RESULTS
the power to end poverty

Consultation Overview

Date: May 20, 2015

Time: 6:00-8:00pm

Location: Orakai Songdo Park Hotel, Lily Hall, Incheon, South Korea

In partnership with RESULTS Korea, this consultation was conducted on the sidelines of the World Education Forum. The consultation focused on general feedback to project methodology as presented and as found in the RTEI Background Paper as well as specific feedback on indicator areas of the Draft RTEI Questionnaire. It looked particularly at those indicators classified as minimum core obligations and focused on the value of using this lens to further refine the Questionnaire. Additionally, the consultation sought specific input on the question of using global (UIS) or national data for Questionnaire completion.

Consultation Agenda

6:00-6:30	Welcoming guests	All
6:30-6:40	Opening remarks	Sunnie Kim, RESULTS Korea
6:40-7:10	RTEI overview	Tony Baker, RESULTS Educational Fund
7:10-7:50	Plenary clarification Q&A and discussion • Overall reactions • Minimum core obligations • Global (UIS) vs. national data	All
7:50-8:00	Closing	Sunnie Kim, RESULTS Korea

Feedback from Participants

When provided, responses to feedback from RESULTS staff are included below the initial participant feedback in *italics*. If feedback from the consultative call has been omitted from the comments below and you would like them to be added please email Tony Baker at tbaker@results.org.

Scope

• There was overall good response to using Governance and the 4A framework. Additional refinement/focus on minimum core obligations was also well received.

- In addition to the above, respect, protect, and fulfill was suggested as the language of governments and would be a helpful frame to the Index. Governments are more familiar with their obligations to respect, protect, and fulfill rather than the 4 As.

- While there was recognition that, on the one hand, the Index should be inclusive and comprehensive in nature (as in the Indicators section below), there was also a popular suggestion that it be further refined/targeted. Simplicity in terms of scope and number of indicators was emphasized.
    - Having fewer indicators preserves the analytic power and make the advocacy tool easier to communicate. Other indices have been successful because they are simple.
    - In practical terms, fewer indicators will be easier for partners to work with and use to collect the needed data.

Indicators

- It was highlighted that it is important that the indicators capture the structural, process, and outcome aspect of the area under inspection. There is a difference between having laws and those laws being enforced. Laws do not change quickly, so if the exercise is to be conducted every two years, it is important to look at process/outcome changes on the ground.
    - *Response indicated that RTEI is to include structural, process, and outcome indicators related to the areas being evaluated.*

- Various indicators and types of indicators were highlighted as being omitting or meriting insurance for inclusion:
    - Access should be looked at, but indicators should go beyond access to include learning.
    - Completion of primary school is important, but it is also important to complete on time. Net completion rates should be included in addition to gross completion rates.
    - More broadly, there may be the need to pay special attention to age-based indicators. Some indicators look good when reported, but if not age-based, can skew realities on the ground.
    - An indicator on school fees is important, but non-fee barriers should also be sought after.
    - The right to education is broader than primary or basic education. Secondary and tertiary education should also be included.

- It was suggested that the indicators, particularly outcome indicators, align with those of other indices, as it will help guarantee credibility.

- Focus should be placed on the indicators that add value to the global dialogue, focusing on the uniqueness of RTEI and the types of information it reveals beyond the more usual data/statistics regularly discussed by the global community.

Indexing

- Given certain weaknesses of index methodologies, a suggestion from a previous consultation was to individually score countries but not rank them. This consultation suggested that comparability is a powerful advocacy tool, is central to index initiatives, and that some form of ranking should be included in RTEI. To avoid explicit linear rankings, rankings could be done through categories, groupings, or scorecard methodology such as a green, yellow, red stoplight system.

Data availability and type

- It was suggested that external, existing data and sources, such as national data or that provided by UIS, should be used.
  - *Response indicated that it is the intention of RTEI to use existing data and not require field work to complete the questionnaire.*

- It was reported that availability of national data can be a problem. For example, the latest data civil society can get in Nigeria is from 2012. It was suggested that one can get unpublished data from the government if one works closely with them however.

- There was a question of data credibility, especially when that from the government may not be trusted. In South Asia, organizations have had to develop alternative data.
  - *Response suggested that consensus acquired through the double-blind peer review process should offer some mitigation to this scenario. For example, if the primary civil society respondent and two research organization peer reviewers agree on alternative data and the government disagrees, there is justification to maintain the answer informed by the alternative data.*

- It was suggested that benchmarks should be established, and ratios, such as toilet-pupil ratios and textbook-pupil ratios, should be used instead of real numbers.
  - *Response indicated that RTEI plans to use ratios where possible.*

Government involvement and opportunity to respond

- The data collection process includes sharing completed questionnaires with governments to provide them a 30-day opportunity to review, comment, or dispute answers if they'd like. Primary points of contact are with the Ministry of Education, which can liaise with other ministries, such as Ministry of Finance, if further information is required during their review.
  - It was discussed how difficult it can be to solicit information or comments from the government and that they often fail to respond within a month, if at all.
  - It was mentioned that best practices from other initiatives, such as the Open Budget Index and other surveys, should be used. Some governments respond while some do not, but the exercises are nevertheless successfully completed.
    - *Response indicated that government response is not methodologically necessary but rather provided as an opportunity and so as to conduct due diligence.*

List of Participants

Edem Amou, All-Africa Students Union (AASU)
Zehra Arshad, Pakistan Coalition for Education (PCE)
Tony Baker, RESULTS Educational Fund
Batjargal Batkhuyag, Mongolian Education Alliance (MEA)
Jean-Marc Bernard, Global Partnership for Education (GPE)
Daniel Choi, Yonsei University
Helen Dabu, Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education (ASPBAE)
Tungalag Dondog, All For Education Coalition
Boniventura Godfrey, HakiElimu
Ed Gragert, Global Campaign for Education, U.S. Chapter (GCE-US)

Allison Grossman, RESULTS
Eunjin Kim, Good Neighbors
Sunnie Kim, RESULTS Korea
Prof. B. Vijay Kumar, World Federation of Teachers
Soonju Kwon, Good Neighbors
Yamjoo Lee, Good Neighbors
Keith Lewin, University of Sussex
Thein Lwin, Thinking Classroom
Albert Motivans, UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS)
Tanvir Muntasim, ActionAid
Sang-eun Nam, World Vision
Chioma Osuji, Civil Society Action Coalition on Education for All (CSACEFA)
Jayeon Park, Hope is Education
Suyeon Park, Korean International Cooperation Agency (KOICA)
Rene Raya, Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education (ASPBAE)
Luke Shore, Open Society Foundations (OSF)
Dr. V. K. Tewari, World Federation of Teachers
Hawng Tsai, Thinking Classroom
Antoni Verger, Autonomous University of Barcelona
Abdul Waidl, Network Education Watch (NEW) Indonesia