



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

UNESCO Bangkok
Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau
for Education




unite for children

ASIA-PACIFIC

END OF DECADE NOTES ON EDUCATION FOR ALL



Universal Primary Education



ASIA-PACIFIC

END OF DECADE NOTES ON EDUCATION FOR ALL



Universal Primary
Education

Published by UNESCO Bangkok, UNICEF EAPRO and UNICEF ROSA
www.unesco.org/bangkok, www.unicef.org/eapro, www.unicef.org/rosa and www.unicef.org/southasia

© UNESCO and UNICEF 2013

All rights reserved

ISBN 978-92-9223-433-1 (Print version)

ISBN 978-92-9223-434-8 (Electronic version)

The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNESCO and UNICEF concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

The presentation of data and information as contained in this book, and the opinions expressed therein, do not necessarily reflect the position of UNESCO or UNICEF.

UNESCO and UNICEF are committed to widely disseminating information and to this end welcomes enquiries for reprints, adaptations, republishing or translating this or other publications. Please contact ikm.bgk@unesco.org for further information.

Design/Layout: Sirisak Chaiyasook

Cover photos:

Front (from left to right): 1. © UNICEF/IDSA2011-00031/Josh Estey, 2. © UNICEF/2011/Naser Siddique, 3. © UNICEF/NYHQ1997-0462/Jim Horner, 4. © UNICEF/LAOA2008-5750/Jim Holmes

Back (from left to right): 1. © UNICEF/INDA2010-00566/Giacomo Pirozzi, 2. © UNICEF/NYHQ2007-2772/Palani Mohan, 3. © UNICEF/NYHQ2012-1517/James Alcock

Contents

Acronyms	v
Preface	vi
Foreword	viii
Acknowledgements	ix
Executive summary	1
1. Introduction	3
1.1 End of Decade Note on EFA Goal 2.	3
2. Asia and the Pacific region: A highly diverse environment for schooling.	4
2.1 Structure and overview of this End of Decade Note	5
3. Current status of EFA Goal 2 and progress since the Mid-Decade Assessment	8
3.1 Access and participation	8
3.2 Progress and retention	20
3.3 Completion	23
3.4 Transition to secondary education	24
3.5 Public expenditure on education.	25
4. Policy initiatives and strategic directions to achieve EFA Goal 2. .27	
4.1 Increasing policy emphasis on creating legal provisions for advancing primary education as a right	27
4.2 Investment in primary education.	28
4.3 Strategies for broad-based public management of basic education	29
4.4 Partnerships and non-state providers in education service delivery	30
4.5 Decentralization of educational management as a strategy to improve service delivery	32
5. Interventions targeting disparities and marginalization in primary education	35
5.1 East Asia	35
5.2 Central Asia	37
5.3 South and West Asia.	38
6. Conclusions and recommendations	41
6.1 Putting equity at the heart of education to reach the marginalized	42
6.2 Promoting good governance and partnerships to expand the delivery of education	43
6.3 Supporting the expansion of quality pre- and post-primary education	43
References	44
Statistical annex	49

List of Boxes

Box 1: Providing inclusive education to children with disabilities	15
Box 2: Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children	16
Box 3: India – Making eight years of elementary education free and compulsory.	28
Box 4: Philippines – Networking through the concept of a grand alliance for advancing EFA	30
Box 5: Faith-based organizations in education.	31
Box 6: South-East Asian countries working together to reach the unreached and marginalized in education	36
Box 7: Japan – A historical innovative approach for reaching the unreached.	36
Box 8: Kazakhstan – Paving the way for children with disabilities to access an inclusive education . . .	37
Box 9: Nepal – Teaching to read in the local language helps children perform better in school	38
Box 10: Sri Lanka – Providing education in conflict areas through home/school programme	39
Box 11: Afghanistan – Clean water and toilets to improve school attendance, particularly among girls	39

List of Figures

Figure 1: Progress in participation in primary education, by adjusted net enrolment rate, 2000 and 2009	6
Figure 2: Regional share (%) of the world's total primary enrolment, 2009	8
Figure 3: Subregional share (%) in the total primary enrolment of Asia-Pacific region, 2009	9
Figure 4: Progress in total enrolment at the primary level (% change over the base year)	9
Figure 5: Adjusted net intake rates and gross intake ratios in primary education, 2009	11
Figure 6: Adjusted net intake rate in primary education, 1999 and 2009	11
Figure 7: Gender Parity Index of the adjusted net intake rate in primary education, 2009.	12
Figure 8: Progress in gross enrolment ratios for primary education, by region	13
Figure 9: Progress in adjusted net enrolment rates for primary education, by region	13
Figure 10: Change in the ANER for primary education, 2000 and 2009	14
Figure 11: The five dimensions used in the UNICEF/UIS Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children . .	17
Figure 12: Out-of-school rate in primary education, 2009	18
Figure 13: Survival rate to the last grade of the primary education, 2000 and 2009 where available. . .	21
Figure 14: Proportion of children repeating, by grade (%) in South Asian countries participating in the Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children, latest year available	23
Figure 15: Gross intake ratio in the last grade of primary education, 2000 and 2009.	24
Figure 16: Transition rate from primary to general secondary education, 2000 and 2009.	24
Figure 17: Public expenditure on education as a percentage of GDP, 2000 and 2009	25
Figure 18: Public expenditure on education as a percentage of total public expenditure, 2000 and 2009	26
Figure 19: Public expenditure, by education level and as a percentage of GDP, 2009	29

List of Tables

Table 1: Distribution of countries in the Asia-Pacific region, by distance from achieving the goal of universal participation in primary education (ANER \geq 99%) and with the most recent year available	14
Table 2: Primary and lower secondary school-age children not attending school within the countries participating in the Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children in East Asia	18
Table 3: Primary and lower secondary school-age children not attending school within the countries participating in the Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children in South Asia	19
Table 4: Enrolment and associated problems in progression and retention	20
Table 5: Number of times children repeated grades, Cambodia, 2009.	22

Acronyms

ADB	Asian Development Bank
ANER	adjusted net enrolment rate
ANIR	adjusted net intake rate
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
BRAC	Bangladesh Rehabilitation Assistance Committee
CARE	Cooperation for Advancement, Rehabilitation and Education
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
CREATE	Consortium for Research and Educational Access, Transitions and Equity (Bangladesh)
DHS	Demographic Health Survey
DISE	District Information System for Education (India)
E-9	Nine High-Population Countries
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council
EDN	End of Decade Note (<i>Asia-Pacific End of Decades Notes on Education for All</i>)
EFA	Education for All
ESWG	education sector working group
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GDP	gross domestic product
GER	gross enrolment ratio
GIRLG	gross intake rate to the last grade
GMR	[EFA] Global Monitoring Report
GPI	Gender Parity Index
HIV and AIDS	human immunodeficiency virus and acquired immunodeficiency syndrome
ILO	International Labour Organization
ISCED	International Standard Classification of Education
MDA	Mid-Decade Assessment (of EFA)
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MICS	Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey
MOE	Ministry of Education
NedNet	National Education Network (Thailand)
NGO	non-government organization
NSSO	National Sample Survey Organization (India)
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OOSCI	Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children
PEDP	Primary Education Development Programme (Bangladesh)
PPP	public-private partnership
PPP	purchasing power parity
PSLM–HIES	Pakistan Social and Living Standards Measurement Survey–Household Integrated Economic Survey
SAFED	South Asian Forum for Education Development
SALR	Social Adaptation and Labour Rehabilitation
SEAMEO	Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization
UIS	UNESCO Institute for Statistics
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCAP	United Nations Economic and Social Commission in Asia-Pacific
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNGEI	United Nations Girls' Education Initiative
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNICEF CEECIS	UNICEF Regional Office for Central, Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States
UNICEF EAPRO	UNICEF East Asia and Pacific Regional Office
UNICEF ROSA	UNICEF Regional Office for South Asia
UNPD	United Nations Population Division
WHO	World Health Organization

Preface

“The equation is simple: Education is the most basic insurance against poverty. Education represents opportunity. At all ages, it empowers people with the knowledge, skills and confidence they need to shape a better future.”

Irina Bokova, Director-General, UNESCO

Article 26 of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that “everyone has the right to education”. Not only is education a basic human right, it both equips individuals with the skills and knowledge to lead better lives and underpins human development. But education is still not a right recognized by all, and many who miss out on education miss out on the opportunity to improve their lives.

In recognition of this, governments, United Nations agencies, donors, NGOs and civil society groups made a joint commitment to provide Education for All (EFA) in March 1990 at the World Conference on Education for All in Jomtien, Thailand. The pledge was made by 155 governments and representatives from 20 intergovernmental and 150 non-governmental agencies. The *World Declaration on Education for All* and the *Framework for Action to Meet Basic Learning Needs* adopted by the World Conference on EFA in Jomtien reaffirmed education as a fundamental human right and urged governments to intensify their efforts to address the basic learning needs of all by 2000 (UNESCO, 1990).

The global assessment of EFA progress in 2000 showed that the commitment made in Jomtien was not delivered. Thus in April 2000 at the World Education Forum in Dakar, Senegal, the international community reaffirmed its commitment to achieve Education for All, this time by 2015.

The Dakar Framework for Action specifies the following six goals:

1. Expanding and improving comprehensive early childhood care and education, especially for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged children.
2. Ensuring that by 2015 all children, particularly girls, children in difficult circumstances and those belonging to ethnic minorities, have access to and complete free and compulsory primary education of good quality.
3. Ensuring that the learning needs of all young people and adults are met through equitable access to appropriate learning and life skills programmes.
4. Achieving a 50 per cent improvement in the levels of adult literacy by 2015, especially for women, and equitable access to basic and continuing education for all adults.
5. Eliminating gender disparities in primary and secondary education by 2005, and achieving gender equality in education by 2015, with a focus on ensuring girls’ full and equal access to and achievement in basic education of good quality.
6. Improving all aspects of the quality of education and ensuring excellence of all, so that recognized and measurable learning outcomes are achieved by all, especially in literacy, numeracy and essential life skills.

Some of these goals were later reiterated in September 2000 when 189 nations came together at the United Nations Millennium Summit and endorsed the Millennium Declaration. The Declaration set out the eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to be achieved by 2015, including achieving universal primary education (MDG 2) and promoting gender equality and empowering women (MDG 3). There is clear consensus that the achievement of EFA contributes to the attainment of the other MDGs as well.

The End of Decade Notes

At the close of the 2000s, specialists within the Asia-Pacific region reviewed the regional and national progress toward the EFA goals and targets. The resulting *Asia-Pacific End of Decade Notes on Education for All* take stock of the progress, persisting issues and remaining challenges in achieving each EFA goal.

The End of Decade Notes, or EDNs, highlight examples of innovative policy reforms and strategies, particularly those aimed at reducing disparities in access to and quality of education. They also emphasize the policy, capacity and governance gaps to be addressed in order to achieve EFA in the region.

The EDNs consist of six reports, one for each EFA goal that build on the findings of the Asia-Pacific EFA Mid-Decade Assessment (2006–2008), which examined EFA progress and gaps at the mid-way point of the 2000–2010 decade.

The first section of each EDN report provides an overview of progress towards the respective EFA goal. The second section discusses the remaining challenges and priority issues. Each report concludes with recommendations on what needs to be done to accelerate progress towards the 2015 targets.

While each EDN covers the Asia-Pacific region, it also highlights issues and challenges specific to subregional groupings, as per the *Education for All Global Monitoring Report*. The EDNs thus cover the subregions of Central Asia, South and West Asia and East Asia and the Pacific. Details on which countries are included in the subregional groupings are found in the Statistical Annex at the end of this EDN.

Foreword

In 1990, a World Declaration on Education for All was adopted in Jomtien, Thailand reaffirming the notion that education was a fundamental human right.

With less than four years remaining for the EFA goals to be achieved, it is now an opportune moment to take stock in Asia and the Pacific of both achievements and shortcomings to draw lessons and move forward. Understanding and sharing the information on how much has been accomplished during the past decade and the main hurdles to attaining the goals by 2015 will help countries and EFA partners in the region identify options and strategies for achieving the goals. Success in Education for All is critical to meeting the Millennium Development Goals, including in areas related to poverty reduction, nutrition, child survival and maternal health.

Within this context, the *Asia-Pacific End of Decade Notes on Education for All Goals* examine what the region has attained between 2000-2010. The Notes highlight policy reforms and strategies implemented by countries, especially addressing disparities in education, as potential models and provide the latest thinking on ways forward.

The Asia-Pacific region has experienced strong economic growth, substantially reduced poverty and ensured more children are enrolled in school. This progress, however, has been skewed; rising income inequality and inequalities in access to basic human services continue to plague the region, presenting significant challenges and long-term consequences.

Progress in meeting the six goals has been uneven with some groups of children left out, such as ethnic minorities, migrant children, children with disabilities and in South Asia, girls. Slow progress has been especially noted in the expansion of early childhood care and education, in reducing out-of-school numbers, and in improving the quality of education.

To ensure regional stability and prosperity, we must address these inequities and we must ensure the provision of quality education for all learners. Many countries in the region have endeavoured to 'reach the unreached' and ensure that education is truly for all. The End of Decade Notes aim to support and strengthen this momentum, energy and commitment to EFA in the region.

With less than four years remaining before 2015, we are racing against time. We need renewed vigour and concerted action to guarantee equitable access to quality education and to ensure that children are not missing out on schooling and learning opportunities because of their sex, geographic location, ethnicity, disability, socio-economic status or other causes of marginalization.

UNESCO and UNICEF are committed to supporting countries and working with partners to speed up progress in meeting the EFA targets by 2015. The End of Decade Notes, created under the auspices of the Regional Thematic Working Group on EFA, which UNESCO and UNICEF co-chair, is one way of extending our support and advocacy for EFA.

We hope the End of Decade Notes will serve to guide actions and interventions and ultimately accelerate the progress towards the EFA goals.



Gwang-Jo Kim
Director
UNESCO Bangkok



Daniel Toole
Regional Director
UNICEF (EAPRO)



Karin Hulshof
Regional Director
UNICEF (ROSA)

Acknowledgements

The *Asia-Pacific End of Decade Notes on Education for All* have been published with the support, advice and inputs of many individuals and organizations. UNESCO and UNICEF, which led and coordinated the publication of the End of Decade Notes, extend gratitude to the individuals and organizations who have dedicated their time to the preparation of the package.

We want to thank members of the Regional Thematic Working Group on EFA* who volunteered to be part of a small group of contributors and reviewers for each of the six EDNs; they gave valuable insights and provided inputs that are reflected in each one.

Special thanks go to the government and non-government representatives from the Asia-Pacific region who provided further inputs to the various drafts of each EDN.

We are grateful to the members of the core review group – Simon Ellis, Abdul Hakeem, Gwang-Chol Chang and Cliff Meyers – who gave guidance and comments that were crucial to the completion of all the EDNs. The core group was assisted by Aurélie Acoca, Adrien Boucher, Kate Glazebrook, Maxwell Handrus, Leotes Lugo Helin, Nantawan Hinds, Sena Lee, Rachel McCarthy, Carey Neill, Tanaporn Perapate, Kevin Richtscheid, Malisa Santigul and Michaelle Tauson.

Under the guidance of Rangachar Govinda, Vice Chancellor, National University of Educational Planning and Administration, the End of Decade Note on progress in universal primary and basic education was prepared by Dr K. Biswal and Dr Madhumita Bandopadhyay and edited by Karen Emmons. Raka Rashid (lead), Shailendra Sigdel and Nyi Nyi Thaug served as co-leads in coordinating the preparation of the report. Michaelle Tauson also contributed greatly to finalizing the report.

Our appreciation also goes to the contributors and reviewers of this report: Lieke van de Wiel (UNICEF ROSA), Simrin Singh (ILO), Sherin Khan (ILO), Kimmo Kosonen (SIL International), Jim Smith (SIL International), Ushio Miura (UNESCO) and Florence Migeon (UNESCO). Special mention should be made to the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, which was the main source of internationally comparable education data used in the EDNs.

UNESCO and UNICEF express gratitude to participants of the Twelfth Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators in Seoul, Republic of Korea in July 2011 who reviewed and provided comments on the End of Decade Notes.

* Website of the Regional TWG on EFA: <http://www.unescobkk.org/education/efa/efa-network/east-and-south-east-asia/twg-on-efa>

Executive summary

Combined, Asia and the Pacific constitute the largest region in the world in terms of their share of primary enrolment, accounting for 56 per cent of total enrolment in primary education – with 390 million children in schools in 2009.

The second Education for All (EFA) goal is concerned with “ensuring that by 2015 all children, particularly girls, children in difficult circumstances and those belonging to ethnic minorities, have access to, and complete, free and compulsory primary education of good quality”. The achievement of EFA Goal 2 is dependent on governments fulfilling their obligations to provide free and compulsory primary education in accordance with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and other international instruments. As signatories to the CRC and other international commitments, countries are obligated to make their education systems inclusive, flexible and responsive to the needs of all learners.

The *Asia-Pacific End of Decade Note on Education for All Goal 2* (or EDN) examines how the region’s progress fares in relation to universal primary education. Given the diversity of the region, this EDN on Goal 2 looks at three major variables in measuring progress of participation in primary education – the size of countries, the need for all countries to make progress towards universal participation and completion, and the difficulties that most countries are experiencing in reaching marginalized groups.

This report illustrates how the Asia-Pacific region has reached significant but uneven progress towards achieving EFA Goal 2 during the post-Dakar (2000–2009) period.¹ The region as a whole is on track to achieve the goal of universal participation in primary education by 2015. But disparities in participation in primary education still exist at the subnational level in many countries. Nine countries have already achieved universal participation in primary education, and 11 other countries are very likely to achieve the goal by 2015. Many countries, however, still have large numbers of out-of-school children, and expanding overall provision and access to primary education remains a priority.

With the majority of countries in the region achieving near universal enrolment rates at the primary level, much attention is now focused on expanding access to lower and upper secondary education. Many countries are now aiming for universal basic education, expanding the coverage of compulsory education to apply to the primary and lower secondary levels and, increasingly, upper secondary school. Some governments also provide free basic education to help attain the universal basic education goal. Countries also face an increased demand for secondary and higher levels of education as well as for more access to pre-primary education.

Interventions in many developing countries in the region still place more emphasis on increasing initial access and participation rather than on retention and progress through the school system, which remain a challenge. Apart from the institutional barriers, lack of information and capacity (both at individual and organization levels) limit the relevance and success of interventions that aim at school effectiveness and efficiency in service delivery. Factors such as language of instruction in schools also act as barriers for children from minority groups who may not speak the official language. Equally, social stigma, discrimination, the lack of facilities and support services as well as the lack of an inclusive approach in the classroom may either prevent children, particularly children with disabilities, from attending school or discourage them from continuing to attend.

¹ Participants at the World Education Forum in Dakar, Senegal in April 2000 produced the Dakar Framework for Action, specifying the 6 goals and 12 strategies to achieve education for all.

Reaching the last segment of the relevant primary school-age population has become the most critical issue requiring attention of all countries in the region; this EDN on Goal 2 includes a section on country and subregional interventions for reaching the unreached and marginalized. Other challenges that became evident in the research for this report include: making quality educational services accessible to all, getting children into school at the official entry age, retaining children through the primary grades, improving pre- and post-primary education opportunities, improving school effectiveness and learning achievements, ensuring gender equality, improving the quality of institutions and governance and increasing funding for basic education.

Based on the analysis of progress and challenges related to meeting Goal 2, this EDN concludes with the following recommendations to accelerate the achievement of universal primary education in the region, grouped together in three main priority areas:

- 1. Centre equity at the heart of education to reach the marginalized:** This includes creating the enabling conditions for the enforcement of the legal provisions related to free and compulsory primary education; mitigating the indirect costs of schooling, with a particular focus on children living in poverty and those suffering from multiple disadvantages; undertaking an in-depth, evidence-based analysis on the unreached, including those in emergency and conflict situations, for informed policy planning, targeting and programme design; analysing the trends in drop-out, survival, repetition and completion rates in primary and basic education, particularly at the subnational level, taking into consideration specific marginalized groups; further exploring good practices that have been successful in reaching marginalized groups, including those in conflict and emergency situations; and implementing targeted interventions to reach children not in school, based on the analyses of the characteristics of out-of-school children and reasons why they are not in school.
- 2. Promote good governance and partnerships to expand the delivery of quality education:** This includes the adoption of innovative public–private partnerships and other types of partnerships to expand the delivery of quality education; strengthening local-level capacity in the planning and management of education; strengthening monitoring and review systems and promoting the evidence-based management of education; increasing the allocation of resources to education for the most disadvantaged groups as a long-term investment towards accelerated economic development and social equity; maximizing the use of existing partnerships, networks and events to advocate for better governance, efficient and equitable allocation of resources and use of alternative ways to expand the delivery of quality education for all; and developing communication strategies that inform stakeholders at local levels about policies, local school budgets and general implementing procedures.
- 3. Support the expansion of quality pre- and post-primary education:** This includes adopting and implementing legislation and policies that support the expansion of pre-primary education and secondary education to increase access to primary schooling through push- and pull-side interventions; adopting and implementing targeted policies to help marginalized groups successfully transition from the home to primary school and from primary to lower secondary school; ensuring appropriate training, curriculum and technical support for expanded pre-primary coverage with quality.

1

Introduction

The international community, including governments and development partners, reaffirmed the commitment to achieve Education for All (EFA) by 2015 at the World Education Forum in Dakar, Senegal in April 2000. The Dakar Framework for Action specifies 6 goals and 12 strategies to achieve EFA (UNESCO, 2000).

Now with less than three years to the 2015 target year, there is a need to assess where Asia and the Pacific as a region and where countries within it stand in relation to reaching the EFA goals. Understanding and sharing the information on how much progress has been achieved during the decade and the main barriers to attaining the goals will help governments adapt or adopt strategies to accelerate the achievement of the EFA goals.

The End of Decade Notes (or EDN) take stock of the progress and remaining challenges for each EFA goal. The notes highlight innovative approaches in policy reforms and strategies, especially towards reducing disparities in education, as well as the remaining policy, capacity and finance gaps to achieve education for all and the education-related Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

1.1 End of Decade Note on EFA Goal 2

EFA Goal 2 calls for “ensuring that by 2015 all children, particularly girls, children in difficult circumstances and those belonging to ethnic minorities, have access to and complete free and compulsory primary education of good quality” (UNESCO, 2000, p. 8).

This note on Goal 2 builds on the findings of the Asia-Pacific EFA Mid-Decade Assessment (2006–2008), which examined EFA progress and gaps at the midway point of the 2000–2010 decade and the country papers presented at the Twelfth Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators (in Seoul, Republic of Korea, 25–28 July 2011). The note maintains the focus on reaching the unreached in education and Education for All with equity priorities that surfaced in the Mid-Decade Assessment. With its specific focus on universal primary education, this report also captures progress and gaps in relation to MDG 2.

This EDN covers those countries within the UNESCO regional (Asia-Pacific) and the subregional groupings of East Asia and the Pacific, Central Asia and South and West Asia (see Annex 2 for the listing of countries).

2

Asia and the Pacific region: A highly diverse environment for schooling

The Asia-Pacific region is home to 61 per cent of the world's population and presents a diverse socio-economic environment for schooling. In recent years, the overall population growth rate in the region fell to less than 1.2 per cent (UNESCAP, 2011a: ix, 1 and 147). Countries in the region vary considerably, not only in size but there is great diversity in terms of economic and political systems, culture, history, social development and levels of educational development. Even within countries, there exists much diversity in culture, ethnicity and linguistics as well as uneven levels of development.

The region has achieved substantial economic growth since 1990, with several countries transitioning to middle-income country status. Despite the economic progress, however, income inequality is a growing problem, even increasing in some countries, including the new middle-income countries. This is imposing huge social, economic and political consequences. Economic data show that across the region, the national income share of the top 20 per cent of the population has steadily gone up while that of the bottom 20 per cent has decreased. The Gini index, which is the standard measure of inequality, also has been increasing for most countries in Asia-Pacific (UNESCAP, ADB and UNDP, 2010).

Hunger and malnutrition are still widespread in the region. An estimated one person in six suffers from malnourishment and one child in three is underweight (UNESCAP, ADB and UNDP, 2010); 62.5 per cent of the world's 'hungry' live in Asia-Pacific. A significant portion of the region's population continues to experience multiple deprivations: in access to education, basic sanitation, health care and food security (FAO, 2010). Income inequality and the problems associated with it are expected to rise further due to the global economic crisis. At the same time, governments are making efforts to achieve 'inclusive growth'² and working to distribute the benefits of development to all sections of society. In doing so, many are increasingly recognizing education as a pivotal component of inclusive growth.

Despite the region's impressive economic progress, more than 950 million people still live below the official international poverty benchmark of US\$1.25 a day (UNESCAP, 2011b). Rising food and oil prices could push an estimated 42 million additional people into poverty. According to the *Asia-Pacific Regional MDG Report 2011/12*, the region has made slow progress in reaching the targets for MDGs 4 (on child health) and 5 (on maternal health). In 2010 alone, more than 3 million children died before reaching the age of 5. At least 32 countries in the region (where information is available) are off track for meeting the target of reducing the under-5 mortality rate. Further, only six countries (where data is available) are on track to reach MDG 5 (UNESCAP, ADB and UNDP, 2011).

Other regional challenges include various forms of emergencies, such as disasters, armed conflict and violence. In the decade between 2001 and 2010, an average of more than 200 million people were affected and 70,000 were killed annually in the region from natural disasters. Those figures represent 90 and 65 per cent of the world's totals, respectively (UNESCAP, 2011a). Conflict is often centred on ethnicity, religion, culture and modes of governance. Political instability, even when non-violent, can often lead to the closing of schools or the non-attendance of children and teachers. Poor governance and weak service delivery systems have also become barriers to education for many children in several countries in the region.

2 The term 'inclusive growth' is understood as "growth with equal opportunity" (Felipe, 2010).

2.1 Structure and overview of this End of Decade Note

This report consists of six sections. Beyond the introduction, this second section provides the rationale of the note, the context for schooling in Asia and the Pacific and an overview of progress towards EFA Goal 2 since the 2000 Dakar global EFA conference, highlighting the emerging issues at the regional and subregional levels. The third section focuses on quantitative analysis of the progress towards Goal 2 across subregions and countries in Asia and the Pacific since the Dakar meeting. The fourth section briefly reviews the recent policy initiatives and programmes as they relate to EFA Goal 2. The fifth section looks at strategic interventions that governments have adopted during the past decade to address disparities and marginalization. The final section discusses the remaining challenges and points out action areas that could be considered to accelerate progress towards reaching EFA Goal 2.

Background of universal primary education

EFA Goal 2 is concerned with access and completion of free and compulsory primary education of good quality, particularly for girls, children in difficult circumstances and those belonging to ethnic minorities (UNESCO, 2000, p. 15). It has three primary components – i) universal access and participation, ii) universal retention and progression and iii) universal achievement and completion. Together the three reflect the need for all children to attend school, make regular progress through school and graduate. They have traditionally been considered, for example in successive EFA Global Monitoring Reports, as components within the educational process that reflect upon the questions of whether children enter school (have access), whether they progress through school without repetition or dropping out and whether they complete their schooling.

The achievement of EFA Goal 2 is dependent on countries fulfilling their obligations to provide free and compulsory primary education in accordance with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and other international commitments. As signatories to the CRC and other international commitments, countries are obligated to make their education systems inclusive, flexible and responsive to the needs of all learners. Effective social policies, strategic interventions and incentives are necessary in all countries to make education free and affordable.

Aside from providing free primary education, the indirect costs of attending school need to be mitigated, with a particular focus on creating schooling opportunities for children living in poverty, those suffering from disadvantages of various kinds (such as child labourers, children with special needs, children from disadvantaged ethnic or religious minorities, migrant populations, remote or isolated communities or urban slums) and children from populations affected by armed conflicts, disasters or excluded from education in some other way.

With the majority of countries in the region achieving near universal net enrolment rates (more than 90 per cent), much attention is now focused on expanding access to lower and upper secondary education. Many countries are aiming for universal basic education, expanding the coverage of compulsory education to cover primary and lower secondary education and, increasingly, upper secondary education. Some governments also provide free basic education to help attain the goal of universal basic education. For example, in 2009, the Thai Government expanded its coverage of free schooling from 12 to 15 years (Ministry of Education, Thailand, 2010). In 2010, Pakistan passed the 18th amendment to its Constitution; Article 25a of that amendment calls for free and compulsory education for all children aged 5–16 years old (UNICEF, 2012b).


The countries and territories in which lower secondary is part of compulsory education include, but are not limited to, Fiji, Hong Kong (China), India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Macao (China), Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Pakistan, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Uzbekistan and Viet Nam (see Statistical Annex 1).

Summary of progress

Strong foundations are needed to ensure progress is made towards universal primary education. Global evidence demonstrates that pre-primary education is an important precursor to and push factor for primary education. However, pre-primary gross enrolment ratios (GER) in Central Asia remain low, with an average of 28 per cent in 2009 (up from 21 per cent in 2000). South and West Asia reported the most significant progress, with an average gross enrolment ratios in pre-primary education reaching 47 per cent in 2009 (up from 25 per cent in 2000). East Asia and the Pacific as a subregion, has the highest participation ratio at 52 per cent as of 2009 (up from 39 per cent in 2000). Among countries with 2009 data, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Kyrgyzstan, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Tajikistan had very low participation ratios, with GERs in pre-primary education at less than 20 per cent (see Statistical Annex of EDN 1).

Significant progress towards universal primary education has been achieved in South and West Asia (figure 1) – the subregion in Asia-Pacific with the lowest participation rate of primary school-aged children at the start of the decade. Participation in primary education in South and West Asia, as measured by the adjusted net enrolment rate (ANER), increased to 91 per cent in 2009 from 80 per cent in 2000. Starting from already higher enrolment rates in 2000, East Asia and the Pacific, with a rate of 94 per cent, increased enrolment by 1 per cent in 2009.

Figure 1: Progress in participation in primary education, by adjusted net enrolment rate, 2000 and 2009



Source: Statistical Annex, UIS, 2011.

Survival through the primary grades remains a major concern in South and West Asia, where around 34 per cent of children enrolled in primary education do not reach the last grade of primary school (UNESCO Bangkok, 2011). Although Central Asia has nearly achieved universal participation in primary education, low internal efficiency of education systems remains a major challenge to quality education.

Low-quality primary education continues to be a major concern in many countries in the region. Various national and international learning assessments show average student performances in reading and mathematics at near or below basic competency levels set by international and national standards. The surveys for the *Annual Status of Education Report*, conducted by civil society groups in India, Nepal and Pakistan to measure reading levels and arithmetic competency, indicate that for both India and Pakistan, the ability to read an entire story has been declining among students in all class levels since 2008. The ability to divide has decreased in India and has varied over a three-year period in Pakistan (SAFED, 2012). Several countries in South and West Asia also undertake national exit or entry exams that provide an idea about learning achievements. In the Maldives, for instance, the proportion of students passing the O-level examinations (end of tenth grade) dropped from 25 per cent to 20.8 per cent, and the A-level (end of the twelfth grade) examination scores dropped

from 44.4 per cent to 39.4 per cent from 1999 to 2005 (Ministry of Education, Maldives, 2007). In Nepal, learning outcomes are assessed through the percentage of students passing the School Leaving Certificate examination; the percentage of students passing the examination has been decreasing, from 68.5 per cent in 2008 to 55.5 per cent in 2010 (Ministry of Education, Nepal, 2011).

According to the EDN on Goal 6, evidence shows that the quality of education in the region, especially for those in disadvantaged communities, remains poor; schools and systems are often unable to respond to the diverse constraints to quality learning due to various individual and family factors, such as poverty, gender biases, language and location. Such factors as poor qualifications and inefficient deployment of teachers, overcrowded classrooms and lack of textbooks in several low-income countries limit the improvement of the quality of education.³

National averages demonstrate that gender parity in participation in primary education has been achieved in East Asia and the Pacific and Central Asia. South and West Asia may reach the target by 2015.⁴ However, while data aggregated to the regional level adds up to parity, many countries remain far from achieving gender parity in enrolment at a subnational (regional or district) level.

Since 2000, there have been an increasing number of primary school graduates moving on to secondary education. The growing focus on universal basic education also has contributed to the consistent increase in secondary enrolment in many countries in the region. The secondary education gross enrolment ratio in Central Asia reached 96 per cent in 2009, while in East Asia and the Pacific it was 78 per cent. Although the gross enrolment ratio in South and West Asia continued to increase, it remained low, at 56 per cent in 2009 – considerably below the world average of 68 per cent (see the Statistical Annex of EDN 3).

This brief summary of progress towards EFA Goal 2 points to the need for a shift in priorities. In some countries, expanding the overall provision and access to primary education remains a priority due to the large number of school-age children remaining out of school. Other countries are close to achieving universal primary education, and their focus has shifted in two important ways. First, they are targeting policies on the remaining ‘unreached’ or ‘marginalized’ groups. To do so, they are concentrating on removing social and economic barriers as well as making schooling relevant for those from particular cultural backgrounds and remote areas. Second, countries with more than 90 per cent primary enrolment are confronted with an increasing demand for secondary and higher levels of education as well as for more access to early childhood care and education; these countries are attempting to address those needs.⁵ Furthermore, improving the quality of primary education, especially the quality of learning, has become an increasing concern for many governments.

³ See the EDN on Goal 6 for more detailed analysis on quality education.

⁴ See the Statistical Annex and EDN 5 for more detailed analysis on gender.

⁵ These issues are dealt with, respectively, in the EDN on Goals 1 and 3.

3

Current status of EFA Goal 2 and progress since the Mid-Decade Assessment


This section focuses on analysis of national quantitative data to assess the progress towards universal primary education since the 2000 Dakar Conference and the 2005 EFA Mid-Decade Assessment (MDA). Areas of progress or lack of progress across countries and subregions in the Asia-Pacific region are highlighted.

3.1 Access and participation

The Asia-Pacific region is the largest region in terms of its share of primary enrolment, accounting for 56 per cent of the world's total in 2009 (figure 2). The region has achieved significant but uneven progress towards achieving EFA Goal 2 since the Dakar Conference. Globally, between 2000 and 2009, there was an 8 per cent increase in the number of children enrolled in primary education, while the Asia-Pacific region registered a 2.2 per cent increase in total primary enrolment, from 381.6 million in 2000 to 390.1 million in 2009 (Statistical Annex). This translates to 8.5 million more children enrolled in primary schools in the region. The slower growth in the total number of children enrolled in Asia and the Pacific is partly due to the smaller number of children enrolled in primary schools in East Asia and the Pacific in 2009 compared with 2000, which is mainly due to the slowdown in population growth in some countries, particularly in China.

Progress in South and West Asia has contributed to a large portion of the growth in the region (figure 3); from 2000 to 2009, the total primary enrolment increased sharply – by 26 per cent, with substantial growth of 20 per cent between 2000 and 2005 and a slower growth of 5 per cent between 2005 and 2009. South and West Asia experienced a faster increase in the number of children enrolled in primary school in the post-Dakar period (2000–2009) compared with the pre-Dakar period (1990–2000) (figure 4). Although Afghanistan increased its total primary enrolment by more than 5.5 times, it is India's 28 per cent increase that explains the figures for South and West Asia. In eight years, India increased the number of students in primary education by almost 32 million.

Figure 2: Regional share (%) of the world's total primary enrolment, 2009



Source: Statistical Annex, UIS, 2011.

Figure 3: Subregional share (%) in the total primary enrolment of Asia-Pacific region, 2009





Figure 4: Progress in total enrolment at the primary level (% change over the base year)



Note: The chart presents the percentage change of the total enrolment in primary school over different time periods (which are indicated in parenthesis). As shown in the chart, the changes vary by region and by period, and they can be negative or positive. For example, for all time periods, enrolments in primary school have gone up substantially in sub-Saharan Africa compared with other regions.

Source: Statistical Annex, UIS, 2011.

In analysing national and regional progress towards universal access and participation in primary education, the following factors were taken into account:

- i. **Share of the regional or global population of children of the official age in primary school.** In 2009, five countries in the region (Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia and Pakistan) that are part of the E-9 Initiative⁶ accounted for 45 per cent of the total global enrolment in primary education and 80 per cent of the Asia-Pacific region's total enrolment.⁷ These countries are also home to 45 per cent of the world's population and 75 per cent of the Asia-Pacific population (UNESCAP, 2011a, pp. ix, 1 and 147). The pace of progress in primary education in the Asian E-9 countries is thus critical for determining the progress towards EFA, both at the global and regional levels. On this measure, the largest countries have made enormous progress by bringing tremendous numbers of children into primary education. However, there are still significant numbers of children who are out of school.

⁶ The E-9 Initiative is a forum for nine of the most highly populated developing countries (Bangladesh, Brazil, China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Nigeria and Pakistan) to discuss their experiences in education, exchange best practices and monitor progress on achieving Education for All. Since its launch during the EFA Summit of the Nine High-Population Countries in New Delhi in 1993, the network has become a powerful lobby for EFA and South-South cooperation. What goes on in these highly populated developing countries (which account for more than 50 per cent of the world's population) weighs heavily on global education trends.

⁷ See the Statistical Annex.

- ii. **Progress towards 100 per cent adjusted net enrolment rate.** This is the most common way to measure progress towards EFA Goal 2; with this gauge, the largest countries (Asian E-9) are considered alongside the smallest (such as the Pacific islands). The rates in the countries are compared without taking into account the different sizes of countries in terms of the numbers of children and resources. On this measure, many of the E-9 countries, such as India and Pakistan, still have much progress to make.
- iii. **Reaching the unreached and the marginalized.** In many countries in Asia-Pacific, the vast majority of the primary school-age population attends school. In those countries, the focus thus has been more on the remaining out-of-school groups, which tend to consist of people in remote areas, socially marginalized groups of minorities, children with disabilities or a particular sex. In the last case, girls' education is often a major issue, especially in Afghanistan, Cambodia, India, Lao PDR and Pakistan. However, in some countries, such as Bangladesh, Kiribati, Mongolia, Nauru and Philippines, the retention of boys in education has become a challenge.⁸

Together, these three factors capture some of the important dimensions affecting progress with participation in primary education – the size of countries, the need for all countries to make progress towards universal participation and completion, and the difficulties that all countries face in reaching marginalized groups.

3.1.1 Access to primary education

Each country specifies its own official entrance age into primary education. Entry into the first grade at the correct age continues to be a major problem across the region. In 2009, only 72 per cent of children starting school in Central Asia were of the official entrance age. In several countries in East Asia and the Pacific and in South and West Asia in 2009, less than 70 per cent of children starting school were of the official entrance age (UIS, 2011, Statistical Table 2).

In some countries there is a mismatch between the formal entrance age into primary education and the actual entrance age; in practice, parents send their children to school one or two years later (or earlier) than government policy would suggest (figure 5). This has several important implications. From the point of view of national policy, it represents a disconnect between policy and practice. This may have practical or developmental impacts in the classroom if the curriculum in the first grade is aimed at children one or two years younger or older than those who are actually found in a classroom. It may also have a cumulative impact, affecting secondary schooling. For example, children who enter primary school one year later than expected will enter secondary school late as well. Late enrolment can also impact drop-out rates. As children age, there is more pressure on them to contribute to the household, commonly through income earning or through caretaking, oftentimes leading to their leaving school (Sabates et al., 2010). Additionally, there are emotional impacts related to the age when children start school if parents regard their child as too young or too old to start school or to be a first grader. On the other hand, in countries such as Indonesia, where the age of grade 1 enrolment is 7 years, more than 70 per cent of 6-year-olds and 11 per cent of 5-year-olds enrol in grade 1 early. This means they are learning a curriculum and using materials that are not age appropriate, and thus they are much more likely to repeat or drop out (UNICEF, Indonesia report, forthcoming). For these reasons, a difference of even one year of age between policy and practice in children starting school can be significant.


Most countries cannot provide data on new entrants by age, and many countries in the region have no data on the net intake rate (NIR) in primary education. The net intake rate measures the total number of new entrants to the first grade of primary education who are of the theoretical primary school entrance age, expressed as a percentage of the population of the same age.⁹ The lack of data makes it difficult to assess the accessibility of the first grade of primary education for children of the appropriate age. To overcome this issue, the adjusted net intake rate (ANIR) is

⁸ Gender issues in primary education are discussed more in the EDN on Goal 5.

⁹ See Annex B: Definition of indicators in UIS, 2011 or the UIS online glossary.

used. The adjusted net intake rate measures the total enrolment in primary education (not just the first grade) of pupils of the official entrance age, expressed as a percentage of the population of the same age in a given school year. It thus measures the actual level of access to primary education of the population of the official school entrance age (UIS, 2011).


Figure 5: Adjusted net intake rates and gross intake ratios in primary education, 2009



Source: UIS, 2011, Statistical Table 2.

In the Asia-Pacific region, there has been significant progress in access to primary education during the post-Dakar period, especially in six countries. The increase of percentage points in the size of the adjusted net intake rate in primary education was highest between 1999 and 2009 in the Islamic Republic of Iran (52), followed by Bhutan (36), Cambodia (16), Lao PDR (14), Cook Islands (14) and Australia (13). Most of the small island countries in the Pacific experienced a sharp decline in their adjusted net intake rate in primary education during that same period. In the Philippines, the decline was by more than 22 percentage points, while the decrease was between 6 and 10 percentage points in Fiji, Maldives and the Republic of Korea (figure 6).

Figure 6: Adjusted net intake rate in primary education, 1999 and 2009




Source: UIS, 2011, Statistical Table 2.

Gender issues in access to primary education

National averages indicate that most countries in East Asia and the Pacific as well as in Central Asia have already achieved gender parity in access to primary education (figure 7). UNESCO (2003) set a gender parity index (GPI) value of between 0.97 and 1.03 as the achievement of gender parity. A GPI below 0.97 indicates a bias against girls while a GPI higher than 1.03 indicates boys are at a disadvantage. The GPI of the adjusted net intake rate in primary education in the region points to boys as disadvantaged in access to primary education in Australia, Hong Kong (China), Nauru, Philippines, Solomon Islands and, to some extent, Brunei Darussalam. Gender disparity in access to primary education is a major issue in Pakistan (with a GPI in the adjusted net intake rate of 0.86 in 2009). Twenty-two of the countries presented in figure 7 have achieved gender parity, with a GPI rating of between 0.97 and 1.03.

Gender inequalities in education, however, continue to persist at the subnational level. EFA Goal 5 calls for gender parity (which is often measured by the GPI) and gender equality in education by 2015. As noted in the EDN on Goal 5, achieving gender equality by 2015 “depends on the ability of education policy and other initiatives to eradicate the barriers that keep girls and boys out of education as well as the teaching practices, curricula and learning materials that reinforce gender stereotypes and lead to gendered learning outcomes” (UNESCO and UNICEF, 2012, p. 12). There is thus also a need for more qualitative indicators to measure the overall progress towards Goal 5 (see the EDN on Goal 5 for more detailed discussion).

Figure 7: Gender Parity Index of the adjusted net intake rate in primary education, 2009



Source: UIS, 2011, Statistical Table 2.

3.1.2 Participation in primary education


Participation in primary education can be measured using a number of indicators. The two most common are the gross enrolment ratio (GER) and the adjusted net enrolment rate (ANER).¹⁰ The gross enrolment ratio in primary education is the total number of children enrolled in primary education, expressed as a percentage of the official primary school-age population in a given year. The adjusted net enrolment rate in primary education is the enrolment of the official primary school-age population enrolled in primary or secondary education as a percentage of total primary school-age children. While the gross enrolment ratio reflects the general level of participation, the adjusted net enrolment rate measures the actual school participation of the official primary school-age population. This indicator can shed light on the efficiency of an education system.

¹⁰ See <http://glossary.uis.unesco.org/glossary/en/home>

The region achieved steady but uneven progress in participation in primary education in the post-Dakar period. South and West Asia have made the most impressive progress as measured by the GER in primary education, while progress has stagnated in East Asia and the Pacific and in Central Asia, largely because the two subregions already had high gross enrolment ratios in 2000 (figure 8). A gross enrolment ratio of more than 100 per cent indicates inefficiencies within the system, including high, late or early age enrolment and high repetition.


The adjusted net enrolment rates indicate that Central Asia and East Asia and the Pacific have nearly achieved universal participation in primary education, while South and West Asia made remarkable progress towards this goal from 2000 to 2009. However, the expansion of the adjusted net enrolment rate in South and West Asia slowed between 2005 and 2009, after it reached 89 per cent in 2005 (figure 9).

Figure 8: Progress in gross enrolment ratios for primary education, by region



Source: Statistical Annex, UIS, 2011.

Figure 9: Progress in adjusted net enrolment rates for primary education, by region



Source: Statistical Annex, UIS, 2011.

The region as a whole is thus on track to achieve the goal of universal participation in primary education by 2015, although completion rates must be examined to review progress towards EFA Goal 2 and MDG 2, which also call for universal completion of a full primary education cycle. However, disparities in participation in primary education still exist at the subnational level in many countries. Table 1 illustrates how far or close countries are to achieving Goal 2, based on national averages. Nine countries have already achieved universal participation in primary education, and 11 countries are very likely to achieve the goal by 2015, if the past trend in the adjusted net enrolment rate continues. Two of the Asian E-9 countries, Bangladesh and Pakistan, remain far from achieving the goal of universal participation in primary education as measured by the adjusted net enrolment rate. An additional imperative point is that national averages mask gaps within countries. Also, a few countries in the region do not have historical data, hence are not covered in this analysis (see the note to table 1).

Table 1: Distribution of countries in the Asia-Pacific region, by distance from achieving the goal of universal participation in primary education (ANER \geq 99%) and with the most recent year available


Subregion	Universal participation achieved (ANER of 99% or more)	Close to the goal (ANER between 95% and 99%)	Intermediate (ANER between 90% and 94%)	Far from the goal (less than 90%)
Central Asia	Kazakhstan (2010) Mongolia (2009)	Tajikistan (2006)	Kyrgyzstan (2009), Uzbekistan (2009)	
East Asia and the Pacific	Japan (2009) New Zealand (2009) Niue (1999) Republic of Korea (2009) Samoa (2009) Tonga (2005)	Australia (2009) Brunei Darussalam (2009) Cook Islands (2010) Indonesia (2009) Hong Kong, China (2009) Palau (2000) Viet Nam (2001) Vanuatu (2005)	Cambodia (2006) Fiji (2008) Malaysia (2008) Philippines (2008) Thailand (2010)	Lao PDR (2008) Macao, China (2009) Marshall Islands (2001) Timor-Leste (2009) Solomon Islands (2007)
South and West Asia	Islamic Republic of Iran (2005)	India (2008) Maldives (2005)	Sri Lanka (2009)	Bangladesh (2009) Bhutan (2009) Nepal (2000) Pakistan (2009)

Note: There is no data from 1999 to 2010 for Afghanistan, China, DPR Korea, Kiribati, Micronesia, Myanmar, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Singapore, Tokelau, Turkmenistan and Tuvalu.

Source: Statistical Annex, UIS, 2011.

During the post-Dakar period, four countries (Bhutan, Cook Islands, India and Pakistan) registered an increase of 9 percentage points or more in their adjusted net enrolment rates for primary education. However, Fiji, Indonesia, Malaysia and Sri Lanka all recorded decreases in their ANER during the same period (figure 10). While there has been a decline in net enrolment rates in the period since 2000 in a number of Pacific countries, there is limited evidence of any increase in the number of out-of-school children. The accuracy of numbers from the Pacific is constrained by the lack of data. It is likely that the phenomenon is linked to rising emigration from other islands. This may be a 'statistical artefact' caused by the lag between children leaving the islands and their schools there and the official revision of population forecasts.

Figure 10: Change in the ANER for primary education, 2000 and 2009



Source: Statistical Annex, UIS, 2011.

3.1.3 Reaching the unreached: The most critical gap to overcome, to ensure progress towards universal primary education

Countries in the region have not reached the segment of primary school-aged children living in difficult circumstances. These children are mostly from disadvantaged sections of society. Every country in the region has a large number of disadvantaged children who lack access to quality education. Problems they endure include poverty, child labour, social exclusion, geographic remoteness, ethnic and linguistic disadvantages, physical and mental disabilities, gender stereotyping and difficult circumstances such as living on the streets or in areas affected by disasters, armed conflict and/or racial, religious, social and ethnic discrimination and child labour.

The definition of 'marginalized' and 'disadvantaged' varies widely across countries in the region, and identifying such children and understanding their circumstances continues to be a major concern in the absence of reliable data and information. In Central Asia, socially disadvantaged children are defined as children with disabilities, orphans, children without parental care, street children, children from poor families and non-student and non-working young people. The homeless, migrants, refugees, stateless children, children infected or affected by HIV or AIDS and child workers are all considered disadvantaged groups in those countries as well (UNESCO, 2010b). In contrast, in South and West Asia, the disadvantaged and the marginalized include those same categories as well as children who have no access to primary education because of economic, social, ethnic, religious, geographic and language barriers. Additionally, a large number of children caught in armed conflict or affected by natural disasters and other emergencies within countries are considered disadvantaged in terms of their circumstances with schooling.

Box 1: Providing inclusive education to children with disabilities

The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates the number of children aged 0–14 years with a moderate or severe disability at 93 million (5.1 per cent of the global population of that age), with 13 million (0.7 per cent) children experiencing severe difficulties (WHO, 2008). UNICEF estimated the number of children with disabilities younger than 18 at 150 million in 2005 (UNICEF, 2005).

Various surveys and studies have shown that children with disabilities are less likely to attend school or, if they do, are more likely to drop out. This pattern is more pronounced in poorer countries. In the Asia-Pacific region, the gap in primary school attendance rates between disabled and non-disabled children ranges from 10 per cent in India to 60 per cent in Indonesia and for secondary education, from 15 per cent in Cambodia to 58 per cent in Indonesia (WHO and World Bank, 2011).

In India, the findings from a World Bank survey placed the estimated share of disabled children not enrolled in school at more than five times the national rate, even in the more prosperous states. In Karnataka, the best performing state economically, almost 25 per cent of children with disabilities were not in school. In poorer states, such as Madhya Pradesh and Assam, more than half of the children with disabilities were out of school (World Bank, 2009).

Countries cannot achieve universal primary education without providing access to quality education for all children with disabilities. Several international mandates recognize the right of all children with disabilities to be included in the general education systems and to receive the individual support they require. The most recent is the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, adopted in 2008. Article 24 of the Convention stresses the need for governments to ensure equal access to an "inclusive education system at all levels" and provide reasonable accommodation and individual support services to persons with disabilities to facilitate their education (UN, 2006, p. 16).

Children who lack education at an early age will have limited opportunities for employment and are likely to be bound by poverty in adulthood. Researchers in a study in Bangladesh estimated the cost of disability due to forgone income from a lack of schooling and employment, both of people with disabilities and their caregivers, at US\$1.2 billion annually, or 1.7 per cent of GDP (World Bank, 2008).

Several countries in the region are trying to reach children with disabilities under the overall umbrella of inclusive education. More efforts at systemic change, however, are needed to remove barriers and provide support services to ensure that children with disabilities are not excluded from mainstream educational opportunities (WHO and World Bank, 2011).

Addressing marginalization in education has been a major priority for countries in the region since 2006 and was the focus of the EFA Global Monitoring Report for 2010.¹¹ The regional EFA Mid-Decade Assessment attempted to establish a common approach for identifying unreached groups. Although countries may use different classifications when considering ethnic minorities, common standards and understanding of disabilities are gaining ground. South-East Asian countries, through the Southeast Asia Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO), agreed in 2011 to adopt the Washington Group on Disability Statistics¹² and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) standards for describing disabilities.¹³ Since 2009, a joint UNICEF and the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) initiative on out-of-school children has concentrated on harmonizing statistical analysis, monitoring the data and sharing solutions to the problems. The global initiative is designed to understand the links between those who never go to school, those who drop out and those who are at risk of dropping out (box 2).

Box 2: Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children

To provide better information on children not attending school, UNICEF and UIS launched a global initiative in 2010 to provide the data required to inform policies aimed at reducing the number of out-of-school children. The specific objectives of the project are to:

- improve information and statistical analysis of data on out-of-school children and develop complex profiles of these children that reflect the multiple deprivations and disparities they face in relation to education
- analyse existing interventions related to enhanced school participation, identify bottlenecks and develop context-appropriate policies and strategies for increasing enrolment and attendance of excluded and marginalized children.

Twenty-six countries from seven regions are currently engaged in the initiative. In East Asia, the participating countries are Cambodia, Indonesia, Philippines and Timor-Leste and in South Asia they are Bangladesh, India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka.

As part of the initiative, country and regional studies are being prepared as well as a global report on out-of-school children and a methodological document. The aim is to inform education sector planning and reform efforts as well as annual sector and budget reviews within the framework of the Global Partnership for Education.

At the country level, household surveys are used as the main source for the national studies combined with some administrative data from schools collected by the Ministry of Education. Both sources have their limitations and strengths. Household survey or census data have the advantage of:

- covering children both in and out of school, making direct analysis of the out-of-school population possible
- disaggregation according to numerous individual or household characteristics
- collecting data on school attendance, covering all types of providers (public and private)
- providing data on child labour, a phenomenon related to school attendance.

11 The series of regional meetings that have addressed the issue are described in UNESCO Bangkok, 2010. The global situation is analysed in UNESCO, 2010b.

12 The Washington Group on Disability Statistics was established in 2001 to promote and coordinate international cooperation in the area of health statistics, focusing on disability measures suitable for censuses and national surveys. It is composed of representatives of national statistic offices, international organizations and NGOs. See <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/citygroup/washington.htm>

13 For an overview on disability in the region, see UNESCO Bangkok, 2009.

Continued from Box 2


Household survey data also have limitations, including:

- It is often not possible to link results to information about the education system.
- Large household surveys are generally not carried out every year.
- The sample population typically does not include the homeless (including street children) and nomadic or mobile populations, which can constitute a significant number of out-of-school children in some countries.
- The precision of estimates and the level of disaggregation are limited by the design of a survey and the sample size.

The initiative’s conceptual and methodological framework introduced a model for analysing the problem of out-of-school children through ‘five dimensions of exclusion’ (figure 11). The model presents five target groups of children that span i) three age groups: children of pre-primary, primary and lower secondary school age; and ii) two groups by school participation status: children who are out of school and children who are in school but at risk of dropping out. The term ‘exclusion’ has a slightly different meaning, depending on the population concerned: children who are out of school are excluded from education, while children who are at risk of dropping out may be excluded within education

Source: OOSCI Conceptual and Methodological Framework, UNICEF and UIS, unpublished framework.

Figure 11: The five dimensions used in the UNICEF/UIS Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children



Sources: UNICEF and UIS, 2012.


Reaching out-of-school children

Even with a visible increase in participation at the primary school level in many countries, a large number of out-of-school children are found in almost all subregions of Asia-Pacific.

According to the UIS Global Education Digest (2011), globally 67 million children of primary school age were out of school as of 2009. Among them, 16.3 million primary school-aged children were out of school in South and West Asia, 8.3 million in East Asia and the Pacific, and 0.4 million in Central Asia. In the Pacific, relatively large proportions of school-age children remained out of school in small island countries including the Marshall Islands (20 per cent) and the Solomon Islands (19 per cent). In East Asia, they were concentrated in Lao PDR (18 per cent), Timor-Leste (17 per cent), Macao, China (13 per cent), Cambodia (11 per cent) and Thailand (10 per cent). In South and West Asia, Pakistan had the largest proportion of out-of-school children at the primary level (34 per cent),

while in Central Asia, Uzbekistan (10 per cent) had the largest proportion (figure 12). It should be pointed out as well that 17 countries in the region have not provided data on their out-of-school rate in primary education for the year 2009 (UIS, 2011).

Figure 12: Out-of-school rate in primary education, 2009



Note: Countries with a 1 per cent or less out-of-school rate are not included in the graphic.

Source: UIS, 2011, Statistical Table 5.

Tables 2 and 3 show the numbers of primary and lower secondary school-aged children who are not attending school in countries in East Asia and South Asia that are part of the Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children. The numbers are based on household surveys, and calculations are also based on International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) definitions of primary and lower secondary education. In East Asia, an estimated 2.2 million primary school-age children and 3.1 million lower secondary school-age children were not attending school in four countries. In South Asia, there were 23.8 million primary school-age and 15.6 million lower secondary school-age children not attending school in four countries.

Table 2: Primary and lower secondary school-age children not attending school within the countries participating in the Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children in East Asia

Country	Primary school-age children not attending school			Lower secondary school-age children not attending school		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Cambodia	174,452	146,320	320,773	70,238	74,656	144,894
Philippines*	720,106	544,964	1,265,070	624,074	355,688	979,762
Timor-Leste*	28,956	26,017	54,990**	6,619	6,694	13,323**

Notes: The numbers are affected by survey time, country-specific academic year and pre-school age definition.

* Number calculated using United Nations Population Division (UNPD) figures from the survey year.

Sources: Cambodia Socio-Economic Survey 2009, Philippines Annual Poverty Indicators Survey 2008 and Timor-Leste DHS 2010, cited in UNICEF, EAPRO regional report, forthcoming.

Table 3: Primary and lower secondary school-age children not attending school within the countries participating in the Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children in South Asia

Country	Primary school-age children not attending school			Lower secondary school-age children not attending school		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Bangladesh	1,565,865	1,004,919	2,574,172	1,820,546	1,204,999	3,008,212
Pakistan	2,991,865	3,640,074	6,631,939	1,096,818	1,664,326	2,761,144
Sri Lanka	13,745	11,341	25,086	23,905	19,196	43,101

Notes: Percentages calculated using UNPD population data; Pakistan uses PSLM.

Total figures differ slightly from the sum of male and female numbers due to the back calculations from percentage to numbers and rounding.

India is part of the Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children, but findings from the national study were not yet available at the time of this report.

Sources: Bangladesh MICS 2006, Pakistan Social and Living Standards Measurement Survey – Household Integrated Economic Survey (PSLM-HIES), 2007–08 and Sri Lanka Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) 2006–07, cited in UNICEF, ROSA regional report, forthcoming.

Countries may be divided into two groups in regards to the out-of-school problem. The first group consists of countries such as Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand and Sri Lanka, where the vast majority of children attend school and the out-of-school population is limited to a specific population (UNICEF, EAPRO regional report, forthcoming and UNICEF ROSA regional report, forthcoming). The groups of children left out of school tend to consist of children with special needs, children who live in remote villages, ethnic minorities, nomads and a number of groups experiencing particular social or economic barriers, such as children living in Sri Lanka’s tea estates. Targeted policies and resources are necessary to bring these children into school, in addition to increasing the protective function of schools.

The second group consists of countries in which the size of the out-of-school population relative to the overall school-age population is much larger, such as India and Cambodia. Although there may be specific groups that tend to be out of school, such as Scheduled Castes and Tribes in India, or the disabled in Cambodia, the larger size and broad characteristics of the whole out-of-school group suggest a prevalence of more generic problems in the provision of education. Barriers inherent to the education system, such as discriminatory practices in hiring staff, language of instruction and lack of gender sensitivity, need to be addressed to make the system more inclusive and reflect the needs of excluded groups. A broad-based expansion in the number of schools or teachers is needed alongside targeted programmes for particular groups.

Given the past challenges in the reduction of out-of-school children in large countries and several Pacific island countries, many primary school-age children are expected to remain out of school by 2015.

As noted previously, there is a close relationship between those who never go to school and those who drop out. Factors preventing children from ever going to school can include fundamental characteristics of the education system, which is the case for children from minority groups where a national curriculum taught in the official majority language may not be accessible to them. Equally, social stigma, discrimination, the lack of physical facilities or access ramps as well as the lack of an inclusive approach in the classroom may either prevent disabled children from attending school or discourage them from continuing to attend.

Various interventions have been used to address these issues across the region. Some of those interventions to reach the disadvantaged and the marginalized are highlighted in section 5 of this EDN. Developing context-specific evidence-based strategic interventions to reach the unreached is the key to achieving Goal 2 – and EFA in general – in the region.

3.2 Progress and retention

Achieving EFA Goal 2 and MDG 2 demands not only that all boys and girls of primary school age attend school but that they progress through and complete primary education on time. If pupils delay their progression through the primary grades (repeat) or leave school before completing the primary cycle (drop out), the goal of universal completion cannot be achieved. An assessment of retention and progress in primary education thus forms an integral part of the analysis of EFA Goal 2. EFA interventions in many developing countries in the region place more emphasis on increasing initial access and participation rather than retention and progress through the school system. Apart from the institutional barriers, lack of information and capacity (both at the individual and organization levels) limit the relevance and success of interventions that aim at school effectiveness and efficiency in service delivery. The overall quality of education certainly plays a large part, as emphasized in the EDN on Goal 6.

Table 4 indicates that, with a few exceptions, countries that have successfully enrolled more than 95 per cent of primary school-age children do not suffer from problems of repetition and progression. By contrast, countries that have difficulty enrolling children into school at the official entrance age often encounter further problems in keeping children in school until they graduate from primary education.

Table 4: Enrolment and associated problems in progression and retention

	Countries and territories	High % of repeaters (≥4%)	Low or late intake at official age (ANIR≤90%)	Low gross intake rate to the last grade of primary (≤85%)
Low enrolment rate (ANER<95%)	Kyrgyzstan	θ	89	θ
	Uzbekistan	θ	87	θ
	Lao PDR	17 ⁻¹	79 ⁻¹	75 ⁻¹
	Macao (China)	6	73	θ
	Malaysia	θ	89 ⁻¹	θ
	Philippines	θ	53 ⁻¹	θ
	Timor-Leste	20	76	80 ⁻¹
	Fiji	θ	84 ⁻¹	θ
	Solomon Islands	...	40 ⁻²	...
	Bangladesh	13*	90*	61*
	Bhutan	7	59	θ
	Pakistan	θ	69*	61
High enrolment rate (ANER>95%)	Sri Lanka	θ	θ	θ
	India	θ	θ	θ
	Brunei Darussalam	θ	84	θ
	Australia	...	81	...
	Hong Kong (China)	θ	θ	θ
	Indonesia	4	θ	θ
	Cook Islands	θ	θ	θ
	New Zealand	...	θ	...
	Samoa	θ	77	θ
	Republic of Korea	θ	θ	θ
	Kazakhstan	θ	θ	θ
	Mongolia	θ	θ	θ
	Japan	θ	θ	θ

Notes: θ Data available but not fulfilling the requirement.

... No data available.

* National estimation.

xⁿ Data refer to the school or financial year n years prior the reference year.


Sources: Statistical Annex, UIS, 2011 and UIS, 2011.

In 2009, five countries/territories in the region (Brunei Darussalam, Kyrgyzstan, Macao (China), Malaysia and Uzbekistan) had survival rates to the last grade of primary school of between 95 and 98 per cent. These countries are thus likely to achieve universal retention by 2015. The level of internal efficiency of primary education is high in Central Asia, with only around 1 per cent of pupils dropping out in 2007. In contrast in East Asia, around 8 per cent of pupils left school without completing primary education in 2007, and in South and West Asia, nearly one in every three children enrolled in primary education left school without completing the primary cycle in 2007 (UNESCO, 2011b).

Progress in reducing the drop-out rate at the primary school level remains slow. In 2009, the survival rate to the last grade of the primary education cycle was as low as 54 per cent in Cambodia and between 60 and 67 per cent in Bangladesh, Pakistan, Nepal and Lao PDR (figure 13). Given the large number of out-of-school children in these countries, the persistence of high drop-out rates further adds to the pool of disadvantaged children. In a few East Asia and Pacific countries (Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Philippines), a large number of children drop out of primary education due to such socio-economic factors as poverty, the hidden costs of schooling, civil conflict, disasters, disease, displacement, migration, language barriers and the low quality of primary education (UNICEF, EAPRO regional report, forthcoming). Unless these countries address the issue of high drop-out rates in primary education and institute targeted policies and strategic interventions, the region will not reach the goal of universal retention even past 2015.

Since 2000, marked progress in the survival rate to the last grade of primary education is evident in Lao PDR, Myanmar and Nepal (figure 13). Countries that made no progress or fell back on this indicator since the Dakar Conference include Cambodia, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran and the Republic of Korea. It is worrying that four of the five Asian E-9 countries (excluding China because data on the indicator are not available; for India, see the Statistical Annex), are not on track to ensure universal retention in primary education by 2015.

Figure 13: Survival rate to the last grade of the primary education, 2000 and 2009 where available



Source: Statistical Annex, UIS, 2011.

Grade repetition in primary education remains an issue in some countries, although some governments have introduced liberal grade promotion. In Central Asia, once enrolled in school, pupils rarely repeat primary grades. In South and West Asia, repeaters constituted around 4 per cent of the total enrolment in primary education in 2008 (UNESCO, 2011b).

Primary grade repetition is clearly a problem in such countries as Timor-Leste (20 per cent in 2009), Lao PDR (17 per cent in 2008), Nepal (14 per cent in 2010), Bangladesh (13 per cent in 2009), Vanuatu (14 per cent in 2009) and Cambodia (11 per cent in 2008). The following table from the Cambodia Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children study reflects the number of times children

there repeated grades in 2009. That repetition was highest in the first grade of primary education, with 15.2 per cent of children repeating the grade at least once and 2 per cent repeating the grade twice. Overall, approximately 88 per cent of children passed through primary and lower secondary education without repetition, while 10 per cent repeat at least once, and 2 per cent repeated multiple times.

Table 5: Number of times children repeated grades, Cambodia, 2009


Highest grade achieved	Total							
	Number of times repeated							Total attended
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
1	82.5	15.2	2.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	464,351
2	85.5	12.5	1.7	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	451,385
3	86.5	12.0	1.3	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	412,227
4	87.5	10.7	1.5	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.0	363,191
5	87.8	10.9	1.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	358,074
6	87.5	11.9	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	333,532
7	89.8	9.6	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	262,175
8	89.2	10.4	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	209,674
9	90.5	8.8	0.6	0.1	0.0	0.0		128,796
10	90.5	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.0			72,431
11	88.7	11.3	0.0	0.0				27,791
12	94.6	0.0	5.4					3,344
No grade completed	25.7	1.9	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	230,957

Source: Data from the Cambodia Socio-Economic Survey 2009 cited in UNICEF, Cambodia report, forthcoming.

Figure 14 shows repetition rates by grade in the four countries in South Asia participating in the Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children. Although Sri Lanka has very low repetition rates, at about 1 per cent throughout the primary and lower secondary grades, Bangladesh has fairly high rates of repetition (at 11–15 per cent) in the lower primary grades. This however, drops to around 3–4 per cent for the final grade of primary and throughout lower secondary. Pakistan's primary repetition rates are higher than lower secondary rates. Repetition is highest in the first two grades of primary education (at 6.4 per cent in grade 1 and 4.4 per cent in grade 2 in the 2007/2008 school year). India shows less variation by grade, with repetition rates of around 4–5 per cent in most grades, rising by a few percentage points at the beginning and end of each cycle.

There are some marked variations by location and sex in some countries. Figure 14 shows the gap between urban and rural repetition rates is highest in the first grade of primary education in Pakistan with the rural rate reaching 7.1 per cent in the 2007/2008 school year vis-à-vis 5 per cent in urban areas. After grade 1, there is no clear pattern in the gap between urban and rural repetition rates in Pakistan. In India, there was little disparity in the repetition rates by location or sex generally, although the repetition rate among first grade rural children was 5 percentage points higher than their urban peers in the 2007/2008 school year.

Figure 14: Proportion of children repeating, by grade (%) in South Asian countries participating in the Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children, latest year available



Note: The numbers below the bars denote grades.

Sources: Country data from Bangladesh ASC 2009, India DISE school level data 2007–2008, Pakistan PLSM-HEIS 2007–2008 and Sri Lanka Ministry of Education Data Management Branch, 2010 cited in UNICEF, ROSA regional report, forthcoming.

It is important when designing appropriate interventions at the subnational level to examine the trends in drop-out rates, survival rates and repetition in primary education, particularly at the subnational level and taking into consideration specific marginalized groups. Not only is the issue of reaching the unreached important in the region but so is the challenge of retaining the potentially vulnerable and disadvantaged groups through the primary cycle. Improving the internal efficiency of the school system is a critical EFA development challenge for the region.


3.3 Completion

Progress towards raising the rates of primary school completion has been uneven across subregions and countries in the post-Dakar period. Although several countries have created capacity in the education system to provide primary completion to the official entrance age population of the last grade,¹⁴ a number of South and East Asian countries are struggling to improve their gross intake ratio to the last grade of primary education (see Statistical Annex).

The gross intake ratio to the last grade of primary is low (85 per cent or less) in nine countries – Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Timor-Leste and Vanuatu. Two of the Asian E-9 countries – Bangladesh and Pakistan – have very low primary completion rates (at 61 per cent) that affect the overall progress towards Goal 2 in the region. India and Indonesia, however, have a gross intake ratio to the last grade (GIRLG) of primary education of 95 per cent or more.

Remarkable progress towards increasing the size of the gross intake ratio to the last grade has occurred in several countries, reaching as high as 37 percentage points in Bhutan, 28 percentage points in Cambodia and 22 percentage points in India (figure 15). At the same time, there has been a decrease in the size of the gross intake ratio to the last grade of primary education, as high as 18 percentage points in Brunei Darussalam and 15 percentage points in Hong Kong (China). Also, fewer boys are starting the last grade of primary education in Bangladesh, Bhutan, Niue, Philippines and Tuvalu, each which have a gender parity index higher than 1.06.

¹⁴ The gross intake ratio to the last grade of primary is used as a proxy for the completion rate.


Figure 15: Gross intake ratio in the last grade of primary education, 2000 and 2009

Source: Statistical Annex, UIS, 2011.

3.4 Transition to secondary education

A successful outcome of primary education is an increase in the demand for secondary education and thus an increase in enrolment at the secondary level. In the Asia-Pacific region, the transition to general secondary education has improved significantly during the post-Dakar period. In 2007, the survival rate to the last grade of primary education was 99 per cent in Central Asia. Around 92 per cent of students in East Asia (no data for the Pacific) and 66 per cent in South and West Asia moved on to general secondary education (UNESCO, 2011b).

While 12 countries in the region have near universal transition from the primary to secondary level (98 per cent or more), rates remain low in Cambodia, India, Lao PDR, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. The transition rate from primary to secondary education varies among those countries, from between 44 per cent and 87 per cent, which includes three E-9 countries. The gender disparity in transition rates from primary to secondary school fortunately is not a major issue in most countries.¹⁵

Figure 16: Transition rate from primary to general secondary education, 2000 and 2009

Source: Statistical Annex, UIS, 2011.

¹⁵ See the Statistical Annex and table 3 in section 3.3 of the EDN on Goal 5.

Progress in the transition rate from primary to secondary school is evident in Bhutan, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Lao PDR, Macao (China), Myanmar and Nepal (figure 16). Cambodia, India, Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan, on the other hand, experienced a fall in their transition rate, suggesting either that fewer children are moving from primary to secondary school or that the expansion in primary graduates has not been matched by a proportionate expansion into the secondary school system.


3.5 Public expenditure on education

Education finance: Percentage of GDP

The internationally recommended minimum investment in education¹⁶ is 6 per cent of GDP. In most countries of the region, public expenditure for education is still well below 6 per cent. Among the 27 countries for which data were available for 2009, public expenditure on education was still less than 3 per cent of GDP in eight countries. Only four countries in 2009 spent 6 per cent of GDP or more (Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, New Zealand and Timor-Leste (figure 17). Some countries, such as Bangladesh, Cambodia and Lao PDR, barely spent 2 per cent of their GDP on education.

Since 2000, the spending on education has gone down in 11 countries or territories (where information was available). Although the proportion of GDP spent on education remained more or less stagnant in several countries between 2000 and 2009, 1 to 2 percentage point increases were registered in Kyrgyzstan, Nepal, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Samoa and Tajikistan. Spending in some of those countries, however, was still low.

Figure 17: Public expenditure on education as a percentage of GDP, 2000 and 2009



Source: Statistical Annex of EDN on Goal 6.

Financing by level of education

Most countries in the region spend between 10 and 20 per cent of their GDP per capita on primary school students. Of those that report data to the UIS, only the Philippines (9 per cent) and Bhutan (7 per cent) spent below this level, while Maldives (26 per cent), Thailand (24 per cent) and Japan (22 per cent) spent more. Data on the proportion of public spending on education devoted to staff

¹⁶ The threshold was first recommended in Learning: The treasure within report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, published in 1996. The recommendation has since then been reiterated in various high-level EFA meetings, including the Jomtien Declaration of the High-Level Group Meeting on EFA in March 2011.


salaries in formal education (ISCED1-4)¹⁷ in 2009 was only available for seven countries: Vanuatu with 87 per cent, followed by Indonesia, the Philippines, Australia, Republic of Korea, Bangladesh and finally Timor-Leste with just 55 per cent (UIS, 2011).

Financing by percentage of total government spending

The priority assigned to education in many countries is also reflected in the government's spending on education as a share of total government expenditure. This share varies greatly across the region, from 7.5 per cent in Nauru to 24 per cent in Hong Kong (China) and Vanuatu. Several countries increased their share of government expenditure on education during the post-Dakar period. An increase of between 5 and 7 percentage points was found in Indonesia, Lao PDR, Nepal, Tajikistan and Vanuatu. A decrease in public spending was found in a number of countries, including Cambodia, Malaysia and Thailand (figure 18). Public expenditure on education as a percentage of total government expenditure was relatively low in some of the Asian E-9 countries during this period (Bangladesh, India and Pakistan). Low investment in education is often directly linked with lower-quality education.

Increased investment, better planning and the more efficient allocation of resources would improve the provision of free quality education. For example, improved planning would allow for governments to anticipate costs necessary to provide free education for all students. Enhanced efficiency also would mean that governments would maximize outputs for money spent and thus not necessarily need to increase the level of investment to achieve results.

Figure 18: Public expenditure on education as a percentage of total public expenditure, 2000 and 2009



Source: Statistical Annex of EDN 6.

¹⁷ Primary education to post-secondary non-tertiary education, according to the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED).

4

Policy initiatives and strategic directions to achieve EFA Goal 2

This section highlights the policy initiatives and strategic directions taken across the region, with particular emphasis on legal frameworks and governance reforms. All countries, regardless of their socio-political characteristics, have taken up initiatives to expand their education system in order to achieve universal primary education or universal basic education.

4.1 Increasing policy emphasis on creating legal provisions for advancing primary education as a right

All countries in the region are signatories to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Article 28 of the CRC obliges countries to provide free and compulsory primary education to all children. In combination with articles 2 and 29, the state is obliged to offer quality education to all, without discrimination. Many governments have further promulgated this right by legislating free and compulsory primary or basic education through their constitution and varying policies and education acts (see Statistical Annex 1). However, some countries are still in the process of actualizing this right, such as Nepal, which has only a draft Education Act.

A considerable gap exists between policy and practice in introducing the provision of free education. The difference between free and compulsory education is noteworthy here. *Free education* implies that the government will provide access to education without any direct fees. This of course does not mean that families will not be responsible for other indirect costs, such as uniforms and transportation. *Compulsory education* refers to the mandatory number of years of education that each student must complete and includes primary school and, increasingly often, secondary education (see Statistical Annex 1). The difference between the two is evident in the case of China, where, despite having a nine-year compulsory education act since 1986, the Government still has not been able to offer free education to all (Tilak, 2010; Tomasevski, 2006). Like China, a number of countries in the region have made legal promises to provide free¹⁸ education while still allowing schools to charge some fees. An opposite example is Malaysia, where basic education (including secondary) is free while only primary education is compulsory.

Not all countries have put into practice their compulsory education laws. For example, a policy may be in existence that mandates the attendance of primary school-age children. But without proper enforcement mechanisms, the authorities, schools and parents will not be held accountable for noncompliance. There are a variety of impediments to free and compulsory education. Again, poor planning, weak management capacity, low investment and inefficient spending are reasons for difficulty in enforcement. Lack of social norms that value education and reinforce participation as well as the lack of monitoring also contribute to difficulties with enforcement.

¹⁸ These countries are Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, China, India, Iran, Kyrgyzstan, Lao PDR, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Philippines, Tajikistan, Timor-Leste, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Viet Nam (see Annex 1).

India passed a new education act in 2009 (box 3) that aims for systemic reform and removal of disparity and inequality. It is ground-breaking because it makes primary education compulsory and requires accountability from the system as well as from parents and the community. The Indian education system also must work to provide free and compulsory education in congruence with the country's weak institutions and limited local capacity in planning and management (Ministry of Human Resource Development, India, 2010).

In the Mekong subregion, where primary education is both compulsory and free in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Thailand and Viet Nam, additional costs of schooling are barriers to primary education (UNESCO Bangkok, 2010).

Other countries are attempting to widen the provision and include higher levels of education as free and compulsory, such as the Islamic Republic of Iran. According to Iran's Constitutional Law, education is free until the end of secondary schooling. To reach the hardest-to-reach regions and the disadvantaged, the Government has planned and allocated the required educational facilities that provide equitable schooling opportunities to children living in rural, remote and nomadic areas. Mongolia, which has sustained a high educational enrolment rate for several years, extended its schooling provision from 10 to 11 years in the academic year of 2005/06 and subsequently to 12 years in 2008/09 by lowering the school entrance age from 8 to 7 and then to 6. The Philippines has been considering extending the age of compulsory education from 12 to 14 years. Other countries, in addition to the provision of free education, provide various incentives, such as scholarships, school meals, textbooks, bicycles and uniforms for poor and disadvantaged children.

Box 3: India – Making eight years of elementary education free and compulsory

A major development in India is the enforcement of the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, which took effect on 1 April 2010. The legislation, along with the insertion of Article 21A in the Constitution, mandates the provision of free and compulsory education to all children aged 6–14 years. The Indian Government has allotted funds to ensure the implementation of the Act and has specified the sharing of financial and other responsibilities between the central and state governments. The Act also calls for the rational deployment of teachers and to ensure the appointment of appropriately trained teachers. The legislation is expected to benefit an additional 200 million primary school-age children in India.

Source: Ministry of Human Resource Development, India, 2010, pp. 7–9.

Due to a number of political tensions and conflicts, some governments have suspended (Fiji, for example) or have dissolved themselves in order to rewrite (as in Nepal) their constitutions, which would otherwise mandate free and compulsory education. These political tensions have occurred with some frequency in the region; it is important that the right to education be respected also in times of transition and instability.

4.2 Investment in primary education

In principle, spending on education is not always correlated with learning outcomes and school participation. It would seem obvious that the more investment a government makes, the better the outcomes. However, if efficiency, transparency and good governance are not present, higher levels of spending will not lead to improved outcomes. This is not to say that investment should be lowered, but that governments should focus more on efficiency in two aspects: one, in efficient spending and two, efficiency in managing the education system (including to improve student flows, specifically the repetition and drop-out problems) so that there is less wastage.


Spending on primary education varies throughout the region. The Malaysian Government, for example, spends 5.8 per cent of its GDP on education, but the expenditure on primary education as a percentage of GDP is only 1.6 per cent (figure 19). In Vanuatu, expenditure on primary education

is high, with 2.8 per cent of GDP going to primary education. This is also true for Australia and New Zealand (1.8 per cent). Hong Kong (China) and Singapore, spend less than 1 per cent of their GDP on primary education.

Only two countries (Philippines and Vanuatu) spend more than 50 per cent of their education expenditures on the primary level. Three countries allocate 40 per cent of their total education expenditures to the primary level: Bangladesh, Cambodia and Thailand. The remaining countries spend around one third or less of education budgets on primary education.

In 14 of 19 countries with available data, the percentage allocated to secondary education is higher than to primary education. The percentage of expenditures at the tertiary level is higher than at the primary level in four countries/territories: Hong Kong (China), Malaysia, New Zealand and Singapore (figure 19). In countries that are attempting to offer quality universal primary education to all, the numbers are relatively low, and governments need to carefully balance their expenditures to ensure that a healthy foundation for education at the primary level can be built on at the secondary and tertiary levels (the dangers of low public expenditure on primary education are explored in the next section).

Figure 19: Public expenditure, by education level and as a percentage of GDP, 2009



Note: * Other includes expenditure for pre-primary education, post-secondary education and not allocated expenditure.

Source: UIS database.

In 2009, the expenditure in primary education per student varied widely across the Asia-Pacific region, ranging from purchasing power parity¹⁹ (PPP) of US\$134 in Bangladesh to PPP US\$7,213 in Japan (UIS, 2011).

4.3 Strategies for broad-based public management of basic education

The delivery of primary and basic education could be further strengthened through broader partnerships between governments, civil society groups, development partners, the private sector and the community. To achieve EFA Goal 2 as well as the other EFA goals, partnerships are needed at many levels – between schools and parents, between civil society organizations and governments, and between state and non-state education providers (UNESCO, 2009). The Millennium Declaration also acknowledged the role of partnerships in bringing about development, with MDG 8 calling for a global partnership for development (UNDP, 2012).

¹⁹ The same acronym is used in this report for purchasing power parity (meaning adjusted for purchasing power) and public-private partnership.

Various partnerships and arrangements for education are increasing in countries across the region. The Philippines EFA Plan espouses the concept of a ‘grand alliance’ in the country (see box 4). The physical manifestation of this Grand Alliance is the National Education for All Committee composed of the Department of Education, other National Government Agencies and various civil society actors. One of the major accomplishments of the Committee has been the convening of various government line agencies, the Congress and various non-government organizations to spell out a commitment to achieve basic education targets. The concept of the grand alliance distributes the responsibility and accountability of basic education performance from the Department of Education alone to all sectors of the society.

Box 4: Philippines – Networking through the concept of a grand alliance for advancing EFA

In the Philippines, the framework of a ‘grand alliance’ of all sectors aims at broadening the use of basic educational resources, strengthening and formalizing societal responsibility as well as providing the Department of Education strategic allies and stakeholder support in major policy decisions and programmes for basic education. The grand alliance coordinates and integrates efforts of all instruments, both public and private, that deliver and advocate the massive provision of basic learning needs under one coherent framework and course of action. The provision of basic learning needs as a societal responsibility calls for new and revitalized partnership at all levels: i) among all subsectors and forms of education; ii) between the Department of Education and other government departments (including planning, finance, labour, communication and other social sectors); and iii) between government and NGOs, the private sector, local communities, religious groups and families at the subnational level.

Source: Department of Education, Philippines, 2010.

Other key partnership arrangements include education sector working groups (ESWGs), often established to support the government in preparing and funding education sector plans. Countries like Cambodia have established such a working group that includes a range of Ministries other than Education, including the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Social Welfare. The NGO Education Partnership is a consortium of more than 100 NGO members who are also represented in the working group, along with development partners and civil society organizations. Countries with a robust working group are able to bring a broad base of stakeholders together for consultation and engagement on education sector planning. In Lao PDR, the working group has made major contributions to the national education system, including technical assistance to the development and implementation of an Education Sector Development Framework (Government of Lao PDR, 2010). Lao PDR is among the developing countries in the Asia-Pacific region receiving funds from the Global Partnership in Education (formerly the EFA Fast Track Initiative). In Nepal, education sector donors have also formed a group to support the School Sector Reform Programme. In Bangladesh, education donors and partners are working with the government through a sector-wide approach and have taken a prominent role in the design, funding and implementation of the Primary Education Development Programme Phase II, or PEDP-II. Donors pooling their funds and working closely together through an education sector working group are rising up in more and more countries as part of an overall trend to improve aid effectiveness.

4.4 Partnerships and non-state providers in education service delivery

The state is responsible for ensuring that free and compulsory education is provided to all children. But there are many financial and institutional constraints to such provision. With the demand for education straining a government’s capacity, many partnerships with non-state partners have formed in the region to fill the various gaps in service delivery as well as management, finance and capacity development and training (discussed further on).

There are also existing partnerships and networks that may not necessarily contribute to the direct provision of education but are useful platforms for advocacy, knowledge sharing, etc. One such network is the United Nations Girls' Education Initiative (UNGEI), a coalition of partners at the global, regional and national levels. Among other functions, its main role is to "assist national governments as they fulfil their responsibilities towards ensuring the right to education and gender equality for all children, girls and boys alike" (UNGEI, 2008).

Public–private partnerships

The definition of a public–private partnership (PPP) is extremely broad and varies by agency. Generally, however, it is considered a formal arrangement between a government and the private sector. The private sector can consist of corporations or philanthropic entities, and they share the responsibility for service provision with the government. In this sense, the government leads by providing policies and targets, and the non-governmental entity delivers the services, either with private funding or public funding, depending on the partnership. LaRocque and Fielden (2008) identified six types of public-private partnerships: education service delivery initiatives, non-state management of public schools, voucher initiatives, professional and support services, infrastructure services and philanthropic initiatives.

These partnerships exist throughout the world. Within this region, for example, the Government of the Philippines uses an Education Service Contracting scheme to contract private schools – if space is available – to take children who would otherwise be enrolled in public schools where there is lack of space (LaRocque and Lee, 2011). Similarly, governments can contract private entities to provide specialized curricula. This takes place often in technical and vocational education and training. In Lao PDR, printing companies pay for the training of students so that they will have a skilled labour force from which to choose. In India, the recently introduced Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act (2009) has helped facilitate public–private partnerships; according to the Act, which was upheld by the Indian Supreme Court in April 2012, all private schools have to open up at least 25 per cent of the total admissions to children associated with disadvantaged groups. The Government will reimburse private schools the cost on a fixed per capita basis.

Box 5: Faith-based organizations in education

Many governments in East Asia and the Pacific, particularly countries with dominant religious traditions, have more formal and systematic partnerships with non-state providers to help deliver education service. An example is the case of faith-based organizations in Indonesia. Islamic institutions (madrasahs) account for approximately 6 million school-age children, or about 20 per cent of primary school enrolment. These institutions are managed by private, non-government providers but are under the oversight of the Ministry of Religious Affairs. Government-run schools are under the Ministry of National Education.

Similarly in Papua New Guinea, around 50 per cent of primary schools and 30 per cent of secondary schools are managed by churches. However, the degree of government involvement, such as in terms of funding and regulation, is not as strong as in Indonesia.

Source: ADB and UNICEF, 2011.

Pakistan offers an example of private management of public schools, where a local NGO, the Cooperation for Advancement, Rehabilitation and Education (CARE), manages public schools in Lahore. Professional and support services are service contracts that are provided to private enterprises in the hopes that the private enterprise can more efficiently and cost-effectively provide specific services. These services can be school lunches (Mongolia) or capacity development services, such as in Bangladesh and Pakistan under the NGO, Bangladesh Rehabilitation Assistance Committee (BRAC). Education philanthropy takes place in many forms as well. One example is the Adopt-a-School Program introduced by the Department of Education in the Philippines, which provides tax incentives to private corporations assisting public schools in the poorest provinces (LaRocque and Lee, 2011).

The voucher system is another type of public–private partnership that allows students to attend a school, or type of school, they prefer. Simply, public funding follows a child, not the school, and can go with a child to a private education institution. Voucher systems exist in Hong Kong (China), New Zealand and Pakistan.

Public–private partnerships have a number of potential benefits, including improved efficiency, improved quality and risk sharing with a government. However, a number of negative outcomes are possible, such as the decreased quality of public schools and further disparity and inequity between socio-economic groups. In addition, weak government institutions that do not have an appropriate framework may not be able to oversee partnerships and could expose governments to a number of risks (LaRocque and Lee, 2011).

At this stage, there are many mixed results in outcomes; it is difficult to determine if public–private partnerships do benefit the most marginalized populations. If countries in the region do choose to partake in such partnerships, it is necessary to create the institutional framework for adopting such a partnership to ensure maximum benefits (LaRocque and Lee, 2011).

Privatization

Privatization differs from a PPP in that no partnership exists between the public and private sectors; rather, the private sector maintains all control. Some Asia-Pacific countries are experiencing a steady growth of private schools and privatization, with an increasing number of NGOs and businesses engaged in the provision of primary education (UNESCO Bangkok, 2012b). Almost all countries in the region, including China, have some form of private schools. The proportion of enrolment in private primary schools is quite high in some low-income countries like Bangladesh (40 per cent) and Pakistan (31 per cent), whereas it is around 18 per cent in Thailand and 10 per cent in Nepal (UNESCO, 2012b).

In India, private and small NGO-run schools account for around one tenth of all primary-level institutions. Low public investment in primary education has created a range of schooling facilities. Fully private schools have only been introduced recently in Cambodia, China, Mongolia and Lao PDR, but their popularity is growing fast.

In some countries, private education is seen as of higher quality, while government schools may be poorly funded, with inadequate expenditure on quality teachers, textbooks and other learning materials or libraries. Also, the lack of incentives, like scholarships or free school meals for those students who are most poor, lead parents to pay more for the education of their children. Some government schools are still considered better than private ones in India, although many are not. Private schools are in increasing demand due to the quality of English-language instruction and for the overall quality education. In some places, some parents from lower economic strata can now afford private schools (Kingdon, 2007; Tooley et al., 2007), and children from poorer households are attending low-cost private schools even in rural areas (Tooley and Dixon, 2005). Because this is a fast-growing phenomenon, rules and regulations have not kept pace, and many challenges of minimum wages, quality and safety standards need to be addressed.

4.5 Decentralization of educational management as a strategy to improve service delivery

Decentralization is a very broad and complex term. Simply stated, it is the shifting of the responsibility of the provision of education from the central government to lower levels of government, the community or the school level (UNESCO Bangkok, 2012b). This shift often takes place because central governments are unable to address the increasing demand for education and aim to transfer responsibilities to lower levels of authorities. Strong political support for the

decentralization of education management has been observed in many countries in this region. In view of the challenges posed by the diverse needs of populations and the contexts in which schools are functioning, many governments are moving towards decentralized forms of education service delivery. Varying strategies and levels of decentralization have taken place throughout the region, involving the decentralization of management, construction or even finance. Benefits from decentralization may include the more efficient use of resources, accountability, improved access and participation for children and the integration of local language and culture into the curriculum. Possible downsides include further marginalization of the disadvantaged, undefined roles and responsibilities that lead to further inefficiency, and a lack of capacity at the local level. The results from decentralization have been quite mixed throughout the region, and the best practices related to decentralization have yet to be fully researched and analysed in multiple contexts.

There are many examples of decentralization of education in the Asia-Pacific region. In countries like India, the central Government shifted authority – financial and management – to the states. Pakistan abolished the central government mandate for education, devolving education policy-making and implementation to the provincial and district government authorities. Countries like Cambodia, Lao PDR, Nepal and Thailand have shown increased decentralization by maintaining the decision-making process in the central government but moving the process within the education bureaucracy. Some governments, like China, moved financial responsibility to the local level (county governments). However, that move led to increased disparity in the most marginalized counties and now the Government is working to recentralize to increase equity (UNESCO, 2012b).

In India, the Right to Education Act further decentralized functions to the local level in the hopes of ensuring that every child in the 6–14 age group is not only admitted but also attends and completes elementary education. The Act defines local authority to include municipalities, Panchayats at different levels and any other authority having administrative control over a school. The duties of the local authority are also clearly laid down, with the intent of ensuring the availability of a neighbourhood school for all children. The aim of the decentralization of those duties is to ensure that: there is no discrimination against children from disadvantaged groups and weaker sections of the population; children of migrant families are admitted to school; infrastructure, teaching staff and learning materials are provided; records are maintained; and the provision of good-quality elementary education conforming to the norms and standards prescribed in the Act.

Many countries have taken the initiative to form school management committees that involve parents and community members along with teachers. These committees are responsible for the local management of schools, although the level of participation of community members and parents varies considerably both across and within countries.

In Nepal, the voluntary transfer of school management to local communities may provide better service because more autonomy is provided to the community through the School Improvement Plan, which is based on block grants and per capita financing for teachers. In the Philippines, as part of the reform thrust of the Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda, the Department of Education is pursuing the school-based management approach to empower schools. Studies have demonstrated that for this system to be successful in general, a functional community is needed that is able to achieve appropriate checks and balances at the school level.

In Bangladesh, a new education policy was approved by the National Parliament in December 2010, which states that “the process of nationalization of primary education should continue. The responsibility for primary education cannot be transferred to the private sector or NGOs” (Ministry of Primary and Mass Education, 2010b, pp. 4–5). However, the policy ambiguously agrees at the same time that an NGO or an individual can operate a primary school, subject to the approval of authorities and state regulations. According to a recent policy brief published under the Consortium for Research and Educational Access, Transitions and Equity (CREATE) project (Ahmed et al., 2007), non-government and quasi-government schools have flourished in Bangladesh. The Government allows these quasi-government institutions to carry much of the burden of expanding

primary education services to achieve universal primary education. Almost a quarter of children, largely from poor and disadvantaged populations, are served by NGO-run schools. These types of decentralization initiatives are likely to continue in a region where governments alone have trouble addressing all of the needs of their people in order to achieve universal education for all. These solutions come with some disadvantages, such as sustainability in financing. But such strategies also encourage innovation, more community involvement when implemented at a smaller scale and the provision of additional services through these institutions.

5

Interventions targeting disparities and marginalization in primary education

In most countries in the region, reaching the unreached continues to be a major EFA concern. There are several innovative programmes and initiatives to address the issue of disparities and marginalization in education. This section examines how some governments have responded to this concern and how most countries in the region are struggling to formulate evidence-based and sustainable policies and interventions to reach the unreached.

5.1 East Asia

Countries in East Asia are resorting to a number of measures to reach the unreached. Targeting is a major strategy for bridging regional, ethnic, linguistic and gender disparities in most countries in the subregion. In Lao PDR, where there is considerable ethnic diversity (39 per cent of the population are ethnic groups) and 37.4 per cent of the population lives below the international poverty line, the Government has identified the most educationally disadvantaged districts by ranking them according to the girls' primary school net enrolment rate and the female survival rate to grade 5. On this basis, out of roughly 140 districts, 56 are found to be well below the national average; special focus has thus been given in policy planning to address their EFA needs. The EFA Fast Track Initiative (now called the Global Partnership for Education, or GPE) is targeting those districts, with funds allocated for the construction of new classrooms and the renovation of existing ones, with community grants and school meals to remove barriers due to poverty and with the upgrading of qualifications of existing teachers and the introduction of quality model schools.

In Indonesia, providing education to all is a challenging task due to the huge ethnic and language diversity. There are 300 ethnic groups in Indonesia and 583 traditional languages. The country also has problems of child labour, especially in rural areas, where 79 per cent of child workers live; of them, 62 per cent work in the agriculture sector. The Government is making continuous efforts to reach the unreached and marginalized children through strategic interventions such as: i) an Open Junior High School Programme; ii) a One Roof Junior Secondary School Programme; iii) an Educational Equivalency Programme; and iv) an Education in Disaster Areas Programme. In addition, the Government has introduced need-based programmes, such as community boat schools for children in fishing communities.

The Philippines Government has adopted many innovative strategies to provide education to disadvantaged groups: tracking the most disadvantaged, preparing a comprehensive picture of their socio-economic and demographic characteristics and establishing the causes of marginalization. A major strategy to reach the unreached is through the Alternative Learning System, which is an equivalent and parallel delivery system of formal schooling dedicated to providing education services to out-of-school youth, children living in remote areas and other marginalized groups who are unable to access the regular, formal basic education system.

Box 6: South-East Asian countries working together to reach the unreached and marginalized in education

As part of the EFA Mid-Decade Assessment process, the 11 member countries of the Southeast Asia Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO), the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and UNESCO organized a workshop in September 2008. Ten collaborative projects aimed at reaching the unreached in education were singled out and later endorsed by education ministers at the 44th SEAMEO Council Conference in April 2009. The projects focus on learners with special needs, students at risk of dropping out, out-of-school children, girls and women in rural areas and ethnic minorities, pre-school children from poor families, learners in remote and rural areas, stateless and undocumented children, learners affected and infected by HIV or AIDS, and learners in difficult circumstances. The projects empower SEAMEO member countries to lead their own EFA priorities with the support of EFA partners, such as UNESCO and UNICEF.

Source: UNESCO Bangkok, 2011

In Viet Nam, the Government set up 'floating classrooms' (classrooms on boats) for children in fishing communities as well as satellite schools, which are not formal schools but a cluster of classrooms in a commune or village. These have been found to be very useful in attracting and retaining children in school, especially ethnic minority children. Another practice is hiring teacher assistants or satellite school assistants who go to homes to collect children and take them to school. Assistants from the same ethnic group are used to encourage parents of ethnic minorities to send their children to school and to support communication with teachers who rarely speak the local language. In addition, the Government has been successfully piloting a bilingual education programme in three languages, which has been shown to increase retention and attendance of ethnic minority children as well as to improve learning outcomes in the pilot schools.

Box 7: Japan – A historical innovative approach for reaching the unreached

For countries having trouble with narrowing the gender gap in primary education, Japan may provide useful lessons for evolving strategies to reach the unreached. One of the famous practices in the past in Japan was the 'Komori schools', which were schools for children who otherwise spent their days babysitting. When modern education began in Japan in the late nineteenth century, there was a perception that girls would not need education. In those days, people had a custom of family labour that prevented girls from attending school. Absolute poverty was one of the factors sustaining the custom. Girls were given some major responsibilities in household work, one of which was babysitting. Many school-age girls had to take care of their younger brothers and sisters while the others were at school. Some girls babysat other families' children, which was then one of the rare cash earning opportunities for their family. The first school for babysitting girls opened in 1878. The schools were allowed to use a simplified curriculum. Girls attended the Komori schools together with the babies they were taking care of. In many cases, the students carried babies on their back while in class. Such schools were formed in one of several ways: a special class was created in a regular school during school hours; a branch of elementary school was established as a Komori school; or special lessons were offered after school or on weekends. Teachers taught voluntarily in many of those situations.

Source: Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan, 2011.

In Thailand, one project strives to improve data collection systems and the use of data in decision-making, which is becoming an important strategy to reach the unreached in several countries. For this initiative, steps have been taken to better integrate and share education-related information. In 2010, the Ministry of Education launched its 3Ns for the Quality of Thai Education programme. The 3Ns include the National Education Network (NedNet), which links existing schools, colleges, universities and libraries; the National Education Information System, which brings together available education data and facilitates the exchange of information between relevant agencies; and the National Learning Centre, which serves as a virtual forum for the exchange of teaching and learning materials.

5.2 Central Asia

Countries in Central Asia are implementing several strategic interventions to address marginalization in reaching the EFA goals. Disparity in access to quality education still exists, due mainly to the difficulty of access for those in rural and remote areas, poverty, ill health of children, language of instruction and gaps related to cultural, religious, linguistic and ethnic diversity. Additionally, there are shortages of trained teachers, teaching materials and textbooks, particularly in remote areas inhabited by ethnic minorities.

In Uzbekistan, the Government devotes special attention to protecting the rights and interests of children who live under difficult circumstances or are deprived of parental and family care, including orphans and disabled children. The Government has also given special attention to the development of supplementary education for out-of-school children and teenagers. This entails organizing children's leisure time through a network of art and music schools, children's libraries, children and youth sports schools, hobby clubs and playgrounds, with the goal of facilitating school attendance. The initiative also includes the development of sports centres for children and youth targeting rural areas, low-income families and orphaned and handicapped children. In contrast, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, the poorest countries in the region, have low investment in education and extracurricular activities.

Box 8: Kazakhstan – Paving the way for children with disabilities to access an inclusive education

The Social Adaptation and Labour Rehabilitation (SALR) Center in Almaty, Kazakhstan has an ongoing project called I'm Among You, which aims to prepare teachers, parents and autistic children to join mainstream schools. The project provides training sessions on appropriate methodologies for teachers and specialists working with children with autism. It also introduces parents and families to methods of working with autistic children in inclusive education settings, thus promoting a wider understanding and acceptance of autism and related issues. So far, 15 children involved were successfully integrated into the mainstream education system. Plans have been made to extend and broaden the services, including opening a resource centre and specific early years training for both teachers and parents. A strong point of the project is its systematic approach to the needs and challenges of the target group and the potential of the model to be extended through existing teacher training institutes and school networks. The project offers the possibility to scale up, both in Kazakhstan and in other Central Asian countries.

Source: UNICEF, 2012a, p. 51.

In Mongolia, despite a rapid increase of enrolment in primary education, a proportion of children who are very diverse in terms of language, culture and economic background still remain out of school. School drop-outs are mainly a rural phenomenon and closely linked with a shortage of dormitories and schools in remote rural areas. Out-of-school children consist of children from poor families, children with disabilities, ethnic minority children and children of migrant families. Delayed entry to school, which contributes to higher drop-out and lower achievement rates, is also high among certain ethnic groups. Increasingly, the Mongolian Government is targeting Kazakh children as well as other ethnic minorities (such as the Tuva) through a mother tongue and bilingual language approach. The Government also recently developed the National Framework on Education for Kazakh Children, which recognizes the need for bilingual education strategies for Kazakh children and other ethnic minority children. A national programme on Tuva language was approved by the Ministry of Education in 2007, but no progress has been made towards its implementation.

5.3 South and West Asia

In general, governments in this subregion have given special attention to the education of marginalized populations, particularly those living in remote areas, ethnic and linguistic minorities, girls and children in difficult circumstances. A few governments have introduced new policy frameworks and made efforts to improve the quality of education as well as the expansion of educational facilities in geographical areas hitherto lacking schools. All countries in the subregion have focused on overcoming the problem of out-of-school children to meet EFA Goal 2. Although significant progress has been made over the past few years (see section 2), South and West Asia remains the subregion in which the most progress still needs to be made.

In Bangladesh, the Government is planning for needs-based expansion of a Primary School Stipend Programme, which had been extended to the 40 per cent of poorest students until 2010 – numbering 4.8 million students from primary schools in rural areas. The project was revised to accommodate 7.8 million students, with many (45 per cent to 90 per cent) in the most remote and difficult areas. The programme is making an important contribution towards increasing enrolment and the retention of socio-economically disadvantaged children. The Bangladesh Government, with support from the World Food Programme, is also planning for the phased expansion of its School Feeding Programme, which currently benefits 1.1 million primary school students in food-insecure areas. It will now cover the Char, Haor, Baor, Hill and Monga (geographically remote) areas and gradually be extended throughout the country. The Government plans to create primary education facilities in those remote areas to serve 1,943 villages (each with a population of more than 2,000) that are still without a school. The Government also plans to establish 1,500 new schools in those villages as well as child-friendly learning centres in the Char, Haor, Baor, Hill and other remote areas. The construction of additional classrooms and the recruitment of teachers in existing primary schools are also planned. A recent survey revealed that 0.12 million more classrooms are required to reduce class sizes to 45 students (Ministry of Primary and Mass Education, Bangladesh, 2010).

The Royal Government of Bhutan promises free education to all children aged between 6 and 16 years. The education sector has been given high priority within the Government's development policy, and its share in the allocation of the total budget has never been below 10 per cent. Despite considerable improvement, however, the Government has difficulties in providing education to small and scattered settlements in mountainous terrain and remote areas. It is establishing extended classrooms in the small and remote communities as well as instituting demand-side interventions to reduce the cost of education, such as the provision of free uniforms and textbooks.

Box 9: Nepal – Teaching to read in the local language helps children perform better in school

When Save the Children conducted literacy assessments in Nepal in 2008, it found that 42 per cent of grade 3 children in partner schools in Kailili could not read a single word. Most of those who were struggling to read were children whose mother tongue was not the language of instruction. This prompted intensive efforts to create local language reading interventions through the development of a Literacy Boost programme. Started in 2009, Literacy Boost included local language materials development and provision, reading-focused instruction for classroom teachers and community reading activities overseen by volunteers who could speak Tharu, the local mother tongue. Later testing showed that children in schools using the Literacy Boost programme performed much better in terms of fluency and accuracy than children in comparison schools. Save the Children has since expanded Literacy Boost elsewhere in Nepal, including in Bajura in the Far Western Region and in Kapilvastu in the Western Region.

Source: UNESCO Bangkok, 2012a.

Box 10: Sri Lanka – Providing education in conflict areas through home/school programme

The conflict-related displacements in the North and East of Sri Lanka disrupted learning for many students. An initial strategy was conceived to develop an alternative education programme and home schooling system for those students who were unable to attend school regularly. The development of the programme was spearheaded by the Ministry of Education, with technical assistance from the National Institute of Education. The programme entailed developing curriculum-based modules that children could use at home on days when they could not attend school due to insecurity. The Key Stage 1 modules for Sinhalese, Tamil and mathematics, catering to the first two grades of school, were developed in 2008 and piloted in 2009. Then the second and third modules covering up to the fifth year of primary school were completed, with an initial print run of 60,000 copies. The Home Learning modules remain a viable short-term alternative to prevent those children remaining in internally displaced persons camps or transitioning to resettlement areas from falling behind in school.

Source: Ministry of Education, Sri Lanka, 2011.

India has shown tremendous progress in providing basic education. As mentioned earlier, the Government introduced the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act in 2009, which promises education for all children aged between 6 and 14 years (Government of India, 2009). Under the Education Guarantee Scheme, small and remote communities were provided with primary schools. Under the Alternative and Innovative Education programme, flexible strategies were established to educate children who cannot directly enrol in a school. Inclusive education is now promoted to make schools barrier free for children with special needs. Residential bridge courses, noon meals, scholarships, free textbooks, uniforms and transport allowances are provided not only to reduce marginalization in EFA but also to improve retention and learning achievements.

Box 11: Afghanistan – Clean water and toilets to improve school attendance, particularly among girls

"In 2010, the Ministries of Education, Public Health and Rehabilitation and Rural Development joined hands with civil society groups, donors and community members to forge a Joint Action for Water, Sanitation and Hygiene [WASH] in Schools initiative.

The initiative set out to improve hygiene and water access in Afghan schools. Providing clean water and sanitation facilities, such as toilets, will significantly reduce hygiene-related diseases, thereby increasing student attendance. Data collected from 7,769 schools in 24 provinces in 2009 showed that only 36 per cent had safe drinking water, 22 per cent had separate toilets for boys and girls, 8 per cent had separate toilets for physically challenged students, and 13 per cent had hand-washing facilities. The initiative will also greatly encourage more girls to go to school. There are an estimated 8 million primary and secondary school students in Afghanistan, of which only 3 million are girls (2012 Afghanistan Education Sector Joint Review, June 2012).

By the end of 2010, progress was evident. The line ministries, in coordination with the international and local stakeholders, had developed a school WASH plan, with guidelines and standards. Capacity development of school principals, teachers, students and other relevant staff was started. Various parties are involved through monthly school WASH coordination meetings at the zonal level. Facilities for females, including an incinerator for the safe disposal of sanitary napkins, have also been constructed in schools.

The Afghan Ministry of Education estimates that by 2014, more than 10 million primary and secondary school-age children will be enrolled in 16,500 schools. The plan is for 80 per cent of schools to have adequate water and sanitation by 2014 and to reach full coverage by 2015.

Source: Excerpted from the WASH Case Study for Education for All, UNICEF Afghanistan Country Office, Kabul, 2011.

Although the previous boxed highlights provide only a select few examples, many countries in the region have been making efforts to reach the unreached. In addition to creating legal provisions and increasingly recognizing the critical role of primary education in national development, governments are adopting multipronged strategies to deal with disadvantages and marginalization in EFA. Challenges still exist, and there continues to be an inadequate availability of data to identify and track out-of-school children in East Asia and the Pacific as well as difficulties in enrolling and retaining disadvantaged and marginalized children in schools.

Other challenges include: an inadequate level of inter-ministerial and inter-departmental coordination; the absence of strategic plans to reach the unreached; a low level of priority assigned to education in some countries; high or hidden costs or opportunity costs of education; low national capacity in terms of funding and required technical and professional expertise; remoteness; and civil conflicts and emergencies that still continue to act as barriers to reach the unreached. Reaching the last segment of the relevant primary school-aged population has become the most critical issue requiring attention of all nations in the region for achieving the EFA goals in general and Goal 2 in particular.

6

Conclusions and recommendations

The region has achieved significant progress towards EFA in general and EFA Goal 2 and MDG 2 in particular. National averages show most countries have already achieved or are about to achieve universal participation in primary education. On an aggregate level, an equal proportion of boys and girls participate and progress through primary grades across most countries. An increasing number of primary school graduates are moving on to secondary education.

However, a number of challenges relating to Goal 2 remain:

- i. Reaching the unreached:** Even with tremendous progress, most countries in the region have yet to effectively reach the poor, vulnerable, disadvantaged and marginalized children by improving accessibility to education facilities and keeping them in school. Reducing inequalities and disparities in participation, retention and learning outcomes in primary education based on differences in sex, language, socio-economic status, disabilities and household location is the most critical challenge facing the region. Civil conflicts and disasters further add to the challenge.
- ii. Offering quality education services to all:** Given the rapid and increased demand for primary education, several countries in the region struggle to ensure standards in schooling provisions, including teacher deployment and quality. The lack of a safe physical school environment continues to be a major barrier to improving participation and retention in primary education. The low quality of schools and schooling environments coupled with low learning achievements contribute significantly to keeping children away from school as well as pushing children out of school. Improvements in school effectiveness in terms of addressing learning needs of children, particularly from disadvantaged and marginalized populations, is a major challenge.
- iii. Getting children to school at the official entry age:** Even with significant increases in access to primary education in the region, many children do not enter school at the official entrance age, which has several implications on children's progression in school and the overall internal efficiency of the education system.
- iv. Retaining children through primary grades:** The success story of several countries that have reached the target of universal participation is offset by the very low internal efficiency of primary education in many countries. Reducing high repetition and drop-out rates and therefore increasing survival rates through the primary grades poses a major challenge.
- v. Improving pre- and post-primary education opportunities:** Improving pre-primary education and expanding opportunities for secondary education, which provide push and pull factors for improving Goal 2, remain major challenges.
- vi. Ensuring gender equality:** Creating safe and gender-sensitive learning environments and eliminating gender discrimination in social, economic and political life remains a major challenge in almost all countries of the region. This includes addressing the underlying causes of gender inequality in education that affect mainly girls in some countries and boys in others. It also requires addressing subnational gender disparities.
- vii. Improving the quality of institutions and governance:** Improving governance and service delivery through the strengthening of management capacity, improved accountability, social audit provisions and enabling norms, rules and regulations is a major challenge in most

countries, particularly in those that are off track to achieve Goal 2. This is especially important in countries that are decentralizing because there are significant risks to education systems that devolve accountabilities to local authorities before their capacity is built.

- viii. Increasing funding for basic education:** Given the adverse impact of the global financial crisis, mobilizing additional resources and sustaining government expenditure remains among the challenges facing several small and low-income countries. Reducing the indirect costs of primary schooling is another challenge.

Despite all these challenges, the Asia-Pacific region as a whole remains on track to reach Goal 2. However, individual countries may not reach Goal 2, and major disparities within countries mean that groups of children still do not have access to primary education. The region also lags behind in terms of improvements in several EFA indicators. Over the years, political commitments for the EFA movement have increased dramatically across countries, with governments recognizing the critical role of education in their socio-economic development.

With little time until 2015, targeted policy interventions to accelerate progress towards Goal 2 are needed. The following recommendations for governments are grouped into the three main priority areas:

6.1 Putting equity at the heart of education to reach the marginalized

- i. Create the enabling conditions for enforcing legal provisions related to free and compulsory primary education, including the enactment of pending legislation and monitoring the enforcement of existing legislation.
- ii. Take concrete yet sustainable measures to mitigate the indirect costs of schooling, with a particular focus on children living in poverty and those suffering from multiple disadvantages. Research shows that even free schooling is unaffordable to poor families, who cannot afford learning materials and snacks for children, the costs of transport or the loss of the child's contribution to family subsistence. Social protection measures, including incentives of cash or food stuffs, or family welfare payments linked to children's regular school attendance, can be an effective means of ensuring that children from disadvantaged families stay in school.
- iii. Undertake an in-depth, evidence-based analysis on the unreached, including those in emergency and conflict situations for informed policy planning, targeting and programme design across all countries in the region. In line with this, document and exchange information on what works and what does not work in relation to reaching the marginalized and promoting equity in education in the region.
- iv. Analyse the trends in drop-out, survival, repetition and completion rates in primary and basic education, particularly at the subnational level, taking into consideration the specific marginalized groups. Evidence can be used to design and implement appropriate interventions at the subnational level, including the improvement of education quality.
- v. Further explore good practices that have been successful in reaching marginalized groups, such as the provision of mid-day meals, transportation support for girls and female teachers, social protection support, the use of mother tongue education, educating and involving parents and the community on inclusive education for children with disabilities, provision of education for children in emergencies and conflict situations, etc.
- vi. Implement targeted interventions to reach children not in school, based on analyses of the characteristics of out-of-school children and the reasons why they are not in the system. Pilot alternative ways to reach out-of-school children other than the provision of formal education.

Findings from national and regional reports as part of the Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children can be used as a reference.

- vii. Provide a basis for policy and related interventions, based on the analysis of the regressive trend in the progress towards Goal 2 in the Pacific.

6.2 Promoting good governance and partnerships to expand the delivery of education

- i. Adopt innovative public–private partnerships and other forms of partnering to expand the delivery of quality education for the marginalized, channelling government resources to non-state providers who target disadvantaged groups.
- ii. Strengthen local capacity in planning and the management of education, including in gender-responsive management, to improve governance, especially accountability and transparency.
- iii. Strengthen monitoring and review systems in education, including setting equity targets and making use of data, not only for demonstrating progress towards EFA but also for examining the lack of progress, with the eventual aim of contributing to the evidence-based strategic management of education.
- iv. Increase the allocation of resources to education as a long-term investment towards accelerated economic development and social equity and not merely as a measure to reach the EFA goals by 2015.
- v. Maximize the use of existing partnerships, networks and events (such as education sector working groups, parliamentarians’ forums, EFA high-level meetings, UNGEI, SAARC and SEAMEO meetings) to advocate for better governance, efficient and equitable allocation of resources and the use of alternative ways to expand the delivery of quality education for all.
- vi. Develop communication strategies that inform stakeholders at local levels, including parents, about policies, local school budgets and general implementing procedures.

6.3 Supporting the expansion of quality pre- and post-primary education²⁰

- i. Adopt and implement legislation and policies that support the expansion of pre-primary education and secondary education in countries in the region to increase primary schooling through push- and pull-side interventions, such as the expansion of coverage of free education to include lower secondary education.
- ii. Adopt and implement targeted policies to help marginalized groups successfully transition from home to primary school and from primary to lower secondary education.
- iii. Ensure appropriate training, curriculum and technical support for expanded pre-primary coverage with quality. Without ensuring quality, there is a risk that young children could drop out of pre-primary before reaching grade 1.

²⁰ More discussion and specific recommendations on pre-primary and secondary education is covered in EDN Goal 1 and EDN Goal 3, respectively.

References

- Ahmed, M., K. S. Ahmed, N. I. Khan and R. Ahmed. *Access to Education in Bangladesh: Country analytic review of primary and secondary school*. CREATE Country Analytic Review. Brighton: University of Sussex, 2007.
- Ahmed, M. and R. Govinda. "Introduction: Universal primary education in South Asia: A right that remains elusive". *Prospects* 40. no. 3. 2010. pp. 321-335.
- Asian Development Bank (ADB) and United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). *Non-State Providers and Public-Private Partnerships in Education for the Poor*. Thailand: ADB and UNICEF, 2011.
- Bruns, B., A. Mingat and R. Rakotomalala. *Achieving Universal Primary Education by 2012: A chance for every child*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 2003.
- Chudgar, A. and M. N. Shafiq. "Family, Community and Educational Outcomes in South Asia". *Prospects* 40. no. 4. 2010. pp. 517-534.
- Clemens, M. *The Long Walk to School: Development goals in historical perspective*. Center for Global Development Working Paper. Washington D.C.: 2010.
- Department of Education. *The Philippines EFA Country Paper*. Paper prepared for the Twelfth Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators, Seoul. Manila: Government of Philippines, 2011.
- . *The Philippines Country Report*. Paper prepared for the Eleventh Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators, 18-20 November 2010, Bangkok. Manila: Government of Philippines, 2010.
- Development Initiatives. *Monitoring the Impact of Financial Crisis on International Aid*. Paper commissioned for the Education For All Global Monitoring Report, 2011. Paris: UNESCO, 2010.
- Felipe, J. "Inclusive Growth through Full Employment: The role of investment and industrial policy". J. Zhuang (ed.). *Poverty, Inequality and Inclusive Growth in Asia*. Manila: Asian Development Bank, 2010. pp 161-198.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2010: Addressing Food Insecurity in Protracted Crises*. Rome: FAO, 2010. Available at: www.fao.org/docrep/013/i1683e/i1683e.pdf.
- Genevois, I. *Can and Should Public-Private Partnerships Play a Role in Education?* Paris: IIEP, 2008.
- Government of India. *The right of children to free and compulsory education act*. New Delhi: Government of India, 2009. Available at: www.childlineindia.org.in/CP-CR-Downloads/RTE,2009.pdf (accessed 10 Oct 2012)
- Government of Lao PDR. *Terms of Reference for Education Sector Working Group (ESWG)*. Vientiane: Government of Lao PDR, 2010.
- Horvat, P. *Conflict and Education – Data Analysis on the Public's Views on Education in Conflict-Affected Countries*. Paper commissioned for the Education for All Global Monitoring Report, 2011. Paris: UNESCO, 2010.
- International Labour Organization (ILO). *The Worst Forms of Child Labour, Education and Violent Conflict*. Paper commissioned for the Education for All Global Monitoring Report, 2011. Paris: UNESCO, 2010a.
- . *Facts on Child Labour 2010*. Geneva: ILO, 2010b.
- Kingdon, G. G. "The Progress of School Education in India", *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 23. no. 2. 2007. pp. 168-195.
- Kyrili, K. and M. Martin. *Monitoring the Impact of Financial Crisis on National Education Financing: A cross-country study*. Paper commissioned for the Education For All Global Monitoring Report. Paris: UNESCO, 2010.
- LaRocque, N. and J. Fielden. *The Evolving Regulatory Context for Private Education in Emerging Economies*. Washington D.C.: World Bank, 2008.

LaRocque, N. and S. Lee. *Non-state Providers and Public-Private Partnership for Education of Poor*. Bangkok: UNICEF and ADB, 2011. Available at: http://observgo.quebec.ca/observgo/fichiers/69936_nonstate-providers-ppp-education.pdf.

Lameta, E. *Pacific Regional Overview of Progress Towards EFA Since Dakar*. Paris: UNESCO, 2005.

Lohani, S., R. Singh, and J. Lohani. "Universal Primary Education in Nepal: Fulfilling the right to education". *Prospects* 40. no. 3. 2010. pp. 355-374.

MartinJenkins. *Final Report of Evaluation of the Asia-Pacific EFA Mid-Decade Assessment and Mid-Term Policy Review*. Auckland: UNESCO, 2010.

Ministry of Education, Bhutan. *EFA Country Report*. Paper prepared for the Eleventh Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators, 18-20 November, 2010, Bangkok. Thimphu: Government of Bhutan, 2010.

Ministry of Education, Cambodia. *EFA Country Report*. Paper prepared for the Eleventh Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators, 18-20 November, 2010, Bangkok. Phnom Penh: Government of Cambodia, 2010.

Ministry of Education, China. *EFA Country Report*. Paper prepared for the Eleventh Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators, 18-20 November, 2010, Bangkok. Beijing: Government of China, 2010.

Ministry of Education, Fiji. *EFA Country Report*. Paper prepared for the Eleventh Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators, 18-20 November, 2010, Bangkok. Suva: Government of Fiji, 2010.

Ministry of Education, Republic Islamic of Iran. *EFA Country Report*. Paper prepared for the Eleventh Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators, 18-20 November, 2010, Bangkok. Tehran: Government of Iran, 2010.

---. *EFA Mid-Decade Assessment: Iran Country Report*. Tehran: Government of Iran, 2008.

Ministry of Education, Lao PDR. *EFA Country Report*. Paper prepared for the Eleventh Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators, 18-20 November, 2010, Bangkok. Vientiane: Government of Lao PDR, 2010.

---. *EFA Mid-Decade Assessment: Lao PDR Country Report*. Vientiane: Government of Lao PDR, 2008.

Ministry of Education, Malaysia. *EFA Country Report*. Paper prepared for the Eleventh Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators, 18-20 November, 2010, Bangkok. Kuala Lumpur: Government of Malaysia, 2010.

Ministry of Education, Maldives. *EFA Mid-Decade Assessment: Maldives Country Report*. Male: Government of Maldives, 2007.

Ministry of Education, Nepal. *Nepal EFA Country Paper*. Paper prepared for the Twelfth Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators, 25-28 July, 2011, Seoul. Kathmandu: Government of Nepal, 2011.

---. *School Leaving Exam Results*. Government of Nepal, 2011. Available at: <http://soce.gov.np> (accessed 6 July, 2012)

---. *Nepal Country Report*. Paper prepared for the Eleventh Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators, 18-20 November, 2010, Bangkok. Kathmandu: Government of Nepal, 2010.

Ministry of Education, Pakistan. *EFA Mid-Decade Assessment: Pakistan Country Report*. Islamabad: Government of Pakistan, 2008.

Ministry of Education, Papua New Guinea. *EFA Country Report*. Paper prepared for the Eleventh Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators, 18-20 November, 2010, Bangkok. Port Moresby: Government of Papua Guinea, 2010.

Ministry of Education, Sri Lanka. *EFA Country Report*. Paper prepared for the Twelfth Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators, 25-28 July, 2011, Seoul. Kotte: Government of Sri Lanka, 2011.

Ministry of Education, Thailand. *EFA Country Report*. Paper prepared for the Eleventh Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators, 18-20 November, 2010, Bangkok. Bangkok: Government of Thailand, 2010.

Ministry of Education and Sports, Nepal. *EFA Mid-Decade Assessment: Nepal Country Report*. Kathmandu: Government of Nepal, 2007.

Ministry of Education and Training, Viet Nam. *EFA Country Report*. Paper prepared for the Eleventh Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators, 18-20 November, 2010, Bangkok. Hanoi: Government of Viet Nam, 2010.

Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, Mongolia. *EFA Country Report*. Paper prepared for the Eleventh Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators, 18-20 November, 2010, Bangkok. Ulaanbaatar: Government of Mongolia, 2010.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan. *EFA Country Report*. Paper prepared for the Twelfth Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators, 25-28 July, 2011, Seoul. Tokyo: Government of Japan, 2011.

Ministry of Human Resource Development, India. *EFA Country Report*. Paper prepared for the Eleventh Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators, 18-20 November, 2010, Bangkok. New Delhi: Government of India, 2010.

Ministry of Human Resource Development and National University of Educational Planning and Administration, India. *EFA Mid-Decade Assessment: India country report*. New Delhi: Government of India, 2008.

Ministry of National Education, Indonesia. *EFA Country Report* Paper prepared for the Eleventh Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators, 18-20 November, 2010, Bangkok. Jakarta: Government of Indonesia, 2010.

---. *Indonesia: Education for all Report 2005-2009*. Jakarta: Secretariat of Education for All, Republic of Indonesia, 2009.

Ministry of Primary and Mass Education, Bangladesh. *EFA Country Report*. Paper prepared for the Eleventh Regional Meeting of National EFA Coordinators, 18-20 November, 2010, Bangkok Dhaka: Government of Bangladesh, 2010a.

---. *National Education Policy 2010*. Dhaka: Government of Bangladesh, 2010b.

Ministry of Public Education, Uzbekistan. *The National EFA Mid-Decade Assessment Report*. Tashkent: Government of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 2007.

Sabates, Ricardo et al. "School Drop out: Patterns, Causes, Changes, and Policies". Background paper prepared for the Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2011. *University of Sussex*. 2010.

Sherman, Joel D. "Regional Disparities in Primary School Participation in Developing Countries". *Prospects* 38. no. 3. 2008. pp. 305-323.

South Asian Forum for Education Development (SAFED). *Annual Status of Education Report*. SAFED, 2012. Available at: <http://www.aserpakistan.safedafed.org/document/aser/2011/ASERPakistan2011.pdf>

Tilak, J.B.G. "The Global Financial Crisis and the financing of Education in Asia: The national and international trends and strategies". *Journal of Educational Planning and Administration* 24. no. 3. 2010. pp. 237-268.

Tomasevski, K. *The State of the Right to Education Worldwide: Free or fee: 2006 global report*. Copenhagen: 2006.

Tooley, J., P. Dixon and S. V. Gomathi. "Private Schools and the Millennium Development Goal of Universal Primary Education: A census and comparative study in Hyderabad, India". *Oxford Review of Education* 33. no. 5. 2007. pp. 539-560.

Tooley, J. and P. Dixon. *Private Education Is Good for the Poor: A study of private schools serving the poor in low-income countries*. Washington, D.C.: Cato Institute, 2005.

United Nations, *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2011*. New York: United Nations 2011.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). *A global partnership for development*. UNDP, 2012. Available at: www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/mdgoverview/mdg_goals/mdg8

United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP). *Statistical Yearbook for Asia and the Pacific 2011*. Bangkok: UNESCAP, 2011a.

---. *Economic and Social Survey of Asia and the Pacific 2011*. Bangkok: UNESCAP, 2011b.

UNESCAP, ADB and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). *Accelerating Equitable Achievement of the MDGs, Closing Gaps in Health and Nutrition Outcomes*. Asia Pacific MDG Report 2011/2012. Bangkok: UNESCAP, 2011.

---. *Paths to 2015: MDG priorities in Asia and the Pacific*. Asia-Pacific MDG Report 2010/11. Bangkok: UNESCAP, 2010.

---. *Access to Basic Services for the Poor: The importance of good governance*. Asia-Pacific MDG Study Series. Bangkok: UNESCAP, 2007.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). *Education and Key to Achieving All Millennium Development Goals: Prospects and challenges in the Asia-Pacific region*. Background Note of the ECOSOC Annual Ministerial Review (AMR) Regional Preparatory Meeting for Asia and the Pacific, 24 March, Jomtien. Jomtien: 2011a.

---. *The Hidden Crisis: Armed conflict and education*. EFA Global Monitoring Report 2011. Paris: UNESCO, 2011b.

---. *Implementing the Right to Education: A compendium of practical examples*. Paris: UNESCO, 2010a.

---. *Reaching the Marginalized*. EFA Global Monitoring Report 2010. Paris: UNESCO, 2010b.

---. *Summary of Progress Towards Education for All*. Working Document of the Tenth Meeting of the High-Level Group on Education for All, 22-24 March, 2011. Jomtien: UNESCO, 2010c.

---. "Overcoming inequality: why governance matters". EFA Global Monitoring Report 2009. Paris: UNESCO, 2009.

---. *Synthesis of the Pacific Education for All Action Plans 2003*. Samoa: UNESCO Office for the Pacific, 2003.

---. *The Dakar Framework for Action: Education for All: Meeting our collective commitments*. Paris: UNESCO, 2000.

---. *World Declaration on Education for All and Framework for Action to Meet Basic Learning Needs*. Guidelines for implementing the World Declaration on Education for All adopted by the World Conference on Education for All Meeting Basic Learning Needs, Jomtien, Thailand, 5-9 March, 1990. New York: UNESCO, 1990. Available at: http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/JOMTIE_E.PDF

UNESCO Bangkok, *Why Language Matters for the Millennium Development Goals*. Bangkok: UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau of Education, 2012a.

---. *Decentralized Finance and Provision of Basic Education*. Bangkok: UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau of Education, 2012b.

---. *Regional Report on Progress towards Education for All in Asia and the Pacific*. Bangkok: UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau of Education, 2011. Available at: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0019/001916/191665e.pdf>.

---. *Reaching the Unreached in Education in Asia-Pacific to Meet the EFA Goals by 2015: A Commitment to Action*. Bangkok: UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau of Education, 2010.

---. *Towards Inclusive Education for Children with Disabilities*. Bangkok: UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau of Education, 2009.

---. *Asia and the Pacific Education for All (EFA) Mid-Decade Assessment: Mekong Sub-Region Synthesis Report*. Bangkok: UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau of Education, 2008a.

---. *Asia and the Pacific Education for All (EFA) Mid-Decade Assessment: Insular South-East Asia Synthesis Report*. Bangkok: UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau of Education, 2008b.

---. *Asia and the Pacific Education for All (EFA) Mid-Decade Assessment: South Asia sub-region synthesis report*. Bangkok: UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau of Education, 2008c.

---. *Asia and the Pacific Education for All (EFA) Mid-Decade Assessment: Central Asia synthesis report*. Bangkok: UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau of Education, 2008d.

---. *Getting Girls Out of Work and into School*. Policy Brief. Bangkok: UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau of Education, 2006.

UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS). *Global Education Digest 2011*. Montreal: UIS, 2011.

---. *The Quantitative Impact of Conflict on Education*. Paper commissioned for the Education for All Global Monitoring Report, 2011. Paris: UNESCO, 2010a.

---. *Global Education Digest 2010*. Montreal: UIS, 2010b.

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). *The Right of Children with Disabilities to Education: A rights-based approach to inclusive education*. Position paper. Geneva: UNICEF Regional Office for CEECIS, 2012a. p. 51.

---. More than 7 million primary school aged children in Pakistan missing out on education. UNICEF, 2012b. Available at http://www.unicef.org/pakistan/media_7611.htm (accessed October 2012).

---. "Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children: Cambodia National Report". Working draft. Phnom Penh: UNICEF Cambodia Country Office, forthcoming.

---. "Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children: East Asia and the Pacific Regional Study". Working draft. Bangkok: UNICEF Regional Office for East Asia and the Pacific, forthcoming.

---. "Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children: India National Report". Working draft. New Delhi: UNICEF India Country Office, forthcoming.

---. "Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children: Indonesia National Report". Working draft. Jakarta: UNICEF Indonesia Country Office, forthcoming.

---. "Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children: South Asia Regional Study". Working draft. Kathmandu: UNICEF Regional Office for South Asia, forthcoming.

---. *WASH Case Study for Education for All*. Kabul: UNICEF Afghanistan Country Office, 2011.

---. *The State of the World's Children 2006: Excluded and invisible*. New York: UNICEF, 2005.

UNICEF and UIS. *All Children in School by 2015*. Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children Conceptual and Methodological Framework. Unpublished framework. UNICEF and UIS.

---. *All Children in School by 2015*. Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children flyer. UNICEF and UIS, 2012. Available from: www.unicef.org/education/files/OOSCI_flyer_FINAL.pdf

United Nations Girls in Education Initiative (UNGEI). *Mission Statement*. UNGEI, 2008. www.ungei.org/whatisungei/index_211.html (accessed 3 July 2012)

World Health Organization (WHO). *The Global Burden of Disease: 2004 update*. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2008.

WHO and World Bank. *World Disability Report*. Geneva: WHO, 2011.

Wils, A., B. Carrol and K. Barrow. *Educating the World's Children: Patterns of growth and inequality*. Education Policy and Data Center, Washington D.C.: 2005.

World Bank. *Maintaining Progress amid Turmoil*. Global Economic Prospects January 2012. Washington D.C.: World Bank, 2012. Available at: <http://econ.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTDEC/EXTDECPROSPECTS/0,,contentMDK:23064688~pagePK:64165401~piPK:64165026~theSitePK:476883,00.html>.

---. *People with Disabilities in India: From commitments to outcomes*. Washington D.C.: World Bank, Human Development Unit, South Asia Region, 2009.

---. *Project Appraisal Document on a Proposed Credit to the People's Republic of Bangladesh for a Disability and Children-at-Risk Project*. Washington D.C.: World Bank, 2008. Available at: http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2008/06/16/000333037_20080616025100/Rendered/PDF/417950PAD0P1061y100IDAR20081021911.pdf

Statistical annex

Annex 1: Structure of compulsory primary education in countries in the Asia-Pacific region

Subregion/country	Compulsory education	Legal guarantee of free education	Official primary school entry age	Duration of primary education 2008	Duration of lower secondary	Compulsory includes lower secondary?	Duration of upper secondary	Compulsory includes upper secondary?
Central Asia								
Kazakhstan	7–17	Yes	7	4	5	Yes	2	Yes
Kyrgyzstan ²	7–15	Yes	7	4	5	Yes	2	No
Mongolia ²	7–15	Yes	7	5	4	Yes	2	No
Tajikistan ²	7–15	Yes	7	4	5	Yes	2	No
Turkmenistan ²	7–15	Yes	7	3	5	Yes	2	No
Uzbekistan ²	7–17	Yes	7	4	5	Yes	2	Yes
East Asia and the Pacific								
Australia	5–15	Yes	5	7	4	Yes	2	No
Brunei Darussalam	...	Yes	6	6	3	...	4	...
Cambodia ²	.	Yes	6	6	3	...	3	...
China ^{2,7}	6–14	Yes	7	5	3	Yes	3	No
Cook Islands ⁴	5–15	Yes ¹	5	6	4	Yes	3	No
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	6–16	Yes	6	4	3	Yes	3	Yes
Fiji	6–15	No	6	6	4	Yes	3	No
Indonesia ¹	7–15	Yes	7	6	3	Yes	3	No
Japan ³	6–15	Yes	6	6	3	Yes	3	No
Kiribati ⁴	6–15	Yes ⁱⁱ	6	6	3	Yes	3	No
Lao People's Democratic Republic ²	6–14	Yes	6	5	3	Yes	3	No
Macao, China ⁶	5–14	...	6	6	3	Yes	3	No
Malaysia	6–11	Yes ⁱⁱⁱ	6	6	3	No	4	No
Marshall Islands ^{3,4}	6–14	No	6	6	2	Yes	4	No
Micronesia (Federated States of)	6–14	No	6	6	2	Yes	4	No
Myanmar ²	5–9	Yes	5	5	4	No	2	No
Nauru	6–16	Yes ^{vi}	6	6	4	Yes	2	No
New Zealand ³	5–16	Yes	5	6	4	Yes	3	No
Niue ⁴	5–16	Yes ^v	5	6	4	Yes	2	No
Palau ^{3,4}	6–17	Yes	6	5	3	Yes	4	Yes
Papua New Guinea	...	No	7	6	4	...	2	...
Philippines ²	6–12	Yes	6	6	3	No	1	No
Republic of Korea ^{1,3}	6–15	Yes	6	6	3	Yes	3	No
Samoa	5–12	No	5	6	2	Yes	5	No
Singapore ⁶	6–14	No	6	6	2	Yes	2	No
Solomon Islands	...	No	6	6	3	...	4	...
Thailand	6–16	Yes	6	6	3	Yes	3	No

Subregion/country	Compulsory education	Legal guarantee of free education	Official primary school entry age	Duration of primary education 2008	Duration of lower secondary	Compulsory includes lower secondary?	Duration of upper secondary	Compulsory includes upper secondary?
Timor-Leste ²	6–11	Yes	6	6	3	No	3	No
Tokelau	.	Yes	5	6	3	...	2	...
Tonga	6–14	No	5	6	4	Yes	2	No
Tuvalu ⁴	7–14	Yes ^{vi}	6	6	4	Yes	2	No
Vanuatu	...	No	6	6	4	...	3	...
Viet Nam ^{2,10}	6–14	Yes	6	5	4	Yes	3	No
South and West Asia								
Afghanistan ²	7–15	Yes	7	6	3	Yes	3	No
Bangladesh ²	6–10	Yes	6	5	3	No	4	No
Bhutan ²	.	Yes	6	7	4	...	2	...
India ²	6–14	Yes	6	5	3	Yes	4	No
Iran, Islamic Republic of ^{2,13}	6–10	Yes	6	5	3	No	4	No
Maldives	6–12	Yes ^{vii}	6	7	3	Yes	2	No
Nepal ^{2,6}	5–10	Yes	5	5	3	No	4	No
Pakistan	5–9	Yes ^{viii}	5	5	3	No	4	No
Sri Lanka ¹	5–14	No	5	5	4	Yes	4	No

- Notes:**
- Information on compulsory education comes from the Reports under the United Nations Human Rights Treaties.
 - Some primary school fees continue to be charged despite the legal guarantee of free education (Bentaouet-Kattan, 2005; Tomasevski, 2006; World Bank, 2002, 2006).
 - No tuition fees are charged but some direct costs have been reported (Bentaouet-Kattan, 2005; Tomasevski, 2006; World Bank, 2002).
 - National population data were used to calculate enrolment ratios.
 - Children can enter primary school at age 6 or 7.
 - Enrolment ratios were not calculated due to inconsistencies in the population data.

Symbol:

- (.) The category is not applicable or does not exist.
 (...) No data available.

-
- i www.unesco.org/education/wef/countryreports/cook_islands/rapport_1.htm
 ii www.unescobkk.org/education/resources/education-system-profiles/kiribati/basic-education/
 iii www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/WDE/2010/pdf-versions/Malaysia.pdf
 iv www.unesco.org/education/wef/countryreports/nauru/rapport_2.html
 v www.unesco.org/education/wef/countryreports/niue/rapport_2.html
 vi www.unesco.org/education/wef/countryreports/tuvalu/rapport_3.html
 vii www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/WDE/2010/pdf-versions/Maldives.pdf (p. 3)
 viii www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/WDE/2010/pdf-versions/Pakistan.pdf (p. 3)

Annex 2: Subregions and countries covered by the End of Decade Notes on Education for All

The EDNs use the UNESCO regional and subregional groupings. UNESCO has 49 Member States and Associate Members in the Asia-Pacific region, which have been grouped into the following subregions:

- **Central Asia (6 countries):**

Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan

- **East Asia (17 countries/territories):**

Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Hong Kong (China), Indonesia, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Macao (China), Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Viet Nam

- **Pacific (17 countries/territories):**

Australia, Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, New Zealand, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu

- **South and West Asia (9 countries):**

Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka

Annex 3: Goal 2 - Table 1 - Enrolment in primary and secondary

Region Country or territory	Reference year	Enrolment			Gross enrolment ratio				Net enrolment rate (adjusted)			
		MF (000)	% F	% Private	MF	M	F	GPI	MF	M	F	GPI
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Central Asia												
Kazakhstan	2009	958 ⁺¹	49 ⁺¹	1 ⁺¹	109 ⁺¹	109 ⁺¹	109 ⁺¹	1.01 ⁺¹	100 ⁺¹
	2005	1,024	49	1	105	105	105	1.00	99	98	99	1.01
	2000	1,208	49	-	97	97	98	1.01	95 ^{**}	94 ^{**}	96 ^{**}	1.02 ^{**}
	1990	1,160	114
Kyrgyzstan	2009	392	49	1	95	95	95	1.00	91	91	91	1.00
	2005	434	49	-	96	96	95	0.99	93	92	93	1.01
	2000	466	49	-	97	97	96	0.99	87	87	86	0.99
	1990	341	50	...	110	109	111	1.02
Mongolia	2009	253	49	5	110	110	110	0.99	100
	2005	250 ⁺¹	50 ⁺¹	...	99 ⁺¹	99 ⁺¹	99 ⁺¹	1.00 ⁺¹	96 ⁺¹	95 ⁺¹	96 ⁺¹	1.02 ⁺¹
	2000	253	50	1	103	102	104	1.02	97	95	98	1.03
	1990	166 ⁺¹	50 ⁺¹	...	97 ⁺¹	96 ⁺¹	98 ⁺¹	1.02 ⁺¹
Tajikistan	2009
	2005	688 ⁺¹	48 ⁺¹	. ⁺¹	100 ⁺¹	103 ⁺¹	98 ⁺¹	0.95 ⁺¹	97 ⁺¹	99 ⁺¹	95 ⁺¹	0.96 ⁺¹
	2000	680 ⁺¹	47 ⁺¹	. ⁺¹	97 ⁺¹	100 ⁺¹	93 ⁺¹	0.93 ⁺¹	96 ⁺¹	100 ⁺¹	92 ⁺¹	0.92 ⁺¹
	1990	507 ⁺¹	49 ⁺¹	...	91 ⁺¹	92 ⁺¹	90 ⁺¹	0.98 ⁺¹
Turkmenistan	2009
	2005
	2000
	1990
Uzbekistan	2009	1,996	49	.	92	93	91	0.98	90	91	89	0.98
	2005	2,383	49	...	98	99	97	0.98
	2000	2,598 ⁺¹	49 ⁺¹	...	99 ⁺¹	100 ⁺¹	99 ⁺¹	0.99 ⁺¹
	1990	1,711	49	...	110	111	109	0.99
East Asia												
Brunei Darussalam	2009	45	48	37	107	106	107	1.01	97	96	98	1.02
	2005	46	48	36	107	107	107	1.00	97	96	98	1.01
	2000	45	47	35	111	112	110	0.99
	1990	39 ⁺¹	47 ⁺¹	25 ⁺¹	114 ⁺¹	117 ⁺¹	110 ⁺¹	0.94 ⁺¹	92 ⁺¹	93 ⁺¹	91 ⁺¹	0.98 ⁺¹
Cambodia	2009	2,290	47	1	116	120	113	0.94
	2005	2,582 ⁺¹	47 ⁺¹	1 ⁺¹	122 ⁺¹	126 ⁺¹	118 ⁺¹	0.93 ⁺¹	90 ⁺¹	91 ⁺¹	89 ⁺¹	0.98 ⁺¹
	2000	2,431 ⁺¹	46 ⁺¹	1 ⁺¹	110 ⁺¹	117 ⁺¹	104 ⁺¹	0.89 ⁺¹	85 ^{**,+1}	88 ^{**,+1}	81 ^{**,+1}	0.93 ^{**,+1}
	1990	1,277	94
China	2009	103,617	46	5	113	111	115	1.04
	2005	108,925 ⁺¹	47 ⁺¹	4 ⁺¹	111 ⁺¹	109 ⁺¹	113 ⁺¹	1.04 ⁺¹
	2000	130,133 ⁺¹	48 ⁺¹	...	112 ⁺¹	111 ⁺¹	114 ⁺¹	1.03 ⁺¹
	1990	123,731	46	-	129	135	122	0.90	97
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	2009
	2005
	2000
	1990

Region Country or territory	Reference year	Enrolment			Gross enrolment ratio				Net enrolment rate (adjusted)			
		MF (000)	% F	% Private	MF	M	F	GPI	MF	M	F	GPI
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Hong Kong SAR of China	2009	369	48	15	104	103	105	1.02	98*	97*	100*	1.03*
	2005	451	48	11	101	102	100	0.98	98*	99*	97*	0.99*
	2000	498 ⁺¹	48 ⁺¹		105 ⁺¹	108 ⁺¹	103 ⁺¹	0.95 ⁺¹	98 ^{*,+1}	99 ^{*,+1}	96 ^{*,+1}	0.96 ^{*,+1}
	1990	534	...	10	104
Indonesia	2009	29,901	48	16	121	123	119	0.97	98
	2005	29,142 ⁻¹	49 ⁻¹	16 ⁻¹	118 ⁻¹	119 ⁻¹	117 ⁻¹	0.98 ⁻¹
	2000	28,690 ⁺¹	49 ⁺¹	16 ⁺¹	115 ⁺¹	116 ⁺¹	114 ⁺¹	0.98 ⁺¹	99 ^{**,+1}
	1990	29,934	48	17	119	121	116	0.96	98
Japan	2009	7,156	49	1	102	102	102	1.00	100
	2005	7,232	49	1	101	101	101	1.00
	2000	7,529	49	1	100	100	100	1.00	100
	1990	9,607	49	1	99	99	99	1.00	99	99	99	1.00
Lao People's Democratic Republic	2009	901 ⁻¹	47 ⁻¹	3 ⁻¹	112 ⁻¹	117 ⁻¹	106 ⁻¹	0.91 ⁻¹	82 ⁻¹	84 ⁻¹	81 ⁻¹	0.96 ⁻¹
	2005	891	46	2	108	115	101	0.88	78	80	76	0.95
	2000	832	45	2	111	120	102	0.85	79	82	75	0.92
	1990	564	43	-	101	112	89	0.79	67
Macao, China	2009	27	47	97	100	102	97	0.95	87	88	87	0.99
	2005	37	47	96	104	109	100	0.92	89	91	88	0.97
	2000	47	47	94 ^{**}	103	105	100	0.95	86	86	86	1.00
	1990	33	47	...	101	104	98	0.95	80	81	80	0.99
Malaysia	2009	3,053 ⁻¹	49 ⁻¹	1 ⁻¹	95 ⁻¹	95 ⁻¹	94 ⁻¹	0.99 ⁻¹	94 ^{**,-1}	94 ^{**,-1}	94 ^{**,-1}	1.00 ^{**,-1}
	2005	3,133 ⁺¹	49 ⁺¹	1 ⁺¹	98 ⁺¹	98 ⁺¹	98 ⁺¹	0.99 ⁺¹	97 ⁺¹	98 ⁺¹	97 ⁺¹	1.00 ⁺¹
	2000	3,040 ⁻¹	48 ⁻¹	...	98 ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	97 ⁻¹	0.98 ⁻¹	98 ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	97 ⁻¹	0.98 ⁻¹
	1990	2,456	49	-	92	93	92	0.99
Myanmar	2009	5,095	49	1	116	117	115	0.98
	2005	4,933 ⁻¹	50 ⁻¹	. ⁻¹	111 ⁻¹	111 ⁻¹	111 ⁻¹	1.00 ⁻¹
	2000	4,858	49	.	103	104	103	0.98
	1990	4,848	48	-	95	98	92	0.94
Philippines	2009	13,411 ⁻¹	48 ⁻¹	8 ⁻¹	110 ⁻¹	111 ⁻¹	109 ⁻¹	0.98 ⁻¹	92 ⁻¹	91 ⁻¹	93 ⁻¹	1.02 ⁻¹
	2005	13,084	49	8	109	109	108	0.99	91	90	92	1.02
	2000	12,760 ⁺¹	49 ⁺¹	7 ⁺¹	110 ⁺¹	110 ⁺¹	109 ⁺¹	1.00 ⁺¹	90 ⁺¹	90 ⁺¹	91 ⁺¹	1.01 ⁺¹
	1990	10,285	49	7	109	110	108	0.98	98	99	97	0.98
Republic of Korea	2009	3,482	48	1	104	105	103	0.98	99 ^{**}	100 ^{**}	99 ^{**}	0.99 ^{**}
	2005	4,031	47	1	102	103	100	0.97	98	100	97	0.97
	2000	3,946 ⁻¹	47 ⁻¹	1 ⁻¹	100 ⁻¹	100 ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	1.00 ⁻¹	98 ⁻¹	98 ⁻¹	98 ⁻¹	1.00 ⁻¹
	1990	4,894	49	1	106	105	107	1.01	99
Singapore	2009	295	48	8
	2005
	2000
	1990	258	47	24
Thailand	2009
	2005	5,844 ⁺¹	48 ⁺¹	17 ⁺¹	96 ⁺¹	97 ⁺¹	95 ⁺¹	0.98 ⁺¹	93 ⁺¹	94 ⁺¹	92 ⁺¹	0.98 ⁺¹
	2000	6,120 ⁻¹	48 ⁻¹	13 ⁻¹	94 ⁻¹	95 ⁻¹	93 ⁻¹	0.97 ⁻¹
	1990	6,957 ⁺¹	49 ⁺¹	10 ⁺¹	101 ⁺¹	102 ⁺¹	100 ⁺¹	0.98 ⁺¹
Timor-Leste	2009	214	48	13	113	116	109	0.95	83	84	82	0.97
	2005	178	47	...	100	104	96	0.92	69 ^{**}	70 ^{**}	67 ^{**}	0.96 ^{**}
	2000	189 ⁺¹	127 ⁺¹
	1990

Region Country or territory	Reference year	Enrolment			Gross enrolment ratio				Net enrolment rate (adjusted)			
		MF (000)	% F	% Private	MF	M	F	GPI	MF	M	F	GPI
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Viet Nam	2009	6,745	48	1
	2005	7,773	47	-
	2000	9,751 ⁺¹	48 ⁺¹	- ⁺¹	104 ⁺¹	107 ⁺¹	101 ⁺¹	0.95 ⁺¹	95 ⁺¹	97 ^{**+1}	92 ^{**+1}	0.95 ^{**+1}
	1990	8,583	103
Pacific												
Australia	2009	1,992	49	31	106	107	106	1.00	97	97	98	1.01
	2005	1,935	49	29	102	102	102	1.00	95	95	96	1.01
	2000	1,906	49	27	101	101	101	1.00	95 ^{**}	94 ^{**}	95 ^{**}	1.01 ^{**}
	1990	1,583	49	25	106	106	106	1.00	98	98	98	1.01
Cook Islands	2009	1.8 ⁺¹	48 ⁺¹	22 ⁺¹	109 ^{*,+1}	107 ^{*,+1}	110 ^{*,+1}	1.02 ^{*,+1}	98 ^{*,+1}	98 ^{*,+1}	99 ^{*,+1}	1.02 ^{*,+1}
	2005	2.2	48	20	112 [*]	110 [*]	113 [*]	1.03 [*]
	2000	2.6 ⁻¹	46 ⁻¹	15 ⁻¹	96 ^{*,+1}	99 ^{*,+1}	94 ^{*,+1}	0.95 ^{*,+1}	86 ^{*,+1}	88 ^{*,+1}	85 ^{*,+1}	0.96 ^{*,+1}
	1990
Fiji	2009	103 ⁻¹	48 ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	94 ⁻¹	95 ⁻¹	94 ⁻¹	0.99 ⁻¹	92 ⁻¹	92 ⁻¹	92 ⁻¹	1.00 ⁻¹
	2005	114 ^{**}	48 ^{**}	99 ^{**}	103 ^{**}	104 ^{**}	102 ^{**}	0.98 ^{**}	96 ^{**}	96 ^{**}	96 ^{**}	1.00 ^{**}
	2000	116 ⁻¹	48 ⁻¹	...	109 ⁻¹	109 ⁻¹	108 ⁻¹	0.99 ⁻¹	99 ^{**,-1}	98 ^{**,-1}	99 ^{**,-1}	1.01 ^{**,-1}
	1990	122 ⁺¹	49 ⁺¹	...	112 ⁺¹	112 ⁺¹	112 ⁺¹	1.00 ⁺¹
Kiribati	2009	16 ⁻¹	50 ⁻¹	...	116 ⁻¹	114 ⁻¹	119 ⁻¹	1.04 ⁻¹
	2005	16	49	...	115	114	116	1.02
	2000	16 ⁻¹	49 ⁺¹	...	116 ⁺¹	114 ⁺¹	117 ⁺¹	1.03 ⁺¹
	1990	15	50	-	115	114	116	1.02
Marshall Islands	2009	8.4	48	20	90	91	90	0.99
	2005	8.3 ⁺¹	48 ⁺¹	...	104 ⁺¹	104 ⁺¹	104 ⁺¹	1.00 ⁺¹
	2000	8.5 ^{**+1}	47 ^{**+1}	...	108 ^{**+1}	111 ^{**+1}	105 ^{**+1}	0.94 ^{**+1}	85 ^{**+1}	85 ^{**+1}	85 ^{**+1}	1.00 ^{**+1}
	1990
Micronesia (Federated States of)	2009	19 ⁻²	49 ⁻²	8 ^{**,-2}	110 ⁻²	110 ⁻²	111 ⁻²	1.01 ⁻²
	2005	19	48	...	112	113	111	0.98
	2000
	1990
Nauru	2009	1.3 ⁻¹	50 ⁻¹	...	93 ^{*,+1}	90 ^{*,+1}	96 ^{*,+1}	1.06 ^{*,+1}
	2005	1.8	48	...	125 [*]	122 [*]	129 [*]	1.05 [*]
	2000	1.6	53	...	99 [*]	86 [*]	115 [*]	1.33 [*]
	1990
New Zealand	2009	348	49	12	101	101	102	1.01	99	99	100	1.01
	2005	353	49	12	101	101	101	1.00	99 ^{**}	99 ^{**}	99 ^{**}	1.00 ^{**}
	2000	360	49	...	99	99	99	1.00	98 ^{**}	98 ^{**}	99 ^{**}	1.00 ^{**}
	1990	316 ⁺¹	49 ⁺¹	2 ⁺¹	103 ⁺¹	104 ⁺¹	102 ⁺¹	0.99 ⁺¹	100 ⁺¹	100 ⁺¹	100 ⁺¹	1.00 ⁺¹
Niue	2009
	2005	0.18	51	...	112 [*]	119 [*]	106 [*]	0.89 [*]
	2000	0.27 ⁻¹	46 ⁻¹	- ⁻¹	99 ^{*,+1}	99 ^{*,+1}	98 ^{*,+1}	1.00 ^{*,+1}	99 ^{*,+1}	99 ^{*,+1}	98 ^{*,+1}	1.00 ^{*,+1}
	1990	0.37 ⁺¹	...	- ⁺¹
Palau	2009	1.5 ⁻²	48 ^{**,-2}	23 ⁻²	101 ^{*,+1}	100 ^{**,-2}	103 ^{**,-2}	1.03 ^{**,-2}
	2005	1.9 ^{**}	48 ^{**}	21 ^{**}	108 ^{**}	109 ^{**}	108 ^{**}	0.99 ^{**}
	2000	1.9	48	18	113 [*]	115 [*]	111 [*]	0.97 [*]	96 ^{**}	98 ^{**}	94 ^{**}	0.96 ^{**}
	1990

Region Country or territory	Reference year	Enrolment			Gross enrolment ratio				Net enrolment rate (adjusted)			
		MF (000)	% F	% Private	MF	M	F	GPI	MF	M	F	GPI
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Papua New Guinea	2009
	2005	532	44	...	56	61	51	0.84
	2000	560	45	...	69	74	63	0.86
	1990	415	44	2	65	71	59	0.84	65**	71**	59**	0.84**
Samoa	2009	30	48	...	100	101	99	0.98	99**
	2005	31 ⁻¹	48 ⁻¹	17 ⁻¹	103 ⁻¹	104 ⁻¹	103 ⁻¹	0.99 ⁻¹	99** ⁻¹
	2000	27 ⁻¹	48 ⁻¹	16 ⁻¹	98 ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	97 ⁻¹	0.98 ⁻¹	94 ⁻¹	94 ⁻¹	94 ⁻¹	0.99 ⁻¹
	1990
Solomon Islands	2009	83 ⁻²	47 ⁻²	18 ⁻²	107 ⁻²	109 ⁻²	106 ⁻²	0.97 ⁻²	81 ⁻²	81 ⁻²	80 ⁻²	0.98 ⁻²
	2005	81 ⁺¹	47 ⁺¹	17 ⁺¹	106 ⁺¹	107 ⁺¹	104 ⁺¹	0.97 ⁺¹	80 ⁺¹	80 ⁺¹	80 ⁺¹	0.99 ⁺¹
	2000	57	46	...	85	88	82	0.94
	1990	48	44	12	87	93	80	0.86
Tokelau	2009
	2005
	2000	0.27 ⁺¹	46 ⁺¹	. ⁺¹	112 ^{*,+1}	106 ^{*,+1}	119 ^{*,+1}	1.13 ^{*,+1}
	1990	0.25 ⁺¹	48 ⁺¹
Tonga	2009
	2005	17	47	...	113	114	111	0.98	99**
	2000	17 ⁻¹	46 ⁻¹	7 ⁻¹	108 ⁻¹	111 ⁻¹	106 ⁻¹	0.96 ⁻¹	88 ⁻¹	90 ⁻¹	86 ⁻¹	0.95 ⁻¹
	1990	17	48	7	109	110	108	0.98	94	94	94	1.01
Tuvalu	2009
	2005	1.5	48	...	100*	101*	98*	0.96*
	2000	1.5	48	...	105*	103*	107*	1.04*
	1990	1.3	49
Vanuatu	2009	39	47	28	108	111	105	0.95
	2005	39	48	26	114	116	113	0.97	98	98	97	0.98
	2000	34 ⁻¹	48 ⁻¹	...	111 ⁻¹	112 ⁻¹	110 ⁻¹	0.98 ⁻¹	92** ⁻¹	92** ⁻¹	91** ⁻¹	0.99** ⁻¹
	1990	24	47	22	96	97	95	0.98
South and West Asia												
Afghanistan	2009	4,946	39	...	104	123	83	0.67
	2005	4,319	36	...	104	130	77	0.59
	2000	749	-	...	22	42	-	-
	1990	623	34	...	30	39	22	0.55
Bangladesh	2009	16,539*	50*	41*	95*	93*	97*	1.04*	89*	86*	93*	1.08*
	2005	16,219	50	42	94	92	96	1.04	91	88	93	1.05
	2000
	1990	11,940	45	15	72	78	66	0.84	64	70	59	0.85
Bhutan	2009	109	50	3	109	108	110	1.01	88	87	90	1.03
	2005	99	49	2	96	98	95	0.97	74**	74**	74**	1.00**
	2000	85	46	2	78	83	72	0.87	59	62	56	0.90
	1990
India	2009	145,454 ⁻¹	117 ⁻¹	97** ⁻¹
	2005	138,788	47	...	112	114	110	0.96	94**	96**	92**	0.96**
	2000	113,613	44	17	94	102	86	0.84	85**	92**	77**	0.84**
	1990	97,318	41	...	93	106	79	0.74

Region Country or territory	Reference year	Enrolment			Gross enrolment ratio				Net enrolment rate (adjusted)			
		MF (000)	% F	% Private	MF	M	F	GPI	MF	M	F	GPI
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	2009	5,655	49	7	103	103	102	0.99
	2005	6,207	48	...	106	107	105	0.98	99**
	2000	8,288	48	3	109	112	106	0.95	93**	94**	91**	0.97**
	1990	8,817	46	...	106	112	99	0.88	92	96	88	0.91
Maldives	2009	45	48	2	111	114	108	0.95
	2005	58	48	1	120	124	117	0.95	97**	98**	96**	0.97**
	2000	74	49	2	134	135	134	0.99	99**	99**	99**	0.99**
	1990
Nepal	2009	4,901 ⁺¹	50 ⁺¹	13 ⁺¹
	2005	4,026 ⁻¹	45 ⁻¹
	2000	3,780	43	...	118	131	104	0.79	74**	81**	66**	0.82**
	1990	2,884 ⁺¹	37 ⁺¹	5 ⁺¹	111 ⁺¹	135 ⁺¹	85 ⁺¹	0.63 ⁺¹
Pakistan	2009	18,468	44	31	85	92	77	0.84	66*	72*	60*	0.84*
	2005	17,258	42	36	83	94	71	0.76	65**	73**	56**	0.76**
	2000	14,205 ⁺¹	39 ⁺¹	...	70 ⁺¹	83 ⁺¹	56 ⁺¹	0.68 ⁺¹	57 ^{**+1}	68 ^{**+1}	46 ^{**+1}	0.68 ^{**+1}
	1990
Sri Lanka	2009	1,619	49	-	97	97	97	1.00	95	95	96	1.01
	2005	1,635**	49**	2**	111**	111**	111**	1.00**
	2000	1,768 ⁺¹	49 ⁺¹	- ⁺¹	108 ⁺¹	108 ⁺¹	107 ⁺¹	0.99 ⁺¹	100 ^{**+1}
	1990	2,112	48	1	111	114	109	0.96
REGIONAL AVERAGES												
World	2009	701,646	47	...	107	109	105	0.96	90**	91**	89**	0.98**
	2005	685,289	47	...	105	107	102	0.95	88	89	87	0.97
	2000	650,860	47	...	99	103	95	0.92	84	87**	82**	0.94**
	1990	578,886	46	...	100	106	93	0.88	83**	86**	78**	0.91**
Arab States	2009	41,323	47	...	97	101	93	0.92	86**	89**	84**	0.94**
	2005	39,281	47	...	94	98	89	0.91	83	87	80	0.93
	2000	35,725	46	...	89	94	83	0.88	78	82	75	0.91
	1990	28,108	44	...	83	91	74	0.81	73**	79**	67**	0.84**
Central and Eastern Europe	2009	19,644**	49**	...	99**	99**	98**	0.99**	94**	94**	94**	1.00**
	2005	21,206	48	...	98	99	97	0.98	93	93	92	0.99
	2000	23,778	48	...	102	104	101	0.97	95**	96**	93**	0.98**
	1990	28,712	48	...	101	102	100	0.98
Central Asia	2009	5,480	48	...	98	99	98	0.98	93	94	92	0.99
	2005	6,118	49	...	99	100	98	0.98	95**	95**	94**	0.99**
	2000	6,748	49	...	98	99	98	0.99	95**	95**	94**	0.99**
	1990	5,284	49**	...	106	107**	106**	0.99**
East Asia and the Pacific	2009	186,735	47	...	111	110	111	1.01	95**
	2005	197,693**	47**	...	109**	109**	110**	1.01**	94**	93**	95**	1.02**
	2000	217,668**	48**	...	109**	109**	109**	1.00**	94**	94**	94**	1.01**
	1990	208,280	47	...	119	123	114	0.93	96	98**	94**	0.96**
Latin America and the Caribbean	2009	68,194**	48**	...	117**	119**	115**	0.97**	95**	95**	95**	1.00**
	2005	69,047	48	...	118	119	116	0.97	95	95	96	1.01
	2000	70,201	48	...	121	122	119	0.97	94	95**	93**	0.99**
	1990	64,822	49**	...	115	116**	115**	0.99**	87**	88**	86**	0.97**

Region Country or territory	Reference year	Enrolment			Gross enrolment ratio				Net enrolment rate (adjusted)			
		MF (000)	% F	% Private	MF	M	F	GPI	MF	M	F	GPI
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
North America and Western Europe	2009	51,563	49	...	102	101	102	1.00	96	95	96	1.01
	2005	51,585	49	...	101	101	101	0.99	96	95	96	1.01
	2000	52,747	49	...	102	103	102	0.99	97	97	97	1.00
	1990	49,942	49	...	104	105	104	0.99	97	97**	98**	1.01**
South and West Asia	2009	197,923**	110**	91**
	2005	188,614	46	...	107	110	103	0.93	89	92	87	0.94
	2000	157,178	44	...	90	98	82	0.84	80	87	73	0.84
	1990	134,432	41	...	88	101	76	0.75	76**	84**	68**	0.80**
Sub-Saharan Africa	2009	130,783	47	...	101	106	97	0.92	77**	79**	75**	0.95**
	2005	111,746	47	...	95	101	89	0.88	71	74	69	0.93
	2000	86,814	46	...	82	89	76	0.85	61	65	57	0.89
	1990	59,306	45	...	73	80	66	0.83	53**	58**	48**	0.83**

Note: Data extracted from the UIS database on October 2011.

Symbol:

... No data available

** For country data: UIS estimation

For regional averages: Partial imputation due to incomplete country coverage (between 25% to 75% of the population)

* National estimation

x⁺ⁿ Data refer to the school or financial year n years after the reference year

x⁻ⁿ Data refer to the school or financial year n years prior the reference year

Annex 4: Goal 2 - Table 2 - Progression and completion in primary education

Region Country or territory	Reference year	Percentage of repeaters			Survival rate to last grade of primary				Gross intake ratio to last grade of primary				Transition rate from primary to secondary (general programmes)			
		MF	M	F	MF	M	F	GPI	MF	M	F	GPI	MF	M	F	GPI
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
Central Asia																
Kazakhstan	2009	+1	+1	+1	99	98	99	1.01	108 ⁺¹	107 ⁺¹	108 ⁺¹	1.01 ⁺¹	100	100	100	1.00
	2005	-	-	-	99	99	100	1.01	107	107	107	1.00	100	100	100	1.00
	2000	-	**	**	95**	97**	92**	0.95**	94**	94**	95**	1.01**	99**	100**	98**	0.98**
	1990
Kyrgyzstan	2009	-	-	-	96 ⁻¹	96 ⁻¹	97 ⁻¹	1.01 ⁻¹	94	94	95	1.01	100 ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	100 ⁻¹	1.00 ⁻¹
	2005	-	-	-	98	97	100	1.03	96	96	97	1.01	100	100	100	1.00
	2000	-	-	-	93	94	92	0.98	95	95	94	0.99	98	100	97	0.97
	1990
Mongolia	2009	-	-	-	94 ⁻²	94 ⁻²	95 ⁻²	1.01 ⁻²	93 ⁻¹	94 ⁻¹	92 ⁻¹	0.98 ⁻¹	98 ⁻¹	96 ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	1.03 ⁻¹
	2005	+1	+1	+1	84 ⁺¹	86 ⁺¹	83 ⁺¹	0.97 ⁺¹	110 ⁺¹	110 ⁺¹	110 ⁺¹	1.00 ⁺¹	96 ⁺¹	95 ⁺¹	97 ⁺¹	1.02 ⁺¹
	2000	1	1	1	89	86	92	1.07	90	87	93	1.06	97	95	98	1.03
	1990
Tajikistan	2009	-1	**,-2	**,-2	99 ⁻²	98 ⁻¹	97 ^{**,-2}	93 ^{**,-2}	0.96 ^{**,-2}	98 ⁻²
	2005	+1	**,+1	**,+1	99 ^{**,+1}	106 ⁺¹	108 ^{**,+1}	104 ^{**,+1}	0.96 ^{**,+1}	98 ⁺¹	98 ^{**,+1}	98 ^{**,+1}	0.99 ^{**,+1}
	2000	+1	**,+1	**,+1	96 ^{**,+1}	93 ^{**,+1}	100 ^{**,+1}	1.07 ^{**,+1}	98 ⁺¹	102 ^{**,+1}	94 ^{**,+1}	0.92 ^{**,+1}	98 ⁺¹	99 ^{**,+1}	98 ^{**,+1}	0.99 ^{**,+1}
	1990
Turkmenistan	2009
	2005
	2000
	1990
Uzbekistan	2009	-	-	-	98 ⁻¹	98 ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	1.01 ⁻¹	92	93	91	0.98	99 ⁻¹	100 ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	0.99 ⁻¹
	2005	-	-	-	98	98	99	1.01	98	99	97	0.98	100	100	100	1.00
	2000	+1	+1	+1	98 ⁺¹	100 ⁺¹	96 ⁺¹	0.96 ⁺¹	100 ⁺¹	101 ⁺¹	100 ⁺¹	0.99 ⁺¹	100 ⁺¹	99 ⁺¹	100 ⁺¹	1.01 ⁺¹
	1990
East Asia																
Brunei Darussalam	2009	1	1	-	96 ⁻²	96 ⁻²	96 ⁻²	1.00 ⁻²	104	103	104	1.01	99 ⁻¹	100 ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	0.99 ⁻¹
	2005	2	3	1	97	96	97	1.01	107	103	111	1.08	94	92	96	1.04
	2000	122	122	121	0.99
	1990	10 ⁺¹	80 ⁺¹	100 ⁺¹	78 ⁺¹
Cambodia	2009	11 ⁻¹	12 ⁻¹	10 ⁻¹	54 ⁻²	52 ⁻²	57 ⁻²	1.10 ⁻²	79 ⁻¹	80 ⁻¹	79 ⁻¹	0.99 ⁻¹	79 ⁻²	80 ⁻²	79 ⁻²	0.99 ⁻²
	2005	13 ⁺¹	14 ⁺¹	11 ⁺¹	54 ⁺¹	53 ⁺¹	56 ⁺¹	1.05 ⁺¹	87 ⁺¹	87 ⁺¹	86 ⁺¹	0.99 ⁺¹	79 ⁺¹	81 ⁺¹	78 ⁺¹	0.96 ⁺¹
	2000	16 ⁺¹	17 ⁺¹	16 ⁺¹	64 ⁺¹	65 ⁺¹	62 ⁺¹	0.95 ⁺¹	51 ⁺¹	57 ⁺¹	46 ⁺¹	0.80 ⁺¹	83 ⁺¹	86 ⁺¹	78 ⁺¹	0.91 ⁺¹
	1990
China	2009	-	-	-
	2005	+1	+1	+1
	2000
	1990	7	87	104	65
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	2009
	2005
	2000
	1990

Region Country or territory	Reference year	Percentage of repeaters			Survival rate to last grade of primary				Gross intake ratio to last grade of primary				Transition rate from primary to secondary (general programmes)			
		MF	M	F	MF	M	F	GPI	MF	M	F	GPI	MF	M	F	GPI
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
Hong Kong SAR of China	2009	1*	1*	1*	100 ⁻²	100 ⁻²	100 ⁻²	1.00 ⁻²	93*	92*	93*	1.01*	100 ^{*-1}	100 ^{*-1}	100 ^{*-1}	1.00 ^{*-1}
	2005	1	1	1	100	99	100	1.01	95	96	94	0.98	100	100	100	1.00
	2000	1 ⁺¹	99 ^{**+1}	108 ⁺¹	99 ⁺¹
	1990	1	96	102
Indonesia	2009	4	4	3	80 ⁻²	77 ⁻²	83 ⁻²	1.07 ⁻²	109	109	110	1.01	92 ⁻¹	91 ⁻¹	93 ⁻¹	1.02 ⁻¹
	2005	3 ⁻¹	3 ⁻¹	3 ⁻¹	83 ^{**,-1}	86 ^{**,-1}	81 ^{**,-1}	0.94 ^{**,-1}	103 ⁻¹	102 ⁻¹	104 ⁻¹	1.01 ⁻¹	78 ^{**,-1}	79 ^{**,-1}	78 ^{**,-1}	1.00 ^{**,-1}
	2000	6 ⁺¹	6 ⁺¹	6 ⁺¹	86 ⁺¹	83 ⁺¹	89 ⁺¹	1.07 ⁺¹	98 ⁺¹	98 ⁺¹	99 ⁺¹	1.01 ⁺¹	78 ^{**+1}	77 ^{**+1}	79 ^{**+1}	1.02 ^{**+1}
	1990	10	80	96	49	52	46	0.88
Japan	2009	-	-	-	100 ⁻¹	100 ⁻¹	100 ⁻¹	1.00 ⁻¹	102	102	102	1.00
	2005
	2000
	1990	-	-	-	101	100	101	1.00	100	100	100	1.00
Lao People's Democratic Republic	2009	17 ⁻¹	18 ⁻¹	16 ⁻¹	67 ⁻²	66 ⁻²	68 ⁻²	1.02 ⁻²	75 ⁻¹	78 ⁻¹	71 ⁻¹	0.91 ⁻¹	79 ⁻²	80 ⁻²	77 ⁻²	0.96 ⁻²
	2005	19	20	18	62	63	62	0.99	71	75	67	0.89	77 ^{**}	79 ^{**}	75 ^{**}	0.95 ^{**}
	2000	20	21	18	53	53	54	1.02	69	75	63	0.84	74	76	71	0.93
	1990	30	33	45	62
Macao, China	2009	6	8	5	98 ⁻¹	98 ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	1.01 ⁻¹	99	102	95	0.93	91 ⁻¹	89 ⁻¹	94 ⁻¹	1.05 ⁻¹
	2005	6	8	4	96	95	96	1.01	90	87	93	1.07
	2000	8	9	5	97	93	102	1.09	85	85	84	0.99
	1990	7	8	6	67	67	68	1.01	97	97	97	1.00	81	71	91	1.29
Malaysia	2009	. ⁻¹	. ⁻¹	. ⁻¹	96 ⁻²	96 ⁻²	96 ⁻²	1.01 ⁻²	97 ⁻¹	97 ⁻¹	97 ⁻¹	1.00 ⁻¹	99 ^{**,-2}	100 ^{**,-2}	98 ^{**,-2}	0.98 ^{**,-2}
	2005	. ⁺¹	. ⁺¹	. ⁺¹	92 ⁺¹	92 ⁺¹	92 ⁺¹	1.00 ⁺¹	96 ⁺¹	97 ⁺¹	96 ⁺¹	1.00 ⁺¹	99 ^{**+1}	100 ^{**+1}	98 ^{**+1}	0.98 ^{**+1}
	2000	. ⁻¹	. ⁻¹	. ⁻¹	94 ⁻¹	95 ⁻¹	93 ⁻¹	0.99 ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	98 ⁻¹	100 ⁻¹	1.02 ⁻¹
	1990	83	83	83	1.01	90	90	90	1.00
Myanmar	2009	-	-	-	70 ⁻¹	70 ⁻¹	69 ⁻¹	0.99 ⁻¹	99	98	100	1.02	73 ⁻¹	74 ⁻¹	73 ⁻¹	0.98 ⁻¹
	2005	1 ⁻¹	1 ⁻¹	1 ⁻¹	87 ⁻¹	88 ⁻¹	87 ⁻¹	0.99 ⁻¹	72 ^{**,-1}	72 ^{**,-1}	71 ^{**,-1}	0.98 ^{**,-1}
	2000	1	1	1	55	55	55	1.00	80	82	78	0.95	66	67	65	0.98
	1990
Philippines	2009	2 ⁻¹	3 ⁻¹	2 ⁻¹	75 ⁻²	71 ⁻²	80 ⁻²	1.13 ⁻²	94 ⁻¹	91 ⁻¹	97 ⁻¹	1.06 ⁻¹	99 ⁻²	99 ⁻²	98 ⁻²	0.99 ⁻²
	2005	2	3	2	70	66	75	1.14	94	90	98	1.08	98	99	97	0.98
	2000	2 ⁺¹	2 ⁺¹	1 ⁺¹	75 ⁺¹	71 ⁺¹	80 ⁺¹	1.12 ⁺¹	101 ⁺¹	97 ⁺¹	106 ⁺¹	1.10 ⁺¹	98 ⁺¹	98 ⁺¹	97 ⁺¹	0.99 ⁺¹
	1990	2	61	88	89
Republic of Korea	2009	-	-	-	99 ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	1.00 ⁻¹	101	102	101	0.99	100 ⁻¹	100 ⁻¹	100 ⁻¹	1.00 ⁻¹
	2005	-	-	-	99	98	99	1.00	99	101	96	0.95	99	99	99	0.99
	2000	. ⁻¹	. ⁻¹	. ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	1.00 ⁻¹	100 ⁻¹	100 ⁻¹	101 ⁻¹	1.02 ⁻¹	100 ⁻¹	100 ⁻¹	100 ⁻¹	1.00 ⁻¹
	1990	-	-	-	88	87	88	1.01	99	99	100	1.02
Singapore	2009	-	-	-	99 ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	1.00 ⁻¹	89 ⁻¹	86 ⁻¹	92 ⁻¹	1.07 ⁻¹
	2005
	2000
	1990
Thailand	2009	9 ⁻²	12 ⁻²	6 ⁻²
	2005	87 ⁺¹	85 ⁺¹	89 ⁺¹	1.05 ⁺¹
	2000	3 ⁻¹	3 ⁻¹	4 ⁻¹	87 ^{**,-1}	87 ^{**,-1}	87 ^{**,-1}	0.99 ^{**,-1}
	1990

Region Country or territory	Reference year	Percentage of repeaters			Survival rate to last grade of primary				Gross intake ratio to last grade of primary				Transition rate from primary to secondary (general programmes)			
		MF	M	F	MF	M	F	GPI	MF	M	F	GPI	MF	M	F	GPI
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
Timor-Leste	2009	20	21	18	80 ⁻¹	80 ⁻¹	79 ⁻¹	0.98 ⁻¹	87 ⁻¹	86 ⁻¹	88 ⁻¹	1.02 ⁻¹
	2005
	2000
	1990
Viet Nam	2009
	2005	1	93 ^{**}
	2000	3 ⁺¹	3 ⁺¹	2 ⁺¹	89 ⁺¹	90 ⁺¹	88 ⁺¹	0.98 ⁺¹	102 ⁺¹	105 ⁺¹	100 ⁺¹	0.96 ⁺¹	95 ⁺¹	95 ⁺¹	94 ⁺¹	1.00 ⁺¹
	1990
Pacific																
Australia	2009
	2005
	2000
	1990
Cook Islands	2009	.. ⁺¹	.. ⁺¹	.. ⁺¹	102 ^{*,+1}	101 ^{*,+1}	103 ^{*,+1}	1.02 ^{*,+1}
	2005
	2000	3 ⁻¹	88 ^{*,+1}	90 ^{*,+1}	86 ^{*,+1}	0.96 ^{*,+1}
	1990
Fiji	2009	2 ⁻¹	2 ⁻¹	1 ⁻¹	92 ⁻¹	92 ⁻¹	91 ⁻¹	0.99 ⁻¹	100 ⁻²	99 ⁻²	100 ⁻²	1.00 ⁻²
	2005	2 ^{**}	3 ^{**}	2 ^{**}	101 ^{**}	101 ^{**}	101 ^{**}	1.01 ^{**}	96 ^{**}	96 ^{**}	97 ^{**}	1.01 ^{**}
	2000	.. ⁻¹	.. ⁻¹	.. ⁻¹	82 ⁻¹	82 ⁻¹	82 ⁻¹	1.00 ⁻¹	104 ⁻¹	104 ⁻¹	105 ⁻¹	1.01 ⁻¹	100 ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	100 ⁻¹	1.01 ⁻¹
	1990
Kiribati	2009
	2005	118 ^{**}	118 ^{**}	118 ^{**}	1.00 ^{**}
	2000	.. ⁺¹	.. ⁺¹	.. ⁺¹	69 ⁺¹	72 ⁺¹	67 ⁺¹	0.94 ⁺¹	117 ⁺¹	117 ⁺¹	117 ⁺¹	1.00 ⁺¹
	1990	1	1	1	101	100	102	1.01	35	35	34	0.98
Marshall Islands	2009	.	.	.	83 ⁻¹	87 ⁻¹	80 ⁻¹	0.91 ⁻¹	94	93	94	1.01	91 ⁻¹	92 ⁻¹	90 ⁻¹	0.97 ⁻¹
	2005	.. ⁺¹	.. ⁺¹	.. ⁺¹	71 ⁺¹	69 ⁺¹	72 ⁺¹	1.04 ⁺¹	106 ⁺¹	104 ⁺¹	107 ⁺¹	1.02 ⁺¹	93 ⁺¹	91 ⁺¹	96 ⁺¹	1.06 ⁺¹
	2000	.. ^{*,+1}	.. ^{*,+1}	.. ^{*,+1}
	1990
Micronesia (Federated States of)	2009
	2005
	2000
	1990
Nauru	2009	97 ^{*,+2}	96 ^{*,+2}	99 ^{*,+2}	1.03 ^{*,+2}
	2005
	2000	-	-	-
	1990
New Zealand	2009
	2005
	2000
	1990	3 ⁺¹	4 ⁺¹	3 ⁺¹
Niue	2009
	2005	126 ^{**}	123 ^{**}	130 ^{**}	1.06 ^{**}
	2000	.. ⁻¹	.. ⁻¹	.. ⁻¹	85 ^{*,+1}	88 ^{*,+1}	83 ^{*,+1}	0.95 ^{*,+1}
	1990	96 ⁺¹

Region Country or territory	Reference year	Percentage of repeaters			Survival rate to last grade of primary				Gross intake ratio to last grade of primary				Transition rate from primary to secondary (general programmes)			
		MF	M	F	MF	M	F	GPI	MF	M	F	GPI	MF	M	F	GPI
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
Palau	2009
	2005
	2000	-	-	-	99*	107*	90*	0.85 [†]
	1990
Papua New Guinea	2009
	2005
	2000	-	-	-	53	58	49	0.84
	1990	-	-	-	48	50	47	0.93	48	54	43	0.80
Samoa	2009	1	1	1	93	97	90	0.93
	2005	1** ⁻¹	1** ⁻¹	1** ⁻¹	96** ⁻¹	95** ⁻¹	98** ⁻¹	1.04** ⁻¹
	2000	1 ⁻¹	1 ⁻¹	1 ⁻¹	90* ⁻¹	88* ⁻¹	92* ⁻¹	1.04* ⁻¹	95 ⁻¹	100 ⁻¹	90 ⁻¹	0.90 ⁻¹	93 ⁻¹	87 ⁻¹	99 ⁻¹	1.14 ⁻¹
	1990
Solomon Islands	2009
	2005
	2000	56**	57**	55**	0.97**
	1990	10	61	61
Tokelau	2009
	2005
	2000	. ⁺¹	. ⁺¹	. ⁺¹	156* ⁺¹	164* ⁺¹	147* ⁺¹	0.90* ⁺¹	67 ⁺¹	53 ⁺¹	86 ⁺¹	1.62 ⁺¹
	1990
Tonga	2009
	2005	5	5	4	90	89	91	1.02	111	110	111	1.02	71	72	69	0.97
	2000	9 ⁻¹	8 ⁻¹	9 ⁻¹	98 ⁻¹	96 ⁻¹	101 ⁻¹	1.05 ⁻¹	72** ⁻¹	74** ⁻¹	69** ⁻¹	0.93** ⁻¹
	1990	4	4	4	128	136	119	0.88
Tuvalu	2009
	2005	106*	102*	110*	1.08*
	2000	.**	.**	.**	110**	108**	112**	1.04**	61**	69**	51**	0.74**
	1990	-	-	-	69	77	57	0.74
Vanuatu	2009	14	15	13	71 ⁻¹	74 ⁻¹	69 ⁻¹	0.94 ⁻¹	83	83	83	1.00
	2005	51	50	51	1.02
	2000	11** ⁻¹	11** ⁻¹	10** ⁻¹	69 ⁻¹	67 ⁻¹	71 ⁻¹	1.06 ⁻¹	85** ⁻¹	85** ⁻¹	85** ⁻¹	1.00** ⁻¹	44 ⁻¹	43** ⁻¹	46** ⁻¹	1.07** ⁻¹
	1990
South and West Asia																
Afghanistan	2009
	2005	16	18	14	39	55	21	0.39
	2000
	1990
Bangladesh	2009	13*	14*	13*	67* ⁻¹	67* ⁻¹	66* ⁻¹	0.98* ⁻¹	61*	58*	63*	1.09*
	2005	10	10	10	55	52	58	1.10	61	59	63	1.07	93	90	95	1.06
	2000	59	58	61	1.07
	1990	47	52	41	0.79
Bhutan	2009	7	7	6	90 ⁻¹	84 ⁻¹	95 ⁻¹	1.12 ⁻¹	88	85	92	1.09	94 ⁻¹	91 ⁻¹	96 ⁻¹	1.05 ⁻¹
	2005	10	10	9	84	81	88	1.08	65	65	65	0.99	93	92	94	1.03
	2000	13	14	13	81	78	85	1.09	52	55	48	0.87	82	82	83	1.00
	1990

Region Country or territory	Reference year	Percentage of repeaters			Survival rate to last grade of primary				Gross intake ratio to last grade of primary				Transition rate from primary to secondary (general programmes)			
		MF	M	F	MF	M	F	GPI	MF	M	F	GPI	MF	M	F	GPI
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
India	2009	3 ⁻¹	3 ⁻²	3 ⁻²	95 ⁻¹	95 ⁻¹	94 ⁻¹	0.99 ⁻¹	81 ⁻²	81 ⁻²	81 ⁻²	1.00 ⁻²
	2005	3	3	3	66	66	65	0.99	85	88	83	0.94	84	86	82	0.96
	2000	4	4	4	59	59	59	0.99	72	80	64	0.80	87	88	85	0.96
	1990
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	2009	2	2	2	94 ⁻¹	94 ⁻¹	94 ⁻¹	1.00 ⁻¹	101	101	101	1.00	97 ⁻¹	96 ⁻¹	97 ⁻¹	1.01 ⁻¹
	2005	2	3	2	109	104	114	1.10	88	93	83	0.90
	2000	5	7	4	97	98	97	0.99	102	104	99	0.95	90	90	90	1.01
	1990	10	12	8	69	72	65	0.90	84	89	78	0.87	68	70	66	0.95
Maldives	2009	4	4	3	119	127	112	0.88	86 ⁻¹	84 ⁻¹	89 ⁻¹	1.07 ⁻¹
	2005	5	6	4	138	142	134	0.94	81	76	85	1.12
	2000
	1990
Nepal	2009	14 ⁺¹	14 ⁺¹	14 ⁺¹	62 ⁻²	60 ⁻²	64 ⁻²	1.07 ⁻²	81 ⁻²	81 ⁻²	81 ⁻²	1.00 ⁻²
	2005	22 ^{**,-1}	22 ^{**,-1}	22 ^{**,-1}	62 ^{**,-1}	57 ^{**,-1}	67 ^{**,-1}	1.17 ^{**,-1}
	2000	25	25	25	46	42	52	1.23	66	74	57	0.77	72	71	73	1.02
	1990	27 ⁺¹	36 ⁺¹	51 ⁺¹	66 ⁺¹
Pakistan	2009	3	3	3	60 ⁻¹	61 ⁻¹	60 ⁻¹	0.98 ⁻¹	61	68	54	0.79	72 ⁻¹	73 ⁻¹	72 ⁻¹	0.99 ⁻¹
	2005	3	3	3	61	71	50	0.71	72	69	75	1.08
	2000
	1990
Sri Lanka	2009	1	1	1	97	97	98	1.01	96 ⁻¹	95 ⁻¹	97 ⁻¹	1.02 ⁻¹
	2005	1 ^{**}	1 ^{**}	1 ^{**}	93 ^{**}	93 ^{**}	94 ^{**}	1.00 ^{**}	112 ^{**}	112 ^{**}	112 ^{**}	1.00 ^{**}	97 ^{**}	96 ^{**}	97 ^{**}	1.01 ^{**}
	2000	1 ⁺¹	2 ⁺¹	1 ⁺¹	107 ⁺¹	108 ⁺¹	107 ⁺¹	0.99 ⁺¹	98 ^{**,+1}	97 ^{**,+1}	99 ^{**,+1}	1.02 ^{**,+1}
	1990	8	9	7	93	92	94	1.02	98	98	98	1.00	86	85	88	1.03

Note: Data extracted from the UIS database on October 2011.

Symbol:

... No data available


** For country data: UIS estimation

For regional averages: Partial imputation due to incomplete country coverage (between 25% to 75% of the population)

* National estimation

x⁺ⁿ Data refer to the school or financial year n years after the reference year

x⁻ⁿ Data refer to the school or financial year n years prior the reference year



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

UNESCO Bangkok

Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education

Mom Luang Pin Malakul Centenary Building
920 Sukhumvit Road, Prakanong, Klongtoey
Bangkok 10110, Thailand
E-mail: bangkok@unesco.org
Website: www.unesco.org/bangkok
Tel: +66-2-3910577 Fax: +66-2-3910866

unicef 
unite for children

UNICEF East Asia and Pacific Regional Office (EAPRO)

19 Phra Atit Road
Chanasongkram, Phra Nakorn
Bangkok 10200, Thailand
E-mail: eapro@unicef.org
Website: www.unicef.org/eapro
Tel: +662-356-9499 Fax: +662-280-3563

UNICEF Regional Office for South Asia (ROSA)

Lekhnath Marg, Kathmandu, Nepal
E-mail: rosa@unicef.org
Website: www.unicef.org/rosa and
www.unicef.org/southasia
Tel: +977-1-4417-082
Fax: +977-1-4419-479 and 4418-466