



**TO THE AUTHORS OF THE WORLD BANK'S
WDR 2018 CONCEPT NOTE**

Brussels, 28 April 2017

Dear Sirs,

Education International welcomes the fact that education is the theme of the World Development Report (WDR) 2018, *Realizing the Promise of Education for Development*. It was high time, after nearly 40 years of publication and extensive policy and lending advice on education, that the World Bank's key analytical report featured education, a fundamental trigger of development. Education sector workers across the globe – rich with experience and first-hand knowledge of education systems, the reality of the classroom, and learners' needs – are willing and able to contribute to making the report relevant and useful, reflecting the issues we face daily. Under difficult conditions, we are fully committed to getting education right and that commitment entails getting the WDR 2018 right, too. To achieve that, we want to share preliminary thoughts and concerns about the WDR 2018 concept note and refer you to research evidence and the experiences of teachers and education support personnel around the world. To this end, you will find attached to this letter both specific points related to the report as well as a list of relevant research that would strengthen it.

While we share the World Bank's concern with improving learning our concerns are broader. Decades of prescriptive test-based reform and the ensuing fatigue from educators across the world demonstrate that the simple use of summative assessments does not equal quality. School and classroom-based formative assessment is a cornerstone of quality education and supports the learning process of students in a way that summative assessments can never do. In fact, the classroom should be the primary site of assessment.

Additionally, we are worried that the WDR concept note seems to largely bypass the issue of access and completion. This is of particular concern to us, as there is ample evidence that access for all has not yet been achieved and completion has stagnated. In fact, progress in enrolment has stalled since 2007 and one of the key obstacles to the realisation of the Education 2030 agenda is reaching the most disadvantaged and marginalised children. Many children and youth cannot hope to break the poverty cycle without free access to and completion of quality education.

With regards to Theme 1, "The promise of education", we agree that "the promise of education is corrupted when the quality of service delivery perpetuates, rather than reduces, broader economic inequalities; or when it exacerbates social exclusion, because the education system favours students from certain groups over others". It is precisely for this reason that national governments are responsible for offering free access to the best possible education for all citizens, whoever they are, wherever they are. While there is strong Bank support for so-called "low-fee private schools", research shows that these schools take students from public systems that could be strengthened, add additional barriers to poor families, and make their profits by cutting corners at the expense of students' wellbeing. Similarly, there is increasing evidence that other manifestations of privatisation such as Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs), school grants, or voucher systems often exacerbate rather than reduce inequalities – reducing inequality should be one of the Bank's priorities.

As for theme 2, "The learning crisis and learning metrics to guide reform", we fully share the importance of taking urgent and comprehensive measures to ensure that "schooling leads to learning". However, the concept note makes numerous, largely uncited references to research that we believe would benefit from greater validation. When we shared some of the assertions with teachers and education support personnel in two countries you noted, they were surprised to learn that such claims were made.



The Bank's emphasis on learning metrics is well known and documented. Many Bank projects have spent millions of dollars putting learning assessments in place. While opinions may vary about the validity and usefulness of such metrics, one thing is certain: test results are not enough to improve the efficiency of an education system. Unless we build the capacity of the education system's actors, at central and local level, to reflect on the metrics and to understand the causes of inadequate performance, national assessments do not provide "value for money". The test score is just a snapshot and a comparison of schools' test scores is not sufficient to understand what contributed to those results. Learning metrics alone are too narrow to "set priorities and guide experimentation" that is relevant. The concept note is correct when it says that "education is not the panacea" to the eradication of poverty. In the same vein, learning metrics are not the panacea to improving education systems. What learners need is a system that understands their strengths and weaknesses, in other words, a system where there is effective planning and collaboration among all key actors, at central and local level.

The concept note indicates the report will "document proximate causes" to the learning crisis, and refers to school entrants who already fall behind, students who lack family support or motivation, high rates of teacher absence from schools and classrooms, low levels of teacher subject knowledge, ineffective pedagogy, principals without management skills, unused or inappropriate materials, and programmes teaching unmarketable skills. If the report is to be useful in providing guidance to governments on how to tackle these "proximate causes", it will need to go beyond a mere description of the symptoms. To be a game changer, it must do what has not been done in the past, that is, to try to look at the root cause, for example, of teacher absenteeism. Does it have to do with the fact that, in countries that accepted Bank loans and its conditionalities, the caps on salaries and investment in public education have undermined the attractiveness of the profession? Are the materials unused or inappropriate because they were printed in a foreign country? In short, if the WDR aims to offer effective guidance to "policymakers who want to improve learning outcomes", it needs to look beyond the surface and reflect on the real causes of the learning crisis, bearing in mind that, without effective dialogue between key stakeholders, metrics are just a costly exercise.

With regards to theme 3, "Promising approaches to improving learning", we welcome the authors' caution about the mere replication of policies. We share the view that "context is crucial" and that "evidence cannot translate directly into programs for application in a new setting, but it does offer the most promising starting points for local innovation". Nevertheless, the concept note seems to resort to a limited number of studies before concluding that "countries spend a large amount on teacher in-service development, but there is little evidence that most of this is effective".

In reality, various issues affect teacher in-service training, and it is worrying that the WDR seems to jump to conclusions. First, it is not true that countries spend substantial amounts on in-service training. In a study conducted by Education International in ten countries, the lack of in-service training was identified as one of the key causes of ineffective teaching. We ran focus groups with professionals who had never attended *any* training since the beginning of their career. Secondly, when the concept note indicates that "no amount of teacher training will substitute for teacher effort", we would argue that no amount of teacher effort will substitute for inadequate teaching conditions. Who can be an effective teacher in an overcrowded, poorly lit classroom? The conditions in which learning occurs in most of the countries that are struggling and suffering with the "learning crisis" are far from optimal. When the WDR concept note hints that "approaches that build on teachers' intrinsic motivation and that recognize performance in a more holistic way show promise", it severely undermines its credibility, not just because there is extensive literature that proves otherwise, but because the reality in the classrooms of Africa, for example, is proving this claim wrong every single day of the school year.

Lastly, with regards to theme 4, "Learning at scale", we welcome the recognition by the WDR concept note that "it won't be enough to identify effective interventions and then multiply them across thousands of schools". Education system reform is not simple and recipes, especially foreign ones, are often doomed to fail. Nevertheless, we are deeply concerned by the contention that "funding for teacher



salaries often absorb over 80 percent of education budgets in low-income countries, leaving little room for spending in other areas that could perhaps be more effective at the margin". What is the policy proposal that will flow from this? To further reduce teachers' meagre salaries in low-income countries? How is that going to attract new and bright entrants to the profession? An Education International study showed that poor working conditions and salaries, which are often much less than those of professionals with comparable qualifications in other sectors, contribute to a decline in teacher status. If the World Bank is serious about wanting to create systems that are "successful at recruiting high-quality candidates", we hope that the WDR recommendations will reflect this.

It is concerning that the Bank says that teacher salaries take up 80 per cent of a budget and thinks that the problem is not the insufficient budget, but that teachers' salaries are high. In fact, in most low-income countries, teachers live either below or just above the poverty line. Perhaps there is a dearth of knowledge in the "knowledge Bank" about education, even after 55 years of promoting education reform around the world. To contribute to your deliberations and amendment of the concept note, we submit the attached ten recommendations and research for further reading. And, in the spirit of continuous improvement and informed dialogue, we underline our commitment to staying engaged so that the WDR 2018 exceeds expectations.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Fred van Leeuwen'.

Fred van Leeuwen
General Secretary



ANNEX 1

The World Bank Consultation on the 2018 World Development Report: Ten Crosscutting Issues and Recommendations

- R1 Reaffirm education as a basic human right and public good.** In line with the UN human rights treaties and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the WDR should reiterate the obligation of all governments to guarantee the right of every child, youth, and adult to free quality public education, and ensure that primary and secondary education is free, and quality early childhood education and tertiary education are accessible to all. In line with Article 13 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, it should remind governments of their commitment to make post-secondary education progressively free and accessible to all. The Report should reiterate the need for governments to strengthen public education systems at all levels. Furthermore, where private actors exist, governments should regulate their activities and ensure that national accreditation, performance and quality requirements and standards are met by all private actors. Non-state actors in receipt of any level of government funding, directly or indirectly, domestically or extraterritorially, must be not-for-profit/non-commercial in character.
- R2 Urgently increase free access to quality education.** However, 263 million children, adolescents and youth remain out of school; universal completion of primary education only will be realised in 2042 (GEM report, 2016). The report should, therefore, stress the importance of long-term planning that takes access, quality, and equity equally into account. While there is an increasing interest from private providers in filling and profiting from this gap, private actor involvement needs to be treated with caution as it may weaken public education systems, exacerbate inequalities, undermine the right to education, and fail to ensure quality. Furthermore, there is increasing evidence on the pitfalls of Public Private Partnerships in terms of financial risks and power imbalances between resourceful corporations and governments.
- R3 Reject the disproportionate focus on learning metrics.** While data is key for the further development and strengthening of education systems, we are concerned about the concept note's failure to acknowledge the controversies around learning metrics and specifically the global indicator on learning. The assumption that learning metrics foster "healthy political engagement and better service delivery" has yet to be proven; in fact, there is no conclusive evidence of the policy benefits of large-scale international comparative assessments. At the same time, there are numerous examples of the negative impacts of high-stakes testing, both in terms of the narrowing of curricula, reproduced inequalities across systems, and reduced professional autonomy of teachers. Moreover, learning metrics tend to be based on children in school (see GEMR, 2016, p.196). The most marginalised are often excluded from standardised assessments. As for data and systems strengthening, the thematic indicators under the Sustainable Development Goal 4 will provide meaningful insights into the quality and equity of education.
- R4 Reject results-based financing based on test results.** The concerns around the limited use of learning metrics are aggravated by references to financing "aligned towards learning" and results-based approaches linking "resources to results [...]" rather than to inputs". There are manifold examples of how value-added measurement and results-based financing linked to test



results have contributed to underinvestment in the most marginalised schools, fostered a culture of mistrust and competition, and encouraged teaching to the test. It would be extremely important to highlight examples of teachers, students, parents and employers working collaboratively to enhance and ensure quality, without relying on standardised, high-stakes testing.

- R5 Align the report with the Sustainable Development Goals.** The report must respect the Sustainable Development Goal 4 on quality education and its Framework for Action as the roadmap for education and development over the coming 15 years, as adopted by all the world's governments. The World Bank must not undermine their commitment to quality education by promoting narrow measurable learning outcomes. Knowing how to read and write is not a guarantor for an individual's economic prosperity and not enough for creating just and sustainable societies (e.g., the Global North and its major impact on environmental pollution, increasing inequalities and economic exploitation). A whole-child approach to education through, for instance, peace education, global citizenship education as well as, for instance, the availability of psychosocial support should receive similar attention as reading and mathematics, particularly in conflict-affected areas. While learning is a central part of quality education, education refers to the broader process and includes the social and societal aspects of going to school and learning alongside classmates.
- R6 Make equity an absolute priority.** The concept note states that “the learning agenda is fundamentally an equity agenda” and we hope that the final report will critically analyse barriers and challenges faced by various categories of marginalised groups, including girls and boys, women and men, refugees, migrants, the disabled, children with special educational needs, and those in rural and other under-served areas. As correctly stated in the concept note, it is important to expand the provision of Early Childhood Education for all children, and especially for the most marginalised. In addition, it needs to be further stressed that state interventions are needed to balance the playing field through effective provision of school meals, implementation of school health programmes, and the introduction of subsidies in other services (like transportation). Legislation and concerted interventions to address social barriers like racism, child marriage, untouchability, and child labour are key to ensuring that students can make the most of the learning opportunities provided. Furthermore, geographical distance between schools, instruction in an alien language, absence of materials in students' mother tongue, and lack of attention to the culture and history of students in the curriculum all act as barriers to student learning and quality education. To ensure equity, it is also important to prioritise ways to attract and retain well-trained and professionally qualified teachers in general as well as in rural and other disadvantaged communities.
- R7 Invest in trained, qualified, motivated, and well-supported teachers and education support personnel.** It is impossible to ensure quality education without a quality education workforce. As correctly stated in this consultation, it is important to attract high-quality candidates to the profession. However, reducing teachers' salaries and accusing teachers of absenteeism and a lack of effort will not make the profession more attractive. While the concept note claims that this report will be about “getting education right”, decades of education reform efforts funded by the World Bank have undermined the attractiveness of a career in education. By imposing salary caps and reduced investment in the public sector, the World Bank has largely contributed to the learning crisis. Investing in the education workforce entails scrutinising the structural factors impacting directly on the work of teachers, such as large class sizes, lack of training, low salaries, or the need for teachers to leave their schools to collect pay in the nearest city or town.

Interestingly, this issue is also mentioned in the World Bank's lending project reports. Here, the World Bank, contradictory to its policy advice, is more supportive of a professionalisation agenda and places greater importance on activities aimed at improving teachers' training, assuming that the source of the problem is not the lack of effort but rather the inadequacy or scarcity of teacher training.¹ Furthermore, the availability of adequate teaching materials and infrastructure, as well as the inclusion of the workforce in decision-making, have an impact on teachers' and education support personnel's opportunities to provide quality and equitable education.

- R8 Ensure social dialogue.** As correctly stated in the concept note, it is important to “effectively guide reform” and it is only through effective policy dialogue that data generated through learning or other assessments can be put to good use. We hope that the report will stress that governments must deliver on their commitment to decent work for all and ensure institutionalised social dialogue with teacher unions. The scope of social dialogue should be broadened to include the full remit of Education 2030, including the development, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of education policy. In the words of the Education 2030 Framework for Action: “teachers, and their organizations, are crucial partners in their own right and should be engaged at all stages of policy-making, planning and implementation” (2015, p.1). However, the World Bank has an alarming track record of undermining the role of education unions in improving education systems, and we encourage affiliates to share and highlight examples of the positive role and contribution of education unions in strengthening education systems and enhancing equity and quality. For example, in The Gambia, the teachers' union entered into an agreement with the Government to pay teachers through its Cooperative Credit Union, thus solving the problem of ‘absenteeism’ related to a structural issue (teachers having to travel long distances to receive their salary). Through the International Summit on the Teaching Profession and Quality Educators for All programme, Education International has been working with governments to strengthen the teaching profession, teacher competences, and teaching and learning within and beyond the OECD.
- R9 Include a focus on financing.** Domestic investment in education needs to be increased to meet the agreed targets of at least six per cent of GDP or at least 20 per cent of the national budget. A precondition for successful domestic resource mobilisation is ensuring progressive tax policies as well as the closing of tax havens; combatting tax minimisation, avoidance and evasion; and ensuring that companies pay their fair share of taxes. The WDR should also assess and analyse ODA commitments to education, and the need for development partners to meet the target of 0.7 per cent of GNI and to ensure that at least 15 per cent of ODA goes to education. Furthermore, the WDR should promote cost-efficient and equity-driven policies such as copyright exceptions for education and open licensing policies (i.e. open access) for educational materials and academic publications that were paid for with public funds. It will also be important to discuss how to improve the allocation of funding through, for instance, increased budget transparency, social dialogue as well as putting in place legislative safeguards for whistle blowers.
- R10 Caution against "increased flexibility, innovation and adaptation".** "Flexible approaches that allow for innovation, experimentation and adaptation" must be carefully evaluated in consultation with the education community. They must not contribute to the irresponsible and

¹ Verger, T. & Fontdevila, C. (2015) The World Bank's doublespeak on teachers: An analysis of ten years of lending and advice



decontextualised spread of ICT and increased private sector involvement detrimental to the working condition of teachers and education support personnel and the quality of education. The term "innovation" is increasingly abused by private actors that are driven by profit rather than the quest for quality education.



ANNEX 2

Bibliography

1. Privatisation

- Green, A., Lingard, B., & Verger, A. (2016). *Handbook of Global Education Policy*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Verger, A., Fontdevila, C., and Zancajo, A. (2016). *The Privatization of Education: A Political Economy of Global Education Reform*. Teachers College Press.

Vouchers

- González P., Mizala A. and Romaguera P. (2004). *Vouchers, inequalities, and the Chilean experience*. Santiago, Chile: Center for Applied Economics, University of Chile.
- Hsieh, C.-T. and Urquiola, M. (2003). *When Schools Compete, How Do They Compete? An Assessment of Chile's Nationwide School Voucher Program*. NBER Working Paper 10008.
- Mizala, A. and Torche, F. (2010). *Bringing the schools back in: the stratification of educational achievement in the Chilean voucher system*. International Journal of Education Development. Elsevier.

Public-Private Partnerships

- Edwards Jr, D. B., DeMatthews, D., and Hartley, H. (2017). *Public-private partnerships, accountability, and competition: Theory versus reality in the charter schools of Bogotá, Colombia*. education policy analysis archives, 25, 10.
- Rumney, E. (2017). *Sound economic governance depends on strong civil service, IMF official says*. Public Finance International.

“Standing in contrast to the enthusiastic promotion of Public-Private Partnerships frequently heard from the IFIs, the IMF deputy director of the Institute for Capacity Development [Gerd Schwartz] acknowledged the many problems plaguing PPPs, including cost overruns, hidden accounting and power imbalances between deep-pocketed corporations and governments.”

- Sundaram, J. K., Chowdhury, A., Sharma, K., and Platz, D. (2016). *Public-Private Partnerships and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Fit for purpose?* (No. 148). United Nations.
- Verger, A., and Moschetti, M. (2017). *Public-Private Partnerships as an Education Policy Approach: Multiple Meanings, Risks and Challenges*. UNESCO.
- Verger, A. and Moschetti, M. (2016). *Public-Private Partnerships in Education: Exploring Models and Policy Options*. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. [http://s3.amazonaws.com/inee-assets/resources/OSF-INEE_PPP-roundtable_Framing-paper_Verger-Moschetti_ePPPs_\(1\).pdf](http://s3.amazonaws.com/inee-assets/resources/OSF-INEE_PPP-roundtable_Framing-paper_Verger-Moschetti_ePPPs_(1).pdf)

“PPPs seem to be especially problematic in terms of education inequalities, inclusion, and school segregation. This is due to the fact that the competitive environment that many PPP contracts generate incentivizes schools to try to select the best students, as well as to discriminate against those students less academically skilled or with special needs or behavioral issues.” (p.14)

School fees/private education

- Education International and Kenya National Union of Teachers (2016). *Bridge vs. Reality: A study on Bridge International Academies' for-profit schooling in Kenya*. Education International.



- Edwards Jr., D. B., Klees, S., and Wildish, J. (2017). [*Dynamics of low-fee private schools in Kenya: Governmental legitimization, schools-community dependence, and resource uncertainty*](#). Teachers College Record.
- Kamat, S., Spreen, C.A. and Jonnalagadda (2016). [*Profiting from the Poor: The Emergence of Multinational Edu-Businesses in Hyderabad, India*](#). Education International.
- Menashy, Z. and Zakharia, Z. (2017). [*Investing in the crisis: Private participation in the education of Syrian refugees*](#). Education International.
- OECD (2012). *Equity and Quality in Education - Supporting Disadvantaged Students and Schools*.

“School choice advocates often argue that the introduction of market mechanisms in education allows equal access to high quality schooling for all. . . . However, evidence does not support these perceptions, as choice and associated market mechanisms can enhance segregation.” (p. 64)

- RESULTS Educational Fund (2017). [*From Free to Fee: Are for-profit, fee-charging private schools the solution for the world's poor?*](#)
- Riep, C. and Machacek, M. (2016). [*Schooling the Poor Profitably - the Innovations and Deprivations of BIA in Uganda*](#). Education International.
- UNESCO (2010). [*EFA Global Monitoring Report 2010: Reaching the Marginalised*](#). UNESCO, Paris. (p. 140, p. 165, p. 186, p. 189)
- Urban, M. and Rubiano, C.I. (2014). [*Privatisation in Early Childhood Education \(PECE\) - An Explorative Study on Impacts and Implications*](#). Education International.
- World Bank (2004). [*School Fees: A Roadblock to Education For All*](#).

2. World Bank policies and discourse

- Edwards Jr, D. B. and Storen, I. (2016). The World Bank and educational assistance: history, theory, research. *Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education*. Oxford University Press, Oxford forthcoming.
- Fontdevila, C. and Verger, T. (2015). [*The World Bank's Doublespeak on Teachers: An analysis of ten years of lending and advice*](#). Education International.

“A manifest disconnect between talk and action emerges within knowledge products and lending projects. On the one hand, . . . knowledge products seem to express a certain preference for managerialist or neo-bureaucratic reforms, in coherence with a diagnosis of teachers’ issues that emphasises their lack of effort. . . . Conversely, lending projects seem to be more supportive of a professionalisation agenda and place greater importance on activities aimed at improving teachers’ training. Since such documents assume that the source of the problem is not the lack of effort but the inadequacy or scarcity of teacher training , the logical solution lies in the strengthening of the skills of the teaching force.” (Summary booklet, p.8)

- Komatsu, H. and Rapple, J. (2017). A new global policy regime founded on invalid statistics? Hanushek, Woessmann, PISA, and economic growth, *Comparative Education*, 53:2, 166-191, DOI: 10.1080/03050068.2017.1300008

“Several recent, highly influential comparative studies have made strong statistical claims that improvements on global learning assessments such as PISA will lead to higher GDP growth rates. These claims have provided the primary source of legitimization for policy reforms championed by leading international organisations, most notably the World Bank and OECD. To date, there have been several critiques but these have been too limited to challenge the

validity of the claims. The consequence is continued utilization and citation of these strong claims, resulting in a growing aura of scientific truth and concrete policy reforms. In this piece, we report findings from two original studies that invalidate these statistical claims.” (p.166)

- Menashy, F. and Read, R. (2016). Knowledge banking in global education policy: A bibliometric analysis of World Bank publications on public-private partnerships. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24(95). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.24.2523>

“The World Bank mobilizes research production from the Global North, which reflects a disproportionate economic disciplinary focus. Moreover, through a mapping of the cited authors, this network is shown to be highly narrow and privileges authors from a small subset of elite institutions.” (p. 2)

- Mundy, K. and Menashy, F. (2014). The World Bank and Private Provision of Schooling: A Look through the Lens of Sociological Theories of Organizational Hypocrisy. *Comparative Education Review*, 58(3), 401-427.
- Verger, A., Edwards Jr, D. B. and Altinyelken, H. K. (2014). Learning from all? The World Bank, aid agencies and the construction of hegemony in education for development. *Comparative Education*, 50(4), 381-399.

“For the reasons explored here, while the Bank did invite agencies to discuss concrete education policy strategies, they did not use this as an opportunity to contest the Bank’s thinking. Both the position the Bank occupies and the authority ascribed to it in the education for development field contribute to its dominance and help to preclude the participation of other stakeholders, including IAAs, from leading to either substantive policy changes or to challenging feedback.” (p.16)

3. Results-based financing based on test results

- Global Partnership on Output-Based Aid in Education, Results for Development (2016). *Paying for Performance: An Analysis of Output-Based Aid in Education* pp. 1.
- National Research Council of the National Academies of Sciences (2011). [Incentives and Test-Based Accountability in Education](#).
- Sorensen, T. (2016). [Value Added Measurement](#). Education International.
- Washington Post. [Report: Test-based incentives don’t produce real student achievement](#) (28 May 2011).

4. Teacher policies

- Burns, D. and Darling-Hammond, L. (2014). [Teaching Around the World: What can TALIS Tell Us?](#) Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education.
- Frost, D. and Bangs, J. (2011). [Teacher self-efficacy, voice and leadership](#). Education International and University of Cambridge.
- ILO/UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Status of Teachers (1966) and the UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel (1997)
- Moussa, A. (2011). [Reducing Barriers for Community School Teachers to Become Qualified Teachers](#). Education International.
- Vasileios, S. (2015). [The status of teachers and the teaching profession](#). Education International.



TEACHER MOTIVATION

- Education International (2015). *Teachers assessing Education for All: Perspectives from the classroom*.
- Thoonen, E. E., Slegers, P. J., Oort, F. J., Peetsma, T. T. and Geijssels, F. P. (2011). How to improve teaching practices: The role of teacher motivation, organizational factors, and leadership practices. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(3), 496-536.

IMPORTANCE OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING

- UNESCO. 2014. [Teaching and learning: Achieving quality for all. Education for all global monitoring report 2013/4](#). Paris: UNESCO.
- Villegas-Reimers, E. (2003). [Teacher professional development: A review of the literature](#). Paris: UNESCO.

WOMEN TEACHERS

- Stromquist, N. P., Klees, S. J. and Lin, J. (Eds.) (2017). *Women Teachers in Africa: Challenges and possibilities*. Routledge.

TEACHER ABSENTEEISM

- Abadzi, H. (2007). [Absenteeism and beyond. Instructional time loss and consequences](#). World Bank, *Policy Research Working Paper* 4376.
- Fontdevila, C. and Verger, T. (2015). [The World Bank's Doublespeak on Teachers: An analysis of ten years of lending and advice](#). Education International.

“WB lending projects are characterised by a distinct approach that tends to dissociate quality limitations from teachers’ decisions or attitudes – limited teacher time, for instance, is not portrayed as a consequence of voluntary absenteeism but as the result of factors beyond teachers’ control. Furthermore, whereas the absence of accountability mechanisms is underscored by a significant number of the knowledge products, and job stability is frequently regarded as harmful, such an approach is less frequent in lending project.” (p.63-64)

5. ICT

- Kamat, S., Spreen, C.A. and Jonnalagadda, I. (2016). [Profiting from the Poor: The Emergence of Multinational Edu-Businesses in Hyderabad, India](#). Education International.

Development of a vast edu-solutions industry . . . [that] relies on standardisation (e.g. developing large-scale assessment systems, creating online curricula and training software); using untrained teachers at very low wages; and predatory product and school placement, along with aggressive marketing strategies. Instead of improving education, providing much-needed capital or investing in education for the poor, edu-solutions providers sell their products and services”. It is “a laboratory for the Gei to incubate and develop commercially profitable education products and services that will be bought and sold outside India.” (p.10)

- Menashy, Z. and Zakharia, Z. (2017). [Investing in the crisis: Private participation in the education of Syrian refugees](#). Education International.



“Technology has the potential to make a difference, and our research supports a need for the Syrian population to have access to technology in order to participate in local communities and join the workforce. However, the disproportionate stress on technology may be problematic, in particular when viewed as a panacea to break down barriers to schooling for refugees. Moreover, in the context of a poorly coordinated effort, many businesses are duplicating what has already been introduced.” (p. 13)

- OECD (2015). *Students, Computers and Learning: Making the Connection*. Paris: OECD Publishing. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264239555-en>

“[Students, Computers and Learning: Making The Connection](#)” says that even countries which have invested heavily in information and communication technologies (ICT) for education have seen no noticeable improvement in their performances in PISA results for reading, mathematics or science. ([OECD news item](#))

PRIVACY CONCERNS

- Alim, F., Cardozo, N., Gebhart, G., Gullo, K. and Kalia, A. (2017). Spying on Students: School-issued devices and student privacy. Electronic Frontier Foundation.
- Molnar, A., and Boninger, F. (2015). On the Block: Student Data and Privacy in the Digital Age-- The Seventeenth Annual Report on Schoolhouse Commercializing Trends, 2013-2014. *National Education Policy Center*.

“Because digital technologies enable extensive personalisation, they amplify opportunities for marketers to control what children see in the private world of their digital devices as well as what they see in public spaces.” (p.3)

- Reyes, J. A. (2015). The skinny on big data in education: Learning analytics simplified. *TechTrends*, 59(2), 75.

6. Financing

- OECD (2016). *PISA 2015 Results (Volume II): Policies and Practices for Successful Schools*. Paris: OECD Publishing. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264267510-en>.

“Among the countries and economies whose cumulative expenditure per student is under USD 50 000 (the level of spending in 18 countries), higher expenditure on education is significantly associated with higher PISA science scores.” (pp. 185-186)²

- OECD (2013). *PISA 2012 Results: What Makes Schools Successful (Volume IV): Resources, Policies and Practices*. Paris: OECD Publishing. (pp.40 -41)
DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264201156-en>
- Lustig, N. (2017). [Fiscal policy, income redistribution and poverty reduction in low and middle-income countries](#). CEQ Working Paper 54.
- Mundy, K. and Menashy, F. (2012). *The World Bank, the International Finance Corporation, and Private Sector Participation in Basic Education: Examining the Education Sector Strategy 2020*.

² The majority of low and lower-middle income countries fall below this threshold.



- Archer, D. (2016). [*Domestic Tax and Education*](#). International Commission on Financing Global Education Opportunity.
- Cobham, A. and Klees, S. J. (2016). [*Global Taxation: Financing Education and the Other Sustainable Development Goals*](#). International Commission on Financing Global Education Opportunity. (forthcoming)
- Figazzolo, L. (2016). *Spending Better, Smarter and More Equitably: Teachers call for action on resource effectiveness and transparency*. International Commission on Financing Global Education Opportunity. (forthcoming)
- Pawlowski, J. M. and Hoel, T. (2012). *Towards a global policy for open educational resources: the Paris OER Declaration and its implications*. White Paper, Version 0.2, Jyväskylä, Finland.
- Green, C. (2017). Open Licensing and Open Education Licensing Policy. *Open: The Philosophy and Practices that are Revolutionizing Education and Science* (p.29 – 40). London: Ubiquity Press.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5334/bbc>

“Unfortunately, it is almost always the case that these publicly funded educational resources are commercialized in such a way that access is restricted to those who are willing to pay for them a second time. Why should we be required to pay a second time for the thing we’ve already paid for? Governments and other funding entities that wish to maximize the impacts of their education investments are moving toward open education licensing policies. National, provincial/state governments, and education systems all play a critical role in setting policies that drive education investments and have an interest in ensuring that public funding of education makes a meaningful, cost-effective contribution to socioeconomic development.”
(p.38)

TEACHERS’ SALARIES

- Murnane, R. J., and Olsen, R. (1990). [*The effects of salaries and opportunity costs on length of stay in teaching: Evidence from North Carolina*](#). *Journal of Human Resources*, 25(1): 1-6-24.
- Dolton, P., and van der Klaauw, W. (1999). [*The turnover of teachers: A Competing Risks Explanation*](#). *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 81(3): 543–552
- Dolton, P., and Marcenaro-Gutierrez, O. (2011). [*If you pay peanuts, do you get monkeys? A cross-country analysis of teacher pay and pupil performance*](#). *Economic Policy*, 26(65): 5-55

7. Pitfalls of standardised assessments

- Sahlberg, P. (2012). [*Quality and equity in Finnish schools*](#). School Administrator.
- EI Briefing Note on [*Early Grade Reading Assessment*](#) (EGRA) (2015). Education International.

8. Importance of formative assessments

- Yorke, M. (2003). Formative assessment in higher education: Moves towards theory and the enhancement of pedagogic practice. *Higher education*, 45(4), 477-501.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Barron, B., Pearson, P. D., Schoenfeld, A. H., Stage, E. K., Zimmerman, T. D., ... and Tilson, J. L. (2015). *Powerful learning: What we know about teaching for understanding*. John Wiley & Sons.



9. The importance social dialogue and civil society engagement

- Bascia, N. and Osmond, P. (2013). [*Teacher union governmental relations in the context of educational reform*](#). Education International.
- Joof, B. O., Knapczyk, J., Martinez, A., Marmi, L.P., Spreen, C.A. and Verger, T. (2016). *A better bargain: Creating Conditions for Policy Dialogue and Developing Solutions between Governments and Education Unions*. International Commission on Financing Global Education Opportunity. (forthcoming)
- Education International (2015). [*Teachers assessing Education for All: Perspectives from the classroom*](#).
- Dabla-Norris, M. E., Kochhar, M. K., Suphaphiphat, M. N., Ricka, M. F., and Tsounta, E. (2015). *Causes and consequences of income inequality: a global perspective*. International Monetary Fund.

"Weakening of unions is associated with a higher top 10 percent income share for a smaller sample of advanced economies [...] and more lax hiring and firing regulations, lower minimum wages relative to the median wage, and less prevalent collective bargaining and trade unions are associated with higher market inequality."

"A decline in trade union membership (union rate) could reduce the relative bargaining power of labor, exacerbating wage inequality (Frederiksen and Poulsen 2010; Wilkinson and Pickett 2010; Figure 17) [...], evidence from a large sample of countries suggests that de facto labor market regulations (such as minimum wages, unionization, and social security contributions), on average, tend to improve the income distribution (Calderón and Chong 2009; OECD 2011)."