



GLOBAL EDUCATION MONITORING REPORT

2020

From commitments to action: Financing for equity and disability inclusion in education

Manos Antoninis, Director, Global Education Monitoring Report
27 July 2021, Global Education Summit
en.unesco.org/gem-report | gemreport@unesco.org



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization



Global
Education
Monitoring
Report

All means all

Learner diversity is a strength to be celebrated

Out of 100 students...



And this last one?

Hi!

He's new here!

Recommendations on inclusion – 1

1. Widen the understanding of inclusion
Only one in three have such **definitions**
2. Target financing to those left behind
Base financing on **support, not labels**
3. Share expertise and resources
Inclusion is also a **management issue**
4. Engage in meaningful consultation
Inclusion should be **bottom-up**
5. Ensure cooperation across government
Share information for program **efficiency**



Recommendations on inclusion – 2

6. Make space for non-government actors
As both **watchdogs** and **providers**
7. Apply universal design to fulfil potential
Infrastructure, environments, curriculum
8. Prepare all teachers to teach all students
Prepare school leaders for **inclusive ethos**
9. Collect data with attention and respect
Focus also on **sense of belonging**
10. Learn from peers
Always **relevant!**



Resources

en.unesco.org/gem-report/report/2020/inclusion

- Full report: English French Spanish Arabic
- Summary: 26 languages
- Policy papers
- PEER country profiles
- Regional reports on
 - Latin America and Caribbean
 - Central/Eastern Europe, Caucasus, Central Asia

Download the Report
bit.ly/2020gemreport

Policy Paper 44

January 2021

How committed? Unlocking financing for equity in education

It is difficult to agree how much countries should spend on education. The Education 2030 Framework for Action appealed to countries to spend at least 4% of their gross domestic product on education. Some people question even such a modest target because country contexts vary significantly. Different countries appear to achieve the same education results with very different levels of public expenditure. However, there is consensus that, if countries are to achieve the goal of 'inclusive and equitable' education by 2030, they need to spend that budget, whatever their level, in ways that actively pursue these inclusion and equity objectives. This paper discusses four categories of financing policies that can support such equity objectives depending on how comprehensive they are, how targeted their coverage is and how much money they allocate. Mapping policies and programmes from 78 countries around the world shows that around 7 in 5 demonstrate a strong level of commitment to equity in education through these different mechanisms.

The international community's commitment in 2015 to 'ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all' as the fourth Sustainable Development Goal (SDG 4) is one of the clearest examples of the overall pledge to leave no one behind, contained in the United Nations' UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The enforcement challenge of the COVID-19 pandemic risks reversing the unequal distribution of resources and opportunities, and emphasizes the need for financing mechanisms to strengthen their focus on equity in education if countries are not to move further away from their 2030 targets.

The role of public institutions in equity-oriented processes in education has received less attention than the actual results in monitoring SDG 4. This is not surprising. It is easier to measure inequality, especially with the supply of household surveys and learning assessments in recent years. By contrast, monitoring equity-oriented processes, including policies and programmes, in a comparative way is plagued by vast differences in content and has therefore rarely been done systematically until now.

Indeed, multiple policies can be deployed to affect equity in education (OECD, 2020). A recent review of European countries' approaches identifies five sets of policies. First, countries may pursue policies that facilitate stratification. They may encourage special schools, school choice, restrictions on admissions, and placement into separate school tracks or repetition on the basis of low academic results. Second, they may instead promote following the same standards throughout the system. Third, countries may seek to actively support teachers and students at risk of falling behind to compensate for their disadvantage. Fourth, they may promote the provision of early childhood services, which are known to be particularly effective for vulnerable groups that otherwise are not prepared for school. Finally, countries can use financing mechanisms to promote equity (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2020) (Figure 1).

However, this complexity should not prevent efforts to better understand how countries promote equity in education. The purpose of this policy paper is to encourage such a discussion, unpacking just the last of these five sets of policies: countries have at their disposal to promote equity in education financing. The paper uses country examples from a new large of country-specific information made



PEER

Countries follow different paths to achieve their education targets. Having access to comparable information on choices made in different systems can enrich education planners and decision makers' perspectives on how to overcome their challenges. Systematic and comprehensive information on national education legislation, policies and programmes on issues central to achieving SDG 4, our global education goal, is necessary to inform policy dialogue at sub-regional, regional and international levels.



Ecuador	Egypt	El Salvador
Equatorial Guinea	Eritrea	Estonia
Eswatini	Ethiopia	Fiji
Finland	France	Gabon
Gambia	Georgia	Germany
Ghana	Greece	Grenada
Guatemala	Guinea	Guinea-Bissau
Guyana	Haiti	Honduras
Hong Kong, China	Hungary	Iceland
India	Indonesia	Iraq
Ireland	Islamic Republic of Iran	Israel
Italy	Jamaica	Japan
Jordan	Kazakhstan	Kenya
Kiribati	Kuwait	Kyrgyzstan
Lao People's Democratic Republic	Latvia	Lebanon
Lesotho	Liberia	Lithuania