2018 Global Partnership for Education financing conference (see chart, above). This is welcome progress.

### Countries with more than 20% of children out of school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>% GDP</th>
<th>% GDP funding adequacy</th>
<th>% G</th>
<th>% G funding adequacy</th>
<th>Both targets met</th>
<th>% OOSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>Minimum standard met</td>
<td>15.66</td>
<td>Minimum standard met</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>73.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Dem. Rep.</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>14.01</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>63.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>62.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>55.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>47.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>41.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>16.53</td>
<td>Minimum standard met</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>38.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>Data n/a</td>
<td>Data n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>34.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>Minimum standard met</td>
<td>16.78</td>
<td>Minimum standard met</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>33.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>33.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>Minimum standard met</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>32.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>Minimum standard met</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>Minimum standard met</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>27.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>16.19</td>
<td>Minimum standard met</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>17.21</td>
<td>Minimum standard met</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>Funding target met</td>
<td>22.51</td>
<td>Funding target met</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>24.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>Minimum standard met</td>
<td>21.53</td>
<td>Funding target met</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>23.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas, The</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>Minimum standard met</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>Insufficient funding</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>Funding target met</td>
<td>Data n/a</td>
<td>Data n/a</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>21.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>Funding target met</td>
<td>22.66</td>
<td>Funding target met</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>20.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** World Bank (2020)

World Development Indicators


Migration, displacement and education.

**Building Bridges, not walls.**

**Spending pledges: 2018 GPE education financing conference**

This table indicates whether these countries have met the Education 2030 Framework for Action financing targets based on their spending on education as a proportion of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and Government Expenditure (G).
$21 billion USD in aid is needed for education in low-income countries. This represents less than 0.5% of total education spending

Aid for education

Even with a significant increase in spending from domestic resource mobilization, achieving the ambitious global education targets by 2030 will require support from those able to help.

At first glance, the scale of the required increase in education aid seems dramatic—an approximate tripling of education aid levels from $13.5 billion USD in 2017 to $39.5 billion USD. It warrants asking the question, “Is this achievable?”

Spending on education in high-income countries is 138 times higher than that of low-income countries, despite them sharing a comparable amount of school age children. The $21 billion USD in aid being called for to address the expected finance gap for this group, represents less than 0.5% of total education spending for all countries and less than 0.7% of the education spending of high-income countries. When considered in these relative terms, bridging the finance gap seems far more achievable.

UNESCO has estimated that if all donor countries achieved their pledge of giving 0.7% of GNI as official development assistance, and allocated 10% of this to education, sufficient financing would be available.

Between 2009 and 2015, education aid spending has been stagnant, fluctuating between $11.5 and $12.5 billion USD. Encouragingly, in 2016, education aid then increased by 13% to $13.8 billion USD. Before falling back in 2017 to $13.5 billion USD.

The 2017 cut has come largely at the expense of aid to basic education, where investments are most effective.

The problem is twofold: the total volume of aid is far below the promised level of commitment and education allocations are under prioritized.
The donor countries that make up the official Development Assistance Committee (DAC) gave just 0.31% of the GNI in aid in 2017. This amounts to less than half of their long-promised commitment to give 0.7% of GNI in aid. The average is dragged down by a number of large donors with particularly low relative giving. The US and Japan, the two largest economies on the list, give just 0.18% and 0.23% respectively. European Union (EU) countries by contrast, give 0.5% of their collective GNI.

There are several standout performers when it comes to aid giving. Six DAC countries, all European, give near or above the 0.7% target—Sweden, Luxembourg, Norway, Denmark, United Kingdom and Germany. Education’s share of total aid has also fallen over time. In 2007, education represented 10.7% of aid spending. By 2017, it had fallen to 7.2%. This trend needs to be reversed. Increases in aid should also be directed to where the needs are greatest, primarily towards basic education in low-income countries.

The table on the next page represents each DAC country’s performance on meeting their total aid generosity to education benchmark—10% of the 0.7% GNI total aid target or 0.07% of GNI. The final column highlights what share of the target they have achieved.

Three countries have exceeded the target—Luxembourg, Norway and Austria. While Germany, the largest giver to education in terms of aid volume, comes close to the benchmark (achieving 90.4% of the target). It’s worth noting however, that only 14% of Germany’s aid for education’s share of total aid has also fallen over time. In 2007, education represented 10.7% of aid spending. By 2017, it had fallen to 7.2%. This trend needs to be reversed. Increases in aid should also be directed to where the needs are greatest, primarily towards basic education in low-income countries.

The table on the next page represents each DAC country’s performance on meeting their total aid generosity to education benchmark—10% of the 0.7% GNI total aid target or 0.07% of GNI. The final column highlights what share of the target they have achieved.

Three countries have exceeded the target—Luxembourg, Norway and Austria. While Germany, the largest giver to education in terms of aid volume, comes close to the benchmark (achieving 90.4% of the target). It’s worth noting however, that only 14% of Germany’s aid for
education is targeted at basic education, with the majority being focused on post-secondary spending and targeting scholarships for international students (mostly Chinese) to study in Germany. This is a reminder that increases in aid must also be coupled with a focus on quality and equity.51

The least generous givers amongst the DAC community are Iceland, Greece, Japan, the United States and Spain.

Not only are aid levels insufficient to achieve global education goals by 2030, but the targeting of aid remains inefficient and inequitable. In order to achieve the most impact for students, particularly in those areas with high levels of need, aid ought to be prioritized for basic education in low-income countries. Troublingly, the reverse holds true. A trend which can be seen in the graph below.

The share of total aid to education being sent to low-income countries, has fallen from a high of 25% in 2002, to 22% in 2016. But the finance gap for low-income countries represents 54% of the total estimated by UNESCO for all countries ($21 billion of a total $39.5 billion USD).

Furthermore, 35% of primary age OOSC live in low-income countries. But the share of basic education aid to low-income countries has fallen to just 27.3%.

**Share of education aid to low income countries**

![Graph showing share of education aid to low income countries from 2002 to 2017.](https://www.education-progress.org/en/articles/finance)

**Household spending on education**

In many LMICs, household spending contributes between a fifth and a half of total education spending. Education spending by household includes expenditure on tuition, school fees, uniforms, textbooks and other educational equipment52.

Considering household spending can significantly impact on how we view the education financing of a nation. In Uganda, only 2.5% of GDP is allocated to education through government spending (about 10.8% of G). This is one of the lowest relative investments in the world. However, when household expenditure is taken into account (representing an enormous 3.9% of GDP) Uganda leaps ahead of nations like France, Canada and Argentina in terms of relative spending on education.

There are naturally pros and cons to such a significant share of education finance being provided by households, the upside being significantly more resources are made available for education funding. The downside is that this may lead to inequitable outcomes, as those with the resource to do so are able to gain greater access to education or otherwise afford a higher quality education, while poorer households miss out.
By boosting disposable income, remittances lead to an increase in household spending on education. In fact, international remittances increased education spending by 35% in 18 countries in sub-Saharan Africa and Central, Southern and South-eastern Asia, and by 53% in seven countries in Latin America. Remittance-receiving households also record substantially higher school attendance, enrolment rates and years in school, this is especially true for girls.

SDG 10.C sets a target to reduce average remittance transaction costs to 3% and to ensure that there are no areas where it costs more than 5% to remit funds. 20 years ago, remittance costs averaged over 15%. By 2008 they had fallen to 9.81%. In 2020, they have fallen further still to 6.79%. The trajectory is positive, but still short of the 3% target. UNESCO estimates that reaching the 3% global average cost target would raise a conservative $25 billion USD per annum in remittances (this does not include any consideration of the increased incentive from the reduced transaction costs). Taking 4% as a baseline for average household expenditure on education, such efforts may lead to an additional $1 billion USD being spent on education.

In reality, efforts to increase remittances will likely yield even better results, as remittances have been demonstrated to have a significant impact on education spending and the above estimates do not account for the likely annual growth in remittances.

Remittances to aid household education spending

A significant and, until recently, underappreciated source for household income in LMICs are remittances. In 2019, remittances to LMICs hit a record high of $554 billion USD, dwarfing aid ($149 billion USD) and, for the first time, overtaking foreign direct investment. The World Bank is predicting a 20% reduction in remittances in 2020 as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. The combination of closed borders, economic downturn and the vulnerability of migrants, driving this prediction. However, from 2021, remittances are likely to resume their previous growth trend.
Addressing tax dodging by large multinational corporations and high net worth individuals

Raising their tax base as a proportion of GDP is one of the most significant education finance barriers facing LMICs. As previously stated, low-income countries outspend their high-income counterparts on education as a proportion of government expenditure. Relatively speaking, most are prioritizing education funding, given the resource envelope they have.

A significant global measure to help raise finance for education (along with other services) will be plugging the substantial leakage of revenue generated by tax dodging by large multinational corporations and high net worth individuals. Given the secretive and illegal nature of the problem, estimates vary on the extent of the impact. But all agree it will be large.

Global tax experts James Henry and Gabriel Zucman have both attempted to quantify the scale of the loss from wealth being held offshore and left untaxed. Henry suggests that between $21-32 trillion USD is held offshore, while Zucman suggests it’s a more conservative (but still staggering) 10% of global world product. That’s $7.6 trillion USD. Despite the methodological differences between the two, both arrive at the conclusion that around $190 billion USD is being lost in global tax revenue as a result of untaxed offshore wealth.

The impact of corporate tax dodging by multinationals on the global revenue base is even more pronounced than that of offshore private wealth. The International Monetary Fund estimates that approximately $600 billion USD is lost through corporate tax dodging. Approximately $200 billion USD of this amount is attributable to losses to low-income countries (non-OECD) and accounts for approximately 1.3% of their total GDP. High-income countries are also heavily impacted by tax dodging, with losses to OECD countries being estimated at more than $400 billion USD. Research by the Tax Justice Network (using a different data set) comes up with a more conservative global revenue loss estimate of $500 billion USD. However, this research concurs that the loss to lower income countries is around $200 billion USD. Even at the lower estimate of $500 billion USD, the number still represents more than 20% of global corporate tax revenues.

Two steps that nations can take, either individually or (ideally) collectively, to address tax dodging include:

1. **Country-by-country reporting (CbCR)**
   One of the most effective transparency measures available to address multinational tax dodging is public CbCR. Aggregated global and regional reporting standards allow multinationals to obscure the distinctions between where they are generating revenue and where they are locating their taxable income. But a CbCR standard disaggregates financial data at a country level, with this transparency shedding light on when and where profit shifting activities may be occurring.

2. **Public registers of beneficial ownership**
   Many companies and trusts are set up in ways that obscure who their real owners are and who it is that receives benefit from their existence. They do this by creating shell corporations, by using shadow directors or through other elaborate financial structures. Such structures lend themselves to being used for illicit activities, including tax dodging. It’s a problem that can be addressed by mandating that the true beneficiaries of companies and trusts be listed on a publicly accessible register. The creation of such registers has been a recommendation of the OECD’s Financial Action Task Force and, in 2016, the United Kingdom was the first nation to introduce a public register of beneficial owners. Since that time, it has been followed by the Ukraine and Denmark.
Through funding from different donors, ADRA Somalia has been constructing new model schools since 2016. These new schools (16 in total) present a different way of building education facilities by utilizing unique, cost-effective designs which make the learning space conducive for wholesome development of learners.

During the construction of the school in the Kismayu District, the local community received a source of income. Construction materials were purchased from local markets, and many community members were employed as casual workers. These workers were mainly from marginalized communities, returnees, internally displaced persons and minorities — helping to strengthen peaceful co-existence in the community. And a significant number of the construction workers were women.

Many of the parents who helped build the schools also enrolled their children, having acquired ‘ownership’ of the school by being involved in its construction.

There are also many other indirect beneficiaries from this project, one of whom is Luul Mo’alim Ali Abdule, a small-scale entrepreneur who has established a shop next to the school. A mother of six, Mrs. Luul informed the ADRA team that the school is largely the single source of revenue for her fledgling business.

Mrs. Luul is now single-handedly paying almost 80% of the family daily upkeeps and four of her six children are also enrolled at the school—a big change from their two years at home due to being unable to pay the tuition fees which Kismayo schools charge the learners.

“Forty dollars was difficult for me to pay every month for the education of my children. I am grateful to the donors and implementers of this project for ensuring my children go to school and access quality education,” she says.

“I can say this school has transformed the life of my family. My kids are learning in it. My husband is the storekeeper of the feeding program, earning $80 per month, and my best customers are the school population.”

Summary of recommendations for policy makers

**Increased domestic resource mobilization for education**

- Where countries are on track to achieve universal completion of quality secondary education, ensure spending meets minimum financing benchmarks: 4% of GDP and 15% of government expenditure.
- Where countries are not on track, lift spending to at or above upper benchmarks: 6% of GDP and 20% of government expenditure.

**Increased aid for education**

- Lift aid to 0.7% of GNI and dedicate at least 10% to education.
- Allocate a minimum of 50% of education aid to low-income countries.
- Scale up the focus on basic education. Align funding with recipient nation needs and government priorities.

**Reduce remittance costs to increase household expenditure on education**

- Accelerate global efforts to reduce remittance costs to 3% and ensure that there is no destination with higher than 5% costs.

**Curtail tax dodging by large multinationals and high net wealth individuals to increase available domestic resources for education**

- Implement public country-by-country reporting measures for all reasonably sized multinational companies.
- Mandate public registers of beneficial ownerships for all companies and trusts.

**FINANCING EDUCATION**

**CASE STUDY / Somalia**
Many children face social and cultural barriers that prevent them from attending school. Living with disability, being a girl, being a member of an indigenous group or being an ethnic minority, too often means a child will face unsafe school environments or be excluded from school attendance altogether. Cultural issues, such as parental and community stigma, frequently work to create barriers to formal education for these groups. For example, many girls are expected to prioritize domestic work ahead of education, while children living with disability are often considered incapable of learning or, worse still, unworthy of teaching.

SDG 4.5 aims to tackle these barriers: “By 2030, eliminate gender disparities in education and ensure equal access to all levels of education and vocational training for the vulnerable, including persons with disability, indigenous peoples and children in vulnerable situations.”

Undoubtedly, that these barriers continue to exist hampers progress towards achieving SDG 4, as well as a more broadly a sustained reduction in poverty.
In school, children living with disability are often unable to participate, as teachers lack the time or capacity to provide specialized learning assistance or support. They also face an increased risk of violence—girls who live with disability are far more likely to face emotional and sexual violence than their peers. As a result, children living with disability are far more likely to drop out of school and, for many, this can result in a lifetime of poverty due to low employment and earning potential and other health-related issues.

Living with disability

Global statistics indicate that approximately one billion people live with some form of disability. Somewhere between 93 million and 150 million of these people are children, 80% of whom live in developing countries.

Children living with disability are up to five and a half times more likely to be out of school than those who are not living with disability. While, at a primary level, approximately one third of OOSC are living with disability.

Children living with disability face exclusion from the beginning, with the stigmatization and social attitudes embedded by many cultures being a difficult barrier to overcome. Many societies and cultures do not value people living with disability, viewing them as incapable and economically unproductive, with no recognition of their potential or ability. In such contexts, research has shown that a parent’s attitude towards disability is the primary factor in determining whether their child will attend school. Parents who align with the views above, or who fear that their child will suffer in a school environment as a result of being exposed to people who hold those views, will often keep their children from attending school out of shame or fear.

This makes children living with disability among the most marginalized and excluded groups of children. They are routinely denied their right to quality education and are also often invisible or misrepresented in household and education surveys. As a result, accurate data on the number of children living with disability who are also out of school is difficult to collect. Likewise, barriers to education and the causes behind absenteeism can be difficult to map.

The lack of knowledge about inclusive education in many developing countries has also led to systemic challenges for children living with disability, including inaccessible infrastructure and a lack of teacher training and learning materials to support inclusive education. Children living with a disability are often excluded from national and global strategies to target OOSC. And with most curriculums failing to meet the needs of children living with a disability, there is little incentive for them to attend school.

In school, children living with disability are often unable to participate, as teachers lack the time or capacity to provide specialized learning assistance or support. They also face an increased risk of violence—girls who live with disability are far more likely to face emotional and sexual violence than their peers. As a result, children living with disability are far more likely to drop out of school and, for many, this can result in a lifetime of poverty due to low employment and earning potential and other health-related issues.

Being a girl

Education matters for all children, but it is particularly important for girls. Evidence shows that girls who are educated marry later in life, earn more money, avail social services more frequently and participate more actively in government and civil society. But, sadly, far too many girls are locked out of receiving the quality education they deserve.

Some girls never enroll in school, others drop out of school early, while many attend schools which fail to transfer the knowledge and skills needed to lead to a better standard of living.

The issue is systemic—the cost of failing to educate girls being higher rates of child marriage and early childbearing, as well as the generational, negative impact on the children of those girls who have not received a quality education.

Thankfully, sustained global attention on improving access for education to girls has led to significant gains. Two-thirds of countries have achieved gender parity in primary education enrolment (defined as having an enrolment ratio of between 97 and 103 girls for every 100 boys), and the number of out-of-school girls in primary education has fallen from 57 million to 32 million between 2000 and 2018.

But even more encouraging is that the gap between the number of out-of-school girls and out-of-school boys has closed. In 1990, 207 million girls were out of school versus 166 million boys—a gap that meant...
41 million more girls were left out of education, relative to their male counterparts. By 2018 that gap had vanished. Of the 258 million out-of-school children, the gender break-up is virtually half and half. If anything, the available data suggests there are now marginally more boys out of school than girls.80

Despite this progress, in many regions, particularly on the African continent and in countries such as Pakistan, Paraguay, Papua New Guinea, Yemen and Guatemala, significant gender disparities remain. A positive bias for girls being in school in India, the second most populous country in the world, serves to mask these national disparities when only considering global data.

Additionally, gaps remain at some education levels, despite progress. There are 5.5 million more girls than boys who are not enrolled in primary education79. And there are still 129 million girls out of school. In fact, in LMICs, less than two-thirds of girls complete their primary education and only one in three completes secondary education76. Given the positive correlation with the range of social benefits that come from educating girls, it’s clear that ensuring girls receive a quality education must remain a priority.

Reasons for drop out

Early marriage and pregnancy are common reasons that girls drop out of school, while, conversely, each additional year of secondary education lowers a girl’s risk of child marriage before age 18 by six percentage points on average77. But as early marriage is often seen as providing security for vulnerable young girls who live in poverty, one third of girls in the developing world are married before the age of 18, while one in nine are married before the age of 1578. More than 41,000 girls under the age of 18 marry every day79. This problem is frequently exacerbated by conflict and humanitarian crises where early marriage is regarded as protection against the threat of sexual violence. Furthermore, child marriage and adolescent pregnancy are directly linked89. And the sad fact is that girls who become pregnant at an early age, often find themselves unable to attend school during pregnancy and after childbirth. Even when they wish to continue doing so. If universal secondary education was achieved, then child marriage could be virtually eliminated. And the prevalence of early childbearing could be reduced by up to three-fourths, since early childbearing goes hand in hand with child marriage81.

Another common reason for girl school drop out is menstruation. Many girls do not turn up to school during their menstrual cycle or drop out of school altogether once they begin menstruating. Girls in Sub-Saharan Africa miss 20% of their school year once they start menstruating due to lack of appropriate menstrual hygiene education or toilet facilities82.
are Hausas, from the predominantly Muslim north of the country. Additionally, indigenous groups and ethnic minorities tend to live in poorer, more remote areas, where they only have access to schools of lower quality. In some cases, teachers prefer to teach in urban rather than rural areas, leaving a gap in qualified teachers for the most marginalized rural populations. Often, national laws bar or reduce the access that indigenous groups and ethnic minorities have to school. Curriculum can often ignore the history or culture of indigenous groups and ethnic minorities. Education is only available in the dominant, official national language, rather than in mother tongues spoken by indigenous groups and ethnic minorities. And stigma is also an issue, with indigenous groups and ethnic minorities facing discrimination and abuse. For example, textbooks in Sri Lanka are renowned for breeding ethnic enmity. Most of these textbooks portray Sinhala kings as heroes, defeating the Tamils who are depicted as invaders. Even in those textbooks that don’t overtly degrade Tamils, Tamil history, culture and religion is usually brushed over, with the absence of Tamil or Muslim role models offering minority students few figures with whom to identify."}

Globally, there is a long history of education systems not only failing to provide relevant education to indigenous populations, but, instead, focusing on forced assimilation through schooling. In the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, indigenous children were separated from their families and communities to be placed in educational institutions where physical and mental abuse was rife, and where they were prohibited from speaking their native language. This history is still being echoed today, as poverty forces migration to urban areas where culture is eroded and discrimination is acutely felt. Furthermore, urban indigenous populations are often politically invisible, as regulatory frameworks for indigenous rights rarely reference indigenous people living in cities.

Similarly, there are significant challenges in gaining accurate data on the extent of disadvantage faced by children from ethnic minorities. Worse still, this data has historically been misused for purposes of mistreatment. For example, historically, identification as Roma has led to segregation in schools. Fear of such discrimination has made the Roma particularly reluctant to provide data or participate in censuses. Some Roma also fear personal data may be misused to control movement or develop anti-minority policies. Even so, from what the EU does know through their Minorities and Discrimination Survey, only one in two Roma children attended pre-school, just 15% of young Roma completed upper secondary or vocational education and about 20% of Roma could not read.

Social attitudes
Girls are also subject to negative societal attitudes that affect their access to education, with established contextual factors directly impacting gender equality both in and outside education. For instance, poverty forces many families to choose which of their children to send to school. When this choice is made, girls often miss out due to the persistent belief that there is less value in educating a girl than a boy. Instead, girls are sent to work, made to stay at home and carry out domestic chores or are married off.

Similarly, in countries with greater gender inequality, women themselves are more likely to agree that a university education is more important for boys than girls. And that men have more rights to jobs when they are scarce.

Compounding factors
It goes without saying, then, that girls who face multiple disadvantages are farthest behind in terms of access to and completion of education. Of girls not in primary school, 70% came from ethnic minorities and other excluded groups. While, in developing countries, rural girls are twice as unlikely to attend school as their urban peers. This is because there is often a greater prevalence of social and cultural barriers in rural areas, where labor requirements and the distance keep girls out of school. In Pakistan, a half-kilometer increase in the distance to school decreases girls’ enrollment by 20%. In Nigeria, only 4% of poor young women in the rural North West can read, compared with 99% of rich young women in the urban South East.

Being from an indigenous group or ethnic minority
Worldwide, children from indigenous groups and ethnic minorities suffer disproportionately when it comes to unequal access to quality education. Between 50% and 70% of OOSC are from indigenous and ethnic minority populations. For example, estimates in Nigeria are that 54% of all OOSC girls are Hausas, from the predominantly Muslim north of the country. Additionally, indigenous groups and ethnic minorities tend to live in poorer, more remote areas, where they only have access to schools of lower quality. In some cases, teachers prefer to teach in urban rather than rural areas, leaving a gap in qualified teachers for the most marginalized rural populations.

Often, national laws bar or reduce the access that indigenous groups and ethnic minorities have to school. Curriculum can often ignore the history or culture of indigenous groups and ethnic minorities. Education is only available in the dominant, official national language, rather than in mother tongues spoken by indigenous groups and ethnic minorities. And stigma is also an issue, with indigenous groups and ethnic minorities facing discrimination and abuse.

For example, textbooks in Sri Lanka are renowned for breeding ethnic enmity. Most of these textbooks portray Sinhala kings as heroes, defeating the Tamils who are depicted as invaders. Even in those textbooks that don’t overtly degrade Tamils, Tamil history, culture and religion is usually brushed over, with the absence of Tamil or Muslim role models offering minority students few figures with whom to identify.

Globally, there is a long history of education systems not only failing to provide relevant education to indigenous populations, but, instead, focusing on forced assimilation through schooling. In the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, indigenous children were separated from their families and communities to be placed in educational institutions where physical and mental abuse was rife, and where they were prohibited from speaking their native language. This history is still being echoed today, as poverty forces migration to urban areas where culture is eroded and discrimination is acutely felt. Furthermore, urban indigenous populations are often politically invisible, as regulatory frameworks for indigenous rights rarely reference indigenous people living in cities.

Similarly, there are significant challenges in gaining accurate data on the extent of disadvantage faced by children from ethnic minorities. Worse still, this data has historically been misused for purposes of mistreatment. For example, historically, identification as Roma has led to segregation in schools. Fear of such discrimination has made the Roma particularly reluctant to provide data or participate in censuses. Some Roma also fear personal data may be misused to control movement or develop anti-minority policies. Even so, from what the EU does know through their Minorities and Discrimination Survey, only one in two Roma children attended pre-school, just 15% of young Roma completed upper secondary or vocational education and about 20% of Roma could not read.
 Discrimination in education is multifaceted, most severely impacting children living with disability, children belonging to indigenous groups and ethnic minorities, children in rural communities and girls. To ensure the SDG 4 imperative of education for all, efforts must be made to secure quality education for all children. Increased investments need to be made for neglected groups and discriminatory norms, policies and social practices must be dismantled.

**SOLUTIONS**

Actively ensuring all children are included in education will unlock potential opportunities for millions of people around the world. We know that:

- **Women with primary education earn 14% to 19% more than women with no education at all.** With 12 years education, the gain is up to 44.8%. If every girl worldwide received 12 years of quality education, lifetime earnings for women could increase by $15 trillion USD to $30 trillion USD globally.

- **Each additional year a girl completes in secondary school, significantly reduces the likelihood of her marrying as a child.** Ending child marriage and adolescent pregnancy could reduce fertility and lower population growth by about one-tenth in many LMICs with high fertility rates. The results of this are significant, as, globally, gains in wellbeing for populations from lower population growth could reach more than $500 billion USD annually by 2030.

- **Countries that promote participation of persons living with disability in education or labor potentially gain billions in income.** For example, in Bangladesh, the lack of schooling and employment for persons living with disability and their caregivers has an estimated opportunity cost of $1.2 billion USD in income annually.

- **If all mothers completed primary education, maternal deaths would be reduced by two thirds, saving 189,000 lives per year.**

- **The International Labour Organization (ILO) estimates that LMICs that do not adequately promote participation of persons living with disability in the open labor market through improved educational opportunities, lose between 5% and 7% of their annual Gross Domestic Product.** Not only will the education of children who are living with disability increase their potential productivity and economic opportunity, but it also reduces future welfare costs, as well as dependence on families and government resources.

**Challenge social norms and behaviors**

Social norms and behaviours that consciously or sub-consciously discriminate against certain members of society are embedded in many cultures. These norms influence the value placed on certain individuals (by themselves, their families and their communities) and impact their ability to access education. Challenging social norms and behaviors involves advocacy and public campaigning at all levels.

At the international level, issues must be recognized and highlighted. At the country level, raising awareness of the issues in their local context, questioning social norms and setting up platforms for participatory advocacy are critical. At the community level identifying the prevalence of issues, raising awareness of rights and engaging the community in participatory advocacy to solve problems has proven to be effective, and is a hallmark of ADRA’s community development. Likewise, transformation of beliefs, values and practices in a familial and individual context is crucial for reshaping relationships and liberating people from discrimination. ADRA recognizes that this step is often underestimated, or ignored, by many community development practices. Consistent across every level, is the importance of promoting the voice of those who are discriminated against to build empathy, change attitudes, gain insight and ultimately dismantle the barriers to education that do exist.

The importance of challenging social norms and behaviors is well demonstrated by the barriers to achieving gender equality in education. Schools often perpetuate existing gender inequality, rather than challenging it. This can manifest through teacher behavior.
Similarly, advocacy efforts at all levels are necessary for achieving gender equality in education. At the local level, communities can raise awareness, not only about the importance of educating girls, but also about the importance of creating schools which value the education of girls and are also safe for them to attend. This could include hiring more female teachers, building sex-segregated toilets, establishing girls’ clubs and training teachers on gender inclusive learning. While at a global level, advocacy is key to mobilizing political commitment and to positively influencing attitudes and behaviors around girls’ education.

There are currently high levels of political momentum for gender equality in education, with many countries assessing their education systems through the lens of gender inequality thanks to a push for gender-responsive education sector planning. But work needs to continue to ensure education systems around the globe are gender-responsive by design. The UN Girls’ Education Initiative and the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) produced the guidance for Developing Gender-Responsive Education Sector Plans to assist in advocacy efforts in this area, and to find lasting solutions to tackling gender inequality in schools.

Setting and enacting equitable laws and policies

When laws and policies around education are not intentionally inclusive, issues with curriculum, teacher proficiency and inaccessible infrastructure come into play, acting as significant barriers. Removing discriminatory barriers through laws and policies is key to achieving inclusive and quality education. This will increase the retention of marginalized children groups such as children living with disability, children living in remote areas, children from indigenous or minority ethnic groups and girls. It will also give them more equitable access to school.

A closer look at the laws and policies that will help pull down the barriers to education for children living with disability is illustrative. Below are three key steps to developing equitable laws and policies to see marginalized and excluded children in school, considered through the frame of disability.

1. Commitment to international frameworks.

In 2006, the United National Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) established inclusive education as a legal right, calling for inclusive, quality and free primary and secondary education for children living with disability, on an equal basis with others in their community. By signing and ratifying the UNCRPD, countries demonstrate a commitment to follow the principles and ideals of the convention, taking legislative measures to implement the values expressed in the convention.

Currently, 163 countries have signed the UNCRPD. For these countries, this commitment can be made tangible by their adherence to disability inclusive development as part of their international development programs. This approach not only furthers the principles of the UNCRPD, it is also essential to achieving the SDGs.

Disability inclusive development means that all stages of the development process are inclusive of, and accessible to, persons living with disability. Development and education are intrinsically linked, with education improving individual and community wellbeing and contributing to a nation’s overall development, sustainability and stability. Therefore, it is not possible to promote the inclusion of persons living with disability in development if they remain excluded from education.

Disability inclusive education, like development, is a long-term process of changing attitudes, policies and practices in an effort to remove barriers that prevent people from participating and benefitting from quality education.

A strong example of this framework in action is the partnership between the Australian Government’s Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade and United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) to promote disability inclusive development through their joint aid program. Its work focuses on addressing the lack of research, evidence and data on children living with disability in Vietnnam, Papua New Guinea and other Pacific Islands. The aim is for this research to inform policy priorities to better address needs, as well as ensure all children are included. The joint initiative also includes children living with disability and their families in humanitarian action, aiming to enable them to better access services and education.
2. Improve data gathering.

Due to insufficient or outdated data systems that fail to properly recognize them, millions of children living with disability are left invisible to the education sector. Globally, and particularly in developing countries, there is a lack of consistency with how disability is classified, with many individuals being placed under the broad theme of ‘special education’. This broad-brush approach gives little attention to individual context or specific need and is inadequate for most, creating another barrier to quality education. Other factors, such as social attitudes and bias, lead to inaccurate reporting or underreporting (due to stigmatization) and also compound the issue of inaccurate data. Inadequate data negatively impacts a government’s ability to allocate resources and address the educational needs of children living with disability effectively. Therefore, there is a need to invest in the collection of robust, reliable data concerning the education of children living with disability. One example of how this is beginning to be addressed is the enactment of policies to create a common classification framework for defining disability, with work from the OECD and the World Health Assembly underway.

3. Develop more inclusive education policies.

Through committing to international frameworks and the improvement of data collection, nations can develop education policies that strengthen education systems for children living with disability, as well as develop strategies that better their participation. Effective strategies should include improved teacher training (around providing specialized learning support) as well as improving accessibility.

Access to education for children living with disability is also majorly impacted by physical obstacles such as lack of mobility equipment, poor transport infrastructure, road conditions and inappropriately designed buildings. An example of a strong solution to this barrier can be seen in South Africa, where the Department of Basic Education issued a comprehensive set of legally binding norms and standards for all public schools in 2013. These laws include universal design principles on minimum space, toilets and parking spots for children living with disability and must be adhered to in all future construction work of education facilities.

Policies vary considerably worldwide, with some countries prioritizing education for children living with disability in different settings—special schools and centers; special classes in integrated schools; or inclusive schools which work to identify and remove barriers and enable every learner to participate and achieve in mainstream settings. Establishing inclusive schools is widely regarded as desirable for equality and human rights, and it has educational, social and economic benefits.

It is important to note that inaccurate data sets severely impact on other vulnerable children as well. Children displaced by conflict, those who are from certain indigenous groups and ethnic minorities are often missing from data sets, making them invisible when it comes to national education planning. These children are not only being excluded from policies and laws that could improve their access to education, they are even targeted by discriminatory policies aimed at further marginalizing them.

Likewise, having clear policies that promote inclusion can be crucial for ensuring children are not excluded. For example, in China, a country that has experienced what is considered the largest migration in human history, a household registration system was used to restrict access to public schools for children of rural migrants in order to discourage them from moving to cities. Additionally, in the early 2000s, substandard private schools were created to serve rural migrant children. Thankfully government policy has since changed. Fees for rural migrant children in urban public schools were abolished and the government provided additional funding to the schools to help absorb these students. The proportion of migrant students attending public schools had increased to 74% by 2010. This demonstrates the significant role that policy can play in vulnerable children’s access to education, and why focusing on this area is a priority.

Due to insufficient or outdated data systems that fail to properly recognize them, millions of children living with disability are left invisible to the education sector.
Summary of recommendations for policy makers

INCLUSION IN EDUCATION

CASE STUDY / Uganda

Faida rises before the sun every day. On the weekends, she is up early to make mats out of papyrus reeds. She hikes for an hour to the riverbank, chops as much papyrus as she can carry, hikes an hour back home, then dries the stalks and weaves the fibers into a durable floor mat. During the week, she is up even earlier to begin her ten kilometer walk to school. It takes two-and-a-half hours, and if she is even a minute late, her teacher will send her home.

“They tell me, ‘You are late, go back home,’” the teenager says. “I try to explain the distance, but the teacher does not listen.”

The distance is so great because Faida is a refugee, and her home is in a resettlement camp far from school. But Faida is lucky compared to most of the refugee children like her: Faida has access to education. Her school may be ten kilometers away, the teachers may be strict and the cultural barriers may seem insurmountable, but at least she has a school to attend.

When Faida was a girl, it was easy to go to school. Her primary classroom was within the resettlement camp far from school. But Faida is lucky compared to most of the refugee children like her. Faida has access to education. Her school may be ten kilometers away, the teachers may be strict and the cultural barriers may seem insurmountable, but at least she has a school to attend.

“I have two [children] in secondary school and four others in primary school,” Solomon says. “I don’t have a garden to give them food, so I have to buy food.”

Solomon must also pay for school supplies, uniforms, and medicine when one of his family falls ill. To make ends meet, he weaves 20 baskets every day, from sunup to sundown.

““The reason I work so hard is for my children to be educated,” he says. “I stopped in Primary four, and I have seen that my future is not good. I don’t want them to do the same job I’m doing.”

But for now, Faida must try to balance her education with the family trade. During the weekend she weaves papyrus mats with her mother while her father weaves baskets. When the work is over on Sunday, Faida spends the evening washing and ironing her school uniform, preparing food for the family, and studying her textbooks. At 10 p.m. she goes to bed.

Then, on Monday morning, she rises before the sun for the long walk to school.

INCLUSION IN EDUCATION

Challenge social norms and behaviors through:

- Local and global advocacy addressing participation in education as well as tackling negative attitudes, stigma and violence.
- Promoting gender-responsive education planning.

Set and enact equitable laws and policies by:

- Committing to international frameworks that promote disability inclusive development.
- Improving data on children living with disability.
- Developing inclusive education policies (including improved teacher training on special education, curricula that addresses issues of inclusion and building more accessible school facilities).
EDUCATION QUALITY AND RETENTION

BARRIERS

SDG targets 4.1 and 4A highlight the need to provide “equitable and quality” education and building facilities that are “effective learning environments for all”. However, many countries with poor institutional capacity, underprioritized education or limited resources, also struggle to deliver a high standard of education, to implement cohesive policies around education and to monitor its quality. This can lead to poor teaching and a failure to meet learning outcomes, the flow-on effect of which is high levels of school drop out.

While access to education has increased substantially, the average level of student learning remains low in many developing countries. In fact, it is estimated that 274 million children attending school in LMICs are not learning the basic skills necessary to lead productive and healthy lives. These estimates speculate that half of primary school children are not learning basic foundational skills, like literacy and numeracy, and that three-quarters of secondary school students are not learning basic secondary level skills. Students who struggle with basic literacy and numeracy are likely to struggle throughout their schooling, across all subjects, and are more likely to drop out.

274 million children attending school in low and middle-income countries are not learning the basic skills necessary to lead productive and healthy lives.
Teachers

The poor quality of education can largely be attributed to the quantity and training of teachers around the world. There are simply not enough teachers to achieve universal primary or secondary education. Globally, the United Nations estimates that 69 million additional teachers are required to achieve universal primary and secondary education by 2030. Furthermore, much of the current teaching workforce in developing nations is untrained. In fact, in one out of three countries, fewer than three-quarters of teachers are trained to national standards. These challenges lead to children failing to learn the basics, such as literacy and numeracy skills. Furthermore, an imbalance between male and female teachers in the classroom can also have adverse consequences for girls and their learning opportunities. Countries with wide gender disparities in education often also lack female teachers. In South Sudan, where fewer than 10% of all teachers are women, twice as many girls as boys missed out on the opportunity to obtain a secondary education.

Classes and classrooms

Many school environments (formal and non-formal) are not conducive to learning, negatively affecting both student retention and the quality of education provided. Children in many parts of the world are attending school in classrooms that are overcrowded or falling apart, others are simply learning outside. Malawi demonstrates how stretched learning environments can be, with the average size of a grade one class being 130 children. However, often, classes are also filled with multiple education levels. This impacts quality of education as teaching becomes less focused, which, in turn, impacts school drop out rates. Furthermore, many schools do not have running water and toilets, or they have shared sanitation facilities. This is a particular disincentive for girls to attend school.

Learning resources

Learning materials, including textbooks, a sufficient number of desks and chairs, teaching and learning aids, workbooks, exercise sheets and other core materials to help students learn their lessons are in short supply. Textbooks are often shared by six or more students in many parts of the world. In Cameroon for example, there are 11 primary school students for every reading textbook and 13 students for every mathematics textbook in second grade. Other teaching materials needed to help prepare lessons, distribute materials to students and teach lessons are also lacking.

Safe and protective school environments

Schools should be a safe place for quality learning. Instead, children experience fear and violence every day they go to school. Violence against children in schools remains a widespread problem across developing countries. While policies prohibit corporal punishment, national provisions to fulfil these are inadequate. ADRA Norway found that corporal punishment still occurs in many schools, despite it being banned.

School-related sexual violence also negatively impacts access to education. For example, reports show that, in some African countries, 70% of children had experienced sexual harassment. In Côte d’Ivoire, approximately 50% of teachers reported having sexual relations with students. For this reason, the gender of teachers plays a significant role in determining whether children, particularly girls, go to school. With many parents more willing to send their daughters to school if their teacher is female. This creates a barrier to education in areas like Sub-Saharan Africa, where female teachers are scarce.

As children living with disability are perceived to be worth less than other children and are viewed as ‘easy targets’, they are extremely vulnerable to violence in schools. This is because they may be unable to run away, call for help or tell someone about what has happened to them. In fact, 84% of children living with disability who were questioned in a study on school violence in Uganda, said they’d experienced some form of violence at school in the previous week. The situation is often more challenging for girls living with disability, who were more likely to report emotional and sexual violence in schools than girls who live without disability.
Factors such as induction and mentoring, on-the-job training, working conditions and contracts and pay are significant in a teacher’s ability to provide quality education in a safe learning environment.

Measuring learning. Measuring learning at the classroom level is at the core of the learning process, aiding a teacher’s understanding of their students’ knowledge and helping them adapt their teaching accordingly. Measuring learning also helps to inform policy makers on the quality of education being provided across regions and how to allocate resources to ensure equity of learning.

Engaging teachers for effective policy dialogue. Teachers should have a crucial voice when it comes to policy dialogue. As teachers are closest to the reality of the school environment and have most exposure to the beneficiaries of education reform, their input is key to successful policymaking. However, their input is often missing when it comes to polices to improve teaching and learning. It’s been shown that reforms to education are likely to fail, unless teachers are actively engaged in the process.

Implementing participatory learning techniques. Participatory learning encourages the education process to move beyond a simple transference of knowledge. It promotes learner-oriented education and lifelong learning. There are a range of participatory learning methods that can be used, such as discussions, simulations, role playing, games, excursions, outdoor learning and learner-driven projects. These techniques can be implemented at a classroom level through teacher training, as well as at a curriculum level through policy change.

When ensuring children’s access to education, the quality of that education is fundamental in achieving improved learning outcomes that aid in retaining children throughout the education cycle, through to completion, and transitioning them to other life opportunities. Ensuring quality outcomes is the cornerstone to working out solutions to barriers to retention and completion of the education cycle.

Improved learning outcomes

The number of qualified teachers, globally, remains a huge challenge to delivering quality education and achieving improved learning outcomes. The problem is complex, with the global shortage of teachers also leading to the frequent policy misstep of lowering hiring standards. Lack of teachers, increased class size and underqualified teachers are all contributing factors to poor learning outcomes.

Evidently, ensuring that there are sufficient numbers of well-trained teachers is vital to improving education outcomes. A number of steps can be taken to help achieve this:

- **Increasing the amount of quality teachers.** Conducting regular assessment of teacher skills to ensure quality education is being provided is important. UNESCO suggests that global measures are unrealistic, but benchmarking teachers on three broad areas—general knowledge, subject-specific skills and professional skills—is a helpful process. As well as teachers’ abilities, monitoring should also assess whether teachers are feeling motivated and supported.

- **Measuring learning.** Measuring learning at the classroom level is at the core of the learning process, aiding a teacher’s understanding of their students’ knowledge and helping them adapt their teaching accordingly. Measuring learning also helps to inform policy makers on the quality of education being provided across regions and how to allocate resources to ensure equity of learning.

- **Engaging teachers for effective policy dialogue.** Teachers should have a crucial voice when it comes to policy dialogue. As teachers are closest to the reality of the school environment and have most exposure to the beneficiaries of education reform, their input is key to successful policymaking. However, their input is often missing when it comes to polices to improve teaching and learning. It’s been shown that reforms to education are likely to fail, unless teachers are actively engaged in the process.

- **Implementing participatory learning techniques.** Participatory learning encourages the education process to move beyond a simple transference of knowledge. It promotes learner-oriented education and lifelong learning. There are a range of participatory learning methods that can be used, such as discussions, simulations, role playing, games, excursions, outdoor learning and learner-driven projects. These techniques can be implemented at a classroom level through teacher training, as well as at a curriculum level through policy change.
Retention and completion

Ensuring that children are able to be retained in school throughout the education cycle is crucial. Rates of attendance drop dramatically as children progress from primary, to lower secondary and, then, upper secondary education. There are 63 million primary aged children out of school, with an additional 61 million lower secondary aged children and 139 million upper secondary aged children— or one in every three—not enrolled in school. Globally, lower secondary completion rates in low-income countries is 27%, compared to 79% in upper middle-income countries. Moreover, upper secondary completion rates are just 14% for lower income countries, compared to 43% in upper middle-income countries. This demonstrates that while initial enrolment in school is important, there remain many challenges in retaining attendance.

Improved learning outcomes, largely influenced by teacher quality, play a significant part in children's retention and completion of schooling (with solutions to this having been addressed above).

Improved infrastructure is also key to improving retention. In this case, ‘infrastructure’ refers to the learning environment, which in many schools across the globe is not conducive to students being motivated to engage in learning or remain in school. As a result, there has been a formation of infrastructure standards and the introduction of monitoring mechanisms at the national and (sometimes) international levels. For example, in 2008, with funding from the Inter-American Development Bank, the government of Paraguay carried out an infrastructure census, which generated a wealth of data on various learning facilities, like classrooms, libraries, laboratories, electricity, technology, water and sanitation. A basic school infrastructure index was developed to synthesize the information and used to direct future funding.

Finally (although already discussed in detail in the preceding section), the role played by inclusive societal and cultural attitudes in successful student retention and completion should not go unacknowledged. Particularly in the creation of safe learning environments for the most vulnerable learners.
Summary of recommendations for policy makers

**EDUCATION QUALITY AND RETENTION**

**CASE STUDY / Lebanon**

Ten-year-old Rafeef has a genetic disorder in her spinal cord. It affects her mobility, her vision, and her ability to learn. She can shuffle with the aid of her walker, but she is otherwise immobile and dependent on caregivers.

One of those caregivers is Ahlam. She is a tutor with ADRA ABILITY, a project tailored to the needs of children with physical and mental handicaps.

Ahlam knows that life in Lebanon is hard for a girl like Rafeef.

“If you don’t help girls with special needs in Lebanon, they have no future or hope. A girl with disability is thought to be incapable of anything,” she says. “The parents will just try to marry her off to a much older man.”

Because parents do not believe there is value in educating a child with disability, they rarely seek out special care.

ADRA ABILITY is a program that counters that belief and offers hope. Through one-on-one education, tutors like Ahlam are able to visit children in their home and provide a personalized education. Equipped with iPads and additional educational resources, these tutors provide children with access to a world beyond their lonely rooms.

In addition to providing social and educational support, ADRA ABILITY also provides walkers, physical therapy and specialists.

“Children with special needs require special care,” says ADRA Project Manager Rita Haddad. “Even girls without special needs are undervalued here in Lebanon. A girl with special needs is given no priority.”

Thanks to the continued generosity of ADRA supporters, Rafeef can have meaningful hope for a brighter future.
Crises such as conflict, natural disaster and pandemic severely disrupt children’s education. Prior to COVID-19, 104 million children aged 5 to 17 were deprived of education due to these crises\textsuperscript{144}. And where children stop attending school in such contexts, many fail to complete their education altogether. Many children have experienced consecutive displacements, severe illness as a result of inadequate living conditions and traumatic episodes such as the loss of family members due to conflict or disease. Such experiences negatively impact on social and emotional health, attention in class and, ultimately, learning outcomes and retention.

Crisis-affected regions often face the destruction of school infrastructure, disruption of education provisions and even the loss of student and teacher lives\textsuperscript{145}. In spite of this, education has thus far been a very low priority in humanitarian aid to countries in crisis, with only 2.7% of global humanitarian assistance allocated to education in 2016\textsuperscript{146}.

Conflict
Conflict is one of the most significant factors impeding children’s access to education. Children in fragile, conflict-affected countries are more than twice as likely to be out of school than children in non-conflict affected countries\textsuperscript{147}. Of those out of school, 35% of children of primary school age, 25% of adolescents of lower secondary age and 18% of youth of upper secondary age live in conflict-affected areas\textsuperscript{148}.
Instances of crisis, particularly as a result of natural disaster, are widespread across the globe. Earthquakes in China, Haiti and Nepal, cyclones in Bangladesh and typhoons in the Philippines have destroyed thousands of school buildings in the last ten years. While the damage is immediate, the effects often ripple into the long-term. For example, in Nicaragua, Hurricane Mitch resulted in a 45% increase in child labor among the most affected households. Similarly, in the Philippines, Typhoon Mike led to increases in repetition and poor education performance.

It is projected that challenges like these will occur with increasing likelihood due to extreme weather events associated with climate change, making school access for children in disaster prone areas a priority. Frequent shifts from droughts to floods are recurrent in Sub-Saharan Africa, both of which often lead to displacement of populations and, consequently, disruption of education. And poor weather conditions (and lack of rain in particular) have contributed to the significant increase in number of food insecure children, resulting in higher levels of malnourishment. In turn, malnourishment impairs cognitive development and focus, for those students that continue to attend class in the wake of disaster.

In Yemen, the ongoing crisis is affecting the education of its 6.5 million school-aged children. School closures are common, with teachers being forced to look for alternative work when they are not paid for months at a time.

In the Central African Republic, civil war has seen school buildings destroyed by conflict, families displaced and children put at risk of being recruited into armed groups and forced into child marriage. This crisis has deprived an estimated 500,000 children of the opportunity to attend school and receive an education.

Furthermore, conflict fuels the global refugee crisis, with individuals and families facing an average of 20 years of displacement due to conflict. And refugee children are five times less likely to attend school than the children who live in those countries to which they’ve fled. In 2017, four million refugee children were out of school, which was an increase of half a million from the year prior.

Natural disaster

When disease spreads rapidly throughout a country or region, and particularly when it reaches the level of ‘pandemic’, education is considerably disrupted. Schools are closed to curb the spread of illness, which can suspend education efforts and negatively impact student welfare. It is vulnerable and disadvantaged students who are disproportionately impacted on by school closures, as they rely on schools for a range of social services, including health and nutrition, as well as protection and emotional support.

While the damage caused by natural disaster is immediate, the effects often ripple into the long-term.
This has been the primary concern when assessing the educational impact of the COVID-19 pandemic to date, with the crisis stretching across the globe. According to UNESCO, the world has never witnessed educational disruption on such a scale before. By May 2020, 91.3% of the world’s student population had been affected by school closures, with 1.57 billion learners out of school across 188 countries. It’s estimated that 23.8 million children and youth (across all levels of learning) will be cut off from school next year, or drop out entirely, due to the economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Moreover, the loss of school access carries with it significant social and safety implications for vulnerable children, beyond the loss of learning itself. For the most vulnerable children, schools can provide a vital safety net through the provision of food, safe care that allows parents time to earn an income and, concurrently, protection from violent home environments and access to child safe reporting mechanisms. The loss of this safety net during a time when existing vulnerabilities are likely to be exacerbated is deeply concerning, particularly for those 75 million school-aged children and youth who were already affected by crises such as armed conflict, forced displacement and natural disaster.

The full impact of COVID-19 is likely to remain unknown for some time. Especially given the protracted nature of the pandemic. However, the West Africa Ebola crisis of 2014–15, could serve to shed some light on the reach of its potential impact.

Killing more than 11,000 people, leaving tens of thousands of children orphaned and causing mass economic and social disruption, Ebola devastated the West African region. Nearly 20% of all Ebola cases occurred in children under 15 years old. Across Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone, schools were closed for approximately eight months, resulting in a lost year of learning. The crisis led to a spike in teenage pregnancies and a detrimental impact on the ongoing education of many girls who have now become mothers. The crisis also severely impacted vaccination schedules and immunizations which decreased by 30% in that time, with schools being a key component of many vaccination programs.

Though the scale of the Ebola crisis is dwarfed by the magnitude of the current global pandemic, it remains clear that the breadth of its reach extended well beyond the four walls of any classroom. What initially began as a health emergency, eventually affected many facets of life. The same will be (and is already) true for the COVID-19 pandemic. Along with the loss of access to education, a growing rate of school drop out, a growing rate of children (especially girls) affected by violence in the home, food insecurity, malnutrition, a rise in poverty and a rise in psychosocial needs are likely effects of this pandemic. For OOSC, the risks of child marriage, child labor, trafficking and exploitation are also likely to rise.
Support the inclusion of refugee children in national education systems. The Global Compact on Refugees promotes governments expanding and strengthening their national education systems to include refugee children and youth, ensuring displacement does not impede their right to education. In the face of the biggest disruption to education in world history, direct and responsive action is also required. Without this action to ensure affected learners are well supported by strong education systems through this crisis, there is a very real concern that those who lose access to school during this period might never return.

Flexible and accelerated funding to countries in crisis—and particularly in this time of pandemic. Upper-middle income countries can provide increased aid to countries in crisis, directed at ensuring education facilities remain functioning and accessible, even to the most marginalized children.

Prioritize and plan for safety. In this COVID-19 landscape, governments should only reopen schools and allow face-to-face teaching where they can also ensure the safety of children and teachers, alike. This could include the provision of key resources such as PPE, sanitizer, cleaning products, handwash, and proper sanitation. It also means ensuring that practices like physical distance can actually be observed.

Leave no child behind. It is the most marginalized who are disproportionately affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. They ought not bear the brunt of this crisis. Any plans to reopen schools must also consider the needs of the most marginalized children, supporting them to return to face-to-face learning at the same time as their peers.

Every year of schooling reduces a boy’s risk of becoming involved in conflict by 20%.

Education is an enabling right. In other words, one’s quality education (or lack thereof) will directly impact on the achievement of other human rights. A quality education has been demonstrated to significantly improve long-term outcomes for vulnerable children:

Research has shown that providing good quality primary and secondary education reduces the risk of war. When children and young people are disenfranchised, they are more likely to be drawn into violent groups which can further destabilize conflict-affected countries. Young men in particular are often recruited as soldiers, so male secondary school enrolment significantly reduces the risk of conflict. Every year of schooling reduces a boy’s risk of becoming involved in conflict by 20%. According to one study, a country that has more than 87% of its children in school can decrease the risk of conflict by nearly 75%.

Education does more to reduce deaths from climate-related disasters than economic growth, with education helping to reduce vulnerability to disasters and aiding adaptation to climate change. It does this by improving knowledge, the ability to understand and process information and increasing risk perception. It also indirectly enhances socioeconomic status and social capital. These are qualities and skills useful for surviving and coping with disasters. With higher levels of education, people also show greater concern about the wellbeing of the environment.

In crisis contexts, the risk of drop out is high. Planned measures are key to promoting school retention and completion in countries facing crisis. These measures are key to promoting school retention and completion in countries facing crisis. These measures include:

Investment in long-term education planning. Countries prone to disasters or facing long-term conflict can factor in the likelihood of emergency to their education planning, making provisions to keep children in school in the event of a crisis.

COVID-19 has triggered a global learning crisis, felt most keenly in those nations with fragile education systems. A fact which is all the more concerning when you consider the profound force for good which education can have on the lives of individuals and society as a whole. Immediate action to protect, preserve and prioritize quality education for all children, everywhere, is necessary to prevent this learning crisis from descending into generational catastrophe.
Summary of recommendations for policy makers

**EDUCATION AND CRISIS**

**CASE STUDY / Bangladesh**

Everyone is sweating. From within the dim light of the single room, faces can be seen, slick and shining. The air is as heavy as the black tarp roof stretched across bamboo poles, and only the small electrical fan planted in the dirt floor, its wires split and frayed, moves the stillness.

This room and the one adjoining it, a bare kitchen separated by a piece of plastic, are all that belong to Abdu Rahaman. Three months before, the husband and father of four owned a spacious wood house with separate rooms for his children and two latrines for the six-member household.

Now, the whole family sleeps on the floor in the same room and they share two latrines with 70 families.

“Yes, it is hot and crowded here,” Abdu admitted, wiping his forehead. “When one gets sick, we all get sick. But what other option do we have?”

His daughter and oldest child, six-year-old Fayeza, remembers comfortable nights in her own bed. She also remembers the violence that forced her to leave it behind.

When government soldiers raided her village—looting and raping and killing—the little girl and her large family fled away from the soldiers and their bullets. Miraculously, they crossed the river into Bangladesh, and found safety in a refugee camp.

What they don’t have, however, is employment and education.

“I don’t like sitting or roaming around, but what can I do?” Abdu asked. “I want to send my children to school but there are no facilities here.”

Fayeza also wants to attend school. More than that, however, she wants to play with her old friends.

“I wander around here some,” she said. “But there are no schools and not much to do. Mostly, I just miss my friends.”

Respond to crisis by ensuring:

- Countries prone to disaster and affected by conflict should factor crisis into their long-term education planning.
- Refugee children be included in national education systems.
- Education is not the first casualty of crisis. Donor countries should provide flexible and accelerated funding in times of crisis, designated for education.
- As governments formulate their plans to reopen schools, safety for all and inclusion should be incontrovertible considerations.