

Education for rural people

Aid agencies workshop

Organized by FAO Extension,
Education and Communication Service
with the support of the Italian Development Co-operation
and the technical collaboration of IIEP and UNESCO



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



UNESCO Publishing
International Institute
for Educational Planning

Education for rural people
Aid agencies workshop

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

All rights reserved. Reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product for educational or other non-commercial purposes are authorized without any prior written permission from the copyright holders provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of material in this information product for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without written permission of the copyright holders. Applications for such permission should be addressed to the Chief, Publishing Management Service, Information Division, FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy or by e-mail to copyright@fao.org and to the Chief, Communication and Publications Unit, IIEP, 7-9 rue Eugène Delacroix, 75116 Paris, France or by e-mail to copyright@iiep.unesco.org.

Published by:

Food and Agriculture Organization
of the United Nations
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome, Italy
e-mail: sdre@fao.org
FAO web site: <http://www.fao.org>

International Institute
for Educational Planning
7-9 rue Eugène Delacroix
75116 Paris
e-mail: information@iiep.unesco.org
IIEP web site: <http://www.unesco.org/iiep>

Cover design: Nathalie Pruneau
Cover photo: Lavinia Gasperini
Composition: Linéale Production

Working document
© FAO and UNESCO-IIEP, 2003

Contents

Foreword to the series	8
Preface	9
List of abbreviations	11
Executive summary	13
Introductory notes	21
Chapter 1. Setting the stage	23
Chapter 2. Education in poverty reduction and rural development	31
Chapter 3. Intervention frameworks and mechanisms: How to focus better on basic education for rural people?	41
Chapter 4. Monitoring mechanisms and indicators	47
Chapter 5. Co-ordination for effective aid policies and practices	53
Chapter 6. Summary of concrete measures for the ERP flagship to take	59
Chapter 7. Current action by participating agencies	63
Appendices	
Appendix 1 List of participants	81
Appendix 2 Preliminary programme	103
Appendix 3 Announcement on the launch of the new flagship	109

The following speeches are available in the virtual copy of the report on <http://www.fao.org/sd/>

- Appendix 4 “Education for rural people: a crucial factor for sustainable development”, *Sissel Ekaas*
- Appendix 5 Opening speech, “The overall framework and challenges of the EFA initiative and its relationship with this workshop and the flagship on Education for rural people”, *Gudmund Hernes*
- Appendix 6 “Launching a new flagship: Education for rural people”, *Lavinia Gasperini* (slide set)
- Appendix 7 “Education for rural development: Towards new policy responses”, *David Atchoarena, Lavinia Gasperini*
- Appendix 8 “Options for promoting education in rural areas”, *Herbert Bergmann*
- Appendix 9 “Practical subjects in basic education – relevance at last or second-rate education? Lessons from 40 years of experience”, *Herbert Bergmann*
- Appendix 10 “Improving agriculture for rural people: How best to focalize on basic education in rural areas”, *Christian Fauliau*
- Appendix 11 “Guidelines and indicators adopted to formulate a strategy for ERP in Croatia”, *Patrick Gautier* (paper and slide set)
- Appendix 12 “Monitoring and evaluation in non-formal education”, *Aoyagi Shigeru*, (slide set)
- Appendix 13 “Monitoring UPC (universal primary completion)”, *Jean-Claude Balmes* (slide set)
- Appendix 14 “The importance of innovative partnerships and multidisciplinary alliances to enhance education for rural people”, *Tom E. Vandebosch* (paper and slide set)
- Appendix 15 “Co-ordinating external assistance”, *Sukhdeep Brar*
- Appendix 16 “Education for mobile pastoralists: Creating an approach and defining its content”, *Sonja Fagerberg-Diallo*

- Appendix 17 “Education for rural people: targeting the poor” in the perspective of the Austrian Development co-operation, *Maria-Waltraud Rabitsch*
- Appendix 18 “The French Development Agency and education in rural areas”, *Jean-Claude Balmes* (text of slide set)
- Appendix 19 “The challenges of farmer training: The example of French-speaking West Africa”, *Pierre Debouvry, Alain Maragnani, Martin Weiss*
- Appendix 20 “Repositioning IICA to meet the challenges of the twenty-first century: The role of education in agricultural and rural development”, *François Dagenais*
- Appendix 21 “Challenges for skills development for the rural poor: An ILO perspective”, *Josiane Capt* (paper and slide set)
- Appendix 22 “Briefing note for the aid agencies’ workshop on Education for rural people: Targeting the poor”, *Frans Lenglet*
- Appendix 23 “How to better focus on basic education for rural people?”, *Ahlin Byll-Cataria*
- Appendix 24 “Accelerating progress on girls’ education”, *Flora Sibanda-Mulder* (paper and slide set)
- Appendix 25 “WFP and school feeding”, *Flora Sibanda-Mulder*

Foreword to the series

Education for rural people is crucial to achieving both the Education for All (EFA) goals, and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) of eradicating extreme poverty and hunger, ensuring universal primary education by 2015, promoting gender equity and ensuring environmental sustainability. In 1996, the World Food Summit in Rome stressed increased access to education for the poor and members of disadvantaged groups, including rural people, as a key to achieving poverty eradication, food security, durable peace and sustainable development. The 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development, held in Johannesburg, also emphasized the role of education.

As the majority of the world's poor, illiterate and undernourished live in rural areas, it is a major challenge to ensure their access to quality education. The lack of learning opportunities is both a cause and an effect of rural poverty. Hence, education and training strategies need to be integrated within all aspects of sustainable rural development, through plans of action that are multisectoral and interdisciplinary. This means creating new partnerships between people working in agriculture and rural development, and people working in education.

To address this challenge, the Directors-General of FAO and UNESCO jointly launched the flagship programme on *Education for rural people* (ERP) in September 2002 (<http://www.fao.org/sd/erp/>), during the World Summit on Sustainable Development. This initiative involves an inter-agency approach to facilitate targeted and co-ordinated actions for education in rural areas.

It is within this framework, and to provide inspiration for the flagship initiative, that the FAO's Extension, Education and Communication Service and UNESCO's International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) have jointly launched a series of publications. This series is co-ordinated and edited by David Atchoarena (IIEP) and Lavinia Gasperini (FAO).

Gudmund Hernes
Director, IIEP

Ester Zulberti
Chief, Extension, Education and
Communication Service, FAO

Preface

The workshop to which this report refers was one of the first activities of the newest of the Education for All (EFA) flagship initiatives. This flagship, focusing on ‘Education for rural people’ (ERP), was launched by the Directors-General of FAO and UNESCO in September 2002, during the World Summit on Sustainable Development, in Johannesburg, South Africa, to help achieve the goals of EFA and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG).¹

The event was also a follow-up to discussions that began at the World Bank in Washington in December 1999, during a workshop addressing the need to shift from ‘agriculture education’ to ‘education for rural development’. It was a meeting of a group of bilateral and multilateral agencies, which were anxious to see some action on ending, or at least drastically reducing, the disadvantages, which rural people, and especially the rural poor, chronically suffer. The participants recognized that, despite several decades of experience in educational programmes for rural people, there was still a need for a special and concerted effort to draw together into accessible forms the many insights that those experiences had generated. Even more important, of course, was the need to make sure that the people who should use the insights – policy-makers, people who influence the allocation of financial and human resources, programme designers – actually knew about them and could access them.

FAO has entrusted the ERP flagship to its Sustainable Development Department and in particular the Extension, Education and Communication Service. It has the mission to mobilize the partners, without whom the flagship could not sail, and with them to support action for more and better education programmes for disadvantaged rural women, men, girls and boys. Its most important partners are of course the governments of countries where rural people are at the severest educational disadvantages, but they are also the partners most in need of allies beyond their borders.

1. The eight Millennium Development Goals are broadly: 1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger; 2. Achieve universal primary education; 3. Promote gender equality; 4. Reduce child mortality; 5. Improve maternal health; 6. Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases; 7. Ensure environmental sustainability; 8. Global partnership for development. Each goal has time-bound targets attached.

This workshop brought together some of those allies and potential partners to appraise the tasks that have to be undertaken. It was very encouraging that about 30 governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations sent representatives to assist the workshop in Rome. As the record shows, they helped to clarify how best to move forward the mission of the ERP flagship.

An important partner for this workshop has been the Government of Italy through its Ministry of Foreign Affairs and General Directorate for Development Co-operation. It has borne the major portion of the costs. It was a pleasure to welcome Raffaele de Benedictis from the Ministry, who underlined Italy's commitment to reducing poverty in the world and supporting the education necessary for the purpose, especially in regard to rural people.

John Oxenham drafted this report.

Lavinia Gasperini of the Education Group of the Extension, Education and Communication Service of FAO (SDRE), and David Atchoarena of the UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning were responsible for the organization of this workshop.

Grateful thanks are due to colleagues in the UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) and in UNESCO's Division of Basic Education, who not only helped to organize the workshop, but also contributed so substantially to the discussions. The FAO looks forward to continuous close collaboration with them, as it presses forward to fulfil the mission of the flagship.

Ester Zulberti
Chief
Extension, Education and Communication Service
Sustainable Development Department
Food and Agriculture Organization

List of abbreviations

ACCU	Asian Cultural Centre for UNESCO, Tokyo
ADB	Asian Development Bank
EFA	Education for All
ERP	Education for Rural People
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FTI	Fast Track Initiative
GER	Gross Enrolment Ratio
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IIEP	International Institute for Educational Planning
MANGO	Map-based Analysis for Non-formal Education Goals and Outcomes
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
NFE	Non-Formal Education
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
SDRE	Extension, Education and Communication Service, Sustainable Development Department, FAO
SWAp	Sector-Wide Approaches
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UPC	Universal Primary Completion (MDG for 2015)

Executive summary

Purpose of the flagship ‘Education for rural people’ (ERP)*

Within the framework of the drive for Education for All, the flagship programme ‘Education for rural people’ will advocate due priority and resources for the educational interests of the girls, boys, women and men who live in rural communities. Within the communities, the ERP flagship will advocate due attention to educational opportunities for the poor, for females and for minority ethnic and vulnerable social groups, such as HIV/AIDS orphans.

Purposes of the aid agencies’ workshop

The aid agencies’ workshop convened 30 voluntary, bilateral and multilateral international agencies. It aimed to generate ideas and support to make the ERP flagship an effective instrument in promoting education and development for rural people. It also aimed to enable the agencies to inform each other more fully on the current status of their policies, financing, programmes, practices and outcomes.

Issues covered

The challenges outstanding

Despite decades of effort to improve education and development for rural people, especially the poor, the broad picture remains as follows.

First, some 3 billion people live in rural communities, mainly in countries with low per-capita incomes and high rates of poverty. Most make their small incomes from small-scale agriculture and forms of self-employment, and many need the assistance of their children in sustaining their households.

* For further information contact: Lavinia Gasperini (Lavinia.Gasperini@fao.org), Namtip Aksornkool (n.aksornkool@unesco.org).

Second, nearly a billion people – two-thirds of them women and most rural – are unschooled and unable to access information for development. In several countries, rural illiteracy rates are two to three times higher than urban rates.

Third, 130 million children are not in school; most are rural.

Fourth, drop-out rates from rural primary schools remain unacceptably high. Large proportions of drop-outs have not mastered basic skills sufficiently for daily use and further development.

Fifth, 211 million children and adolescents are in forms of child labour that will lead to large proportions of them becoming illiterate adults.

The EFA Global Monitoring Report of 2002 points out that fully 28 countries are at serious risk of not achieving the educational goals agreed at the Dakar Forum by the dates set. In short, hundreds of millions of rural people are unable to access their right to education. From the point of view of resource-poor governments, they represent the frustration of investments in efforts to develop human capital for all forms of development. Education then is not only a human right, it is also a social necessity.

The main challenge facing EFA is strengthening the capacities of the countries with the most needs and least resources. The interest, commitment and energy of these governments and societies in formulating credible plans for EFA will be crucial for mobilizing the support of the international community. New plans will need to generate joint ownership by both governments and donors, while flagships such as ERP will need to make sure that their initiatives retain the confidence and support of both the governments and the donors.

Education in poverty reduction and rural development

A new FAO/IIEP study, “Education for rural development: Towards new policy responses”, reviews the current relationship between education, rural development and the reduction of poverty. It concludes that, for rural development, a more holistic and comprehensive approach is needed than

has been achieved through strategies of ‘integrated rural development’ and their like. A parallel approach is needed for education for rural people, which has too often been equated with agricultural education.

In regard to elementary schooling², the study identified 16 factors that persist in hindering progress towards EFA. Seven of these factors lie on the supply or access side, four on the demand side, while the remaining five concern the quality of education. Although these factors are clearly identified, many countries have still not dealt with them adequately. Nevertheless, the study also documents ranges of measures to counter them.³

2. Elementary education includes five or six years of primary schooling, followed by up to three years of middle school, lower secondary or some equivalent.

3. **Measures suggested for increasing access:**

Expanding and improving:

school network (infrastructure);

school feeding programmes;

non-formal education (e.g. adult literacy, extension etc.) ;

alternative delivery systems including distance education;

early-childhood development programmes;

girls’ enrolment (by increasing female teachers, scholarships, etc.);

targeting specific groups such as:

working children,

remote populations (e.g. mountain areas, small islands),

nomadic populations,

refugees and internally displaced people,

disabled people,

marginalized groups.

Measures suggested for improving quality:

Improving:

teacher training and incentives;

active teaching and learning techniques;

curriculum relevance, valuing also local knowledge and experience and addressing local needs (including in agriculture, nutrition, health and other basic skills);

teaching/learning materials;

community involvement in participatory school governance/management;

information and communication technologies (especially radio);

mother tongue as language of instruction;

accurate assessment of learning outcomes (knowledge, skills attitudes and values).

For adolescents, the study suggests closer attention to the kinds of skills required to cope with constantly changing rural and other labour markets. Education for rural people now needs to connote skills for diversified rural development.

The study shows that traditional vocational agricultural secondary education has not adjusted to rural development needs, so that reforms will be required. It discusses several possibilities.

Much tertiary or higher education has also failed to adjust to new needs in rural development. However, some institutions do now include areas like natural resources management and rural development with off-farm employment, and enable their graduates and others to keep abreast of advances.

The study suggests that among the conditions for a successful regeneration of agricultural higher education are needs to address the issues within the framework of a comprehensive higher-education policy, to offer incentives for institutions to assume leadership in the change process, and to establish a range of interfaces between the demand for rural development specialists and their supply. The institutions also need to diversify their funding and generate their own incomes.

Intervention frameworks and mechanisms

The first requirement for the flagship is to identify precisely where it fits into the many current international initiatives. The second requirement is that it should take full note of the history of efforts to make educational programmes in both schools and other arenas relevant for rural children, adolescents and adults. However, the fact that very few current education plans focus specifically on rural people indicates that the flagship will need to be proactive in demanding attention to the issues.

The flagship's strength should be advocacy, developed through two main capacities: (1) monitoring trends and plans; and (2) convening appropriate forums to keep issues of education for rural people before policy-makers, practitioners and the general public. The flagship should use the processes of

the Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRSP) and Sector-Wide Approaches (SWAp) to press for the proper representation of rural people.

Monitoring mechanisms and indicators

The kind of information required to steer a strategy for education for rural development is not readily available or easily generated in most countries that need one. A fresh effort to generate it uses three foundation concepts: ‘basic education’, indicating actual programmes; ‘basic learning needs’ or necessary content; and ‘education for rural people’ envisaging a broad educational approach in the perspective of enhancing rural development and reducing rural poverty. The analytical scheme adopted examines each component from six perspectives: (1) supply of educational opportunity; (2) actual access to opportunity by population groups; (3) demand expressed through enrolments; (4) quality as embodied in curriculum content and instructional materials; (5) quality as exhibited through attendance, completion and graduation rates; and (6) institutional capacity at every level and component of the education support system. In addition, each indicator systematically compares national and rural ratios and provisions.

While this approach addresses the schools, a prototype methodology aims to monitor and evaluate the non-formal educational activities that occur in rural communities across several development sectors. The methodology – MANGO, Map-based Analysis of Non-formal Education Goals and Outcomes – combines a participatory community-based approach with quantitative statistics. Early indications from the test sites suggest that, when local people understand the data and their usefulness, they will exert themselves to help collect them. A further point is such local databases facilitate linking educational development more completely with the wider spectrum of local rural development.

Two of the Millennium Development Goals for primary education are gender parity by 2005 and universal primary completion (UPC) by 2015. The completion ratio, distinct from the gross and net enrolment ratios, implies a recognition that only completing the full primary course can ensure that young people have equipped themselves with enough skills to function fully as citizens.

Maintaining a special focus on rural people is an essential ingredient of UPC, for most of the progress needs to be made with very poor rural families. Countries now have the data that could generate the required current information, but very few of them have the capacity to capitalize on this potential for better management, planning and reform. Management Information Systems need to be strengthened, along with a streamlining of indicators and the data required to generate them. However, any streamlining should take care to include indicators not only of inputs and outcomes, but also of process, to enable the monitoring of political changes and reforms.

Within a given country, data would be needed to measure how specific areas or population groups were faring in regard to specific objectives. It should also be possible for local people to see how their own localities were doing. That would of course entail developing local databases and nurturing local capabilities to interpret them, along the lines of MANGO.

Co-ordination for effective aid policies and practices

Co-ordination between development agencies is acknowledged to be particularly important for rural development, which is multisectoral in nature but depends on a monosectoral division of labour almost everywhere. Effective co-ordination requires a sense of partnership plus the support of networks. Clearly, too, the scope of co-ordination, partnership and networking needs to be widely cast to include not only donors and governments, but also all the many levels of stakeholders from central ministries through the leaderships of local communities to the prospective beneficiaries themselves. Also, potential partners that are often overlooked are local NGOs, the academic community and the private sector.

In the light of these challenges, the ERP flagship should be a light mechanism of advocacy and co-ordination, shake itself free from bureaucratic constraints and dare to behave as a pioneering, activist, lobbying mechanism.

Summary of concrete measures

The discussions produced a number of guiding points for FAO and IIEP/UNESCO to follow in setting the direction for the ERP flagship and getting it off the ground as an effective advocate.

1. On the international level, the ERP flagship should foster partnerships, networks and co-ordination. In this connection, the universal compartmentalization of specialist ministries, departments and agencies at all levels militates against holistic approaches to education and to rural development. The flagship could explore tools of institutional reform to promote communication and synergy between agencies. It could also prompt its partners to assess the extent to which their internal patterns of incentives for career advancement promote an orientation to partnerships, networks and co-ordination. It should also be on the lookout for exemplary initiatives in partnerships and use them to develop guidelines on how governments might incorporate partnerships for education for rural people – and particularly vulnerable rural groups like HIV/AIDS orphans – into their plans for EFA.
2. The flagship should use the insights accumulated from past and current efforts at education for rural people to develop guidelines on effective strategies in a range of cultural, political and ecological contexts. Such guidelines may be particularly useful for FAO and UNESCO regional offices.
3. It should also help to develop specific guidance on indicators of progress and the options for simple but reliable monitoring mechanisms.
4. The flagship should compile a ‘service package’ of knowledge, tools, concepts and specialists to serve not only ministries of education, but also all the sectoral development agencies, which need rural people to undertake some systematic learning.
5. The flagship should develop guidelines for assessing the costs of ensuring educational opportunities for rural groups in differing circumstances.
6. The flagship should monitor the priority really assigned by governments and other national and international agencies to the education and development of rural people and undertake appropriate advocacy.

7. Because of the likely demand for its services, the flagship should prioritize countries in terms of the educational needs of their rural peoples.
8. It should identify and target specific influential clienteles within those countries and use all available media – e.g. the World Bank’s network of videoconference facilities in its country offices – to acquaint them with the insights accumulated from worldwide experiences in education for rural people and rural development.
9. At country level, the ERP flagship should monitor the provision for different rural groups in plans for meeting both EFA and the MDG. The analysis of plans should enable the flagship to identify missing elements and advocate their inclusion.

Next meeting

The next meeting of the ERP flagship should follow the completion of the suggested service package. It should involve both user governments and aid agencies.

Introductory notes

The workshop, which this document reports, aimed mainly to pave the way for a wider and stronger set of international partners to promote education for rural people. Its format then had three parts: (1) information about a partnership initiative by UNESCO and FAO; (2) information from participating organizations about their current efforts in education for rural people; and (3) discussions on three sets of issues affecting the joint initiative. While the three parts took place in the order given above, this report attempts to facilitate reading by presenting first the information from FAO and UNESCO to set the stage, then moving to the discussions of the three sets of issues and finally describing the work of the participating organizations.

The following notes aim to clarify a few points that may not be familiar to some readers.

What are flagships in ‘Education for All’?

Originally, a flagship was a ship of war, which flew the flag of the commander of either a large fleet or a smaller squadron with a specific mission. ‘Education for All’, under the leadership of UNESCO, is the great flagship for the war against the constraints that still bar a billion human beings from taking up their rights to an adequate education. Sharing the tasks of ‘Education for All’ (EFA) are a number of specialized flagships. Each carries the flag of a specific concern within the range of educational priorities. It aims to sustain attention for that concern through ensuring that all stakeholders across the world have the best information on good policies, good practices and the necessary supporting conditions, as well as the means to evaluate what is most appropriate for particular groups of people in particular circumstances at particular moments in time.

Currently, nine specialized flagships have been launched: Early childhood development; Literacy; Girls’ education; Education in emergency situations; School health; HIV/AIDS; Teachers and the quality of education; Education and disability; Education for rural people.

The reasons, leadership and scope of the last flagship in the list, 'Education for rural people' (ERP), are discussed in this report.

Why organize a workshop for aid agencies only?

The chief and heaviest responsibility for achieving education for all lies with the governments of the world. For that very reason, the first event for the new flagship was a regional workshop with nine governments in Asia.⁴ However, many governments, and especially those furthest from achieving education for all, rely on numbers of external agencies to assist them in the task. UNESCO is of course the prime agency, but the list of other agencies: bilateral, multilateral, non-governmental and private, is long indeed; the list of participants in this workshop provides an excellent example (see *Appendix 1*). One of the problems that governments encounter, when dealing with this range of helpers, is that different helpers sometimes advocate different approaches to dealing with particular issues and these differences can be more hindrance than help.

Efforts are needed then to bring all the agencies concerned to a common and shared treasury of information, a common understanding and agreement on the kinds of help that would be most useful to particular governments and peoples for particular purposes at particular times. The workshop under report is a step towards forming this common ground among international agencies focused on education for rural people.

4. "*Education for rural development*", Bangkok, Thailand, 5-7 November 2002, jointly organized by FAO, UNESCO and IIEP. The workshop brought together ministries of education and of agriculture.

Chapter 1

Setting the stage

The workshop opened with three presentations elaborating the reasons for mounting a special effort in the interests of education for rural people. This chapter summarizes the facts underlying the need, the reason why FAO is leading the flagship and the priorities that the flagship should serve.

The need

The two welcome addresses by Sissel Ekaas⁵ and Gudmund Hernes⁶ sketched two situations in education for rural children. One exists currently in northern Mozambique, on the shores of Lake Nyasa; the other happened in mid-Norway in the mid-twentieth century. In Mozambique, extreme deprivation reigned: the village was poor, villagers living mainly on subsistence agriculture and fishing, with just one shop which stocked no soap, salt, sugar or even matches. Its primary school had only one teacher, who had himself completed just four grades of primary school and was trying to conduct a multi-grade school with no books or other teaching materials. His pupils chanted drills after him and practised writing in the sand. As most of the adult community members were themselves unschooled, there seemed to be no interaction between the daily life of the village and what went on in the school.

In mid-Norway, the primary school was also in a fairly isolated agricultural and forestry community. It, too, was multi-grade and met only every other day. But its teacher was well qualified and its pupils were well equipped with reading and writing materials. In addition, they had a range of practical activities – gardening, carpentry, sewing, knitting – that required them to put their reading, writing, counting and measuring skills to work. From time to time, the school was closed, not for holidays, but to release its pupils to work with and under the guidance of their parents and other adults in the fields. There

5. Director of the Sustainable Development Department, FAO (see *Appendix 4*).
6. Director of the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), UNESCO (see *Appendix 5*).

was much learning by doing and much interaction between the daily life of the village and the routines of the school.

The two schools illustrate what basic education for rural children too often still is, and what it could be if only the right policies, resources and community support were in place and properly applied.

However, the fact is that in too many countries the right policies, resources and community support are not yet in place. For decades, governments have recognized that although rural people form the majority of their population, they and their children get a rough deal when it comes to educational opportunities and provision. Despite this recognition, the broad picture remains as follows.

First, just over half of the world's population remains rural and, despite strong trends of urbanization, will remain rural for at least three more decades. These 3 billion or so people are to be found mainly in the less industrialized countries of the world, that is to say in countries with relatively low per-capita incomes and high rates of poverty and malnutrition.⁷ Most of these people make their small incomes from small-scale agriculture and forms of casual, family or self-employment, and many need the assistance of their children in sustaining their households.

Second, nearly a billion people – two-thirds of them women – are reckoned to be unschooled, illiterate and unable to access the information that could help transform their lives and the lives of their children. Most of them live in rural communities. Most have no opportunity even for adult basic education. Not surprisingly, the gap between rural and urban illiteracy rates is widening, so that in several countries illiteracy in rural populations is two to three times higher than in the urban centres.

Third, 130 million school-age children are reckoned not to be in school, partly because there are no schools available, partly because those that are available are badly run, partly because their families cannot afford the costs, partly because they need their children's labour to keep the family going, and

7. See *Appendix 6* for some statistics presented by Lavinia Gasperini.

partly because some families cannot see what use schooling will be to their children. Most of these children are in rural families.

Fourth, drop-out rates from the rural primary schools of many countries are still high, indeed, in some countries most of the children have dropped out by the age when they should have started in the fifth grade. High proportions of them will not have mastered the skills of reading, writing and counting sufficiently to retain and use them for a lifetime.

Fifth, 211 million children and adolescents need to earn money by working on cocoa, tobacco, banana or other plantations, which are all rural undertakings. However, unlike the pupils in Norway, their work is not combined or alternated with learning. On the contrary, many are forced to work at mind-numbing tasks for more than 12 hours per day in conditions bordering on slavery. No educational opportunities are organized for them either at work or afterwards. Large proportions of these young people will join the ranks of the next generation of illiterate adults.

These facts signal that hundreds of millions of rural people are unable to access one of their fundamental human rights, the right to education. From the point of view of resource-poor governments, they also signal the frustration of lack of investment. For a main reason for spending public money on schools and educational programmes is to invest in human capital that will promote and accelerate the economic, social, cultural and political development of a country. People who have not been able to gain a proper schooling, are disabled from capitalizing on the information and opportunities for improving their standards of living. Education then is not only a human right, it is also a social necessity.

Listing these current facts does not detract from the educational achievements of the past half century. Since the declaration of the right to free, universal and compulsory education, the numbers of children who enter primary school every year have been tripled, the numbers entering secondary school have increased tenfold, while the numbers who enter higher education have grown by an even greater factor. Rural populations have certainly benefited from these efforts. But the list above does underline that the tasks remaining are formidable. As the Education for All forums at Jomtien and

Dakar have made all too clear, these tasks demand renewed, stronger and persevering efforts, if the goals of universal primary education and virtually universal adult literacy are to be attained. In addition, the EFA Global Monitoring Report of 2002 has heightened the urgency by pointing out that fully 28 countries are at serious risk of not achieving either the required net enrolments, levels of adult literacy or gender parity by the dates agreed at Dakar. Further, as the efforts to serve rural people have so far fallen short of what is needed, a special focus or ‘flagship’ must strive to ensure that rural boys, girls, adolescents and adult men and women secure their due place in development and education plans.

FAO and the flagship ‘Education for rural people’

FAO is the United Nations agency most concerned with rural people – its very name suggests that. Promoting better agriculture, better food security, better nutrition and better natural resources and environmental management requires not only promoting all the necessary supporting institutions and infrastructure, but also – and perhaps even more so – organizing appropriate education for all the people involved. FAO has engaged in educating boys and girls through school gardens and men and women through co-operatives, farmers’ field schools and broader extension programmes. It has also long co-operated with UNESCO and IFAD in promoting functional literacy for agricultural and other rural groups. FAO is then a natural partner for UNESCO in leading a flagship to sustain the interests of rural people at all levels of education for the entire age range in human society. An additional point is that this kind of partnership between ‘education’ and ‘agriculture’ serves to promote holistic thinking and interdisciplinary exchange and to mitigate the all-too-frequent tendencies to compartmentalization. The Directors-General of UNESCO and FAO⁸ recognized this, when they jointly launched the ninth flagship in the EFA initiative, ‘Education for rural people’, during the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in September 2002.

Within two months of the launch, 22 organizations, governmental, non-governmental and international, had pledged themselves to work with FAO and UNESCO in pushing forward the programmes of the flagship.

8. Respectively, Koïchiro Matsuura and Jacques Diouf.

This workshop is already the third initiative of the flagship. The first was a regional workshop for policy-makers in agriculture and education from nine Asian governments. The second is a book, “*Education for rural development: towards new policy responses*”, which is the outcome of a set of studies and will be published shortly. The next chapter offers a summary of its content. Both initiatives were joint efforts of FAO, UNESCO and its IIEP.

Next steps

The Director-General of FAO has emphasized four priorities for the new flagship.⁹

The first is to ensure that *national plans for EFA have the education of rural people at their core and that institutional capacities to plan and manage effectively are strengthened.*

The second is to *promote and support initiatives both to expand rural people’s access to education and to increase their attendance and completion rates* through enhanced quality and ranges of measures appropriate to particular communities.

The third is to *improve the relevance of educational programmes to rural interests and livelihoods* in ways that both enable people to understand the immediate usefulness of what is to be learned and simultaneously keep open the avenues to other forms of advancement.

The fourth priority is for international aid agencies to work together and *forge closer and more effective partnerships* with national authorities and other bodies in enabling rural people to obtain the kinds of education that will improve their lives.

To implement these priorities, the partners in the flagship will operate at two levels, national and international. At the national level, they will offer governments and other bodies technical support in addressing rural people to

9. Director-General’s speech at the launching of the FAO/UNESCO flagship programme on ‘Education for rural people’ (September 2002) – http://www.fao.org/sd/2002/kn0904_en.htm

ascertain their educational needs and aspirations. They will also offer help in drawing up appropriate sub-plans of action within overall plans to achieve EFA. Work is already under way in several countries: Bosnia, Croatia, Egypt, Kosovo and Serbia.

At the international level, the flagship will undertake advocacy for ERP through convening workshops, seminars, conferences and Internet forums to analyze and clarify the issues and to keep members abreast of progress and obstacles. It will also promote and facilitate the exchange of good practices through all the available media. Further, the flagship will be alert to identify existing capacity and the emergence of new capacity for different components of ERP within partner institutions, and will work to make it available to countries that need it.

Discussion

Concern was voiced that the concept of flagships seemed to parallel initiatives that several governments had already set in train. Given the international support for the flagships, would they not risk overshadowing such initiatives, marginalizing a government's own overall strategies and jeopardizing a government's ownership of any effort under the flagship? Second, the flagship involved a broad range of activities. Undertaking them could well be within the capacity of participating international organizations and of most governments and their societies. However, they may well be beyond the capacity of the countries most in need of them. How would an initiative like the ERP flagship focus on the most needy?

Offsetting the first concern was the fact that the 180 governments that had set the Millennium Development Goals¹⁰ had themselves established the parallel structures with specially focused functions, like flagships, to help ensure the achievement of the goals. UNESCO, which had been invited to take up general leadership in Education for All by the governments on their behalf, was aware of the risks and would be careful to avoid either parallel plans of action or displacing action already in train.

10. See footnote 1.

Supplementing and strengthening the capacities of the countries with the most needs and least resources are indeed the most strenuous challenges facing EFA in general and will certainly tax the creativity and resourcefulness of the flagships in particular. However, much will depend on the interests, commitment and energy of the governments and societies of the neediest countries themselves. If they do exert themselves to formulate credible plans for EFA for their peoples, the flagships and the international community as a whole are committed to making sure that they do not lack the resources required.

The issue of ‘ownership’ in initiatives and plans for EFA has two sides. Many countries possess the capacity to undertake the broad range of activities that one or several flagship initiatives could involve and would need little outside help to do so. However, for those countries which would need substantial international help to make decent progress towards EFA, ‘ownership’ needs to be felt both by them and by the donors assisting them. The erosion in the funds available for international co-operation had its source in a record of non-return to investments in development co-operation. Initiatives and plans needed, then, to generate joint ownership by both governments and donors. At the same time, the international organizations leading the flagships – in this case, FAO and UNESCO – need to make sure that their initiatives retain the confidence and support of both the governments and the donors.

Chapter 2

Education in poverty reduction and rural development

Prior to the formation of the ERP flagship, FAO and UNESCO/IIEP launched a broad international study reviewing the current relationship between education, rural development and the reduction of poverty.¹¹ Concern with countering the endemic disadvantages that beset educational programmes for rural people has a long history. So has concern with countering the disadvantages that beset and continue to beset rural people in matters of the quality of life: safe water supplies, infant mortality, life expectancy, health services, communications and the like. Alongside has been the concern with raising the incomes and standards of living of the rural poor. These concerns have jointly generated numbers of ideas, experiments, projects and programmes to get education to support the acceleration of rural development and the reduction of poverty. The study surveyed the state of the art in addressing these concerns. It pursued a number of themes and buttressed them with country and institution cases. It has thus helped to bring knowledge of the situation up to the present date. The study also revisited the concepts that link education and rural development and concludes that several shifts in thinking are required.

For rural development, an approach needs to be fashioned that is more holistic than has so far been achieved through strategies of ‘integrated rural development’, ‘district development teams’ or even ‘ministries of rural development’. The approach needs to take account of the changing patterns of national and local economies, and to encompass not only agricultural farm employment, but also ranges of off-farm employments. In addition, social, cultural and political factors, such as the relationships between community groups, have to enter the calculations for planning.

11. Lavinia Gasperini (FAO) and David Atchoarena (IIEP) presented the findings of the study (see *Appendix 7*, “Education for rural development: Towards new policy responses”).

A parallel approach is needed in considering education. Education for rural people has too often been equated with agricultural education, while the primary, secondary and tertiary stages of the schools tend to be treated as separate and independent entities, rather than as a true system, in which one component supports another rather than causes it to malfunction. There also needs to be a recovery of the concept of education as a means for human development and a lessening of the emphasis on education simply as a tool to develop human capital.

In regard to elementary schooling¹², the study identified 16 factors that persist in constraining the education of younger rural children and thus hindering progress towards EFA at the very basic level. Seven of these factors lie on the supply or access side: insufficient numbers of elementary schools, entailing excessive distances for many children; a lack of boarding facilities; incomplete schools; lack of teachers; lack of flexibility in delivery mechanisms; a variety of administrative obstacles; policies privileging schools for urban populations. A further four factors lie on the demand or take-up side: the direct costs of schooling; the opportunity costs of children's labour; gender discrimination; irregular attendance, leading to repetition, drop-out and low completion rates. The final five factors have to do with the quality of education: infrastructure inadequate to support learning; non-availability and inadequacy of teaching and learning tools; unsuitable curricula; language of instruction; absenteeism and high turnover among teachers. Although these factors are clearly identified, many countries have still not dealt with them adequately, so that they remain obstacles to EFA.

Nevertheless, the study also documents how many countries have developed ranges of measures to counter and mitigate these factors.¹³ Expanding access, encouraging and supporting enrolments and enhancing quality in schooling and basic education have all been addressed in various ways. Experience with each of these measures can of course point the way to improvements and the scope for adaptation to other circumstances and other countries.

12. Elementary education includes five or six years of primary schooling, followed by up to three years of middle school, lower secondary or some equivalent.
13. See slides 9-11 of *Appendix 7* for a list of well-known examples.

When the study moves from elementary education for younger children to examining the education of adolescents for their own as well as rural development, it suggests that closer attention will be necessary to the kinds of skills required to cope with rural and other labour markets in a process of constant transformation. As most rural adolescents may still aspire to salaried employment, second-stage education for rural people must not be perceived as an obstacle to or a diversion from it. The challenge is to ensure that young rural people graduate equipped equally to take up a salaried job, or to develop some form of self- or family-employment that will yield them an adequate living. Non-farm employment has been expanding steadily – in South Asia some 30 to 40 per cent of the income of rural households is earned off the farm – and the forms of such employment are diversifying. Further, education itself influences the kinds of employment strategies that young people adopt. Rural households with more education tend to generate larger proportions of their incomes off the farm. In short, whereas education for rural people once connoted education for agriculture, it now needs to connote skills for diversified rural development.

The study shows that traditional vocational agricultural education at the secondary level of schooling has not adjusted with the changing times and with rural development needs. Quite apart from persistent poor quality, it has focused excessively on fitting its graduates for public-sector, i.e. salaried, jobs and for farm employment. It has either not noticed or neglected the emergence of needs and demands for skills in new areas such as environment and natural resources management, biotechnology, agribusiness and other issues related to enhancing rural livelihoods such as population growth, health, HIV/AIDS and others.

The apparent implications of the study are that several reforms will be required of traditional agricultural education at the secondary level, if it is to contribute to rural development. Possible avenues are to strengthen linkages between the schools and rural employers, who are looking for a range of skills in and beyond agriculture. Partnership in governance, adoption and expansion of dual forms of training, through work-based training or work-experience programmes, community-based programmes in the broader context of poverty reduction strategies, more autonomy for institutions to respond to changes in local demand are all options that need to be explored. Possibly, too, new forms of financing will need to be devised, both to ensure adequate support

for programmes to be effective and sustainable and, from the standpoint of equity, to enable resources to be directed towards groups otherwise unable to utilize the education on offer.

What is true for the secondary level is generally true also for tertiary or higher education. In many countries, most courses are still in agriculture, rather than in rural or environmental management and development. Curricula are often outdated, denoting weak relationships with the labour market and leading to high rates of unemployment among graduates with agricultural diplomas and degrees. At the same time, support from governments and external donors has been decreasing, which has led to declines in quality. Further, agricultural colleges tend to be isolated from the rest of the higher-education sector and to suffer from fragmented patterns of management. The combination of these weaknesses has meant that agricultural colleges are finding it harder to compete with the rest of the higher-education sector for high-quality faculty and students.

Counterbalancing these generally negative trends are institutions which are expanding their focus to include areas like natural resources management and rural development with off-farm employment. They are also broadening their range to include not only pre-employment training but also patterns of lifelong learning to enable their graduates and others to keep abreast of advances in science, technology, land management, environmental management and business management.

The study suggests that among the conditions for a successful regeneration of agricultural higher education are needs to address the issues within the framework of a comprehensive higher-education policy, to offer incentives for institutions to assume leadership in the change process, and to establish and sustain a range of interfaces between the demand for rural development specialists and their supply. Existing institutions will need to accept expanded missions, which will involve their commitment to their local communities as well as to rural, in addition to agricultural, development. They will need not only to update and reform their curricula, but also to adopt new ways and newly available media for delivering them, possibly in partnership with employers. They will need, too, to take into account the likely impacts of globalization on patterns of production and on labour markets: for this they will need to cultivate international linkages much more actively than seems to

be the case at present. Finally, they will likely need to diversify their sources of funding, possibly through outreach activities that will generate income.

In sum, the study issues these messages for education systems:

- For basic education for both children and adults, doing more of the same is not enough. More efforts have to be made to take account of the specific conditions of particular rural populations, so as to expand access, promote take up and raise quality and effectiveness.
- For the secondary stages of schooling and adult vocational training, there has to be a more thorough spread of effort from agricultural education to skills for the many dimensions of rural development.
- For the tertiary or higher stages of education and training, reorientation, restructuring and reform are needed to reverse the marginalization of existing institutions.

If these are the messages for education systems, what messages should an initiative like the ERP flagship give? By its very composition, the flagship would have to address the question on two levels, the international and the national.

From an international perspective, the flagship would need to draw attention to changing patterns of production, processing and marketing, their impact on different rural populations and labour markets and the implications for education programmes for adults and children. The decline in international support for agriculture and rural development in non-OECD countries and its impact on the rural poor, who form large proportions of their populations, also constitute a major contextual factor and an additional challenge to meet their educational needs.

Investigating these factors would likely enable the flagship to bring to the attention of OECD donor countries opportunities to use current PRSPs and Sector-Wide Approaches (SWAp) to address rural development and education issues holistically.¹⁴ Given the pressures competing for the attention

14. Strictly speaking, rural populations and areas are not a 'sector' in the sense that education is: rather, they constitute a 'space' within which several sectors like education, health or transport are at work.

of donor governments, partners in the flagship may well have to adopt energetic measures of advocacy to have these insights incorporated into the policies and practices of international co-operation.

Advocacy and lobbying may also be necessary at the national level of governments that need to promote rural development and education for poor rural people. The study signals that the ERP flagship should put the weight of its efforts into making the staff of ministries of education much more aware of and sensitive to the concerns of education for rural development within the drive for education for all.¹⁵ It should strive to ensure that national plans for EFA include a special focus on serving rural children and adults. This could well necessitate identifying and raising awareness of urban bias in plans and allocations of expenditures and, in some cases, pressing for the bias to be addressed.

In addition to sharpening sensitivity, the flagship should emphatically support efforts to build the capacities of ministry staff from the centre down to the smallest school district to plan and actually to implement measures appropriate for education in particular rural localities and communities. This would of course involve promoting better analyses of contexts and needs, in place of relying on a single pattern to satisfy all possible situations. Decentralization is clearly implied, but decentralization without sufficient appropriate capacity would likely fail.

Sustaining such dialogue and support for governments and other country bodies would involve the ERP flagship in another effort at the international level. It would need to mobilize a substantial set of qualified partners, whose technical expertise could be put at the service of the countries that need it. Using the World Wide Web and other media would enable the flagship to sustain forums to exchange evolving information and analyze emerging strategies and policies.

15. The workshop in Bangkok in November 2002 found that the national education plans of only one of nine governments in Asia had paid specific attention to the situations of rural children and adults.

Discussion

The discussion in response to the presentation of the study made a number of points. These are recorded in the following thematic order: the scope of the ERP flagship, rural development and agriculture, the content of education, factors in access to and take up of educational opportunities, priorities within education, implementing the holistic approach to ERP and, finally, compartmentalization between institutions and decentralization.

The study goes beyond the concerns of EFA and reaches into issues of how to reduce poverty, how to respond to globalization, how to adapt to the transformation of rural labour markets. EFA is one part of the more encompassing Millennium Development Goals. While the ERP flagship stresses the educational focus of EFA and starts from an educational base, it necessarily also has to incorporate the larger concerns of the MDG.

It is certainly correct to observe that rural development encompasses much more than agriculture. Nevertheless, it must not be forgotten that, in most developing countries, farmers, female and male, still constitute a major proportion of the labour force. They also remain very important to the economy and food security of their societies. They therefore must have the education and training to be fully professional and able to appraise and, if appropriate, incorporate new technologies into their production. Further, poor small-scale farmers are often unable to respond to marketing opportunities or to adapt to situations of excessive production because of inadequately comprehensive professional education. This implies that, while agricultural education should indeed be broadened for both adults and children, it must certainly not be discounted or eliminated.

From another angle, it is indeed important to point to the need for education for skills for rural development. At the same time, it is equally important to bear in mind that education for rural or any other people is about more than skills: it also includes the values, attitudes, knowledge and behaviour that support preparation for a full life as parent, community member, citizen and participant in the wider culture.

Although rural development does depend on the presence of people sufficiently educated to use available and evolving information and technology, education in turn depends in two ways for its effectiveness on rural development. On the one hand, it needs development to assist it with access and take up. On the other, it needs development to produce the opportunities on which it can work.

As regards access and take up, the improvement of roads, transport and other infrastructure makes it easier for children to travel to and from school and for adults to use various kinds of learning opportunities. It also makes it easier for teachers and their families, as well as staff of other agencies, to accept rural postings. Better incomes from agriculture and new employment opportunities can free families from dependence on their children's labour and enable them to utilize the schools, even to the point of meeting some of the direct costs, such as texts and exercise books. They can also enable families to feed their children better, so that hunger does not diminish learning. The implication is that educational planning should take into account and build on the opportunities that are created by other forms of development.

That said, there are some factors that hinder take up that may need to be addressed by educators on their own. Examples are high failure and repetition rates that cause poor families to conclude that there is not much point in sending their children to school, or arrogant attitudes on the part of some teachers towards the poor. Less easy to deal with are the low aspirations that some very poor families have for themselves and their children, as well as the inability of many families to provide the kinds of moral and pedagogical support that help children do well at school. These are areas where a flagship could help through identifying and disseminating the many quite long-standing efforts to mitigate such factors.

At the output end of education, so to speak, is the productivity of the investments in it. These investments, whether for children or adults, cannot become fully productive unless the institutional and physical infrastructures generate the opportunities for utilizing what has been learned. The many instances of unemployed university, secondary and primary-school graduates confirm this in the case of school systems, on the one side. On the other, is the observation that adult education programmes have little effect where

economic development is stagnant. In short, rural development depends on education and education depends on rural development.

The study listed a number of needs for education for rural people, among which was the need to differentiate between different population groups. Yet resources remain scarce, which means that everything cannot be done simultaneously. Prioritization therefore remains necessary.

Although the study recommends holistic approaches to education for rural development, it acknowledges that designing them presents a difficult challenge. The study therefore urges each country to develop its own path to address ERP. The flagship will contribute by convening forums to share and study successful experiences in how such approaches might be organized. The Bangkok workshop in November 2002 brought together ministries of education and agriculture. This kind of occasion needs to be incorporated into a more thoroughly thought-out framework with permanent mechanisms to help elaborate and implement holistic strategies.

Connected with this issue is the almost universal compartmentalization of ministries, departments and other agencies. For example, dialogue with ministries of education always seems to be restricted to issues and systems of general education. Enquiries about adult education, agricultural education or environmental education are usually referred elsewhere, as other departments are responsible for them. This type of organization actually militates against holistic or 'joined-up' thinking.

One way that has seemed to promise both a corrective to compartmentalization and an avenue for responding to localized needs is decentralization. It has also seemed to offer a substitute for failures by over-centralized states. This is illusory, for decentralized forms of governance depend for their effective functioning and development on support from capable and strong central structures.

Chapter 3

Intervention frameworks and mechanisms: How to focus better on basic education for rural people?

After considering the findings of the study, the workshop took up the question of the kinds of framework that the ERP flagship should develop in approaching its task and the kinds of mechanism it should use to be effective. Three participants¹⁶ formed a panel to launch the discussion.

The first requirement for the flagship is to identify precisely where it fits into the many current international initiatives. The list is long: the Dakar Framework of Action, the G-8 process in 2002, the Fast Track Initiative led by the World Bank and other donors, the PRSP and SWAp frameworks, the United Nations system Network on Rural Development and Food Security, with its 80 national thematic groups. All these initiatives need to be taken into account in delimiting the niche and modus operandi for the ERP flagship. Overlap and duplication are, as always, to be avoided.

The second requirement is that the flagship bear in mind that, despite the apparent neglect of education for poor rural people, the area is not virgin territory. On the contrary, as Mr Bergmann's paper makes very clear, efforts to make educational programmes in both schools and other arenas relevant and useful for rural children, adolescents and adults have a long history and some are still current. In whichever country it works, then, the flagship should be sure that it has learned what efforts have already been made or are still in process, which have been relatively successful and why, and which have been disappointing and why.

16. In the order of their presentations, Mr Herbert Bergmann, Senior Education Planner, German Agency for Technical Co-operation, Mr Christian Fauliau, Senior Economist and Agricultural and Rural Capacity Building Specialist, The World Bank and Ms Alicia García, United Nations system Network on Rural Development and Food Security. See *Appendices 8, 9 and 10* for their papers.

On the other side of the coin, since almost every country can point to at least one initiative of its own in education for rural people, the fact that only one of nine governments in Asia and, as Mr Fauliau pointed out, only two in West Africa have put a special focus on rural people, demands investigation country by country. Without that, the flagship may find its work hindered, if not undermined.

Within the guidelines derived from the considerations above, five parameters should steer the efforts of the ERP flagship. The first will be dependable long-term support, because any initiative will almost inevitably require additional financial and human resources and, in the nature of rural development, a relatively long time to mature.

Second will be painstaking co-ordination between the governments and the donors and between the donors themselves. Given the drive for overarching PRSP and within them SWAp for each development sector, neither donors nor the flagship can logically think in terms of isolated projects. They all need to buy into not only an overall development plan for one sector, but in the case of the rural space, also into a set of harmonized plans for several sectors serving a given population. The ERP flagship would have to be willing to join such concerted activities on the basis of what its comparative advantages could contribute to the overall effort.

The third parameter must be an insistence on quality. Past experience has shown clearly that simply increasing the numbers of schools or enrolments is not enough. Whether programmes serve children or adults, poor quality in instruction and support lead to poor attendance, poor learning, repetition and drop-out. High quality has the opposite effects and indeed helps generate stronger demand and more enrolments.

The fourth and fifth parameters are coupled: capacity building and sustainability. The drive for decentralization necessitates expanded capacities at all levels of an education and development system, because high-quality planning with remote rural communities will come to nothing, if not backed by high-quality support at the central and intervening levels. All countries operate with three interacting sets of institutions, which are not equal in capacity, influence or effectiveness. The weakest in all three dimensions tend to be the

rural communities themselves: articulating their development needs and the education to support them requires a range of capacities that need to be deliberately nurtured. The second set of institutions comprises the sectoral ministries and departments, while the third comprises the cross-sector ministries like finance or national planning, which tend to be the most powerful and influential, particularly in framing the PRSP and allocating finance. All three sets obviously need to work together. Enabling them to do so on a more equal footing is a major challenge of capacity building.

Without capacity building, particularly at the decentralized and community levels, the sustainability of development and educational initiatives will be put at risk.

Within such contexts and frameworks, the ERP flagship could assess, country by country, which points on the demand and supply sides of education it might help address most productively. The range of factors behind weak demand and faulty supply are well known in general terms, but their weights and particular causes differ from country to country, so that priorities and strategies for dealing with them should also vary.

The flagship might review what measures have been used to overcome the universal compartmentalization of specialist ministries, departments and agencies at central, middle and local levels; and explore whether fresh avenues could be opened. Could tools of institutional reform be fashioned to promote and reward more active communication and stronger synergy between agencies concerned with education for rural people and development? Pressing this point further are experiences with primary schools and with adult education programmes. In the Bouaké region of the Côte d'Ivoire, a group of mothers banded together to cultivate a field for profit. Their motive was to raise the money necessary for their children's schooling. To make their enterprise maximally productive – and without assistance from the school or educational authority – they called on an agricultural trainer to help them obtain the necessary inputs and teach them the necessary skills. In adult programmes, efforts to combine literacy instruction with training in improved agriculture, small businesses and income-generating activities have foundered, because they could not obtain the help of the appropriate technical staff. Could the flagship not help design measures to support educational, agricultural and off-

farm business development agencies in collaborating to promote the sorts of enterprise undertaken by the women of Bouaké?

In contrast to the task of determining just how the ERP flagship should reinforce education for rural people, identifying what it should decidedly not attempt is relatively simple. In the matter of objectives, long and varied experience has demonstrated that fostering positive attitudes towards agriculture and manual labour and to reducing rural-urban migration are beyond the power of educational programmes. They are much more under the influence of the economy and its income structure. Related to this is the observation that separate systems or curricula for rural populations are usually rejected by their intended beneficiaries, simply because they appear to cut off avenues to higher-status wage and salary employment, while programmes of pre-vocational training for primary and elementary schools do not yield the expected results.

Discussion

The discussion, which followed the three presentations, ranged over a gamut of issues, from parental control of local schools and teachers to ensuring that PRSP were genuinely 'country driven' and not the preserve of macroeconomists from ministries of finance or economic planning. It reflected the complex nexus of issues involved in education for rural people, as well as the numerous cultural and institutional contexts to which policies need to be adapted. The conclusion was that the ERP flagship should accord priority to a limited number of broad goals. It should in addition help to adapt strategies and measures towards those goals to specific contexts. For example, the topics usually covered by what is commonly known as 'family life education' can contribute to understanding concerns about gender, equality, equity, rural-urban differences, poverty, health and nutrition, so that its promotion could be a goal of the flagship. Clearly, however, no single curriculum in the subject could satisfy the many cultures and religions around the world, while states differ in their arrangements for selecting and developing curricula. Therefore, how the flagship approached this goal would have to be careful, specific and adaptive. Alongside this, the flagship would need to approach issues like institutional reform and decentralization with a balanced and comprehensive perspective, so as to avoid either creating new and possibly worse problems,

while solving old ones, or exacerbating the disruptions that arise from pendulum swings in policy.

The flagship's strength should be advocacy, developed through two main capacities. First would be the capacity to monitor and review trends and plans. On the one hand, the flagship could monitor factors, patterns and shifts in the demand for education among various rural communities and groups. On the other, it could review relevant plans and budgets to assess whether the educational interests of rural people were adequately served. Second would be the capacity to convene appropriate forums – whether face to face, by radio, Internet, video-conference or other medium – to keep issues of education for rural people in the consciousness of policy-makers, practitioners and the general public. As regards PRSP, the flagship should support efforts to ensure that rural people are properly represented in designing the programmes. As regards SWAp, the flagship should promote a holistic approach to assess the implications for the education of rural people in any given sector and possibly across more than one sector. For example, planning for the water sector might include negotiations with the food, health and education sectors on appropriate educational modules for primary, secondary and adult education.

Chapter 4

Monitoring mechanisms and indicators

The workshop discussed indicators and mechanisms for monitoring developments and progress in education for rural people. Three participants¹⁷ opened the discussion with presentations, which laid out the issues and some experiences. First came the case of the initiative in Croatia, which began as recently as October 2002. The government is formulating an overall strategy for rural development and requested FAO to assist with a component for education for rural people.¹⁸ In the two months since work began, it has been possible to agree an approach, a framework for analysis and a set of indicators, that would ensure harmonization with the country's current education policies and strategy, its EFA plan and its policies for rural development and agriculture. Designing mechanisms for implementation will be the next step.

Croatia has around 5 million people, of whom something over 2 million (43 per cent) live in its rural areas, a rural population density of around 37 persons per square kilometre (the European Union deems any population density under 100 persons per square kilometre to be rural). Economically, the country is classed as 'upper-middle income' with a per-capita income of US\$4,520 in 1998. The rural per-capita income is likely to be somewhat lower. Most rural households earn their incomes from several farm and off-farm activities. In terms of human development, Croatia ranks high: life expectancy for women is 77 years, the mortality rate for children under the age of 5 is only 10 per 1,000 – compared with 5 per 1,000 in Sweden and 286 per 1,000 in Sierra Leone – and the female illiteracy rate is only 4 per cent. The net enrolment ratio in primary schools is 82 per cent and both boys

17. In order of presentation, Patrick Gautier, SDRE/FAO, Shigeru Aoyagi, Literacy and NFE/UNESCO, and Jean-Claude Balmes, GAFD (See *Appendices 11, 12, 13*).
18. The initiative for the request came from the Ministry of Agriculture. This led to some difficulty in involving the Ministry of Education, on the one hand, and explaining to the Ministry of Agriculture, on the other, the necessity of starting the analysis in the provision and content of primary education.

and girls are expected to complete 12 years of both primary and secondary courses.

Although these statistics are likely to be less favourable for Croatia's rural people, they would nevertheless suggest that a strategy for education for them would be more in the nature of an operation to mop up pockets of rural disadvantage, rather than an urgent campaign to rectify serious inequities. However, to be soundly designed, any operation requires sufficient relevant and reliable information on what is already in existence, what is missing and what might be improved. The kind of information required to steer a strategy for education for rural development is not readily available or easily generated, even in countries that have reached Croatia's stage of human and economic development. For instance, the data in the country do not distinguish between urban and rural conditions. To identify precisely and with parsimony just what additional information would be needed to proceed, the government and FAO team first established and defined three foundation concepts: 'basic education', framed in terms of actual programmes ranging from pre-school through to literacy and occupational training for youths and adults; 'basic learning needs' comprising the content of knowledge, values and skills; and 'education for rural people' envisaging a broad educational approach for rural children, adolescents and adults in the perspective of enhancing rural development, as requested by the Croatian Government, and reducing rural poverty.

The next step established an agreed analytical scheme. Each component of education would be examined from six perspectives: (1) supply of educational opportunity; (2) actual access to opportunity by population groups; (3) demand expressed through enrolments; (4) quality as embodied in curriculum content and instructional materials; (5) quality as exhibited through attendance, completion and graduation rates; and (6) institutional capacity in every level and component of the education support system. In addition, for each agreed indicator, there would be a systematic comparison between national and rural ratios and provisions.

Since the conceptual framework for analysis, monitoring and indicators has been agreed, the Government of Croatia and FAO are moving forward

with designing mechanisms of implementation that will complement the arrangements that now exist for keeping track of supply, access and quality.

The next presentation moved from the case of a single country developing a system-wide monitoring mechanism, to the case of a prototype methodology for monitoring and evaluating only non-formal educational activities across several development sectors. The need for a better methodology springs from three sources. The major force is the combined concerns of EFA, the United Nations Literacy Decade and the drive for poverty reduction. This has led to a deepening recognition that varieties of learning activities take place in most communities and could benefit from being more systematically supported, if the demand for them were better known, along with their contributions, strengths and needs for reinforcement. The third source is the neglect that methods of monitoring and evaluation for non-formal education have suffered during the past quarter of a century, which has led to a loss of credibility.

Financed by UNESCO's Japanese Funds-in-Trust, four sites in three countries¹⁹ are testing the methodology, which aims to combine a participatory community-based approach with the usual quantitative and necessary statistics on supply, demand, take up, completion rates, costs and so on. The community base enables a full picture of the educational opportunities available to and used by specific groups of people. The scope covers learning activities in adult basic education, extension training in agriculture, cattle and other livestock, forestry, fisheries, health, water and the entire range of occupational training, whether by government agencies or other organizations. In addition to the community base, the project attempts to use information technology and specially designed software, MANGO, so as to make the advantages of computers accessible to communities and local educational and training personnel.²⁰ Testing MANGO began in 2001 and should be completed during 2003.

The third presentation focused on monitoring progress towards the Millennium Development Goals for primary education only: gender parity by

19. Cambodia, India (sites in Andhra Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh) and Tanzania.
20. The acronym MANGO stands for Map-based Analysis for Non-formal education Goals and Outcomes.

2005 and universal primary completion by 2015. The shift of emphasis from the gross and net enrolment ratios to the completion ratio as the appropriate indicator of universal primary education was a recognition that only completing the full primary course could ensure that young people had equipped themselves with enough skills to function fully as citizens. To bear out this point, statistics from Niger showed that fewer than a quarter of adults who had completed only four of the seven-year primary course could read easily, whereas nearly 90 per cent of those who had completed the full seven years could do so.²¹ Using examples from several African countries, the presentation documented the disadvantages suffered by rural children – in one case rural boys were only half as likely to enrol in primary school as urban girls. It also highlighted the disparities between boys and girls in both rural and urban areas, and between the richest, the average and the poorest segments of populations, and pointed out that the disparities are to be found at both macro and micro levels. These more disaggregated figures of course bore out the larger-scale data presented in the opening addresses. They also highlighted the differences that exist between countries in progress towards EFA and in the tasks that remain to be accomplished.

The collection of school data has seen considerable improvement over the past 10 years or so in a number of countries, and central ministries now have databases that could produce detailed disaggregated analyses by regions, provinces and districts. They could generate current information on gender distribution, age distribution, rates of repetition, survival and completion, the incidence of multi-grade teaching and biennial enrolment, as well as pupil/teacher ratios and the distribution of textbooks. At present, however, very few countries actually capitalize on this potential for information and management. This could be a point of leverage for the ERP flagship.

For identifying and comparing trends countrywide, updated demographic data are necessary, but expensive to obtain and therefore scarce. Instead, reliance is placed on average inter-census growth rates that tend to ignore migrations, recent changes in the fertility rate or in the spread of HIV/AIDS. However, several countries do conduct periodic household surveys, which

21. UNESCO originally estimated that four years of effective primary schooling sufficed to enable a child to acquire permanent skills in reading and writing.

can be very helpful in detecting rural/urban and other comparisons and for cross-checking data derived from the school system, particularly from the perspective of poverty alleviation.

Monitoring the quality of achievements and outcomes has for the most part relied on standardized examinations. Despite their limitations in reach – often, pupils thought by their teachers not likely to do well are discouraged from sitting the examinations – and quality in terms of the skills they test, these can be analyzed to detect weaknesses in teaching in particular subjects and in particular geographic areas and schools. However, a few countries have gone beyond general examinations and have introduced more probing assessments of knowledge and skills gained, but only on the basis of samples. These of course need to be reiterated periodically, which in turn requires capacity and expense.

Whatever the progress in refining and monitoring indicators, progress towards UPC itself depends on designing and, even more, on implementing sound education policies. Major gains in efficiency in retaining and actually instructing pupils are imperative, and these can be achieved only through effective reforms in matters like the actual allocation of resources, teachers' terms of service, repetition rates, numbers of hours actually taught in a school year, actual provision of texts and other learning materials. Many of these are of course to be found in the target values of the Fast Track Initiative (FTI). Maintaining a special focus on rural people is an essential ingredient of UPC, for most of the progress needs to be made with poor and very poor rural families (and also poor urban families). The ERP flagship could help ensure that the favourable contexts provided by SWAp and the FTI are properly utilized, as well as work to develop, establish and sustain workable mechanisms for monitoring, data collection, data analysis and the generation of reliable, up-to-date information.

Discussion

The workshop participants recognized that indicators require data and that data require people with the requisite capacities, time and financial resources to gather, collate, organize and analyze them, and then disseminate the information generated. The fact that most countries have an abundance

of data, which they have not analyzed for the purposes of policy and management or for tracking disparities between rural and urban populations, suggests that they may well lack the resources or capacity, or both, to do so, and it is obviously important not to construct monitoring systems that cannot be sustained by local capacities. What seems to be called for is a strengthening of Management Information Systems, along with a streamlining of indicators and the data required to generate them. That would be helpful not only for countries with data overload, but also for those where data are scarce. However, any streamlining should take care to include indicators not only of inputs and outcomes, but also of process, to enable the monitoring of political changes and reforms.

In addition to the concerns about the quantities of data, there was some concern about quality and reliability: for example, school systems where resources are allocated by enrolments have been known to inflate their figures. The issue of devising incentives for the collectors of data to collect carefully and conscientiously had to be considered.

For the national level, the data should be sufficient to indicate overall progress towards EFA. Within the nation, data would be needed to measure how specific areas or population groups were faring in regard to specific objectives. It should also be possible for local people to see how their own localities were doing, which would of course entail developing local databases and nurturing local capabilities to interpret them. This is of course what the MANGO test is seeking to do. Early indications from the three countries testing MANGO suggest that, when local people understand the data and appreciate their usefulness, they can and indeed will exert themselves to help with collecting them.

A further point is that local databases facilitate linking the data from the school system with those from non-formal education activities, which in turn facilitates consistency and complementarity between data and indicators. Indeed, local databases facilitate linking educational development more completely with the wider spectrum of local rural development.

Chapter 5

Co-ordination for effective aid policies and practices

The final discussion of this workshop for aid agencies turned to considering issues of co-ordination between the many agencies involved with different forms of education and training for rural peoples and their development. Four presentations led the discussions.²² Co-ordinating external assistance is already an important item on the agenda of both recipient governments and the agencies dealing with financial resources and technical assistance. PRSP, SWAp, ‘sleeping partners’ and ‘basket’ or pooled financing are all examples of initiatives to promote more effective co-ordination and consistency. In addition, many if not most governments hold annual co-ordination group meetings, at which they and their partners review relative areas of support and approaches to sector development, and agree on strategies to achieve the goals of the different sectors. The principles of avoiding duplications of effort and over-concentrations of resources and seeking how best to invest increasingly scarce externally provided resources to maximize development gains are universally agreed, if not always ideally implemented. Co-ordination is acknowledged to be particularly important for rural development, which is multisectoral in nature but depends on a monosectoral division of labour almost everywhere.

Accumulating experience has made it clear that effective co-ordination between disparate and independent agencies requires at least some sense of partnership. It is also clear that the scope of both co-ordination and partnership needs to be widely cast to include not only donors and governments, but also all the many levels of stakeholders from central ministries through the leaderships of local communities to the prospective beneficiaries themselves. The question for the workshop was whether the ERP flagship could do

22. In order of presentation: Tom E. Vandenbosch (see *Appendix 14*), Sukhdeep Brar (see *Appendix 15*), Malika Ladjali and Christian Fauliau (see Part 2 of *Appendix 10*).

anything about facilitating better partnerships and more effective co-ordination in the service of education and development for rural people.

Eight key principles for successful partnerships were set out. They applied with equal force to partnerships between two individuals, between two or several agencies and between agencies and less-formal communities of interest, such as the parents concerned with primary schools or participants in an adult education programme.

Key principles for successful partnerships

1. Agreeing in detail a common vision, joint objectives and mutual benefits;
2. Identifying complementary contributions that will clearly create new value;
3. Distributing roles in alignment with comparative advantages and without duplication;
4. Openness to learning from each other;
5. Trust and transparency in shared decision-making;
6. Promoting informal personal connections to cement formal institutional links;
7. Fairly sharing work, problems, proceeds, recognition and rewards;
8. Shared monitoring and evaluation of synergy, efficiency, productivity, diversity, openness, flexibility, adaptability, security of relationship and legitimacy.

Working in support of partnerships, and particularly in support of the sixth principle, is the concept of networks. Its aim is to stimulate interaction, sharing information, strengthening professional support and raising awareness of emerging issues and developments among all the stakeholders in a partnership. Although networks can form and develop spontaneously, they, like the partnerships themselves, require deliberate nurturing and support to be fully effective.

In the context of large organizations, especially those with branches spread through several countries around the globe, the leadership's commitment to partnerships needs not only to be explicit and strong, it needs also to permeate every one of its personnel, whose functions affect a partnership. However, without clear incentives to dedicate time and effort to constructing partnerships and making them work, staff can tend to talk the language of partnership, but continue on easier paths of implementation. The ERP flagship could be of use to its many partners by prompting them to assess the extent to which their internal patterns of incentives for recognition and career advancement support and even promote an orientation to partnerships and networks.

In education for rural people and in the present push for decentralization, partnerships and networks can involve eight or more sets of stakeholders on both the national and international planes. As this workshop itself demonstrates, a mechanism like the ERP flagship needs, on the one hand, to work and network with the appropriate personnel of three sets of international stakeholders – governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental – to create, be sure of and sustain a shared vision in the face of the usual fluidity of careers and policies. On the other hand, when it comes to particular countries, the ERP flagship has a double task. It has not only to check that the local staff of the international stakeholders have been appraised of and share the vision, it has also to forge and negotiate that vision with five or more national sets of stakeholders: the central government agencies involved – in rural development, they could be several – the local government agencies involved, a number of non-governmental agencies, some of which may operate only within very restricted areas, teachers' unions or associations, and local stakeholders like community leaders, the parents of local school populations or the participants in local education and development programmes. The number of links in the chain of connections that need to be fashioned to achieve sound partnerships in education for rural people may help explain why the terms 'partnership', 'co-ordination', 'co-operation' and 'collaboration' appear so often in print as aspirations, but less often as fully realized implementation.

However, there are many experiences to show that care, patience and time can make these concepts realities. An example presented to the workshop was the Shiksha Karmi project in the Indian State of Rajasthan. It has a

history of 27 years, 1975-2002, during which time it has grown from a pilot of just three village schools to over 4,000 schools in more than 2,000 relatively isolated villages. Although a detailed description of the initiative is not appropriate here, the experience gives several useful signals for policy in education for rural people.

Perhaps the most important for present purposes is that the ERP flagship should be on the lookout for these kinds of initiatives and use them to develop guidelines on how governments might encourage and incorporate partnerships for education for rural people into their plans for EFA.

A second signal is further confirmation that local NGOs can be vital in developing and testing ideas that are directly relevant to poor rural people and fill gaps that the standard government machinery fails to close. Appropriately encouraging and reinforcing their efforts, particularly those which are faith based, would appear to be sound policy. In several countries, however, relations between governments and NGOs have been marked more by mutual wariness than by mutual trust, encouragement and co-operation. Where this remains the case, the ERP flagship might seek opportunities to promote better relations between the two sets of stakeholders for the greater benefit of rural people.

Alongside the NGOs as possibly under-utilized resources are the academic and private sectors. The educational, agricultural, environmental and economic branches of higher education could be encouraged to undertake the kinds of qualitative, quantitative and action research that could uncover opportunities for productive partnerships between community groups, NGOs, government agencies and international supporters. Similarly, those parts of the private sector that have an interest in rural development and prosperity could, where appropriate, be invited to consider partnerships, while its consulting branch might complement the research capacities of the universities.

A third signal from Shiksha Karmi concerns what is called 'people's participation'. The initiating NGO, the Social Work and Research Centre (SWRC), found that the parents of school-age children, as well as the leaderships of their communities, were willing to accept responsibility for managing and maintaining the schools. In addition to time and effort, this often involved a frequently overlooked type of material resource, namely,

contributions in kind – labour, thatching materials, bricks and the like. These forms of contribution are important, if only to give the community some status as an equal, contributing partner, together with a real and palpable stake in the ownership of the products and benefits of the partnership. The ERP flagship should be sure not to allow this aspect of partnership to be neglected.

A further concern was raised in regard to a rural population group that was at risk of being overlooked. This group comprised the orphans created by the HIV/AIDS pandemic. The inability of many families and communities to cope with the orphans meant that the state had to replace the deceased parents in supporting and educating them. Given the usual bias of the state to concern itself more with urban populations, there was a danger that the extent of the rural dimension of the problem could be underestimated and underserved. The ERP flagship will then need to maintain a watching brief in the interests of the rural HIV/AIDS orphans.

A final point in the presentations was that, given the already long and chronically unequal struggle for education and development for rural people and the huge challenge of its task, the ERP flagship should be a light mechanism of advocacy and co-ordination, shake itself free from bureaucratic constraints and dare to behave as a pioneering, activist, lobbying mechanism.

Chapter 6

Summary of concrete measures for the ERP flagship to take

The discussions produced a number of guiding points for FAO and IIEP/ UNESCO to follow in setting the direction for the ERP flagship and getting it off the ground. Perhaps the most powerful was that education for rural people and for rural development has a long and varied history of efforts to make educational programmes of all kinds more and more relevant and directly useful. It signified that the ERP flagship should not spend time on reinventing wheels. Instead, it should aim first to *make the accumulated cases and insights known and familiar* to current and succeeding generations of practitioners, decision-makers and policy-makers in all agencies concerned with promoting learning and education for rural development. For the purpose, it should not only use the media available for general dissemination, like cheap publications or a web page with links to all the relevant sources, but should seek to target specific clienteles.

In countries where dialogue on possible assistance to address ERP has started – Bosnia, Croatia, Egypt, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mozambique, Serbia – the specific clienteles are relatively clear. However, in countries where the poverty and disadvantages of the rural populations are more severe and more widespread, but where the capacity to articulate them may well be deficient, the flagship should take proactive steps to identify the potential clienteles and bring the information to their notice. To heighten the sense of urgency, brief and inexpensive discussions of that information between the decision-makers of several countries could be arranged through the World Bank’s network of videoconference facilities.

Second, the ERP flagship should use the insights to *respond to requests for guidelines* on strategies for education for rural people in a range of cultural, political and ecological contexts. Such guidelines may be particularly useful for FAO and UNESCO regional offices.

Third, it should develop specific guidance for *developing indicators of progress and instituting reliable mechanisms for monitoring* the requisite data. While the indicators should be especially useful for governments and other local agencies involved with rural people, they would also serve the international community is assessing movement towards EFA and the MDG.

Fourth, a particularly valuable service by the ERP flagship would be *the assessment of the costs* of ensuring the availability of the range of educational opportunities to rural groups in differing circumstances.

Fifth, at the international level with governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental bodies, the ERP flagship might *assess the weight of priority* that each body really assigns to the education and development of rural people. Where the weight seems lighter than warranted or where opportunities seem to have been overlooked, the flagship might undertake appropriate advocacy – it should certainly not underestimate the power of constructive, effective lobbying. Part of this effort could be assessing the internal incentives in each of these institutions to encourage their staff to work in real partnership with other like-minded agencies.

Sixth, similarly at country level, the ERP flagship should see whether the *different rural groups feature appropriately* in plans for meeting both EFA and the MDG. Where higher priority seems warranted, the flagship could use the convening power that both FAO and UNESCO have acquired to have the issue discussed, along with possible instruments for dealing with it equitably. At the same time, the analysis of plans should enable the flagship to identify missing elements. That should in turn enable the flagship to put together a ‘service package’ of knowledge, tools, concepts and specialists, which it could advertise to countries implementing EFA and aiming for the MDG, but not according their rural peoples sufficient attention or resources. In advertising, the flagship should of course address not only ministries of education, but also all the sectoral development ministries and departments, which need rural people to undertake some systematic learning for their programmes to bear full fruit.

Finally, the very size, distributions and current status of rural populations and of their poorer members make it certain that the demand for the ERP

flagship's services will outstrip the currently available supply. Inevitably, then, the flagship will need to determine priorities between regions, between countries and possibly even between sub-populations within countries.

Next meeting

The ERP flagship might convene a meeting to follow this one, once it has undertaken an analysis of a number of plans for EFA and MDG and put together the suggested service package. However, while the purpose of the present meeting made it appropriate to convene only aid agencies, the discussion of the analyses and service package should involve forums of both user governments and aid agencies that actually work with them.

Chapter 7

Current action by participating agencies

After the introductory sessions, the workshop used a ‘show and tell’ session to survey the current policies, programmes and actions of the participating agencies. This section summarizes the 25 contributions in the alphabetical order of the names of the agencies, with the names of their representatives following in parentheses. Where the representatives supplied papers describing their organizations’ work, the number of the appendix in which the paper appears is also given.

Asian Development Bank (*Sukhdeep Brar*)

The Asian Development Bank has of course always supported programmes and projects aimed at improving different dimensions of rural life. That includes projects in education for rural people – examples exist in the most rural countries and among their poorest people, Bangladesh, Nepal, Viet Nam, for instance. Nevertheless, in August 2002, the Bank reformulated its policies on education to emphasize that educational projects must serve the main purpose of reducing poverty. The effects of good education are now well documented and understanding of how best to achieve those effects has evolved out of experience.

The Bank will be supporting efforts to achieve *basic Education for All*, not simply *universal primary education for all children*. It will join in SWAp and also, after thorough analyses of the sectoral situation, in approaching sub-sectors in a similarly holistic way. In parallel with the sectoral approach, the Bank will exert itself to simplify the design and processing of projects. It will also strive for flexibility in assisting governments to respond to the particular requirements of particular groups of rural people. At the same time, extending the holistic perspective in development, the Bank will pursue and work with governments to promote cross-sectoral liaisons and connections, so that education contributes to and is enriched by agriculture and other branches of food production, forestry and other forms of environmental management;

health, water, transport, local government and other forms of social and political development; and small business and other forms of economic development.

Associates in Research and Education for Development *(Sonja Fagerberg-Diallo) (Appendix 16)*

The Associates in Research and Education for Development (ARED) specializes in developing and testing curricula for adults in African languages in both rural and urban areas. The rural groups with whom it has been working for the past 10 years are the mobile pastoralists of Senegal. ARED is an organization that puts into actual practice well-known concepts about working at the grass roots and hands on and face to face with the learners in view, participatory analysis of local needs and curriculum development, using the language most familiar to the learners – in the case of the pastoralists, Fulfulde, spoken by more than 25 million people across the Sahel. It tries to design an education system that will fit the people for whom it is intended, rather than attempt to force people to fit a system never intended for them.

Working with pastoralists, a marginalized and relatively vulnerable set of groups, has stimulated ARED to develop methods, processes and materials that can enable people to learn without formal, regular classes or professionally qualified teachers. The status and predicaments of the pastoralists in a larger society, which does not understand their ways of life and labours under prejudices about them, have stimulated ARED to develop books that help the pastoralists defend their rights. The aim is to help them read to learn, rather than just learn to read. In effect, ARED now promotes community solidarity and development, not just simple tuition.

Austria, Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs *(Maria-Waltraud Rabitsch) (Appendix 17)*

The Government of Austria is in tune with most of the world in regarding education as one of the most effective tools for reducing poverty. It takes a broad view and prefers to work for basic education for all by 2015, rather than only for universal primary schooling by that date. Austria also has a

strong interest in rural development, but has not set out a formal policy on the subject. It finds the movement towards intersectoral approaches to development encouraging, as well as the movement to promote rural development through feasible forms of decentralization. To support and promote this, it participates in district development programmes that stress building local capacity in planning, formulating and monitoring standards, and improving curricula for local training.

In education, Austria has noted that, although post-basic and tertiary education are of huge importance for national development, their beneficiaries, even when they hail from a rural background, seldom return to work in a rural area. Austria therefore focuses on reinforcing the earlier bands of schooling: primary, secondary and vocational. Here it helps with improving access to schooling and on enhancing motivation and raising attendance rates. In addition, it supports primary education for youths and adults, which thus involves it in adult literacy with appropriate education.

Since the population of Austria is only about 8 million, the funds available for international co-operation are comparatively small. Therefore, Austria focuses those funds on only 19 partner countries. Eight of them are 'priority' countries that attract the bulk of co-operation, while the other 11 'co-operation countries' are able to propose programmes for which they have urgent needs unmet by other sources of co-operation.

Belgium, Directorate General for International Co-operation *(Edwin Bourgeois)*

The Government of Belgium has adopted the view that education must have poverty alleviation as one of its principal aims. It recognizes that the urban areas also contain poor people – worldwide, they constitute 30 per cent of the poor, no small proportion. In addition, when the rural poor reach the point of destitution, they migrate to the towns and cities, so that reducing rural poverty would help slow the rate of increase in urban poverty. Therefore, Belgium is helping its partners to raise the quality of education in their rural areas. For example, it is assisting Viet Nam, where 80 per cent of the population is rural, with a four-year programme to place master trainers in seven provinces

to train some 700 primary-school teachers in making their instruction more effective and more immediately useful in their localities. In China, where two-thirds of the population are rural and where efforts to achieve universal literacy are half a century old, Belgium is contributing to adult literacy combined with practical training in agriculture, horticulture and raising small stock. Similar examples could come from other partners, Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Tanzania and others.

Canada, Canadian International Development Agency

(John F. Morris)

The present Canadian Minister for International Development is firmly oriented to agriculture and food security and is pressing the agency to formulate a strategy for co-operating with partner countries in promoting rural development. Given the need for consultations within the Canadian Government itself, as well as with interested partners, the international community and the research and evaluation community, the strategy paper is likely to require some six months to mature.

More generally, the sector policy priorities of CIDA are decided, with the cross-cutting themes of gender and environment affecting all programmes. CIDA is preoccupied, too, with the question of delivering its aid more effectively overseas. Resolving to move from projects to programmes and to programmes that are 'country-driven' rather than only 'government-driven' is easy, but implementing the resolve through the various patterns of bureaucratic machinery that exist in each partner country has turned out to be complicated.

Despite this, CIDA has since the Dakar Forum put even more effort into supporting education that supports development. With Canada's quadrupling its allocations for international development, CIDA has committed itself to supporting the countries in the Fast Track Initiative and at the G-8 meeting in June 2002 also committed itself to contributing to the Africa fund. For example, an allocation of \$100 million will buttress basic education in Mozambique and Tanzania.

Finally, since the deficiency of data and information about education still hampers planning and the allocation of resources, CIDA is making grants to UNESCO to strengthen the capabilities of its Institute of Statistics, now based in Montreal.

Commonwealth Secretariat (*Ved Goel*)

The priorities for the Commonwealth Secretariat are the reduction of poverty, the achievement of the MDG, universal access to and completion of the primary-education cycle, and equity for both girls and boys. Education in small states, whether island or land-locked, experiences problems peculiar to itself. Therefore, the Commonwealth Secretariat gives priority attention to the small states of the Commonwealth, particularly the small island states of the Caribbean and Pacific.

France, Agence française de développement (*Jean-Claude Balmes*) (**Appendix 18**)

Rural development and infrastructure have for years been the major sectors in the portfolio of the Agence française de développement (AfD). Since 1980, the rural development portfolio has included an increasing number of training projects, which aimed to help rural communities articulate their priorities, then build their capacities to achieve their priorities through developing local social and productive infrastructure. In 1999, the Government of France expanded the mission of AfD to include education and health, so the agency created a department of human development. In the three years that have elapsed since then, AfD has funded eight education projects in sub-Saharan Africa, all of them for rural communities.

Most of these projects are components of sector investment programmes, with parallel funding from a number of other sources. In line with the practice of forming consortia with other actors in development co-operation, AfD has committed itself to participation in the Fast Track Initiative. The projects focus on rural communities with low enrolment rates in primary school and enlist the partnership of NGOs in the social aspects of identifying and dissolving

the constraints on enrolments and of building the communities' capacities to manage and monitor the performance of the schools.

Current investment projects align themselves with the MDG and, for education, particularly with universal primary completion and gender parity. They tend to have six core components: (1) school construction; (2) capacity building for teachers, parent-teacher associations, education officers and local government officers; (3) micro-planning to improve school mapping; (4) promoting multi-grade teaching with training and supplying books and teaching aids; (5) social work to foster a community's demand for schooling, especially for the girls; and (6) community involvement in school governance, along with appropriate local projects based on the school.

Financial support for these kinds of projects has been enhanced through bilateral debt relief. For instance, in Mauritania, an amount equivalent to what would normally have been allocated to debt relief is granted to the Treasury as a budgetary resource for the education sector development programme. Although there is an annual assessment of the budget and performance, while outcomes and outcome indicators are monitored, the practical problems of assessing actual progress and in particular the reduction of gender disparity in the rural areas have not yet been fully solved.

France, Ministry of Agriculture, Food, Fisheries and Rural Affairs (Alain Maragnani) (Appendix 19)

The French Ministry of Agriculture, Food, Fisheries and Rural Affairs works mainly with the countries of French-speaking West Africa on improving their agriculture. Within the broader context of rural development, two facts about these countries have to be borne in mind. First, most rural households are farming households – some 70 per cent of the labour force are farmers. Second, farming households make their livings not simply from farming, but from diverse sets of complementary activities: there is no strict frontier between the production, processing and marketing of agricultural products or between these and local crafts and other activities. These households subsist in a period of demographic, social and economic change that is probably too rapid for them to produce through the normal empirical procedures the new knowledge

necessary for them to adapt. In parallel, the education and training systems set up over the past half century have tended to deteriorate rather than respond to the challenges of change, while small-scale private efforts to cope with the situation have produced a varied and incoherent provision of training.

A factor exacerbating the difficulties of working with farming households is their lack of sufficient literacy and numeracy to access and absorb the technical, legal and commercial information necessary to deal with their situation and to protect their interests.

Therefore, the Ministry supports efforts to establish systems that will provide (1) high-quality basic education; and (2) the literacy education for extremely heterogeneous clienteles of youth and adults, as well as the training for extremely heterogeneous and evolving occupational situations through diverse sets of suppliers.

**Inter-American Institute for Co-operation on Agriculture,
Directorate of Education and Training**
(*François Dagenais*) (**Appendix 20**)

The Inter-American Institute for Co-operation on Agriculture (IICA) serves 16 American countries with a range of training in agriculture. With eight of the Caribbean states, it runs a network for distance education and training in agriculture. The IICA also takes part in the World Bank's Global Development Learning Network, through which it organizes global discussions for farmers, agricultural technicians, managers and agro-entrepreneurs through videoconferences, teleconferences and the Internet.

Through partnership with universities in all parts of the Americas, IICA has constructed 22 courses in agriculture, each in the three languages of English, French and Spanish, along with courses for masters' degrees. The courses are provided on CD-ROM, backed up by local tutors through computer and e-mail. Close to 1,000 students are enrolled in the Caribbean.

In November 2002, IICA and the Global Development Learning Network contracted to develop a special module in agriculture and rural development

in the Americas. It will aim to connect the 34 ministries of agriculture, the 500 schools of agriculture and veterinary sciences, a similar number of technical schools of agriculture and all training centres linked to farmers' and other rural organizations. The aims are to have a distance learning centre in all important rural centres and to establish connections and encourage exchanges between the northern and southern countries of the Americas. Preparing the necessary business plans with all the participating institutions should be completed in 2003.

The IICA offers its courses on a fee-paying basis. However, it also has a scholarship fund, which enables it to provide bursaries of \$200 per student per course. Nobody need miss out on an opportunity to learn because of a lack of means.

International Centre for Research in Agroforestry

(Tom Vandenbosch)

The International Centre for Research in Agroforestry (ICRAF) focuses on training trainers in ecological and natural resource management. It uses networks to link colleges and universities across regions and supplements its traditional courses with open and distance learning. One of its strands of work is to study current curricula in primary and secondary education with a view to incorporating natural resource management into them through various devices of adaptation.

Experience has taught ICRAF that training individuals is insufficient to bring about institutional change: it is necessary also to train the institutions in supporting staff so that they are able to put their new learning to use. ICRAF has learned, too, that educational networks are needed not just at the intercontinental level, but at the regional and national levels also.

International Labour Office

(Josiane Capt) (Appendix 21)

The International Labour Office (ILO) bears in mind the declaration of Philadelphia in 1944, "Poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity

everywhere.” It is concerned, therefore, with poverty reduction, decent work and the protection of basic rights at work, employment promotion, social protection and social dialogue. In recent years, employment has been neglected as a way out of poverty and social exclusion, so that the ILO wants to reinvigorate an earlier drive for employment promotion and skills development in correspondence with employability. This includes not only the workers in the formal labour markets, but also the informal sector and rural workers, who in many countries constitute the majorities of the labour forces.

However, targeting the underemployed and the unemployed tends to be difficult in most rural areas, and requires the development of detailed knowledge bases. The tools on which the ILO is focusing for development include community-based training – a comprehensive system for skills development for wage employment and self-employment for the working poor – grassroots management training for micro-entrepreneurs and the self-employed, training in the elimination of child labour and capacity building in the gender equality, poverty reduction and employment promotion dimensions.

Some of the many challenges that face the ILO in skills development are:

- mainstreaming the concerns of the poor into training policies and formal training systems;
- improving employability and, more importantly, economic opportunities;
- improving job quality;
- upgrading training quality and practices in the informal-employment sectors;
- developing flexible and adaptable training practices;
- linking training to other support services, such as micro-credit or business-development advice, that may enable rural workers to break out of the low-income trap;
- addressing the issues of sustainability.

International Plant Genetic Resources Institute

(Elizabeth Doupé Goldberg)

The International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI) works to contribute to the alleviation of hunger and poverty through capitalizing on the potential of the world's plant genetic resources to generate and sustain sufficient supplies of food for the human race. It also works at strengthening the capacities and competence of national institutions to work on the plant genetics of their own countries. As part of this programme, IPGRI identifies and fosters key institutes as magnets for a master's degree in plant genetics. It also adapts content for existing curricula and is exploring the possibilities of offering courses through distance learning. The major issue it faces is that of the sustainability of the capacities of the centres of excellence, in terms both of the recruitment of students and the retention of professionals.

International Training Centre of the International Labour Organization *(Frans Lenglet)* **(Appendix 22)**

The International Training Centre is the training arm of the International Labour Organization. It therefore works in support of the ILO's goals for decent, adequately remunerative and socially protected work for all, especially the 80 per cent of the world's labour force, the majority women, who work in the informal economy and in the rural areas. The Centre operates on the assumption that improvements in agricultural and rural productivity, health, nutrition and community organization will be strongly facilitated by universal basic and primary education. Based in Turin, Italy, its activities take place mainly at the Centre itself, but also reach out through courses in ILO member countries and through distance learning. In total, the Centre reaches about 9,000 participants annually.

Over time, the Centre has developed a number of approaches, programmes and packages on economic empowerment, poverty eradication and social inclusion. They are designed to assist people working with and in the informal economy and with rural populations in developing and transition economies.

A few examples of the courses and materials available are: ‘Local employment initiatives’, ‘Women’s entrepreneurship’, ‘Micro-finance’.

Iowa State University College of Agriculture

(David Acker)

The College of Agriculture of Iowa State University undertakes much the same tasks as any other college of agriculture in the USA. It recognizes that agriculture is a central and major part – but only a part – of rural development and that technical knowledge on its own is a very limited tool in promoting either agricultural or rural development. Skills in teamwork and communications are essential complements. To them must be added ethics, value-added processing and learning through service. Its undergraduate and graduate courses all reflect and stress this outlook. The college also encourages its American students to obtain some international experience, is itself involved in projects in China, Mexico and the Ukraine and, like most American institutes of higher education, welcomes a substantial contingent of international students.

The college has had a long-standing co-operative relationship with FAO, has helped formulate and refine the concept and vision of the ERP flagship, and is committed to promoting its work.

Italy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate General for Development Co-operation *(Raffaele de Benedictis)*

The Government of Italy was more than pleased to demonstrate its strong support for and involvement in education for rural people by joining FAO and UNESCO in helping to finance this workshop. As almost one-third of Italy’s population remains rural, the government has a good understanding of the efforts that it must maintain to ensure equity in education and other aspects of human welfare and development. In pursuance of this concern, Italy has granted UNESCO \$2 million to help promote quality and expansion in education. It has also committed itself wholeheartedly to the Fast Track Initiative for EFA and will be increasing its commitments to help ensure that the world meets the MDG.

Italy, Federation of Christian Organizations for International Voluntary Service (*Giovanna Li Perni*)

Very briefly, the Association of Italian NGOs researches into and advocates for desirable structural changes in development policies, infrastructural reform, food security and the sovereignty of rural communities.

The Netherlands, Permanent Representation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to FAO (*Jacco Bos*)

The Royal Netherlands Government has for several years now dedicated 0.8 per cent of the country's GDP to international co-operation. Its budgetary allocation for the purpose for the current fiscal year is \$3.8 billion. The Millennium Development Goals are central to its policies for international co-operation and it regards basic education as indispensable for the achievement of the first goal, namely, the reduction of poverty and hunger to half their current levels by 2015. Since rural people still form the majority in most co-operating countries, basic education for them remains a priority for the Dutch government.

The Dutch government has adopted the policy that co-operation should be country-driven and has therefore decentralized the budget for international co-operation. Sixty-six per cent of the annual budget is distributed to the Dutch embassies in the co-operating countries, so that they can negotiate the optimum allocation with the governments and other local stakeholders. However, the Dutch government recognizes that the total budget is small in face of the large number of countries and the magnitude of the needs and has therefore focused on only 19 countries and on only two or three sectors within each. It also encourages SWAp, care that programmes are sustainable within national priorities and co-ordination between donors. It has a particular concern for the improvement of governance.

Along with its attention to basic education, the Dutch government recognizes, too, that the higher levels of education and post-academic training are vital for rural development and organizes relevant opportunities through centres in Wageningen and Delft in Holland itself. It also supports research:

for example, it has recently allocated \$25 million for investigations into water supplies. At the other end of the scale, it supports FAO in the programme for grass-roots Farmer Field Schools, which combine agricultural training with coaching in empirical, hands-on scientific experiment and measurement, frequently supplemented with basic literacy and numeracy.

Switzerland, Swiss Development Co-operation *(Ernst Bolliger) (Appendix 23)*

Swiss Development Co-operation (SDC) has a special group working on rural development. A four-year project in Bhutan aims to develop forms of field tuition because of local scepticism about the usefulness of scholastic education through the primary school – a Bhutanese woman farmer, for example, stated flatly that her daughters would learn nothing useful for the farm from the school. The cultural disjunction between state schools and the communities in which they are placed exists also in the Sahel countries, where the lack of effective demand for schooling is particularly evident. Further, the effects of the cultural gap are exacerbated by the lack of wage employment for qualified school leavers, on the one hand, and the persisting reluctance of school leavers to stay in their villages and take up the socio-economic activities of their parents, on the other. These last then have good grounds to question the use of schooling.

Therefore, SDC is working in countries in Sahelian Africa, South Asia and Latin America on identifying what attracts different sets of people and age groups to different forms of education. SDC's approach to these groups and communities incorporates training in a range of skills, uses distance-learning concepts where appropriate, and aims for a workable balance between training and coaching. From these experiences, SDC is fashioning a model approach that is grounded in negotiations and contracts with local rural organizations. It empowers these organizations to negotiate with service providers for education and training that serve their priorities and needs for skills. Eventually and progressively, they will be able to design their own programmes and negotiate not only with local service providers, but also with the government and larger development agencies.

United Nations Children's Fund (*Flora Sibanda-Mulder*) **(Appendix 24)**

UNICEF's medium-term strategic plan runs from 2002 to 2005, the year by when the world aims to achieve parity between girls and boys in enrolments in primary school. UNICEF is using girls' education as the main mechanism to address its global education commitments and is promoting the four 'As' as its basic obligation: Access, Attendance, Attainment, Achievement. It is adopting a selective approach, applying four criteria to identify countries in which it will work intensively. The four criteria are: (1) a net enrolment ratio for girls of less than 70 per cent; (2) a gender gap of 10 per cent or more in primary enrolments; (3) the 10 countries with more than 1 million girls out of school; and (4) high-risk countries, heavily affected by HIV/AIDS, civil conflict, natural disasters and other emergencies. Within this frame fall 25 countries, 15 in Africa, eight in South Asia and one each in Australasia and Latin America.

In these countries, UNICEF will advocate girls' education proactively and intensively. It will seek to create effective partnerships and will adopt an intersectoral approach to promote a range of possible measures to facilitate girls' enrolment and perseverance in school. UNICEF is interested in the ERP flagship, because most of the girls who are not in school live in rural areas.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (*Shigeru Aoyagi*)

Three of the goals agreed at the Dakar Forum necessitate a special drive for the education of rural people and call for the special mechanism of the ERP flagship. The most challenging of the three requires the elimination of gender disparities in primary and secondary education by 2005, just three years in the future. The widest disparities of course exist among rural populations. The other two leave more breathing space, but are equally formidable. One goal demands that all children should by 2015 both have access to and complete a compulsory primary-education course, freely provided. It singles out girls, children in difficult circumstances and the children of ethnic minorities for particular attention. Most of these children live in rural

areas. The third goal requires a 50 per cent improvement in levels of adult literacy, especially among women, plus equitable access to basic and continuing education for all adults. Again, the majorities of the people in mind live in rural areas. Alongside these goals, a new United Nations Literacy Decade has just begun.

UNESCO recognizes the ambitious nature of these goals and the struggle they will demand for their fulfilment among rural people. It therefore heartily welcomes FAO's readiness to take up the challenge and responsibility of leading the ERP flagship.

United Nations system Network on Rural Development and Food Security (*Alicia García*)

The Network on Rural Development and Food Security arose from the 1996 World Food Summit and the goal of 'Food for All'. The participants realized ever more strongly that reducing poverty and hunger demanded much more tightly concerted efforts by all partners in development – the United Nations, governments, civil society, donors. The United Nations set up the Network as a mechanism to reinforce ties, synergies and complementary actions between its several organizations and between them and other stakeholders in development.

The Network comprises 20 United Nations system partners and some 80 participating *country thematic groups* around the world. The latter select priority themes based on a country's needs for rural development. Reducing poverty among rural people is the selected theme of many of the country thematic groups, since poverty is a principal cause of food insecurity. Through information, advocacy and other action, the Network and the country thematic groups aim to shape public opinion and mobilize the political will to act effectively against food insecurity.

United States of America, United States Agency for International Development (*John D. Hatch*)

USAID operates on the principle that education builds human capacity and that people living in rural areas are as much entitled to good education as everybody else. It works not only with governments and donor partners, but also with NGOs and with local civil society in order to satisfy educational needs authentically. Its current portfolio of programmes in education for rural people is fully in line with the Dakar goals, so that USAID offers its full support to the ERP flagship.

In Asia and the Near East, USAID is co-operating with eight priority countries, with emphases on girls' education, sanitation and safe water to protect health, radio for more effective communication, literacy to facilitate development and support for small business.

In the Latin America and Caribbean region, USAID is co-operating with a further eight priority countries. The emphases here are more on literacy for rural girls, secondary education, improved instructional technologies and micro-credit schemes.

In Africa, USAID's programme is larger, since it is co-operating with between 11 and 14 countries. The emphases are on expanding access to schooling, scholarships for girls, school sanitation and safety, school feeding programmes, school mapping, school construction and renovation, HIV/AIDS education and rural development.

World Bank (*Christian Fauliau*)

The World Bank is focused on reducing poverty throughout the world and on ensuring education for all. It also focuses on reducing gender disparities in both poverty and education. However, at present it has no policy focusing on rural people as special groups within the meaning of 'all'. This may be due largely to its member borrowing governments, which tend to have no special policies for rural people and who then do not borrow from the World Bank for rural programmes. The current situation may be changing, as the Bank

encourages countries as wholes, and not only their governments, to take the 'driver's seat' in building policies and strategies for the development of the entire country. The concerted push by the international community including the World Bank for decentralization, appropriate capacity building and better governance should work in favour of rural communities and of the rural poor in particular. However, as the macroeconomists in the Bank and in ministries of finance and economic planning tend not to understand rural milieus, rural development specialists in the Bank and in member countries will need to dedicate much time and effort to advocacy to ensure that rural people are not overlooked.

World Food Programme (*Flora Sibanda-Mulder*) (Appendix 25)

For the past four decades, since 1963, the World Food Programme (WFP) has been supporting access to education through providing meals to schoolchildren in both urban and rural areas in developing countries. It uses food to attract children to school in food-insecure areas, where enrolment ratios are lowest.

Three hundred million of the world's children are chronically hungry: approximately 170 million of these children attend school and try to learn while fighting hunger. Rural children often walk long distances to school on empty stomachs. Many cannot afford to bring food from home to eat during the day. They have problems concentrating on their lessons, while teachers report that breakfast-deprived children fall asleep in class. Several studies have demonstrated that the effects of short-term hunger are exacerbated in children who already have a history of under-nutrition and suffer nutritional deficiencies. WFP school meals encourage poor children to attend class and help them concentrate on their studies. In 2001, WFP fed over 15 million children in schools in 57 countries.

WFP places special emphasis on meeting the needs of women and girls in all of its programmes. Two of WFP's four 'commitments to women' made at the 1995 Beijing Conference on Women relate specifically to educating girls. Sixty per cent of WFP's country programme resources in countries with

a significant gender gap are targeted to women and girls and 50 per cent of all education resources are targeted to girls.

To reinforce incentives to send girls to school, WFP distributes basic food items, for example a sack of rice or several litres of vegetable oil are distributed to families in exchange for enrolling their daughters. These ‘take-home rations’ compensate parents for the loss of their daughters’ labours and enable girls to attend school. Wherever such programmes have been introduced, girls’ enrolment has increased by at least 50 per cent.

World Organization of the Scout Movement

(Paolo Rozera)

The Scout movement is firmly committed to the concept of lifelong learning and is indeed characterized by it. It is also firmly committed to organizing non-formal education for the skills, knowledge and attitudes required to live a satisfying life in one’s community and society. Two principles are central to the Scout movement’s work. The first is voluntarism, which is associated with an orientation to serving people and a value system that supports community service. The second principle is youth participation, which means simply that, as a society’s young people constitute its future, they should start learning the values of service from an early age. The movement’s work in education and service embraces both urban and rural youth.

Appendix 1

List of participants updated 11-12-02

Aid agencies workshop 'Education for rural people: targeting the poor' Rome, FAO Headquarters, 12-13 December 2002

Multilateral agencies and institutions

Asian Development Bank

1. Ms Sukhdeep Brar
Education Specialist
South Asia Social Sectors Division
Asian Development Bank
PO Box 789 0980 Metro MANILA
Philippines

Fax: (632) 636-2293
Telef: (632) 632-6907 or (632) 632-5573
E-mail: sbrar@adb.org

The Commonwealth Secretariat

2. Mr Ved Goel
Acting Deputy Director and Head of Education
Education Section
Social Transformation Programmes Division
Commonwealth Secretariat
Malborough House
Pall Mall
LONDON SW 1Y 5HY
United Kingdom

Tel: (44 20) 7747 6282
Fax: (44 20) 7747 6287 or 7839 9081
E-mail: v.goel@commonwealth.int

Inter-American Institute for Co-operation on Agriculture (IICA)

3. Mr Francois Dagenais
Director of the Strategic Area of Education and Training
Inter-American Institute for Co-operation on Agriculture (IICA)
PO Box 55-2200
CORONADO
Costa Rica
Tel: (506) 216-0222/0236 or (506) 216- 0301
Fax: (506) 216-0233/239
E-mail: francois.dagenais@iica.ac.cr
Web: www.iica.int

International Centre for Research in Agroforestry (ICRAF)

4. Mr Tom Vandenbosch
Project Leader Farmers of the Future
Development Division
World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF)
PO Box 30677-00100, NAIROBI
Kenya
Tel: (254) 2 524228 or 254 2524000
Fax: (254) 2 524001
E-mail: t.vandenbosch@cgiar.org

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

5. Mr Sean Kennedy
International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
Via del Serafico 107
00142 ROME
Italy

Tel: (39) 06 5459 2514
Fax:(39) 06 5459 2018
E-mail: s.kennedy@ifad.org

6. Ms Desiree Hagenaars
International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
Via del Serafico 107
00142 ROME
Italy

Tel: (39) 06 54592224
Fax:(39) 06 545 92018
E-mail: d.hagenaars@ifad.org

7. Ms Annina Lubbock
IFAD
Via del Serafico 107
00142 ROME
Italy

Tel: (39) 06 5459 2489
Fax:(39) 06 50 43 463
E-mail: a.lubbock@ifad.org

International Labour Organization, Geneva (ILO)

8. Ms Josiane Capt
Senior Specialist
In-Focus Programme on Skills, Knowledge and Employability
ILO
4, route des Morillons
CH-1211 GENEVA 22
Switzerland

Tel: (41 22) 799 6478
Fax: (41 22) 799 7650
E-mail: capt@ilo.org

***International Labour Organization
International Training Centre of the ILO, Turin, Italy***

9. Mr Frans Lenglet
Director
Training Department
International Training Centre of the ILO
Viale Maestri del Lavoro, 10, 10127
TURIN
Italy

Tel: (011) 6936651
Fax: (011) 6936348
E-mail: F.Lenglet@itcilo.it

International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI)

10. Ms Elizabeth Doupé Goldberg
Director, Documentation, Information and Training
International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI)
via dei Tre Denari 472/a
00057 Maccaresse, FIUMICINO
Italy

Tel: (39) 06 6118237
Fax: (39) 06 6197 9661
E-mail: e.goldberg@cgiar.org

The World Bank

11. Mr Christian Fauliau
The World Bank
1818 H Street NW, MSN J6-102
WASHINGTON DC 28433
USA

Tel: (202) 458 9870
Fax: (202) 473 5147
E-mail: Cfauliau@worldbank.org

***United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
(UNESCO)***

12. Mr Shigeru Aoyagi
Chief,
Literacy and Non-formal Education
UNESCO
7, Place Fontenoy
75007 PARIS
France

Tel: (33 1) 45 68 21 29 or 09 82
Fax: (33 1) 45 68 56 26/27
E-mail: s.aoyagi@unesco.org

13. Ms Malika Ladjali
Senior Programme Specialist
Education Sector,
Division for the Promotion of Quality Education
UNESCO
7 Place de Fontenoy
75352 PARIS 07
France

Tel: (33 1) 45 68 01 24
Fax: (33 1) 45 68 56 35
E-mail: m.ladjali@unesco.org

UNESCO – International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)

14. Mr Gudmund Hernes
Director
International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)
7-9, rue Eugène Delacroix
75016 PARIS
France

Tel: (33 1) 45 03 77 10

Fax: (33 1) 40 72 87 81
E-mail: g.hernes@iiep.unesco.org

15. Mr David Atchoarena
International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)
7-9, rue Eugène Delacroix
75116 PARIS
France
- Tel: (33 1) 45 03 77 49
Fax: (33 1) 40 72 83 66
E-mail: d.atchoarena@iiep.unesco.org

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)

16. Mr Lino Albano Bordin
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
Case postale 2500
CH-1211 GENÈVE 2 Dépôt
Switzerland
- Tel: (41 22) 739 8111 (automatic switchboard)
Direct: (41 22) 739 8563
E-mail: BORDIN@unhcr.ch

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

17. Ms Flora Sibanda-Mulder
UNICEF/WFP
Via Cesare Giulio Viola 68-70
00148 ROME
Italy
- Tel: (39) 06 6513 2511
Fax: (39) 06 6513 2854
E-mail: flora.sibanda-mulder@wfp.org

World Food Programme (WFP)

18. Ms Dianne Spearman
Division Director
World Food Programme
Head of Strategy and Policy Division
Via Cesare Giulio Viola 68/70
Parco de Medici
00148 ROME
Italy

Tel: (39) 06 65132600 direct, 2611
Fax: (39) 06 65132873
E-mail: Dianne.Spearman@WFP.org

Bilateral agencies

Austria

Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs

19. Ms Maria-Waltraud Rabitsch
Austrian Development Co-operation
(Consultant for Decentralization and Rural Development)
Wimmergasse 34/11
A-1050 WIEN (VIENNA)
Austria

Tel: (43 1) 5446021
Fax: none
E-mail: m.rabitsch@utanet.at

Belgium

Direction générale de la Coopération internationale (DGIS)

20. Mr Edwin Bourgeois
Education Strategies Unit
Directorate General for International Co-operation (DGIS)
rue Brederode 6
B-1000 BRUSSELS
Belgium

Tel: (32) 2 5190609
Fax: (32) 2 5190683
E-mail: edwin.bourgeois@diplobel.fed.be

Canada

Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)

21. Mr Blair Hankey
Deputy Permanent Representative of Canada to the FAO
and Ms Anna D'Annunzio
Executive Assistant to B.Hankey and C.Parker
Permanent Mission of Canada to the FAO, WFP and IFAD
Canadian Embassy,
Via Zara 30, 00198 ROME
Italy

Tel. (39 6) 445 98 2551 Mitnet: 455 2551
Fax: (39 6) 445 98 2930 Mitnet: 455 2930
E-mail: anna.dannunzio@dfait-maeci.gc.ca

22. Mr John F. Morris
Principal Advisor-Education
Scientific, Technical and Advisory Services Directorate
Policy Branch
Canadian International Development Agency
200 Promenade du Portage
HULL, QUEBEC
Canada K1A 0G4

Tel: (1 819) 997 15 43
Fax: (1 819) 953 5229
E-mail: john_morris@acdi-cida.gc.ca

France

Agence française de développement

23. M. Jean-Claude Balmes
Agence Française de Développement (AFD)
5, rue Roland Barthes
75598 PARIS
France

Tel: (33 1) 53 44 42 18
Fax: (33 1) 53 44 38 77
E-mail: balmesjc@afd.fr

*Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation, de la Pêche
et des Affaires rurales*

24. Mr Martin Weiss
Ministère de l'Agriculture de l'Alimentation
de la Pêche et des Affaires rurales: Pôle de coopération internationale
CNEARC Avenue Agropolis BP 5098
F 34033 MONTPELLIER
Cedex 1
France

Tel: (33 4) 67 61 70 08 or (33 6) 30 51 23 12

Fax : (33 4) 67 61 70 67

E-mail: martin.weiss@educagri.fr

25. M. Alain Maragnani
Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation, de la Pêche
et des Affaires Rurales
Inspection de l'Enseignement Agricole
1 ter Avenue de Lowendal 75349
PARIS 07 SP
France

Tel: (33 4) 67 61 70 18 or (33 6) 87 38 89 58

Fax: (33 4) 67 41 02 32

E-mail: alain.maragnani@educagri.fr

Germany

German Agency for Technical Co-operation (GTZ)

26. Mr Dagmar Orth
German Agency for Technical Co-operation (GTZ)
Dag Hammarskjöld Weg 1-5, D- 65726
Germany
Tel: (49) 6196-791277
Fax: (49) 6196-796540
E-mail: Dagmar.orth@gtz.de

27. Mr Herbert Bergmann
Senior Education Planner
German Agency for Technical Co-operation (GTZ)
Dag-Hammarskjöld-Weg 1-5
Postfach 5180
D-65726 ESCHBORN (bei Frankfurt am Main)
Germany
Tel: (49) 6196-791282

Fax: (49) 6196-79801282
E-mail: herbert.bergmann@gtz.de

Italy

Ministry of Foreign Affairs

28. Mr Raffaele De Benedictis
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Italy
Piazzale della Farnesina 1
00194 ROME
Italy
29. Ms Teresa Savanella
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Italy
Piazzale della Farnesina 1
00194 ROME
Italy
Tel: (39 06) 369 15385
Fax: (39 06) 323 5883
E-mail: Teresa.savanella@esteri.it
30. Ms Vincenza Russo
Ufficio Multilaterale
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Italy
Piazzale della Farnesina 1
00194 ROME
Italy
Tel: (39 06) 369 15384
Fax: (39 06) 32 35 883
E-mail: vincenza.russo@esteri.it

Norway

Norwegian Agency of Development Co-operation (NORAD)

31. Ms Elisabeth F. (Betsy) Heen
Norwegian Agency of Development Co-operation (NORAD)
P.O. Box 8034 Dep.
0030 OSLO
Norway

Tel: (47) 22 24 02 15
Fax: (47) 22 24 02 76
E-mail: ehe@norad.no; Elisabeth.heen@norad.no

Ministry of Education and Research, Norway

32. Ms Karen B. Feldberg
Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research
P.B. 8119 Dep.
0032 OSLO
Norway

Tel: (47) 22 24 79 78
Fax: (47) 22 24 27 32
E-mail: Kbf@ufd.dep.no; karen.feldberg@ufd.dep.no]

Republic of San Marino

33. Ms Daniela Rotondaro
San Marino Permanent Representative to FAO
Via Eleonora Duse 35
00197 ROME
Italy

Tel: (39) 06 8072511
Fax: (39) 06 8070072
E-mail: Ambasciatasanmarino@tin.it

Switzerland

Swiss Development Co-operation (SDC)

34. Mr Ernst Bolliger
LBL Landwirtschaftliche Beratungszentrale Lindau
Eschikon 28, CH-8315
LINDAU
Switzerland

Tel: (41) 52 2549723
Fax: (41) 52 3549797
E-mail: ernst.bolliger@lbl.ch

The Netherlands

Permanent Representation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to FAO

35. Mr Jacco Bos
Permanent Representation of the Netherlands to the United Nations
Organizations
Via delle Terme Deciane 6
00153 ROME
Italy

Tel: (39 6) 574 0306 or 2326
Fax: (39 6) 574 4927
E-mail: jacco.bos@minbuza.nl

United States of America

United States Agency for International Development (USAID)

36. Mr John D.Hatch
Basic Education Advisor
USAID, EGAT/ED Rm 3.9.84

1300 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
WASHINGTON D.C., 20523-3901
USA

Tel: (202) 712-0147
Fax: (202) 216-3229
E-mail: JHatch@usaid.gov

Foundations, NGOs, universities and others

Associates in Research and Education for Development (ARED)

37. Ms Sonja Fagerberg-Diallo
Director
Associates in Research and Education for Development (ARED)
BP 10 737
Dakar - LIBERTÉ
Senegal

Tel: (221) 825 7119, or 824 5098
Fax: (221) 824 70 97
E-mail: ared@enda.sn

38. World Organization of the Scout Movement
Mr Paolo Rozera
World Organization of the Scout Movement (WOSM)
c/o UNICEF Via Vittorio Emanuele Orlando, 83 00185
ROME
Italy

Tel: (39) 06 478 09284 or 335 616 6919
Fax: (39) 06 489 03899
E-mail: p.Rozera@unicef.it

***Federazione Organismi Cristiani di Servizio Internazionale Volontario
(FOCSIV)***

39. Ms Giovanna Li Perni
Volontari del mondo - FOCSIV
Via San Francesco di Sales 18
00165 ROMA
Italy
Tel: (39 06) 6877796 or 6877867
Fax: (39 06) 6872373
E-mail: Focsiv@focsiv.it

40. Mr Claudio Trovato
Volontari del mondo - FOCSIV
Via San Francesco di Sales 18
00165 ROMA
Italy
Tel: (39 06) 6877796 or 6877867
Fax: (39 06) 6872373
E-mail: Focsiv@focsiv.it

Representative of Italian NGOs

41. Ms Ada Civitani
Associazione ONG Italiane
Tel: (39 6) 6877796 or (39 2) 27000291
E-mail: focsiv@focsiv.it or easresponsabile@acra.it

Iowa State University

42. Mr David Acker
Professor and Assistant Dean
Iowa State University
104 Curtiss Hall

Ames, IOWA 50011-1050
USA

Tel: (515) 294 8454 or portable: (515) 291 0148

Fax: (515) 294 9477

E-mail: dacker@iastate.edu

Resource persons

43. Mr Charles Maguire
Former Senior Institutional Development Specialist, the World Bank
E-mail: cvmaguire@msn.com or charlesj72@hotmail.com

44. Mr John Oxenham
Rapporteur
Former Unesco/IDS, Sussex/World Bank specialist in education,
especially rural and adult education
15 Derby Hill Crescent
LONDON SE23 3YL
United Kingdom

Tel: (44 20) 8 699 9145
Fax: (44 20) 8 699 1849
E-mail: john_oxenham@yahoo.co.uk

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations

45. Ms Sissel Ekaas
Director, Gender and Population Division (SDW)
FAO Headquarters
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100
ROME
Italy

Tel: (39) 06 570 53351
E-mail: Sissel.ekaas@fao.it

Organizing team

46. Ms Ester Zulberti
Chief
Extension, Education and Communication Service (SDRE)
Sustainable Development Department
FAO Headquarters
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100
ROME
Italy

Tel: (39 6) 570 54001
Fax: (39 6) 570 53801
E-mail: Ester.zulberti@fao.org

47. Ms Lavinia Gasperini
Senior Officer
Education for Agriculture and Rural Development
Extension, Education and Communication Service (SDRE)
Sustainable Development Department
FAO Headquarters
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100
ROME
Italy

Tel: (39 6) 570 56044
Fax: (39 6) 570 53801
E-mail: Lavinia.Gasperini@fao.org

48. Mr Patrick Gautier
Education Officer
Extension, Education and Communication Service (SDRE)
Sustainable Development Department
FAO Headquarters
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100
ROME
Italy

Tel: (39 6) 570 55935
Fax: (39 6) 570 53801
E-mail: Patrick.gautier@fao.org

49. Nicoletta Rossi
Secretary SDRE- Headquarters
Tel: (39 6) 570 56253
E-mail: Nicoletta.rossi@fao.org

50. Ms Carine Rouah
Consultant
SDRE- FAO Headquarters
Tel: (39 6) 570 56356
E-mail: Carine.rouah@fao.org

51. Ms Fiorella Ceruti
Consultant
SDRE- FAO Headquarters
Tel: (39) 06 570 56939
Fax: (39) 06 570 53801
E-mail: Fiorella.ceruti@fao.org

FAO volunteers

52. Ms Diane Durand de Pompignan
Tel: (39 6) 570 56402

53. Ms Jennifer Gacich

54. Ms Marina Emiliani
Tel: (39 6) 570 56175

Observers

55. Ms Alicia García
Consultant for United Nations system Network on Rural Development
and Food Security
Tel: (39 6) 570 55152
E-mail: Alicia.garcía@fao.org
56. Ms Vera Boerger
Agriculture Education and Extension Officer
FAO/ SDRE Sub-regional Office for Southern and East Africa (SAFR)
6th (and 11th) Floor Old Mutual Centre
Cnr. Jason Moyo Avenue/Third Street
P.O. Box 3730 HARARE
Zimbabwe

Tel: (263) 4 252 021 Ext. 220
Fax: (263) 4 700 724 or 703496
E-mail: Vera.boerger@fao.org
57. Mr Malcolm Hazelman
Senior Education and Extension Officer
FAO / SDRE Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP)
Maliwan Mansion, 39 Phra Atit Road
BANGKOK
Thailand 10200

Tel: (66 2) 697 4 145
Fax: (66 2) 697 4445
E-mail: Malcolm.hazelman@fao.org
58. Ms Michelle Owens
Agriculture Education and Extension Officer
FAO/ SDRE Regional Office for Africa (RAF)
FAO Building
Game Abdul Nasser Road
P.O. Box 1628

ACCRA
Ghana

Tel: (233) 24 375 079
Fax: (233) 21 701 0943
E-mail: michelle.owens@fao.org

59. Mr William (Bill) Seiders
Senior Rural Youth Development Officer
SDRE- FAO Headquarters

Tel: (39 6) 570 53615
Fax: (39 6) 570 53801
E-mail: william.seiders@fao.org

60. Mr Jean Pierre Ilboudo
Communication Officer
SDRE – FAO Headquarters

Tel: (39 6) 570 54203
Fax: (39 6) 570 53801
E-mail: Jeanpierre.Ilboudo@fao.org

61. Mr Kalim Qamar
Senior Officer, Agricultural Training and Extension
SDRE – Headquarters

Tel: (39 6) 570 54203
Fax: (39 6) 570 53801
E-mail: Kalim.Qamar@fao.org

62. Mr Peter Van Lierop
Forestry Education Officer
FORC – Headquarters

Tel: (39 6) 570 54392
E-mail: peter.vanlierop@fao.org

63. Mr Mohammed Rouighi
FAO Headquarters, GICD
Tel: (39 6) 570 56186
64. Ms Valeria Menza
FAO Headquarters, Nutrition Officer,
Nutrition Programmes Service (ESNP)
Tel: (39 6) 570 54292
E-mail: Valeria.menza@fao.org
65. Mr Peter Glasauer
FAO Headquarters, Nutrition Programmes Service (ESNP)
Tel: (39 6) 570 53775
66. Mr Tomás Lindemann
FAO Headquarters, Rural Institutions and Participation Service
(SDAR)
Tel: (39 6) 570 56827
67. Ms Helena Gómez Macpherson
FAO Headquarters,
Office of the Assistant Director-General, Agriculture Department (AG)
Tel: (39 6) 570 53187
68. Ms Jennifer Heney
FAO, Office of the Assistant Director-General, Agriculture Department
(AG)
69. Ms Alexandra Rottger
FAO, Office of the Assistant Director-General, Agriculture Department
(AG)
Tel: (39 6) 570 55458

70. Mr Danilo Mejía
FAO, Office of the Assistant Director-General, Agriculture Department
(AG)
Tel: (39 6) 570 55027
71. Mr Richard Moon
FAO, Staff Development Officer
Human Resources Development Service (AFHO)
Tel: (39 6) 570 55912
72. Mr Richard Eberlin
Policy Officer
Regional Office for Europe (REUP)
FAO, Rome
Tel: (39 6) 570 54330
73. Mr Raimund Jehle (REUD)
Tel: (39 6) 570 55471
74. Ms Caroline Marek
FAO Volunteer Headquarters, Information Division (GIIM)
Tel: (39 6) 570 56353
E-mail: missmarek@hotmail.com
75. Ms Nuria Felipe-Soria
FAO Headquarters, Information Division (GII)
Tel: (39) 06 570 55899
76. Mr Aleksander Zaremba
FAO Headquarters, Unit for Co-operation with Multilateral and
Bilateral Agencies (TCDM)
Tel: (39 6) 570 55025

Appendix 2

Aid agencies workshop
‘Education for rural people: targeting the poor’
Rome, FAO Headquarters – 12-13 December 2002

Preliminary programme
Opening ceremony

Iran Room (B016)

Thursday, 12 December 2002

8:00-9:00 Registration

9:00-10:30 **Session one: *Setting the stage***

Chairperson: Ester Zulberti, Chief, Extension, Education and Communication Service (SDRE), FAO

Rapporteur: John Oxenham, Former UNESCO/IDS, Sussex/World Bank specialist in adult education and education in rural areas

Opening address by Sissel Ekaas, Director, Sustainable Development Department (SD), FAO:

“Education for rural people: a crucial factor for sustainable development”

Greetings from Giandomenico Magliano, Director-General, Directorate for Development Co-operation (DGCS), Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Italy

Speech by Gudmund Hernes, Director, International Institute for Educational Planning, IIEP/UNESCO:

“The overall framework and challenges of the EFA initiative and its relation with this workshop and the flagship on Education for the rural people (ERP)”

“Presentation of the flagship initiative, the workshop rationale, objectives and programme” by Lavinia Gasperini, Senior Officer, Education for Rural Development, Extension, Education and Communication Service, Sustainable Development Department, FAO

Sessions reserved to invitees

Malaysia Room (B227)

- 10:30-11:00 Coffee break
Continuation of registration
- 11:00-13:00 ***Session two: Which is the role of Education in poverty reduction and rural development strategies?***
Chairperson: Ester Zulberti, FAO
Overview of main findings of the FAO/SDRE – IIEP/ UNESCO study on *“Education for rural development: towards new policy responses”*
Report from the FAO and IIEP/UNESCO Seminar *“Education for rural development in Asia: experiences and policy lessons”* by David Atchoarena, IIEP/UNESCO Programme Specialist and Lavinia Gasperini.
General discussion
- 12:55-13:00 Fiorella Ceruti: Logistics information for the day
- 13:00-13:10 Group photo (Flag room, in front of the stairs of the Iran room)

- 13.10-14:30 Lunch (FAO Restaurant – Building B – 8th Floor)
- 14:30-16:00 **Session three: “Show and Tell” session. Agencies will briefly present their recent policies, experiences and lessons learned in providing education to rural people:**
Chairperson: Ester Zulberti, FAO
Timekeeper: Jennifer Gachich, FAO Volunteer
- 16:00-16:30 Break
- 16:30-18:30 Continuation of the “*Show and Tell*”
Chairperson: Gudmund Hernes, IIEP/UNESCO
Concluding remarks of the first day by: Ester Zulberti, FAO/
Gudmund Hernes, IIEP/UNESCO
- 18:30-18:35 Communications for next day and closure by: Lavinia Gasperini, FAO
- 18:35-19:00 Facilitators Co-ordination Meeting (Blue Bar, 8th Floor, building C)
- 20:00 Dinner in Trastevere at a traditional Roman Trattoria (il Buttero, Via della Lungaretta, 156 – Trastevere – Tel: 06-5800517)

Friday, 13 December 2002

Malaysia Room (B227)

- 9:00-10:30 **Panel discussion No. 1:
Intervention frameworks and mechanisms:
How to better focus on basic education for rural people?
The panel will address examples and proposals on how
the following framework addresses ERP:**

- Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRSPs);
- Sector Wide Approaches (SWAp);
- United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF);
- Education for All (EFA) fast-track initiative;
- EFA action plans;
- The United Nations Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) Network on Rural Development and Food Security.

Facilitator: John Morris, Senior Advisor – Education/Scientific, Technical and Advisory Services Directorate/Policy Branch/ Canadian International Development Agency

Panellists:

- Christian Fauliau, Senior Economist-Agricultural and Rural Capacity Building Specialist, World Bank.
- Herbert Bergmann, Senior Education Planner, German Agency for Technical Co-operation (GTZ)
- Alicia Garcia, United Nations system Network on Rural Development and Food Security (ACC)

10:30-11:00 Coffee break

11:00-12:30 **Panel discussion No. 2:
Which are the monitoring mechanisms for education for rural people and which are the indicators?**

The panel will discuss on:

The basis of donors' monitoring experience: how to monitor improvements in removing disparities in rural people's access and retention in basic education, in the quality of their education within a defined time-frame.

Facilitator: David Acker, Professor and Assistant Dean, Iowa State University, USA

Panellists:

- Patrick Gautier, Education for rural development Officer (SDRE), FAO
- Aoyagi Shigeru, UNESCO, Chief of Literacy and Non-formal Education, Division of Basic Education
- Jean Claude Balmes, Manager of the Education and Training Division, Agence française de développement

12:30-14:00 Lunch (FAO Restaurant - Building B - 8th Floor)

14:00-15:30 **Panel discussion No. 3:**

Donors' co-ordination for effective aid policies and practices?

How to strengthen the new EFA flagship on Education for rural people and:

- consolidate new partnerships;
- increase access and retention;
- improve quality;
- strengthen capacity to plan and manage education for rural people;
- next steps.

Facilitator: Charles Maguire, Former Senior Institutional Development Specialist, World Bank

Panellists:

- Tom Vandenbosch, Project Leader Farmers of the Future, World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF)
- Christian Fauliau, Senior Economist-Agricultural and Rural Capacity Building Specialist, World Bank
- Sukhdeep Brar, South Asia Social Sectors Division, Asian Development Bank
- Malika Ladjali, UNESCO Division for the Promotion of Quality Education

15:30-16:00 Coffee break

Iran Room (B016)

16:00-17:00 **Winding up: Improving education for rural people:** conclusions and remarks by the Rapporteur, John Oxenham, and proposals for further actions by Ester Zulberti and Lavinia Gasperini, FAO

Official closure and acknowledgements by Ester Zulberti, FAO

17:00-19:30 Rome by night. ‘Walking and talking’: networking on education for rural people (in front of the most beautiful fountains and piazzas of Rome)

20:00 Dinner at typical Roman Pizzeria (Pizzeria Pasquino, Piazza Pasquino, 1 (piazza Navona, Tel.: 06-6893043)

Appendix 3

Announcement on the launch of the new flagship

February 2003

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Launching a new flagship on education for rural people

Background

The Sustainable Development Department of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) are inviting member countries, United Nations agencies and civil society to join in the establishment of a new partnership on *Education for rural people*.

The initiative seeks to address rural-urban disparities, which are a serious concern to governments and the international community as a whole. About 70 per cent of the poor live in rural areas. Despite the fact that education is a basic right in itself and an essential prerequisite for reducing poverty, improving the living conditions of rural people and building a food-secure world, children's access to education in rural areas is still much lower than in urban areas, adult illiteracy is much higher and the quality of education is poorer.

In this regard, FAO and UNESCO are joining efforts in the establishment of a new flagship within the *Education for All* (EFA) initiative with a focus on *Education for rural people*. The flagship is a call for collaborative action to increase the co-ordination of efforts targeting the educational needs of rural people. The partnership is open to members committed to working separately and together to promote and facilitate quality basic *Education for rural people*.

Objectives

The flagship's objectives are to:

- build awareness on the importance of *Education for rural people* as a crucial step to achieve the Millennium Goals of eradicating extreme poverty and hunger and achieving universal primary education (www.un.org/millenniumgoals/);
- overcome the urban/rural education gap;
- increase access to basic *Education for rural people*;
- improve the quality of basic education in rural areas;
- foster the national capacity to devise and implement basic education plans to address the learning needs of rural people.

For more information, the concept paper *Targeting the rural poor: the role of education and training* (March 2002, http://www.fao.org/sd/2002/kn0301a_en.htm) can be consulted.

Activities

At the national level

- technical support to countries willing to address the basic educational needs of the rural people by formulating specific plans of action as part of the national plans on *Education for All*.

At the international level

- advocate and mobilize partnerships for *Education for rural people* by concentrating on strategic global, regional and international events, and encouraging the same within countries;
- identify the capacity for different substantive components on *Education for rural people* within partner institutions;
- support the exchange of good practices and knowledge on *Education for rural people*.

Meetings

The new FAO/UNESCO flagship was officially launched at a side event during the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, South Africa, 3 September 2002.

The following are some examples of other international events presenting the flagship:

- Regional workshop on *Education for rural development* organized in partnership with FAO, UNESCO and UNESCO-IIEP, Bangkok, Thailand, 5-7 November 2002;
- Aid agencies workshop on *Education for rural people*, organized by FAO with the technical collaboration of UNESCO and UNESCO-IIEP, Rome, Italy, 12-13 December 2002;
- Youth employment summit 2002, Alexandria, Egypt, 7-11 September 2002;
- International symposium on rural education organized by UNESCO Office in Beijing, China, together with the International Research and Training Center for Rural Education (INRULED, China), the Chinese Ministry of Education and the Chinese National Commission for UNESCO, 20-23 January 2003.

Members of the flagship programme

International organizations

1. FAO – Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
2. UNESCO – United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
3. ICRAF – World Agroforestry Centre
4. IPGRI – International Plant Genetic Resources Institute
5. WFP – World Food Programme
6. CIAT – International Center for Tropical Agriculture
7. Commonwealth Secretariat, United Kingdom

Governments

8. The Government of Egypt
9. The Government of San Marino

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs), foundations and others

10. Terre des hommes, Italia
d.vergari@tdhitaly.org
11. CELIM – Centro Laici Italiani per le missioni, Italy
info@celimbergamo
12. ACRA – Associazione di Cooperazione Rurale in Africa e America Latina, Italy
acra@acra.it
13. UCSEI – Ufficio centrale Studenti Esteri in Italia, Italy
ucsei.roma@flashnet.it
14. CISP – Comitato Internazionale per lo sviluppo dei popoli, Italy
cisp.pro@cisp-ngo.org
15. OPAM – Opera di Promozione dell Alfabetizzazione nel Mondo, Italy
opam@opamprog@tiscalinet.it
16. ISCOS – Istituto Sindacale per la Cooperazione con i Paesi in via di sviluppo, Italy
simonecirulli@iscos-cisl.org
17. AIFO – Associazione Italiana Amici di Raoul Follereau, Italy
simonecirulli@iscos-cisl.org
18. FOCSIV – Federazione Organismi Cristiani Servizio Internazionale Volontario, Italy
focsiv@focsiv.it
19. CTM – Controinformazione Terzo Mondo, Italy
info@ctm-lecce.it
progetti_italia@ctm-lecce.it
20. CVCS – Centro Volontari Cooperazione allo Sviluppo, Italy
cvcsgo@tin.it
21. CIDE – Centro de Investigación y Desarrollo de la Ecuación, Chile
s.martini@cide.cl
22. EDC – Education Development Center Inc, USA
jwong@edc.org

23. Universidad Nacional de Salta, Argentina
ferretti@ciunsa.edu.ar
24. Social Development Forum 2000, Pakistan
sdforum2000@yahoo.co.uk
25. FOCA – Fundação Oásis Cidade Aberta, Brazil
president@foca.org.br
26. Association SAHEL DEFIS, Bamako, Mali
saheldefis@yahoo.fr (contact Seydou Sanou)
27. APEAN – Asia and Pacific Association of Educators in Agriculture
Education and Environment, Thailand
apean@lb.msc.net.ph
28. ONGDERPREA, Cameroon
ongderprea@yahoo.fr
29. BUNYAD, Lahore, Pakistan
bunyad@brain.net.pk
30. APPEAL – Pacific Programme for Education for All
a.hakeem@unesco.org
31. RSPN – Rural Support Programmes Network, Pakistan
faisal@rspn.org.pk
32. PASSAGE, The Philippine Association of Agriculture Educators,
Philippines
passage80@yahoo.com
33. Anamorphose, France
anamorph@imaginet.fr
34. ZOE – Center for Rural Heritage Preservation from Zagreb, Croatia
ivana.laginja@zg.tel.hr
35. IOWA State University, USA
dacker@iastate.edu
36. LABE, Literacy and Adult Basic Education, Uganda
LABE@africaonline.co.ug
37. FEC – Fundação Evangelização e Culturas (contact person Catarina
Lopes)
lopes_catarina@yahoo.com.br
38. ESE – Escola Superior de Educação, Portugal (contact Júlio
Gonçalves dos Santos)
jgsantos@ese.ipvc.pt

39. PRWSWO – Secretary General. Pakistan Rural Workers Social Welfare Organization (contact SABIR FARHAT)
farhat2@mul.paknet.com.pk
40. Learning Channel, India (contact: Geeta Sharma)
Geeta.Sharma@oneworld.net

Focal points

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

Lavinia Gasperini

The Extension, Education and Communication Service
Research, Extension and Training Division
Sustainable Development Department
FAO, Via delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy
E-mail: lavinia.gasperini@fao.org
Tel. (39 6) 57056253
Fax: (39 6) 57053801

IIEP publications and documents

More than 1,200 titles on all aspects of educational planning have been published by the International Institute for Educational Planning. A comprehensive catalogue is available in the following subject categories:

Educational planning and global issues

General studies - global/developmental issues

Administration and management of education

Decentralization - participation - distance education - school mapping - teachers

Economics of education

Costs and financing - employment - international co-operation

Quality of education

Evaluation - innovation - supervision

Different levels of formal education

Primary to higher education

Alternative strategies for education

Lifelong education - non-formal education - disadvantaged groups - gender education

Copies of the Catalogue may be obtained on request from:

IIEP, Communication and Publications Unit

information@iiep.unesco.org

Titles of new publications and abstracts may be consulted at the following web site: www.unesco.org/iiep

The International Institute for Educational Planning

The International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) is an international centre for advanced training and research in the field of educational planning. It was established by UNESCO in 1963 and is financed by UNESCO and by voluntary contributions from Member States. In recent years the following Member States have provided voluntary contributions to the Institute: Denmark, Finland, Germany, Iceland, India, Ireland, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland.

The Institute's aim is to contribute to the development of education throughout the world, by expanding both knowledge and the supply of competent professionals in the field of educational planning. In this endeavour the Institute co-operates with interested training and research organizations in Member States. The Governing Board of the IIEP, which approves the Institute's programme and budget, consists of a maximum of eight elected members and four members designated by the United Nations Organization and certain of its specialized agencies and institutes.

Chairperson:

Dato' Asiah bt. Abu Samah (Malaysia)
Director, Lang Education, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Designated Members:

Carlos Fortín
Assistant Secretary-General, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), Geneva, Switzerland.

Thelma Kay
Chief, Emerging Social Issues, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP), Bangkok, Thailand

Jean Louis Sarbib
Senior Vice-President, World Bank, Washington DC, USA.

Ester Zulberti
Chief, Extension, Education and Communication for Development (SDRE), Food Agriculture Organization (FAO), Rome, Italy.

Elected Members:

José Joaquín Brunner (Chile)
Director, Education Programme, Fundación Chile, Santiago, Chile.

Klaus Hüfner (Germany)
Professor, Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany.

Zeineb Faïza Kefi (Tunisia)
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Tunisia to France and Permanent Delegate of Tunisia to UNESCO.

Philippe Mehaut (France)
Deputy Director, Centre d'études et de recherches sur les qualifications (Céreq), Marseille, France.

Teboho Moja (South Africa)
Professor of Higher Education, New York University, New York, USA.

Teiichi Sato (Japan)
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary and Permanent Delegate of Japan to UNESCO.

Tuomas Takala (Finland)
Professor, University of Tampere, Tampere, Finland.

Inquiries about the Institute should be addressed to:
The Office of the Director, International Institute for Educational Planning,
7-9 rue Eugène Delacroix, 75116 Paris, France.