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Summary Report
A Dialogue on Education and Development to 2015 and Beyond

On the 11 December 2012, UKFIET hosted a DFID/UKFIET dialogue at the Institute of Education University of London on *Education and Development to 2015 and Beyond*. Twenty eight participants followed a five session programme comprising:

**SETTING THE GLOBAL SCENE: POST 2015**  
**LEARNING LESSONS 2000-2012**  
**MAKING THE CASE FOR EDUCATION POST 2015**  
**ADDRESSING REAL NEEDS POST 2015**  
**DEFINING POST 2015 FRAMEWORKS**

This summary report follows the sequence of the programme. The list of participants and short resource lists are attached. Presentations can be accessed on the UKFIET website at [http://www.ukfiet.org/](http://www.ukfiet.org/)

**Setting the Scene**

The *global environment* in which new post-2015 frameworks are being negotiated is significantly different from 2000 when commitments were made to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the Education for All (EFA) Goals. Desmond Bermingham (Chair UKFIET Trustees) identified some of the significant trends influencing the formulation of post-2015 compacts.

The world’s *population* profiles are changing. Poverty is concentrated in a small group of large countries: six income states (India, Nigeria, China, Pakistan, Indonesia and the Philippines); four low income countries (Bangladesh, DRC, UR Tanzania and Ethiopia). Five and half billion people in the least developed regions of the world will live in cities by 2050. Globally, people over 60 years of age will outnumber children under the age of 15 by 2050. This group will constitute 25% of Asia’s population by 2025 (nearly 30% in Europe). The youth population (15-24) is flattening out. After rising from 0.7 billion in 1970 to 1.20 billion in 2010, the projected total for 2050 is 1.25 billion. These profiles and patterns have implications for the provision and financing of education.

The dangers of *climate change* are intensifying. Falling crop yields, rising sea levels, loss of eco-diversity, and extreme weather events are increasingly disruptive of secure and stable lives and livelihoods. *Patterns of projected economic growth* show major shifts in the geo-politics of development. Growth rates of over 5% per annum are now characteristic of China, India, Sub-Saharan Africa and Indonesia. Official foreign exchange reserves in “emerging regions” are almost double those of the “rich world”. Patterns of *armed conflict* are showing a long term fall in interstate warfare with in-country *societal warfare* being much more prevalent in the 21st century. *Democracy* is on the rise: from 20 to 90 countries in the last 60 years (states with a population of over 500,000). And personal *technologies* are changing everyone’s lives with mobile phones penetrating even the poorest communities.

Sources and types of *aid and development cooperation* are changing too. Net aid from DAC donors is falling (from a 2010 peak) but private philanthropy flows have almost doubled since 2005. Recent estimates show $55.9 billion from private giving; $42.1 billion from bilateral assistance; $27.2 billion from multilateral assistance; and, $15 billion from South-South assistance.

A map of United Nations’ 2013-2015 activity is provided in the figure below: it is a complex and multi-faceted process. A UN Task Team (UNCTT) coordinates virtually all of the UN agencies.

A High Level Panel (UK Prime Minister and the Presidents of Liberia and Indonesia) has been established by the UN Secretary General. A UN Working Group is developing Sustainable Development Goals and there are at least 50 national and nine thematic consultations. Important milestones in 2013 include the report of the UN High Level Panel in March and the United Nations General Assembly MDG Review Summit in September. As the annex to this report shows there is a variety of regional, national, NGO/CSO and research activity that is contributing to, and commenting on, the mainstream of UN programming.

David Cameron’s stated objectives for the High Level Panel are: the eradication of poverty; finishing the work of the current MDG agenda; tackling the causes as well as the symptoms of poverty; asking the poorest themselves what they want; and a simple, bold and ambitious framework of goals.

As the resource lists annexed to this summary show, there are important education dialogues taking place too. These include: a post 2015 global consultation on education convened by UNESCO and UNICEF; the UN Secretary General’s Initiative on Education – Education First; the UIS and Brookings Institute Learning Metrics Task Force; and the Commonwealth Ministers of Education Working Group on Recommendations for the Post 2015 Development Framework for Education.

**Issues/Questions**
**Trends:**
- Insufficient attention to equity and equality within and across countries. In the recession, the voice of the rich in the Western world is stronger than the voice of the poor. The redistributive nature of aid is overshadowed by the failures of fairer trade. And there is much less consensus now on how to achieve economic development
- The emerging economies have a very different world views to those of OECD DAC countries
- Conflict takes new cross national forms: corruption and crime.
- Gender based violence is pervasive
- Patterns of gender equity are changing – more so in education than in employment

**Process:**
- Will new global compacts recognise poverty as a truly global issue? Will the complexities of poverty be recognised? Or will a reductionist view be taken? It seems – at present – that there is room for these debates.
- How will the findings of diverse international post 2015 processes come together? As the yet the answer is unclear.
Lesson Learning

Pauline Rose (Director of the EFA Global Monitoring Report) introduced a debate on education and development 2000-2012 at a time when education’s honeymoon appear to be over.

The six EFA goals illustrate the challenges associated with global goal setting. For example, differentiation is needed between the broader purposes of education and goal setting designed to hold governments to account. Similarly, benchmarking global progress should not be incompatible with national timelines. Universally clear definitions are required. Measures of equity and equality are necessary (see http://www.education-inequalities.org/). These are relatively well handled by the EFA goals except for the quality of learning goal. The education related MDGs were defined more narrowly; they are not directly compatible with the EFA goals and use different indicators.

The new World Inequality Database on Education heightens our knowledge of important intra-country inequities associated with gender, wealth, and location. These interrelated factors impact on access, participation, progression and transition. Ghana, Pakistan and Bangladesh illustrate stark intra-country disparities that do not appear in national statistical data and reporting.

The global community needs to be much smarter post-2015. What are the educational goals that must be in the broad post-2015 agenda, in the almost certain knowledge that they will be narrowed down? There is a danger that the debate will focus on clearly measureable goals that could lead to either nothing being included; or the adoption of a single dominating goal that lacks broad global agreement; for example am MDG on learning and not completion. Goals are needed for equitable access AND learning with targets that are clearly defined, measurable (including equity) and based on data that can be collected within defined timeframes.

The accountability of donors has been weak. And despite a focus on poverty and basic education, at least half of aid to education has been spent on higher education (most of which remains in developed countries). The UK is an important exception to this fact, as the figure below shows. New compacts must hold the international community to much greater account for their commitments.

---

**Ensuring aid is spent in countries most in need**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% aid by type of spending, 2010 ($millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues/Questions

• The circumstances of Western governments in 2000 and 2012 are very different. How driven will their governments be in according priority, politically and financially to new global compacts and at a time when the Paris/Accra agendas are weakening significantly?
• Attention to countries in conflict brings with it a much closer association of foreign policy, defence and aid agendas which are neither easily negotiated nor managed in the interests of poor people. DFID retains its aid budget but this is being diversified into conflict and security related issues.
• How will the major debate on the increasing involvement of the private sector be negotiated post 2015 in meeting the needs of those who live in absolute poverty?
• Much greater attention should be given to scholarships that are related to MDG issues. Real aid, says the OECD should be focused on the poorest.
• Employment and getting people into jobs is conspicuous by its absence in education and learning debates.
• Measuring equity is problematic. Household surveys should be used more with much greater attention to their regularity and comparability across countries.
• The education community must work more creatively in communicating progress towards the MDGs and EFA goals.

Making the Case for Education Post 2015

Nicholas Burnett (Results for Development Institute, Washington) asked - are we becoming irrelevant – on the grounds that there is a strong danger that the international education community is not focussed on the developments that are most relevant to education in the developing world.

This was not to question the existence of positive trends. The MDG education goals are arguably closest to being met, even though they will not be achieved by 2015 and their focus is on enrolment rather than learning. There does, however, appear to be a growing consensus around the need for some sort of global learning goal. Ban Ki-moon has announced the Education First initiative, designed, even at this late stage, to meet the 2015 education goals. And Gordon Brown is the new United Nations Special Envoy for Global Education. The UN agencies, especially UNESCO, are finally, waking up to the imminent arrival of 2015, though still mired in the basic education culture of EFA.

Various recent international reports (2012 EFA Global Monitoring Report on skills and the 2013 World Development Report 2013 on jobs) are important markers of the role of education and training in enhancing employability. The revamping of the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) and creation of the International Education Funders Group are positive steps too.

At the same time, too many discussions on post-2015 education goals are taking place within an education bubble, increasingly divorced from the wider global discussions. There is insufficient support for including education in any future MDGs, beyond a debate around the existing MDGs. Even if there is agreement on a revamped set of MDGs, there is no sign of present education being included. The UN High Level Panel is in danger of championing the discredited “Washington consensus”: get macroeconomic management and incentives right and development will follow. The European Commission is almost ignoring education in its preparation for MDG discussions. The United States has not put education on the table as one of its priorities. Even more worrying is the stance taken by the major emerging economies: for example, there is no championing of education by China, India, Mexico, and Indonesia. There is also the widespread perception, outside of the education fraternity, that education’s MDGs have largely been met and no longer need prioritization. Other than the UK and Australia, bilateral donors are all cutting their aid for education, in some cases drastically. The Netherlands, for example, a former leader in educational aid is now cutting back overall aid to below the 0.7% UN target. And there is the 22% cut in UNESCO’s budget as the US is not paying its dues. All this reflects in part on our poor marketing of education. Think of all the items at the top of the global agenda (security/terrorism, climate change, jobs, global health) and it is evident that all require education for effective solutions. Yet education is not up there on this list.
A second area of concern is the major gaps in the education community’s global agenda. For example insufficient is being paid to:

- Equity within education; admirably treated by the EFA GMR in recent years but with almost zero policy reform or international action.
- The growth of the non-state sector and innovation associated with it. You would not really know from the behaviour of agencies such as UNESCO and UNICEF that this is now the most dynamic aspect of education for the poor, increasingly challenging the urban public sector model the international community has promoted over the last 20-30 years.
- The impending technological revolution that I believe, will lead to the end of the classroom as we know it and to a radical transformation of the teacher from purveyor of knowledge to facilitator of skill and knowledge acquisition.
- On secondary education, the international education is largely quiet. Yet in every region except Africa, this is the level which the majority of entrants to the workforce now come. This is likely to be true even in Africa within a decade.
- The informal economy where most jobs lie in developing countries
- Teacher recruitment where it is clear from the record of the countries like Singapore and Finland that recruiting top people into teaching is critical. This fact can only become more relevant as teachers’ roles shift to becoming facilitators. This is difficult in political terms because of the generally heavy rates of unionization of teachers, but it must be tackled.
- The underfunding of public goods in education. There is simply too little funding available for such things as data, research, evaluation, analysis.

The education community needs to get its head out of the sand to make sure that education is on the map, acutely aware of broader global agendas. It lacks major champions: there is no educational Bill Gates. And the dialogue that is taking place is largely in the North.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues/Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The absence of a clear vision of and for education. Everyone has view of education often based on their own experience rather than evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lack of education is itself a measure of poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education takes place in a variety of contexts – political and cultural - but global debate pays far too little attention to this complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The priority accorded to basic education in the MDGs has been a source of tension in education sector aid relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The health sector is increasingly aware of the benefits of education; more cross sector awareness pays dividends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid for education must not be polarised into private-public, or individual- society debates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should be concerned with human development, not just education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Addressing Real Needs Post 2015**

Building on earlier sessions, **Professor Keith Lewin (Professor of Education University of Sussex)** identified some drivers for change in education and development post 2015. Looking down life’s highway new scenarios are emerging that play on education and development:

- Greater energy self-sufficiency in the USA and the UK
- The rise of the G30; a Pacific century under Chinese leadership
- Issues around security – containment or contagion across cultures
- More students studying in situ/remotely
- Device led knowledge – 21st century skills?
- The privatisation of knowledge and education
- Changing age group dependency ratios (see above)
- Needing to service the service sector
- Rebuilding balance sheets - what is the discount rate of capital?
- Aid without trade
New types of aid (direct, micro, single issue, privatised)
Uncertainties, conflict, pandemics

In the zones of exclusion within formal schooling researched in the CREATE project (http://www.create-rpc.org/) it is clear that many factors impact on whether more children learn equitably in school and progress to higher levels of learning. These include: poverty; location; orphan-hood; disability; gender, language, pedagogies; child labour; resources; fragility; social protection; and infrastructure. These considerations will necessarily play on how learning will change in low income countries post 2015. If a global learning goal is being contemplated, how will it reflect these factors and how – in reality – will it be both new and contribute to a better map for learning? Additionally, how will changing demographics affect the landscapes of learning in relation to wealth, gender and location?

Changes in global labour markets are of major significance. The rise of the service sector (and the quaternary sector) has important implications for learning. The arithmetic of youth unemployment is particularly challenging. At the upper secondary level aspirations are unlikely to match with labour market realities. At the junior secondary level, drop out and school leaving may be coupled with a failure to be selected for higher levels of education. At the primary level, young people may queue for jobs and take several years to assimilate into the labour market.

The aid industry is changing too. The BRIC group has limited enthusiasm for the Paris and Accra accords on aid effectiveness and the language and the practice of early 21st century aid. And will traditional donors have the enthusiasm and the will to rebuild their aid balance sheets post 2015 and maintain investment in education as a priority?

Issues/Questions
- The service economy is generating more and more employment in all but the poorest economies; this has implications for how learning needs to change to reflect changing labour markets
- The aspirations of graduates will increasingly not be met as the output of secondary and tertiary graduates outstrips employment growth in many countries; acknowledged in dialogue in countries such as Korea and China
- What are the new 21st century skills that can be learned in schools, which are not 20th century skills?
- The private sector is often dissatisfied with the ability of education systems to deliver the right skills matrix but is its expectations realistic and equitable?
- Investing in girls’ education has greatly reduced disparities in participation, but there remains a distance to travel especially in some parts of the Arab world, South Asia and low income Africa

Against this backdrop, participants split in to four groups on: learning; demography, labour markets and aid. Abbreviated conclusions are noted below.

A Learning Goal?
- Literacy and numeracy acquisition and monitoring. measurements are essential
- Measures of transferable functional skills are needed
- Age specific learning goals are critical to universal access to education
- Learning beyond the early grades matters for development since this is dependent on knowledge and skill at secondary level and above
- Learning goals have to be coupled with indicators of participation or high levels of achievement can coexist with very uneven patterns of access which are inequitable and inefficient.
- Education goals have to be understood in relation to characteristics of systems and valid theories of change rather than as statements of desirable outcomes divorced from feasible strategies to achieve outcomes.

Demography
- Demographic transition to low growth was happening in more and more countries with implications for changed dependency ratios and relationships between the old on the young
- Demographic transition allows more to be invested per child with the same level of financial commitment and this may change maps of learning
- Equity and distribution interact with demographic change to create opportunities and risks for educational development that is inclusive and which has utility. Managing change equitable will be a central feature of the
Labour Markets

- What are the implications of changing patterns of employment and the growth of services and the quaternary sector for education, curricula and pedagogies?
- The context of labour markets varies considerably and requires different educational responses that seek to balance the basic arithmetic of youth unemployment.
- The interests of capital and employers shape skill definition in relation to jobs; this may lead to bi-modal labour markets with demand for low skill and high skill employees but gaps in demand at the middle level.

Aid

- Are we at a tipping point in the nature of aid? Will post 2015 goals be constructed by a much broader constituency than in 2000 including BRICs, sovereign wealth funds, and major recipients? How will this affect modalities and volumes and aid effectiveness?
- Will direct aid (people to people, group to group?) grow or remain marginal to bilateral and multi lateral aid?
- Will donors reduce investment in education and if they do how will this have an impact on poverty and growth?
- There are major tensions across very different types of aid and their conditionalities. Target setters are not always target getters; goals need to evolve to reflect progress and failures; opportunities and risks need to be more clearly linked to accountabilities and attributions.

Defining Post 2015 Frameworks

A panel of five participants offered an assessment of issues around the development of post 2015 frameworks. Susan Nicolai (Research Manager/Fellow ODI) looked at what successful goals look like drawing on research in the health sector with the Gates Foundation. Goals and frameworks should create global awareness, set agendas, and be capable of holding governments to account. There should be a strong technical basis for goals to be successful. Targets should be feasible and realistic in order to sustain enthusiasm and commitment. Goals should be doable using low cost strategies. Initiatives can be successful in leveraging longer term investment. Public monitoring is important. Education needs to learn from the health sector.

Contrary to some of the earlier discussion, Susan was confident that education would find a place in the new global MDG frameworks. This time around a single education goal is more likely with some sub-components in other goals. There will not be an education “package”. But there is a real opportunity to develop the EFA goals to provide a broader global education framework.

ODI has engaged in conducting country case studies as part of its Development Progress project. These have included work on MDG2 (including Benin, Ethiopia, Cambodia). This work focused on access and analysed how progress had been made. Second phase work is looking at learning quality and post primary education and skills. This is proving much more problematic.

Albert Motivans (Head of Statistics UNESCO UIS) stressed the importance of good data. Both EFA and MDG goals lacked data rigour in their design. A long view is needed. Currently, an assessment of progress 2000-2015 is required as is the development of strong 2015 baselines which need to be in place early – including on equity and learning.

There has been progress since 2000. There is a foundation on which to build. National assessments have doubled over the past decade; an indication of a growing interest in outcomes. Regional initiatives (e.g. SACMEQ) have flourished too, enabling the development of useful regional benchmarks. Political awareness of the value of sometimes sensitive data (e.g. HIV/AIDS) has increased in some countries. Household surveys are new powerful tools. They are increasingly compatible through international cooperation. National administrative data remains deeply problematic but there have been significant improvements in some countries (e.g. Mali).
A “full court press” is now needed on equity and learning. National ownership of national goals is required. Demand for good data has to be built. There is promise on the learning front – much less so on equity, where the pressure is coming primarily from external agencies.

Olav Seim (Director EFA International Coordination Team UNESCO) recognised the unusual circumstances of global education in having both the MDG and EFA frameworks. These parallel agendas are different in their scope, focus and logic (see figure below).

In moving forward, the future of the EFA and MDG education goals remains an open question. The MDGs may translate into Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The education community needs to think hard about the implications of such a framework for the sector. EFA remains relevant (as UNESCO discussions at a ministerial level have confirmed) but they need revision, refinement and stronger, workable indicators. Guiding, underpinning principles must include equity, sustainability, inclusion and non-discrimination. Economic growth is an insufficient driver; greater attention to values, to dignity, and to global citizenship is required. And a national and local focus is essential in underpinning regional and global frameworks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFA Goals</th>
<th>Education-related MDGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Education</td>
<td>Primary Schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal and Non Formal Education</td>
<td>Formal Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children, Youth and Adults</td>
<td>(School-age) Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Education &amp; Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>School Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Agenda</td>
<td>Focus on Lower-income Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights Perspective</td>
<td>Instrumental Role of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the national level more attention should be given to rights and entitlements and to cultural diversity and local context. The political economy of education is insufficiently examined. And more generally, though investment is important so too are the public goods of ideas, knowledge generation and the management of innovation.

There are seven key challenges in going forward:

- Balancing global and national dimensions
- Working bottom up rather than top down
- Setting aspirational and realistic goals
- Reflecting local context and challenges
- Setting goals and indicators that are measurable and concrete (you measure what is measurable)
- Setting indicators for “life skills”
- Moving out of the educational silo; strengthening multi-sector dimensions

Ed Barnett (Education and Skills Team DFID) shared some draft formulations on future education goals, learning from the experience of the MDGs. The need for a political consensus in both North and South around clear, tangible, results-oriented education goals was clear. More attention was required to learning and to what happens in schools. A broader sector view beyond primary was needed with much greater attention to growing inequities.
Ten – substantial questions were posited:

- Should education be a post-2015 priority?
- Who should the goals apply to? All countries or only the poorest countries?
- How do we reach the hardest to reach?
- Is appropriate data available or expected to be available?
- What constitutes a relevant education in the 21st century?
- How should equity concerns be reflected?
- How best to focus on access and learning?
- How should a post 2015 framework relate to EFA?
- Should all levels of the education cycle be included?
- How should education respond to cross cutting issues including conflict and climate change?

Some initial thoughts on goals, targets and indicators were reviewed. On goals areas of focus include: every girl and boy in schools and learning; appropriate education and skills for productive participation in society; every girl and boy gets a good start in life; every girl and boy grows up to achieve their potential; and ensure children everywhere receive quality education and have good learning outcomes. The focus here is on children and primarily on schools. Flowing from these goals targets would encompass:

- **Learning** (All girls and boys achieve country specific learning targets at pre-primary, primary and lower secondary levels)
- **Access/inclusion** (All girls and boys complete a full course of pre-primary, primary and secondary schooling)
- **Transition** (All girls and boys move successfully from pre-primary to primary and from primary to secondary school)
- **Equity** (Disadvantaged girls and boys, including those with disabilities, and from religious and ethnic minorities have equal access to effective learning in school.

On indicators, possibilities include:

- The proportion of children achieving a benchmarked set of age-appropriate competencies at each stage of the education cycle from ECD to secondary/tertiary
- Access measures disaggregated by sex, socio-economic background and disability
- Transition rates from one cycle to the next
- The rate of progress of the bottom learning quintile is at least as fast as the average rate of progress at a country level.

The key challenges to making a new or adjusted set of education goals work include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the goal/target/indicator structure right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should education have 1 (or 2) aspirational goal(s) that are universally applicable across UN member states?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could a set of indicators apply universally in terms of an agreed set of key measures needed to demonstrate achievement of the goal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should the targets be nationally defined based on contextual 2015 starting points (baseline)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can equity be adequately reflected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should detailed goals covering all education levels (EFA replacements) sit under a macro goal (MDG replacement)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Simon McGrath (Director of Research School of Education University of Nottingham)** saw the need for a major education meta-goal capable of encompassing both learning and equity. Without this it was unlikely that there would sufficient purchase both globally and nationally in make the case for education. Additionally, the argument must not be lost that education plays a critical role in achieving development goals across the board. This may be understood in the educational fraternity;
less so more widely. As noted earlier, education needs to think beyond its own box and build alliances across sectors and provide a strong demonstration effect in this regard.

In the early post 2015 period (the first 1000 days?) demonstrably valuable initiative should be both developed and communicated to give impetus to the longer term dynamic. In this regard the roles of international agencies need to be well defined.

If one meta-goal is adopted, the development of education specific frameworks at global, regional and national levels remains important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues/Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• New goals need to be written in politically compelling language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The agenda is still largely owned by the North. The process of shifting ownership has a long way to go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ideas around learning and assessment needs to be grounded in country systems and context. Some international work is culturally weak. Public examination systems have their place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Global goals, international targets and national frameworks must all inform post 2015 developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creating the demand for data is vital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Going Forward**

The multi-constituency debate afforded by the Dialogue was welcomed. DFID would value further consultation including on the work of the Learning Metrics Task Force. UKFIET foresaw opportunities for further dialogue on its Community of Practice website ([http://www.ukfiet.org/cop/](http://www.ukfiet.org/cop/)) and at the 12th UKFIET Conference where it is hoped that Dialogue participants would play a part ([Education and Development Post 2015: Reflecting, Reviewing, Re-visioning 10-12 September 2013 Oxford](http://www.cfbt.com/ukfiet/))
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CONSULTATION RESOURCES

Beyond 2015: Campaigning for a Global Development Framework A global civil society campaign that is pushing for a strong and legitimate successor framework to the Millennium Development Goals. A founding principle of the campaign is that it is a partnership between civil society organisations from the ‘North’ and the ‘South.’ bringing together more than 500 organisations from around the world. http://www.beyond2015.org/news

Brookings Institute/UIS Learning Metrics Task Force The UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) and the Center for Universal Education (CUE) at Brookings have joined efforts to convene a Learning Metrics Task Force that will investigate the feasibility of identifying common learning goals to improve learning opportunities and outcomes for children and youth. http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Pages/learning-metrics-task-force.aspx


Education First: The UN Secretary General’s Initiative on Education “to put every child in school, improve the quality of learning, and foster global citizenship”. http://www.globaleducationfirst.org/


Four Discussion Areas are: Equitable Access to Education; Quality of Learning; Global Citizenship, Skills and Jobs; and...
A Dialogue on Education and Development to 2015 and Beyond

Governance and Financing of Education. Each of the discussions will run for two weeks from December 2012 to February 2013. The first discussion on Equitable Access to Education will be held from 10 December to 24 December.

UKFIET 12th International Conference on Education and Development 10-12 September 2013 University of Oxford

Education and Development Post 2015: Reflecting, Reviewing, Re-visioning

www.ukfiet.org/conference

The UN Millennium Campaign
http://www.worldwewant2015.org/

The UN System Task Team on the Post 2015 UN Development Agenda

UNESCO World EFA Conference scheduled for April 2015

UNESCO First Global Education for All Meeting November 2012 http://www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco/events/all-events/?tx_browser_pi1%5BshowUid%5D=5956&cHash=74ecb4cfe3

United Nations: The Future we Want A global conversation about the world you want to live in 20 years from now.
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