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How can evaluation help us to achieve fair, inclusive education?

Members of the Board of Governors of the INEE

As we put out this 5th edition of the Gazette of the National Educational Evaluation Policy, we at the National Institute for the Evaluation of Education (Spanish acronym: INEE) ask ourselves how useful the results of the evaluations and tests that have been implemented for over twenty years now have been in promoting educational policy aimed at eliminating inequality in education.

This concern has also informed the construction of the National Educational Evaluation Policy (Spanish acronym: SNEE), whose governing document establishes the main goals that the different members of the National Educational Evaluation System (Spanish acronym: SNEE) should pursue in the areas of evaluation and educational improvement, and, addressing the said preoccupation, the Gazette, which bears witness to - and informs its readers about - the work being done in the context of the SNEE, has endeavored to bring together a wide range of experiences and proposals in its pages.

We include an article from the INEE on the Consultation with the Indigenous Peoples about Education and Its Evaluation Carried out with the Latter’s Prior Free, Informed Consent, in which it is proposed that resources be used in line with the focus on equity in education. Also this number underlies the participation process to design the guidelines for the improvement of the education provided to the children of migrant agricultural day laborers, along with other articles in which specialists from Argentina, France, Panama, Lebanon and the U.S.A. give us their points of view on the subject of evaluation aimed at promoting fair, inclusive education.

The aforesaid reflections underline how important it is that we take a new look at the challenges facing the National Education System importance, and, especially, at the need to help ensure that hundreds of thousands of Mexican children and youths of both sexes are able to exercise their right to high-quality education, in which the following list of points attests to the urgent need to move forward with specific actions and programs, and the evaluation thereof, in order to diminish inequality gaps:

**Access.** For the 2014-2015 school year, 57.8% of all three-year-olds and 26.8% of all 15-year-olds were not enrolled in school, while enrollment levels are even higher for youths aged over sixteen, standing at 91.8% for 24-year-olds (INEE, 2016b: 32).

**Gender equity and continuity in school.** While 0.4 more males aged fifteen or above are enrolled in school than are females of the same age, there is a considerable generational difference, with males between 15 and 24 years of age having 0.3 more years of schooling than females in the same age group, while the gap between males and females aged between 55 and 64 was 1.1 years (INEE, 2015:108).

**Population breakdown and spread.** According to the 2014 Overview of Education, (Spanish: Panorama Educativo de México 2014) the average number of years of schooling for youths aged 15 or over is 8.6 years nation-wide, 6 years in rural zones, 7.6 years for youths in suburban areas, and 9.7 for youths in urban areas, with a difference also being observed between highly marginalized areas, where young people have an average of 5.5 years of schooling, and ones with low levels of marginalization, whose inhabitants have an average of 8.9 years of schooling (INEE, 2015: 112).

**Infrastructure and basic services.** According to the 2014 Overview of Education, the most serious infrastructural deficiencies occur in elementary schools, 39.3% of which have no drainage system, 61.4% no access ramps or ramps enabling disabled students to move about inside them, 74.7% no bath-rooms for disabled students, 58.3% no Internet connection, 71.7% no computer room, and 54% no laboratory (INEE, 2015: 212).

**Poverty and schooling.** The number of young people aged between 15 and 17 who have fully completed their elementary education differs depending on socioeconomic level, with 93.3% of the population that is neither poor nor vulnerable finishing elementary school, while 78.4% of the impoverished population, 70.9% of those living in extreme poverty, and 75.3% of those who are categorized as needy, do so (INEE, 2016b).

**Migration.** Of the estimated population of between 279 thousand and 326 thousand children of migrant agricultural day laborers, only 46 447 have access to educational services, while no more than 14%-17% of the said children attend school (INEE, 2016b). According to the latest National Survey of Day Laborers (Spanish acronym: ENJO), the average number of years of schooling for the migrant-day-laborer population aged 15 or over was 4.5 years in 2009 (INEE, 2016b).

**Violence and insecurity.** Between 55% and 62% of all young people enrolled in secondary education report having been ill-treated at some time in their life. The murder rate for the population aged between 15 and 17
doubled over a period of 5 years, increasing from 8.2 homicides per 100,000 inhabitants in 2007 to 15.8% homicides per 100,000 inhabitants in 2011 (UNICEF, 2013).

Disablement and difference. The 2014 Overview of Education shows that school-attendance rates for the disabled are lower than those for the rest of the population, with between 5.5% and 19% of the total disabled population for which education is compulsory failing to attend school. All pre-school, primary-school and secondary-school premises lack ramps and/or bathrooms for disabled students (INEE, 2015; 99).

Educational achievement. With regard to learning outcomes, the results of the examination pertaining to the National Plan for the Evaluation of Learning Outcomes (Spanish acronym: PLANEA) show a significant learning lag for children in indigenous communities. In the Language and Communication section of the said examination, 80% of all students enrolled in indigenous primary schools place in Level I, while 83.3% of the said population places in Level I in the Mathematics section, with the same trends being recorded for the Telesecundariaa secondary distance-learning system and the community secondary schools (INEE, 2016a).

Child labor. 10.5% of all children and youths of both sexes between the ages of 5 and 17 (i.e. 3 million, 35 thousand and 466) are involved in child labor, and 40% of these children and youths do not attend school, while 30% carry out agricultural work that is deemed very dangerous (International Labor Organization, 2014).

Dear Reader, this is the size of the challenge that we face—and also our search for solutions—in this edition of the Gazette, to which we welcome you in the hope that its contents will serve as input for the plotting of possible lines of action in the endeavor to improve education via evaluation.
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Statistical data confirmed by the INEE’s General Direction for the Compilation and Information Analysis of the Unit for the Dissemination and Promotion of the Evaluation Culture.

FROM THE DESK

Overcoming Blindness

Se puderes ollar, vê. Se podes ver, repara
(If you can look, see. If you can see, observe).
An Essay on Blindness, José Saramago

In today’s world, we don’t need superheroes, but rather to act with a firm hand and keep our eyes wide open. We need to take a new look at all our children and youths and at their schools, teachers and families, and get to know them again, for somewhere along the way we’ve grown blind.

It’s me, answered the first blind man. There’s somebody else too. Let him identify himself, please. They’ve forced us to live together for who knows how long. It’s essential that we get to know each other.1

In his Essay on Blindness, José Saramago talks about the ability to observe when nobody else stops to do so, and the ability to perceive reality and act on it. It makes sense that we should learn to see in order describe the realities of education in our country, which is marked by problems of lack of coverage, inequity, injustice and low quality on such a broad scale that we seem unlikely to solve them if we don’t learn to look with fresh eyes.

For our country’s different states, the State-Level Program for the Evaluation and Improvement of Education (Spanish acronym: PEEME) - essential tools of the National Educational-Evaluation Policy (Spanish acronym: PNNE) - constitute an opportunity to stop and observe not only results, but also the components and processes of the National Education System (Spanish acronym: SEN) and undertake actions aimed at rectifying inequities.

In this fifth edition of the Gazette we talk about how these challenges can be faced, and we begin our analysis by presenting, in our From the Editor’s Desk section, some reflections gleaned from the different sessions of the Dialogues for the Building of the PNNE that were held in April of this year,2 during which 31 state-level ministers of education talked about the progress achieved in creating the PEEMES3 - i.e. planning tools to be used in order to analyze, define and orient efforts to evaluate and improve state-level education at the elementary and lower-secondary levels, which contemplate 3 dynamics - i.e. national-to-local, local-to-national, and within the school per se- and include the three main processes of: (a) defining educational problems in terms of gaps or shortfalls, and ascertaining the key causes of the said problems, (b) identifying evaluation needs associated with educational problems, and (c) drawing up a Project for the Evaluation and Improvement of Education (Spanish acronym: PROEME) and defining their purposes, aims, actions and benchmarks. With regard to evaluation, the states can achieve their aims either by:

- disseminating and/or using the already existing results of the evaluations of the education system pertaining to: The Professional Teaching Service (Spanish acronym: SPD), the Evaluation of Basic Teaching-Learning Conditions (Spanish acronym: ECEA), the National Plan for the Evaluation of Learning Outcomes (Spanish acronym: PLANEA), etc.

...or by:

- designing and implementing evaluations that take stock of local needs.
What are the states discovering?

Mexico’s most frequent challenges are in the areas of access and achievement. The problems in most of the states are low coverage at the pre-school and lower-secondary levels, and shortages of suitable materials, lack of equipment and inadequate infrastructure in schools that, according to the Planèa evaluations, have a large number of pupils in achievement levels I and II.

The sectors of the population with the lowest inclusion rates are the indigenous communities and children and youths in marginalized, or highly marginalized, communities, and also, though to a lesser degree, the children of migrant agricultural day laborers, while only three states mention disabled people. In these cases, the main challenge consists in offering pertinent schooling.

Also, according to the ministers of education of the different states, violence and insecurity are also factors that engender inequality, since they result in academic lag and more dropouts and hamper learning in the communities where they prevail.

Based on their diagnoses, the different states agree that, in order to raise the quality of educational and make the latter more equitable, it is necessary to:

a) ascertain what impact those involved in education have on educational inclusion.
b) identify areas of opportunity for making teaching programs and materials more pertinent.
c) ascertain how efficient educational processes and management are.
d) determine the state of school equipment and infrastructure.
e) ascertain which shortfalls in institutional capacity may be restricting access and limiting learning outcomes.

Hence, the states have produced a first draft if their PROEMES, and, given the obstacles that hamper the achievement of educational inclusion and equity, it is worth citing the following areas mentioned in the said first drafts, which indicate that it is necessary to:

- evaluate learning outcomes and conditions in primary-level-indigenous, migrant and multilevel education (Baja California Sur – Northwest Region).
- Improve equipment and Internet connectivity in schools in marginalized or highly marginalized communities (Hidalgo – Central Region).
- Strengthen teaching and management practices in schools, especially with regard to teaching in the students’ native language (Durango – Northwest Region).
- Develop a range of different strategies that foster universal inclusion and access to elementary education, resulting in lower dropout rates and improved learning outcomes (Jalisco – Western Region).
- Evaluate the learning outcomes of students with special needs who finish the primary and secondary cycles (Tabasco – South-Southwest Region).

In the pages of this 5th edition of the Gazette—which strives to light the way so that you can observe your fellows and avoid what Saramago describes in his Essay on Blindness, when he writes: “That night, the blind man dreamt that he was blind”.

2 Information excerpted from the presentations about the progress achieved in creating the PROEMES. April 8th: Aguascalientes, Baja California Sur, Campeche, Colima, Nayarit, Quintana Roo, Tlaxcala, Zacatecas; April 12th: Coahuila, Durango, Morelos, Querétaro, Sinaloa, Sonora, Tabasco, Yucatán; April 13th: Baja California, Chihuahua, Guerrero, Hidalgo, Michoacán, Oaxaca, San Luis Potosí, Tamaulipas; April 14th: Chiapas, Mexico City, State of Mexico, Guanajuato, Jalisco, Nuevo León, Puebla, Veracruz.
3 Aguascalientes is currently drawing up its PEEME and PROEMES.

You can find out more about the PEEME by visiting the PNEEME microsite via the INEE webpage at www.inee.edu.mx or consulting the Nautical Letter section of this edition of the Gazette on page 15.

VOICES FROM THE CONFERENCE

From an educational-justice viewpoint, inequality is an ideological choice

Interviewed in Paris by the Gazette, François Dubet, a prominent French sociologist and expert on the marginalization of young people, says: “Though schools cannot eliminate inequality, what they can do is make us feel that we all belong to the same society, but, for that to happen, we need to do away with the ideological mechanisms that lead us to choose inequality”.

People in France cite the three historic values of freedom, equality and fraternity, while the primary value in Mexico might be solidarity. Going beyond the aforesaid specific concepts, how are social values reflected in schools?

The answer to that question is a complex one, because all schools are unfair and inequitable. For a start, the fact that not all children have the same preferences gives rise to a lot of factors that make schools unfair – i.e. if
a society is inequitable, then its schools will also be inequitable, and the most inequitable societies tend to have the most inequitable schools.

This reality forces us to review the two prevailing conceptions of educational justice, the first of which is the traditional one based on the criteria of equal access and equal results. Equal access means that all children, no matter how marginalized, impoverished or disabled they are, and regardless of whether they live in cities or in rural areas, etc., should attend school, while equal results means that, regardless of the school they attend, when they complete their studies, all children should possess adequate knowledge and be familiar with their country's basic culture, meaning, for example, that a Mexican child should not only know how to write, but also be familiar with his country's history and be able to talk about it.

Thus seen, the school is a very powerful institution that needs equipment, trained teachers and many other things in order to perform its primary task of achieving equality and equitable results.

Examples of this type of institution are the State schools based on republican principles that exist in France and in Latin American countries such as Mexico and Argentina, with curricula aimed producing little Frenchmen, little Mexicans and little Argentinians.

To sum up what I've said so far, we can conclude this somewhat modest summary of the traditional view of educational justice by saying that it consists of the idea that all children should go to school and be taught.

The second conception of education is based on the idea of equal learning conditions, which means that students achieve different learning outcomes based on merit, and that the best students succeed regardless of their social backgrounds.

In accordance with this view of education which can be very controversial, since it does not assume that all the students in a given school should get the same results one calculates, for example, how many children from poor communities are enrolled in school or university. Obviously, this second conception of the school assumes different aims than the first one, since it implies differentiating between good students and bad ones, and attributes success to merit.

At this stage of our analysis, it bears pointing out that countries choose among different definitions of educational justice, and also, of course, that the definition they decide to adopt affects their education systems and their social interaction.

On the one hand, each of the aforesaid conceptions is evaluated and propounded in different ways, with priority being given, under the first one, to things such as the provision of abundant funding for the purpose of investing in-and building-schools, and training teachers in poor areas, while the second, merit-based one takes a more selective approach, placing the stress on building specialized institutes of higher studies in engineering or medicine, since it contemplates students progressing in more specific areas according to their merits. For example, Argentina, Chile and Brazil place more emphasis on upper-secondary and higher education than on elementary schooling, with the latter boasting about its higher-education standards while there is a great deal of inequality in its elementary-education system.

On the other hand, when we weigh these two different conceptions, we realize that there are several ways to measure inequality in schools; we can adopt the results approach and say that our schools are good because all the students enrolled in them can read, right and do sums, or we can assert that good schools are ones that enable a lot of their students to get into universities. Of course, we’re talking about two different types of school.

Moreover, these two different models of educational justice have different consequences for the population. For example, the poorer classes stand to gain more from the equal results approach, while the middle classes benefit more under the equal-access-and-learning-conditions one, since it’s middle-class students that go to university, have money and get diplomas. Also, we shouldn't forget that the middle classes normally exercise more influence over the formulation of public policy than the lower ones.

Fundamentally, we must understand that there are many ways of evaluating justice and equality in education systems, and that we must consider different school-evaluation criteria. For example, we can measure effectiveness, ascertaining how much students know, or inequality, asking what disadvantages they face in terms of competencies. One should not forget that sociologists define the school as a place where learning, the acquisition of culture and socialization take place.

Based on the above, we need to take stock of the different concepts of what schools are for, and ask ourselves whether the latter are meant to inculcate shared social values or encourage individuality, to foster competitiveness or promote fraternity.

What we can assert is that an effective school is one that promotes collectiveness, social justice and fairness. This is important because the nature of a society is basically determined by the practices that are fostered in its schools.

And this brings us to the subject of evaluations. After first asserting that we need to acknowledge that these measure pre-established conceptions of learning outcomes, I would like to make it clear that I am in favor of evaluations in school, with the proviso that one needs to be clear as to what is being measured – i.e. what the evaluations are serving to compare.

Today, for the first time since education systems appeared, we are able to identify homogeneity and difference from the outset – i.e. to ascertain whether a system is effective in this or that area and whether it is fair or not, though we should never forget that social inequality springs from what we do in our schools, being determined, in large measure, by the myriad mechanisms and practices there whose reduplication leads to social inequality.

For example, there are countries such as Canada –where one of the functions of the school is to reduce social inequality– that have much more inequality than France, but much less inequality in their schools. This is a very complicated issue in Latin America, whose societies are extremely diverse and very unequal, with high levels of marginalization and, in the case of Mexico, indigenous communities that do not have the same opportunities as the middle class, to mention two specific, widely existing variables.

Via evaluation, we are able to ascertain what is happening in the school and hence tackle the levels of quality and equality that prevail there. This is definitely a policy choice that very frequently involves the dilemma of deciding who is going to pay the bill, and the twin dilemma of deciding which level of education to invest in so as achieve high-quality schools.

In your latest book, ¿Por qué preferimos la desigualdad? (Siglo XXI, 2016), you assert that we are more the creators
than the victims of social inequality, and that solidarity is no longer a permanent feature of the social system, but rather “an ongoing product of individual actions and public policy”. In this regard, what role do we play in creating inequality in our schools and education systems?

Our choices at the individual, family or social level lead to these differences. For example, education is free in France and we have the same examinations, programs and course contents nation-wide. Though our education would seem to be equitable, paradoxically having or not having a diploma is a matter of different values, as is the matter of whether you get the said diploma in a free public school or a private pay school. This type of student choice results in inequality.

It must be stressed that it is ideology that leads to the said inequality. We ourselves do not trust the system. If allowed to choose which kind of educational structure we want to enroll our children in, we prefer private schools over public ones – i.e. we pay lip service to “the fairness of French republican education”, but we do not entrust our children to it.

These mechanisms are developed by minorities within the lower classes. If a family lives in a socially problematic neighborhood and sees that its children are doing well in school, it almost always opts to transfer them to a private school so that they can better exploit their good performance, and even in order to prevent them from being contaminated by the situation in their own neighborhood.

Once again, inequality arises for ideological reasons; we know that the future of our children depends on the schooling that they have access to and want our them to have the best possible education. In other words, as a society, we want our children to go to the best possible schools and, if allowed to choose between a middle- or lower-class school, we always choose the one that we believe to be better.

In France, 40% of all students spend some part of their life in a private school, and the same thing happens, for example, in Argentina, Brazil and Chile. To be more precise, we can assert that, given a chance to choose what kind of kindergarten our children go to, we select the best one, which is almost always private, because we know that their future depends on getting their education off to a good start.

Hence, it should be stressed yet again that inequality is an ideological choice. We choose it even though we pay lip service to equality, and, in very unequal societies such as those of Latin America, private schools become a bull market and dominate educational policy, which means that the more extensive the education system becomes, the more schools and students there are, and everywhere there are plans to open new senior high schools and universities, all in the quest for equality.

However, there are participants and mechanisms that create traps that lead the system to collapse. The best example of this may be the participation of teachers themselves, who know all about the system, accept it and become opinion leaders within it. Parents who are teachers don’t send their children to the schools where they themselves teach, but, rather, behave like everybody else, and perhaps worse, since they have more information. To put it another way, there are unionized republican hypocrites in the great egalitarian discourse.

To conclude my answer to your question, I am convinced that we need to come up with a policy to offset the mechanisms of individual choice that lead to inequality, and, in order to be maximally effective, the said policy must contemplate equality and higher-quality education for the whole population, and above all for the poorest sectors of it.

If we continue to have these enormous differences in the quality of the schooling available to the different sectors of the population, everything else is irrelevant.

What should the local education systems do about internal migration in Latin America and inter-country migration such as that which occurs in the said region between Central America and Mexico, and between the latter country and the U.S.A.? What solutions can be found, or policies established, vis-à-vis this problem?

We don’t need to build special or exclusive schools for migrants. By creating such schools, we are building ghettos and aggravating the existing inequalities and divisive mechanisms. To say that there should be special schools for migrants is tantamount to saying that there should be different special schools for boys and girls respectively, for bright students and for ones who are less bright. That’s futile, and I say this in a context where, in reality, society is demanding division. Let’s be clear, our society wants to separate white people from black people, men from women, and so on. Faced with this insistence on segregating the problematic sectors of society, we must do just the opposite.

We shouldn’t forget that, when the Latino neighborhoods were separated from the Anglo Saxon ones in California, in the U.S.A., the result was a poorer, more fragmented society.

In the case of the school system, public schools are justified insofar as they can keep students together and united, since they are a means of promoting collectivity and unity. If we can’t speak the same language at school, or coexist there, then our society will be even less able to achieve these goals. We can’t spend our lives discriminating between Chicanos and non-Chicanos, or between protesters and non-protestants.

The social demand for separation is unworkable. Educational policy should promote unification. If all the students in a given school can’t have the same syllabus and speak the same language, this failure will be reflected in society.

How can we talk about equality in such diverse societies as those that exist in Latin America, and especially in Mexico, where there are a lot of different indigenous groups and 60 languages are spoken in addition to Spanish?

It is very hard to achieve equal conditions, even if we have incredibly bright students throughout the country. What we need to do from the outset is to propagate the idea that the essential aim is to produce equal results, which is very complicated since we need to strengthen our teachers in order to achieve it.

For example, in the past, the teachers assigned to teach French in non-French-speaking regions where people spoke Breton or Provencal didn’t understand the local language and had no cultural links with their students. This is what happens with teachers, who are often socially close but culturally distant, living beside their students, but not being involved in their world.

Paradoxically, in a society that is becoming more and more integrated, the big problem nowadays is the increasing distance between teachers and students. We must make sure that we have good professional teachers who are natives of the regions where they teach.

What happens in Europe in general, and in France in particular, is that, since the bulk
of our teachers are recruited in cities with predominantly middle-class populations, there is a severe shortage of teachers who have cultural links with students in poor or marginalized regions. Due to this tendency to be physically close, but socially distant, the teachers who work in such communities have very little understanding of them.

We are undoubtedly facing a widespread crisis in this regard, which is why, for example, a teacher in the state of Yucatán is required to form links with the communities in which s/he teaches, and to do a bit of social work, which all teachers should engage in.

Though the public-policy issues are complex, we need to pay a lot of attention to the teaching that is done in poor communities and afford it the importance it deserves – i.e. the same importance as we afford to the teaching done in middle-class communities, and this means that teachers should get involved in the local culture, and be well paid and well trained.

Of course, in order to put the above into practice, we need an appropriate government policy, which means resources, taxation and information systems – something that is very complicated.

In 2015, the richest decile of the Mexican population earned 26.6 times more than the poorest 10% of the said population (INEE, 2016). Is such social inequality acceptable? Does it originate at school? Is our unequal society a product of our classrooms?

It’s a socioeconomic problem that goes beyond the school and arises from inequitable taxation, government corruption and globalization.

In societies such as those of Latin America, there are a lot of mechanisms and practices that engender inequality, and ultimately these problems affect the schools. The question is, what can the said schools do about them?

Let me say from the outset that I don’t believe that we can eradicate social inequality. What the Mexican school system can do, in particular, is to forge links with, and within, society, creating a feeling that we all belong to the latter.

This very French notion that schools can play a similar role in society to that played by the Church can, in a certain way, be applied to Mexican society. Schools have an impact on collective awareness, but can they serve to foster social equality?

If the very extreme social inequality that exists, a good school should teach all its students to read, write and do sums, which is already a step towards fostering equality.

It’s a bit like the health system; if the latter works well and keeps our children strong and healthy, increasing their life expectancy, then that’s already a step towards equality. In other words, we should demand better schools, establish more of them, and strive to produce better students, since all these things help to reduce social inequality, but the notion that the school can, on its own, eliminate inequality is absurd.

In this regard, I should add that France is a country that believes very strongly in educational meritocracy. If asked, the parents of students who attend lower-class schools will say that their children will be engineers, doctors or lawyers, which means that we’ve made a promise that we still haven’t kept.

The truth is that the education system can make a more realistic promise that will still be hard to keep – i.e. it can promise that children and youths will have access to education that will enable them to get a good, well paid job.

There are beliefs about education that are just that – beliefs.

How do you perceive our current schools and how would you like to see them in five or ten years?

I’d like our schools to be places where children learn to read, write and understand, that provide the same kind of education to everyone, that teach children to get along with each other, and that are conceived of as moral institutions where children and youths listen to each other’s views, respect each other, work as teams, study together, sing together and play sports because they are concerned about their fellows and want them to be happy. Our schools should promote peaceful coexistence, and respect for, and belief in, equality.

While good schools are basically concerned with imparting knowledge, I believe that they should increasingly seek to provide education in its broadest sense. When this happens, it will be a true boon to Latin America, since, from what I’ve seen of the Mexican education system, it doesn’t achieve many of the aforesaid aims, and, indeed, I’m aware that a lot of Mexico’s teachers and students not only don’t get on well, but actually clash with each other. Today’s schools should be places that promote both learning and peaceful coexistence. Paradoxically, I believe that the latter should become a growing concern of education; everyone must play his/her part in learning and preparing for life. In this regard, teacher training will be important. While it was the best students that formerly became teachers, now we’re not sure how, or how well, our teachers have been trained.

Why are teacher evaluations necessary and why are they important?

On the one hand, teachers are the people who try hardest to avoid being evaluated, and on the other hand we must endeavor to ensure that we choose and train the best teachers for our classrooms.

Professionals in every other field accept training and evaluation as ways of achieving success, as occurred in France in the areas of medicine and aviation. However, this has never been the case with teachers, whom we’ve never been able to properly evaluate. They are chosen because they know their subject – i.e. history, mathematics, etc. – but this doesn’t ensure that they have all the tools they need in order to teach well.

In this regard, a school where students learn well is, ipso facto, a good school, and, for this to happen, we need to be sure that our teachers are first-class professionals.

Let it be said that private schools choose their teachers very carefully, train them, evaluate them and pay them well. However, there are more factors in our public schools that play a big part in promoting educational inequality. We should never forget that our schools stand to gain from having highly professional teachers.

Interview: Elizabeth Zamorano

French-Spanish translation: Lizbeth Torres Alvarado

The Gazette wishes to thank Elizabeth Zamorano, the head of France’s International Center for Pedagogical Studies (French acronym: CIEP), for helping it to carry out the interview transcribed above, and also to express its gratitude to Patricia Doucoing Watty, a member of the faculty of the Educational University Research Institute (Spanish acronym: IIES) of the National Autonomous University of Mexico (Spanish acronym: UNAM), for making the said interview possible.
Pathways to fair, inclusive evaluation

The author of the following article explains that the aim of the General Department for the Coordination of Intercultural and Bilingual Education is to “promote the transformation from an education system that stressed integration and assimilation to one that fosters respect for multiple cultural identities and the respectful, equitable coexistence of those who differ from each other”, and talks about the context in which the said aim is being pursued, and what is being done to achieve it.

Fernando I. Salmerón Castro
General Coordinator of Intercultural and Bilingual Education of the Ministry of Public Education of México
Ministry of Public Education
fsalmeron@nube.sep.gob.mx

The General Department for the Coordination of Intercultural and Bilingual Education (Spanish acronym: cgeib) is the specialized division of the Ministry of Public Education (Spanish acronym: sep) that promotes education aimed at understanding, acknowledging and appreciating cultural diversity in the National Education System (Spanish acronym: sen). Since the said department was set up, its activities have been rooted in the perception that, for many decades, the sen has based its activities on the mistaken idea that the student population that it serves is homogeneous – an idea that has extend to planning, budgeting, teacher training and evaluation, thus perpetuating the different types of discrimination, segregation and exclusion that permeate the education system as a whole and tend to reduplicate social inequality. In view of this, while no specific studies have been carried out to ascertain the degree and type of inclusion of indigenous children and youths of both sexes, the existing literature on that subject has indeed been reviewed (See, e.g., Salmerón and Porras, 2010; Porras and Salmerón, 2015), and there have been detailed analyses that attest to the pronounced inequality between speakers of indigenous languages and speakers of Spanish (e.g. Coneval, 2012; PNUD, 2010 and PNUD-sep, 2013; INEE, 2013 and 2014).

The proposals of the cgeib

Based on the existing evaluations and consultations, the cgeib has set itself the aim of ensuring that the right to multicultural identity and coexistence based on fairness and respect for difference is respected, defining the said right in the 2014-2018 Special Intercultural-Education Program.

The cgeib has based its design of evaluation strategies on the following four spheres of analysis (Rodríguez, 2015): (a) pedagogical-curricular, which focuses on the processes involved in the creation and implementation of teaching plans and programs, and particularly on proposals regarding the formative stage of education and the professional performance of teachers; (b) organizational, which has to do with participation in the decision-making process by the different members of the school community (i.e. students teachers, authorities and school principals), the different types of school organization, academic teamwork, the use of teaching-learning time, and the effective use of available teaching resources; (c) administrative, which includes criteria for the assignment of resources for institutional tasks and the management of the said resources, labor regulations, academic and administrative rules, premises and equipment; and (d) environmental impact, meaning the relationship between each program and the immediate surroundings – i.e. the relationship with the different members of the community (manufacturers, community authorities, workplaces, municipalities, local government, etc.).

A project that involves more development of the aspects of evaluation that the cgeib wishes to tackle is the one pertaining to the Subject of Indigenous Language and Culture for Secondary Education (Spanish acronym: alcies). The pertinent text, compiled by Ana Laura Gallardo (2013), contains a detailed description of how a proposal for an intercultural curriculum was drawn up. The mainstays of this process that should be stressed for present purposes are those of consultation and evaluation, the first of which is aimed at ensuring that all actions related to proposals for intercultural curricula spring from consultation with the people who should benefit from them – i.e. the Native-Mexican peoples and the local indigenous communities. The outline is not only based on the Mexican and international guideline framework, but also responds to the need for the curriculum to be based on pertinent benchmarks in order to foster collective reflection about – and acknowledgment of – the ethnic, cultural and linguistic contributions made by the indigenous peoples, and, at the same time, “should be seen as a kind of accountability vis-à-vis the education system per se and society” (2013:37).
Moreover, the designers of the said curriculum created an alcies-related teacher-training guide that contains a module on how to evaluate learning outcomes (Galardo and Alonso, 2014).

Some challenges inherent in standardized evaluation

Some very important challenges inherent in the educational evaluation of our country’s indigenous communities have to do with the standardized assessment of progress, learning or performance – i.e. so-called achievement tests. Whatever the case, one must stress the importance that must be assigned to issues of cultural validity. As affirmed in the study of the Test for the Promotion of Educational Equality and Achievement (Spanish abbreviation: EXCAIE): “In order to adequately address cultural and linguistic diversity, special research should be done aimed at developing evaluation models and sampling strategies based on sociocultural and linguistic theory and up-to-date knowledge about our country’s ethnic and linguistic groups” (Ruiz Cuellar et al., 2015).

While the cgeib has not been directly involved in this debate, one should mention the role that it has played as the dependency charged by the then Minister of Education, Alonso Lujambio, with complying with Decree 1/2011 issued by Express Provision of the National Council for the Prevention of Discrimination (Spanish abbreviation: Conapred) in 2011 and subscribed to by the SEP. In order to achieve this, the working brief that was proposed included the design of a strategy aimed at emphasizing issues of pedagogy and educational impact in the enlace test, rather than technical or adaptive aspects. The main tenet of the said brief was the right of indigenous children to be educated in their native culture and language, and in this context, a strategy was proposed based on three main principles – i.e. (a) that of the evaluation model, which stressed the need to review study plans and programs in order to render them culturally and linguistically pertinent; (b) that of the evaluatee, which stressed the need to ascertain how bilingual the students taking the test were, and to emphasize a truly bilingual educational strategy for schools via a system of diversified, interconnected evaluations whereby it would be possible to compare results using shared, but not homogenous, benchmarks; and (c) that of the impact of the evaluation, which eschewed the biased, propagandistic use of test results and stressed the need for the said test to assess competencies rather than contents, and underlined the unfairness of imposing the same evaluation conditions in significantly different contexts.

Based on the aforesaid considerations, the previous working brief proposed that a diversified evaluation system be created as a basis for a pertinent evaluation policy.

Such pertinence can form a basic component of an educational policy that favors interconnectionivity over standardization, since it requires that content be rendered meaningful by taking stock of the sociolinguistic context.

Looking to the future

Since evaluation is a means of providing feedback about all the aspects of education and promoting their ongoing improvement, when developing evaluation tools we should see consultation as a specific means of getting to know, acknowledging and appreciating our fellows in terms of the basic competencies that engender equality, justice and non-discrimination. Diversity and respect for the right to be different should form part of all curricula and teaching-learning processes, and evaluation should also take stock of the need to radically reorganize our schools in order to accommodate the new information and teaching technologies and foster horizontal dialogue, research, positive interaction with the environment, and community participation in the teaching-learning process. For all of these things to be achieved, the participation of two collective protagonists is essential – i.e. the collegiate bodies made up of teachers and school principals, which serve as mediators for learning, and also an active community, both of which ensure pertinence and social supervision and foster the formation of real learning communities.

I end this article with a quotation that very much sums up the kind of evaluation that the cgeib wishes to achieve and points the way for students, teachers and other protagonist vis-à-vis the assessment of components, processes and results in Mexico’s marginalized communities, no matter whether the latter consist of native Mexicans, migrants, disabled people or victims of violence:

“Evaluation is a part of every educational process and must constitute a tool that is at the service of teaching and learning. Thus conceived of, it should be an integral part of teaching and learning from first to last. However, it is generally only partially used, being limited to the assessment and grading of learning outcomes at the end of a planned learning process and failing to take stock of the achievements of the evaluatees and the difficulties they faced during the teaching-learning process. […] since it is important that we review, verify and reorient the processes whereby we become familiar with language and culture and acknowledge and reconsider them in all their complexity, we propose a new view of evaluation that accords with this aim and is congruent with the tenets of our national curricula.” (Alonso and Gallardo, 2014:115).
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Three strategies for reducing inequality: Baja California, Nayarit and Oaxaca

Each of Mexico’s states faces different challenges according to its circumstances, assert the ministers of education of the states of Baja California, Oaxaca and Nayarit, who, in the following article, tell us, in their own words, about the strategies that they are pursuing in the education systems that they head, to achieve inclusion and equality.

HÉCTOR JIMÉNEZ MÁRQUEZ
Minister of Education of Baja California Sur

The immigrant and migrant populations are important
People think that there are no indigenous peoples in our state because its original ethnic groups, the Cochimis and the Pericues are now extinct, but, due to current migratory flows, we have become a destination for migrants from the states of Chiapas, Veracruz, Oaxaca and Guerrero, and each year 20,000 day laborers, belonging to 17 ethnic groups, come to Baja California to harvest tomatoes, and many of them have settled here. A couple of years ago, we set up an educational program run by scholarship recipients and teacher trainees for migrant children in our schools. When they got their degrees or teachers’ diplomas, they were reassigned to regular schools, being replaced by other scholarship holders and trainees, and eventually we decided to change all the staff in the said schools with graduates from teacher-training colleges.

We’ve witnessed increased in continuance in these schools; more and more migrants are applying for permanent residence in our state and we’re now seeing Mixtecs and Zapotecs in upper-secondary and higher education, and even holding government positions.

Our two strategies for providing education to migrant children consist on one hand in changing the profile of our teachers, giving them profession training and assigning them to teaching posts on the one hand, and, on the other hand, in developing and restructuring the 29 rural hostels that were set up 70 years ago. They are now full-blown schools with one teacher per group, and the children who attend them are not only taught, but also receive full board and lodging from Monday through Friday. Migrant children also receive classes in primary and secondary schools via the distance-community-high-school-education system (Spanish acronym: Telebachillerato) and the rudimentary secondary-level distance-education system (Spanish acronym: Telesecundaria).

Program with municipalities: teaching assistants
We’ve promoted a professional teaching-assistant position that didn’t previously exist, managing to get the Los Cabos and La Paz city councils to implement these posts, as well as the municipalities with the highest mobility rates in our state and those that have a lot of disabled children or children urgently needing attention. The people whom we hire via these programs are ones who didn’t manage to get teaching positions per se.

Outstanding teachers with low-performing students
Having scored low on the evaluations pertaining to the National Plan for the Evaluation of Learning Outcomes (Spanish acronym: Planea), we’ve placed the stress on forging links between students and teachers. Though, time and again, our state’s teachers do well in evaluations, their students’ results don’t reflect their achievement, and we need to change this situation. Moreover, we’re seeking to identify schools with success stories in Baja California Sur and have them share them with other schools, and we also believe that it’s essential to identify school principals and supervisors who have the leadership qualities needed to encourage teachers to take trainings, and are able to
Learning outcomes and proposals: input from the National Educational Evaluation Policy (Spanish acronym: PNEE)

While the PNEE has now been established, I also think that it's a top priority to change prevailing perceptions about teacher evaluation, which, rather than being at the end of the road, constitute the start of the next stage of the journey, just as the Planea envisages.

We education authorities never processed the results of National Evaluation of School Learning Outcomes (Spanish acronym: ENLACE) that has now been replaced by the Planea evaluation. It’s not just a matter of saying “We got bad results; let’s see how we do next year”. The point of the PNEE is that it helps us to make use of the aforesaid valuable information yielded by the evaluation to take the decisions that we need to take in order to guide our efforts. Education authorities need to change the way they think about evaluation, while striving to do away with discrimination in the country's most vulnerable sectors.

The said law identifies inequality as one of Oaxaca’s biggest challenges and prioritizes human rights and improved coexistence in schools, with responsibility for the former resting on the 80,000 teachers and other education-sector workers, while, in the second area of coexistence in schools, we have taken several steps to prevent and curtail bullying throughout our state by means of follow-up by an inter-school working group, seeking the cooperation of municipal and other authorities, since we aware that the problem in question is a culturally-rooted one that cannot be solved via official edicts.

The indispensable achievement of normality

We're getting back to a minimal level of normality. The numbers do, indeed, show that "Oaxaca lags behind", largely because things were very chaotic, but, having decided to put our affairs in order, we began to slice through the Gordian knots and create a new paradigm, so that, now, we can take part in the evaluations and take steps to ensure that teachers turn up for work punctually, achieving a minimal level of normality that benefits all our those who work in our state’s education system.

Inclusion of the disabled

We've chosen to promote inclusion via awareness-raising workshops and the dissemination of information to different groups and sectors, stressing respect for human rights and for the underprivileged. In other words, while striving to do away with discrimination, we've also scrutinized the make-up and characteristics of our schools in order to ascertain how they can gradually increase their ability to take attend to disabled pupils.

Moisés Robles Cruz: As a civil servant who is aware of the momentous changes that are currently occurring, committed to his job and conscious of his responsibilities as the leader of a great team, I try, above all, to practice what I preach being punctual, persevering, hard-working and honest, and devoting all my energy to my job.
David Aguilar Estrada, Minister of Education of the State of Nayarit

The indigenous population: some crucial issues
My state is culturally enriched by its very large indigenous population, which we must care for and protect not only via campaigns aimed at providing it with better nutrition, but also by affording it access to an education that helps it to grow and develop.

I believe it is crucial that we invest both financial and human resources in what we already have, and also carry out the restructuring of our schools and teaching staff that the federal government requires us to achieve in this key year of the Educational Reform. We need not only to adopt a positive attitude, but also to carry out authentic research aimed at tackling the educational challenges in our state.

Preventing violence via education
We support schools that take steps to promote healthy, peaceful, democratic coexistence by giving them different coexistence-related teaching materials, with a value ranging from MXP5,000.00 to MXP30,000, for purposes of training, support and evaluation focusing. The said materials, which are split into beginning, middle and terminal levels, enable us to measure progress and results, and additionally teachers, parents and children are asked to fill in a questionnaire the responses to which are used as a basis for making decisions about how to guarantee children's security.

Furthermore, we are currently implementing a project aimed at promoting conviviality in the third grade of primary school, and plan to extend this to all the other primary grades in 2017, and to the whole elementary-school cycle in 2018, including topics such as self-esteem, self-control, respect, negotiation and mediation. The aforesaid measures have enabled us to be among the 5 states with the lowest levels of violence, so that today only the state capital, Tepic, and a small number of housing estates are classified as danger areas.

Evaluation and equity: yardsticks and challenges
The big challenge consists in turning the results of both external and internal evaluations into information that provides us with guidance and feedback that help us to make more informed decisions and foster greater equality. This implies implementing strategies that result in high-quality education, which we define as a balance between efficiency and effectiveness.

We are aware that yardstick measurements don't change overnight, but we must commit ourselves to facing the great educational challenge of ascertaining areas of weakness in order to plot improvement paths. While this task isn't easy, every state in our country needs to address it.

David Aguilar Estrada: I'm very proud to say that I'm a teacher who likes to give warm, top-quality support to his fellow teachers. I like getting out into the field and visiting the schools that I'm responsible for, finding out what their problems are, and working shoulder to shoulder with classroom teachers, supervisors and school principals to solve them. As a professional who has also striven to improve academically, obtaining a master's degree and a Ph.D., I try to be at the forefront of developments in my field while also adhering to the policies set by the federal government.

Towards an evaluation of student achievement with a cultural focus

How can we include an intercultural approach in educational evaluation, and what do the terms “shared” and “different” mean when applied to evaluation? “Mexico is the country with the biggest indigenous population in Latin America and government policymakers cannot ignore this multicultural, multilingual reality”, asserts the author of this article, which proposes two ways of measuring difference in our education system.

Sylvia Irene Schmelkes del Valle
Chairperson of the Board of Governors of the National Institute for the Evaluation of Education (Spanish acronym: INEE)

schmelkes@inee.edu.mx

Introduction
Like several other Latin American countries, Mexico is multicultural and multilingual. The Miradas 2015 Report issued by the Organization of Ibero-American States for the Educación, Science and Culture (Spanish acronym: OEI), coordinated by the National Institute of Educational Evaluation (Spanish acronym: INEE) observes that Mexico was home to 42% of the total indigenous population of Latin America - the said region’s biggest indigenous population - with 11.5 indigenous inhabitants in 2010, 6.9 million of whom 42% spoke an indigenous first language, constituting 51.1% of all the speakers of indigenous languages in the region.
For its part, the survey carried out between censuses in 2015 by Mexico’s National Institute for Statistics, Geography and Computing (Spanish acronym: INEGI) indicates that 21.5% -i.e. one out of every five Mexicans- consider themselves to be indigenous. This multicultural, multilingual reality cannot be ignored by government policymakers, including those who formulate policy pertaining to education and its evaluation, both of which must endeavor to adopt an intercultural approach as a way of acknowledging and valuing their country’s cultural and linguistic and diversity.

Such an approach implies that evaluation, like education, must serve as a means not only of ascertaining the evaluatees’ academic achievements, but also as a way of understanding and addressing the aforesaid diverse realities that eschews erroneous assumptions that the populations taught and evaluated are homogeneous, and avoids oversimplification.

The intercultural approach to student evaluation.

Standardized evaluation of student learning outcomes is just one way of evaluating, which, while it cannot be intercultural, can prevent tests from discriminating against minority-culture populations.

For example, let’s look at the Learning-Evaluation Plan (Plan de Evaluación de los Aprendizajes. Spanish acronym: Planea) created by the INEE to measure student learning outcomes in a standardized way in the light of the aforesaid intercultural approach, for which purpose it adopts the following three definitions/procedures:

1. Since, unlike previous attempts to evaluate student achievement, Planea does not affect teacher pay or endeavor to publish rankings of schools’ student-learning-outcome levels, its results serve not only to foster accountability regarding student achievement in the different educational modalities, but also to find out which inequalities need to be addressed within the education system and the different school districts. If there were no standardized test that also evaluated indigenous populations, we would have no means of ascertaining inequalities in educational achievement, and hence no evidence to serve as a basis for building clearly oriented educational policies aimed at reducing the said inequalities.

2. Planea focuses on the basic learnings that all children and youths should achieve in order to understand the world and interact with others. Since the said learnings are independent of the cultures to which the students belong, and remain the same notwithstanding changes in the curriculum, the Planea results should help minority-group teachers, parents and students to find out both what they have achieved, and also which fundamental learnings for life they should have achieved but failed to acquire, and this information should help us design strategies whereby both schools and pupils can achieve the said learning outcomes which, though essential for all the students in each grade, but not being properly achieved.

3. Planea is created based on a cultural-validity protocol, designed to avoid cultural bias, that involves the following three steps:

a) A table of specifications is drawn up by a team that includes anthropologists, linguists and indigenous teachers.

b) Our country’s cultural, linguistic and socioeconomic diversity are taken into account when defining the populations to which the evaluations will be applied.

c) The illustrations and contextual information used in Planea’s items are carefully chosen.

d) Anthropologists, linguists and indigenous teachers are included in the teams that create and validate the items.

e) The items are checked for cultural bias by a team of reviewers especially chosen for the said task.

f) Items are piloted to ensure that they do not over-represent any minority culture or language.

g) A statistical analysis is carried out to detect bias.

h) Studies are carried out to ascertain whether items are generalizable to different populations.

The aforesaid features and procedures set out to ensure that only those things that are comparable are compared, and that the phenomena measured are valid, so as to reflect a reality that is not filtered through culturally biased test contents.

Since academic achievement is very uneven, and given that students in indigenous schools and from cultural minorities generally get results that fall far short of what is desired, by being able to obtain information that is free of cultural bias and enables us to make comparisons that reveal variations that do not stem from the evaluatee’s membership of a different cultural group, we are already taking an important step, since the information thus obtained enables us to work towards ensuring that all Mexican students acquire the requisite knowledge and skills.

However, this does not amount to achieving an intercultural approach in achievement tests, barely ensuring that the latter do not discriminate against evaluatees belonging to different cultural groups, and failing to address the issue of linguistic diversity or the possible difficulties faced by students whose mother tongue is not Spanish.

Standardized tests can hardly be expected to have an intercultural emphasis, since they measure what students have in common – i.e. what every student of a given age should know and be able to do. However, this doesn’t mean that there cannot be such an intercultural emphasis in achievement tests, which, in order to develop it, would have to measure difference, for which purpose:

1. indigenous organizations would have to define what is meant by different – i.e. stipulate all the things that students would have to learn in school pertaining to their language and culture, and, preferably, ensure that these things were actually taught in the said students’ schools, to which end the latter should ideally receive the support needed in order to properly evaluate the content in question, a task in which the INEE would most certainly take part enthusiastically.

2. via formative evaluation of themselves and their pupils, indigenous schools and teachers can measure their progress, in both what is shared and what is different, insofar as they are clear about what they wish to achieve, adopt pedagogical, student and community strategies for achieving it, measure progress on a daily basis, and provide feedback both to teachers and to students and their families about what still needs to be
achieved. The INEE also undertakes to help the said schools and their teachers to carry out the aforesaid formative evaluation of their progress in achieving their educational aims.

In this endeavor to achieve evaluation with an intercultural focus, in 2014 the INEE carried out a Free, Informed Prior Consultation with Indigenous Peoples and Communities about educational evaluation, involving 49 indigenous communities pertaining to 30 indigenous groups in 19 Mexican states. Adults, children and youths of both sexes took part in this consultation, which was carried out in the respective languages of the different communities via indigenous interpreters approved by the different communities’ assemblies. In this process, which was carried out with care, two months were devoted to providing information to the communities in question, two more to the consultation per se, and a further two to systematizing the results, with the questions being grouped in three big topic areas, pertaining to (a) what those consulted thought about the education they were receiving, (b) what kind of education they would like to receive, and (c) how the said education could be evaluated.

Since the results, which are very wide-ranging, cover highly diverse areas, the following summary limits itself to the evaluation of learning outcomes and, more specifically, to what the communities said about the said evaluation. The respondents proposed that:

- the learning of content be evaluated, including the indigenous language and other aspects of the community culture, as well as attitudes and behaviors that include participation in community practices.
- self-evaluation and pair evaluation be included.
- evaluation should help to improve teaching practices.
- teachers and parents should also take part in evaluation, to which end they should be informed about educational aims.

Conclusions
We have talked about three steps that need to be taken in order for the evaluation of learning outcomes to have an intercultural emphasis. The first of these steps is to ensure that standardized tests are not culturally biased, the second is to ensure that indigenous organizations exercise their right, under Article 14 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, to be educated within their own culture and in their own language, and that their achievements are evaluated once they have defined the kind of education they want, and the third is to ensure that the teachers who work with indigenous populations have the tools that they need in order to carry out formative evaluations in which the community participates in order to measure the learning both of what is shared and of what is different, thus promoting equal achievement.

All of the above implies using evaluation to foster the equitable spread of learning, raise learning quality, and strengthen the different languages and cultures that make us a multicultural, multilingual nation.

However, there is another step that we need to take, and pay more attention to, in order to achieve intercultural education – i.e. that of ascertaining, via standardized tests and formative evaluation, the extent to which everyone in our country is aware of the latter’s cultural and linguistic diversity and respects and values it.

One of the essential aims of our curriculum is that of promoting the aforesaid awareness, respect and appreciation in order to combat against racism, discrimination and inequality.

1 Generalizability is a measure of a test’s reliability based on the quantification of how important each of its variability sources is.
2 The Consultation also covers how teachers, school principals and schools should be evaluated, and the respondents widely acknowledge the importance of the education they receive, while also stressing what it the said education fails to include – i.e. the indigenous language and culture and community values. The communities very clearly explain what kind of education they would like to receive, and the kind of linkage they would like to see between the schools and themselves. The report is available at: http://publicaciones.inee.edu.mx/busca dorPub/P1/D/242/P1D242.pdf
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The State-level Programs for Educational Evaluation and Improvement (Spanish acronym: PEEME) will provide basic input for the creation of the 2016-2020 Medium-term National-Educational-Evaluation-System Program (Spanish acronym: SNEE).

It will enable each state to set up projects, plan actions and establish aims pertaining to evaluation aimed at improving its Elementary Education and Upper-Secondary Education. In this way, by regulating local evaluation policies, with the support of the Document Governing the National Educational-Evaluation Policy (Spanish acronym: DR-PNEE), it will be possible to:

• coordinate the evaluations carried out by the National Institute for the Evaluation of Education (Spanish acronym: INEE) and the state-level education authorities (Spanish acronym: AEE).
• achieve collaboration between the INEE and the AEE, coordinat-
ing and supporting their efforts to carry out state-level evaluations and take such other actions as are deemed necessary for bringing about improvement.
• Set achievable aims up to 2020.

The purpose
The PEEMEs set out to serve as an instrument for planning and guid-
ing evaluation and efforts in order to improve education in line with local needs, thus being a key means of helping each state to:

a) be aware of educational policy and federal and state-level gov-
ernment actions aimed at improving education, as well as ac-
ations that still need to be taken to tackle educational shortfalls.
b) identify evaluation efforts and evaluation-related projects, ar-
eas of opportunity and lines of action.

c) coordinate efforts to carry out improvement-focused evalu-
ation by coming up with strategies for disseminating results and
using them to improve the quality of education and make it
fairer.

What should the priorities be when developing the PEEMEs
Stress should be placed on the forging of horizontal links, and shared decision making, among institutions, aimed at setting AEE priorities for planning and implementing evaluation projects, based on exist-
ing input, in order to provide the information needed by top-level officials, by middle-level consultancy-and-support entities, and by teachers and school principals.

Guidelines and spheres of intervention
These guidelines govern the drawing up of the PEEME in each state, whose team can include the features that render them basic, drawn from the National Educational Evaluation Policy (Spanish acronym: PNNE) three spheres or lines of intervention, which are:

• National to local: The input and evalu-
ations that are needed in order to reach consensus about a national agenda com-
prising the seven core areas of the PNIE
that are set forth in the latter’s Governing
Document.
• Local to national: Bottom-up input and actions defined by the AEE based on
educational needs or local evaluations.
• Horizontal, pertaining to the school per se: Actions taken by the
AEEs via the organization and running of the Technical Support
Service for Schools (Spanish acronym: SATIE), the middle-level
structures and Zonal School Technical Committees in order to
support internal evaluation in schools and help to interpret and
use external evaluations in order to support improvement and
make schools more autonomous.

State-level input and teams
Each state is responsible for creating its own PEEME, basically using
the Guide, and receiving support and advice from the INEE for that
purpose, while also involving the officials responsible for evaluation and
planning in the specific type of education in question and also
from Decentralized Government Entities, the SPD, as well as the
middle-level structure in the state and the people in charge of the
SATE, who jointly set priorities regarding:

• the creation of evaluations based on local initiative.
• efforts to evaluate the other components of the SEN.
• the use of Mexican and international evaluations.
• areas of opportunity linked to the PNIE hubs.

Educational-evaluation measures set forth in the PEEMEs
In order for the AEEs to be able to implement the public-education policies -and carry out the tasks- that are incumbent on them, and
ascertain which evaluation tasks they need to perform, the PEEMEs stipulate the following three areas in which as many actions may be taken –or Evaluation and Improvement Projects (Spanish acronym: PROEME) implemented- as are deemed necessary:

a) Processes: this is the PEEMEs’ biggest area of opportunity, since actions in this area make it possible to evaluate interac-
tions among the various components of the SEN, regardless of
whether they occur in the school, in the school district, in the subsystem or in the local education. The evaluation of school organization also falls within this area, enabling us to ascertain whether schools fulfill the minimal learning, operational and running conditions as determined by the Evaluation of Basic Teaching-Learning Conditions (Spanish acronym: ECEA) or by local evaluations.

b) **Student achievement**: as measured via the National Plan for the Evaluation of Learning Outcomes (Spanish acronym: PLNEA) or via state-level evaluations.

---

### Diagram 1. Menu of possible educational-evaluation actions (components, processes and results)

- **Parents**
- **Students**
- **School**
  - Materials, organization, School principals, plans and programs, infrastructure
- **Teachers**
  - Supervisors and ATP’s
- **Context**
- **Processes**
- **ECEA**
- **SPD**

**Education authorities**

*Source: UNPE-INEE.*

### Diagram 2. Logical mapping (Tavistock)

**Context**
- Educational problem expressed in terms of gaps
- Stage 1. Identify the problem (Stages 1 and 2 for developing the PEEM)

**Resources**
- Financial, Human, Technical (Stage 4. Chronogram and benchmarks)

**Actions**
- Concrete actions (Stage 3. Actions and aims)
- Good evaluation, dissemination and utilization measures

**Results**
- Aims (Stage 3. Actions and aims)
- Stage 3. Analyze the logic underlying the intervention
  - Tavistock and PMaker

**Impacts**
- Reduction of the gap

*Immediate impact*  
*Future impact*

*Source: UNPE-INEE.*
c) **Components**: comprising teachers, school principals, technical-pedagogical advisers, supervisors, infrastructure, teaching materials and methods, school organization, information systems, policies and programs.

**Schedules and methodology**

The PEEME’s are created by recurring to the five regions set up by the SEP so that the local authorities may take actions that complement those promoted in the context of the Educational Reform, being developed based on a four-stage methodology that makes it possible to put together the evaluation and define the annual projects, aims and actions associated with it.

**Stages of the methodology**

One: Identification of problems.
- a) Systematization of the information using a set of 23 key benchmarks; 
- b) analysis of educational gaps or inequalities based on key benchmarks; 
- c) classification of educational problems in order of importance; 
- d) analysis of causes; and 
- e) identification of evaluation needs in accordance with the educational problems.

Two: Announcement of PROEME
- a) Determination that evaluation is needed and definition of PROEME’s; 
- b) decision as to the order in which development should occur and inclusion of the PNEE hubs; 
- c) linkage with the SATE; and 
- d) definition of projects and aims.

Three: PROEME goals and actions
- a) Definition of long-term impact; 
- b) stipulation of target results in accordance with short- and long-term aims; 
- c) development of an ordered sequence of actions; 
- d) identification of the resources needed to carry out the planned actions; and 
- e) identification of the protagonists involved; and 
- f) confirmation of the underlying cause-and-effect logic.

**Tools for designing the PEEME**

**Logical mapping (LM).** This is a methodological tool that enables the user to input, systematize and organize valuable project-related information. Based on a diagnostic study, each PROEME is designed within the framework of the PNEE, in accordance with each state’s features, needs and local challenges. This tool is useful for anticipating possible immediate and long-term impacts on educational problems (diagram 2).

The PM has enabled the state-level teams responsible for creating the PEEME to come up with evaluation procedures aimed at improving education.

**Stakeholder Analysis.** This is carried out using the Policy Maker (PM) tool to analyze information about opposition and support that can lead to a decision about the implementation of a plan, project or policy change. This methodological tool enables planners to classify the key players who act, or cause action to be taken, in order to help or hinder the implementation of the PROEME (see diagram 3), classifying them in accordance with how harmed or benefitted they are by the project.

The said analysis, which should result in a strategy both for tackling opposition and also for taking advantage of support, has a double purpose vis-à-vis the development of the PROEME, being aimed at:
- a) detecting resistance in advance – i.e. opposition and obstacles that protagonists who are harmed, or perceive themselves to be harmed, could have to, or place in the way of, the project; and 
- b) coming up with strategies that can help to fend off their actions.

---

**Diagram 3. Perception of those involved**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resultan realmente</th>
<th>Benefitted</th>
<th>Harmed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Benefitted</td>
<td>![Thumbs Up]</td>
<td>![Thumbs Down]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Harmed</td>
<td>![Thumbs Down]</td>
<td>![Thumbs Up]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Harmed</td>
<td>![Thumbs Down]</td>
<td>![Thumbs Up]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Benefitted</td>
<td>![Thumbs Up]</td>
<td>![Thumbs Down]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** UNPE-INEE.

**Would you like to know more about the PEEMEs?** See the special supplement to Gazette No. 4, entitled “The Snee and the National Educational Evaluation Policy: Progress and Outlook”, or visit the PNEE microsite via the INEE webpage at www.inee.edu.mx. You can also submit queries at: pnee@inee.edu.mx.
Consulting the indigenous peoples and communities about education and its evaluation

“Why have you waited until now to consult us?” was the first question asked by various communities when they were invited to take part in the consultation that the National Institute for the Evaluation of Education carried out in the year 2014 in close collaboration with the National Pedagogic University, the Cañuelas NGO, and UNICEF. Below, we tell the story of the said consultation.

Raquel Ahuja Sánchez
General Director for the Evaluation of Schools (Spanish acronym: DGEOE), INEE
rahuja@inee.edu.mx

Humberto Rivera Navarro
Director of Evaluation and Diversity, DGEOE INEE
hrivera@inee.edu.mx

María Teresa Meléndez Irigoyen
Assistant Director of Evaluation and Diversity, DGEOE INEE
mnelendez@inee.edu.mx

National Educational System Evaluation Unit

Background
The Consultation with the Indigenous Peoples about Education Carried out with the Latter’s Prior Free, Informed Consent –one of the first five actions promoted by the Board of Governors of the National Institute for the Evaluation of Education (Spanish acronym: INEE) after it became autonomous–, was a strategic project that put into practice the principles that the said Board had formulated as a basis for orienting institutional actions in the area of educational evaluation (INEE, 2015a) – i.e. (a) the improvement of education; (b) equality; (c) justice; (d) the recognition, valuing and management of diversity; and (e) participation.

The design of the said Consultation began in the second half of 2013, harking back to events that occurred in 2011 – Decree 1/2011 Issued by the National Council for the Prevention of Discrimination (Spanish abbreviation: CONAPRED) in 2011 against discrimination on grounds of language, social status and ethnic origin in the National Evaluation of Learning Outcomes in Schools (Spanish acronym: ENLACE), and the acknowledgement that Article One of the Mexican Constitution vouchsafed to the various international treaties on human rights that Mexico had signed.

In this context, in 2013 the INEE worked jointly with teachers, academics and both indigenous and non-indigenous intellectuals to define the aims and methodology of the Consultation and determine which communities would take part in it. In the first meetings, it was agreed that the communities would be chosen based on: (i) the density of their indigenous populations, the extent to which their cultures were being preserved, and the degree to which their native languages were still in use; (ii) the type of relationship that existed between the school and the community, and (iii) the community’s geographic location. In the end, 49 communities were chosen, located in 18 states and speaking 27 indigenous languages.

Aims
The main aim of the Consultation, which was based on the systematic participation of its coordinators, its facilitators and the communities themselves, was to document what the said communities understand by “good education”, which teaching practices and, course contents they consider appropriate, and which types of evaluation they believe should be used to monitor the performance of their schools, the purpose of compiling the aforesaid basic information being to design an evaluation policy that is standardized in some areas (i.e. taking as much stock as possible of cultural and contextual variation). A secondary aim was that of drawing up a Consultation protocol.

Methodology
The Consultation was split into the following three stages:

(1) Informative (February and March, 2014). The INEE delivered a formal invitation to the communities that had been chosen to take part, assemblies were held and the community facilitators, who were preferably members of the community in question, or at least spoke the community language, were chosen.

(2) The Consultation per se (April and May, 2014). Each assembly discussed 17 questions previously translated into the community’s native language by the community facilitator. Workshops especially designed for children and youths of both sexes were held so that the latter, using drawings, photographs and games, could freely express their opinions about the education they were receiving and its evaluation, and about the kind of education and evaluation they would like to have. Also, specific meetings with women and old people were held in some communities.
education should be bilingual, which means not only teaching the indigenous language, and using the said language to teach, but also developing a new view of the said language as one of the foundations of the community culture, and hence, in addition to be adequately trained, the teachers assigned to each community should speak its language; (e) the schools in the communities should be decent and have high-quality infrastructure and equipment; (f) the said schools should operate regularly, and teachers should respect established class hours and treat students and their parents with respect; and (g) there should be periodical evaluations in which parents and the rest of the community take part, and the said evaluations should include the local language and local knowledge, with the knowledge acquired in school being evaluated in terms of domestic and community practices, added to which there should be different types of evaluation, such as practical observations, interviews, joint evaluations and self-evaluations, carried out by people who are familiar with the community.

In 2015, in order to confirm these results, they were shared with 174 additional communities that speak 55 indigenous languages, and 97 dialects thereof, in 22 states. These new communities expressed the same general preoccupations as the initial 49 ones

**Results**

Some findings which are especially noteworthy, since they are consistent for all the communities and supported by strong arguments, are that: (a) links between the school and the community should be strengthened, with the latter being involved in academic matters, making, rather than just making economic contributions and organizing recreational activities; (b) teachers should be involved in the community, speak its language and include local knowledge, as well as the contents stipulated at the national level, in their teaching; (c) schools need to inculcate the collective values of cooperation, solidarity, etc., rather than an individualistic outlook that stresses competencies, personal development, etc.; (d) The Consultation methodology

(a) The Consultation was carried out in keeping with the principles of International Labor Office Convention number 160 regarding consultations with indigenous peoples; (b) It was carried out in the native languages of the communities, using facilitators appointed by the latter, who participated in the planning of each stage; (c) The entity consulted was the community, which discussed education and evaluation in ad hoc assemblies; (d) The organizers ensured that children and youths of both sexes took part using a methodology especially designed for them, and the participation of women and old people was specifically encouraged; (e) The Consultation was carried out before changing public policy in order to base the latter’s design on community feedback; (f) A technical follow-up team was formed, made up of heads and directors of both federal and state-level institutions, and Mexican and international observers; (g) In the final phase, regional workshops were set up in which the facilitators and an official from each participating community openly discussed the methodology and the results.
What do the findings mean for educational policy in Mexico?
The children, youths and adults who took part in the community assemblies and workshops talked about the lack of materials in their schools, the inadequacies and slackness of the teachers, and the failure of the curriculum to harmonize with their culture, having different points of view about these problems, but never being resigned about them.

The communities consulted did not see the school as a service provider answerable to the families whose children attend it; for them, children and youths, like the rest of the community, are the concern and responsibility of the community as a whole, and, in this order of things, the intimate school-cum-indigenous collectivity cannot have, as its liaison mechanism, a parents’ association or a local schoolboard.

The communities have high expectations of their schools, expecting the latter not only to educate their children and youths in order that they may develop the job competencies stipulated in the national curriculum, but also to prepare them to play a productive role in community life, and, at the same time, make them good community members by equipping them with local knowledge, as well as teaching them about their country and the rest of the world.

Hence, they demand pertinence, adaptation to local needs and interests, respect and inclusion.

It is impossible to comply with the request that each school teach the local indigenous language in the same way in communities whose language is still in widely used as in ones whose language is being lost. When entering into a dialogue about course contents with those who live in a community, teachers must base themselves on knowledge of the particular culture and eschew debilitating prejudices and idealizations. Given that each of the indigenous peoples has its own particular values and outlooks, which vary from people to people and community to community, but also has some interests and needs in common with non-indigenous communities, government authorities need to realize that the said communities change with the times and vary according to their location, just as non-indigenous communities do.

Rather than ending with the holding of a consultation with nationwide results, the dialogue between government authorities and indigenous communities should be an ongoing one.

Commitments of the INEE springing from the Consultation
The proposals that the communities made during the Consultation have already resulted in more rigorous analysis of the educational problems detected by the research and in the reformulation of public policy, and, further along the road, they will lead the INEE to issue educational-policy guidelines aimed at improving indigenous education and stressing the pertinence thereof.

Moreover, the aforesaid result are informing the drawing up of culturally valid technical criteria (See Schmelkes, 2015) that will enable the INEE to ensure that the evaluation tools that it develops or supervises are as unbiased as possible and help to make evaluation fairer.

Furthermore, the INEE assumes the additional commitment of carrying out and promoting evaluations that attest to the educational disparities between the indigenous and non-indigenous populations (see, e.g., OEI, 2016), not only in traditional communities, but also in other contexts, as well as providing information that serves as a basis for the formulation of educational policies that acknowledge and address diversity and encourage people to recognize and appreciate it.
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I'm the migrant indigenous daughter of day laborers and a success story, having studied at the Iberoamerican University on a Ford Foundation scholarship. The education system doesn't come to us migrants; we have to go to the system.

Gloria Gracida, teacher at the Telesecundaria [distance secondary-education system] in San Quintín, Baja California (INEE, 2015)

The amendment to Article Three of the Mexican Constitution (Spanish acronym: cpeum) that was enacted in the year 2013 stipulates that everyone is entitled to education and that the State must ensure that the compulsory education provided at the pre-school, primary, lower-secondary and upper-secondary levels is of a high quality, which means that all children, of both sexes, regardless of their personal or family circumstances or their location, must be able to go to school and receive educational services that foster continuance and engender optimal, meaningful learning outcomes.

Nonetheless, what really occurs in our country is that socioeconomic inequality is transferred to the school, since a great many Mexicans are unable to exercise the aforesaid constitutional right. According to the report issued in 2014 by the National Institute for the Evaluation of Education (Spanish acronym: INEE), the most disadvantaged students are those living in small rural townships, the sons and daughters of indigenous parents, the children of migrant agricultural day laborers, and working and disabled children.

The statistics show that there have not been enough legislative initiatives, funding, and programs aimed at narrowing the gaps between the above-mentioned groups and the rest of the population, and hence we need to find out where the shortfalls are and how to remedy them by evaluating the efficacy of government policy.

While the INEE is charged with issuing guidelines in relation to various educational problems, it decided to give priority to the education available to the children of migrant agricultural day laborers, and hence the Direction of Guidelines for the Improvement of Education (Spanish acronym: DGDME) asked The Research Institute for the Improvement of Education Institutions and Policies to carry out a study, based on Venn diagrams, of the populations in most dire need of schooling, and the said study split the said populations into the four macro-categories of rural dwellers, migrant agricultural day laborers, indigenous Mexicans and marginalized city dwellers, in each case using the four A's proposed by Katarina Tomaševski to (INEE, 2014) to ascertain why the right to education was not being exercised by these groups.

According to the previous mentioned study, the children of migrant agricultural day laborers—between 83% and 86% of whom do not attend school—are the ones who are least able to exercise their right to education, and this finding (Rodríguez, 2014) is consistent with the educational research that concludes—like similar research carried out in 2000 and 2012—that the situation of these children and youths is
a chronic problem that particularly manifests itself in inadequate infrastructure, bad teaching conditions, child labor and non-continuance in school.

Consequently, the INEE, in its Plan for the Issuance of Guidelines by 2016, affirms that there is a pressing need to improve the policies aimed at providing education to the children of migrant agricultural days laborers as part of the endeavor to make good on the universal right to education.

The creation of guidelines with mechanisms for dialogue with key participants

Based on the Model for the Creation and Issuance of Guidelines (INEE, 2015) —which facilitates discussion with the different authorities involved in the design, implementation and evaluation of guidelines and with those involved in research into the latter, as fostering participation in their formulation by civil society prior to their issuance— the validity of these recommendations, which set out to guide decision-making about educational policy, is founded in evaluation findings, the available substantiated knowledge about the subject in question, past decisions that have proven pertinent and effective, and the fact that the stem from dialogues with different protagonists about their contents, scope and viability.

The three steps involved in the creation of the specific guidelines for improving educational policies vis-à-vis the children of migrant agricultural days laborers consist of: (1) reviewing the literature and educational evaluations associated with the said topic, (2) coordinating and developing external evaluations of the policies in question, and (3) holding open conversations with different participants in order to familiarize society with the proposed guidelines and elicit contributions and observations that enrich them.

Characteristics of the children of migrant agricultural days laborers and the schooling that they receive

In the first phase, we managed to describe the population and teaching service and formulate the first hypotheses as to the problems that existed and their causes, later confirming or rejecting them based on the evaluation results. This stage was backed up by a seminar entitled “Actions and teaching programs vis-à-vis the children of migrant agricultural day laborers”.

The work done during this stage revealed that the aforementioned children live in very precarious, highly-marginalized conditions characterized by low family income, home communities where there are very few opportunities for development, and crumbling social structures, added to which the fact that many of them are forced to work prevents them from exercising their right to education and also jeopardizes their health, farm labor having been classified by the International Labor Organization as a high-risk activity, especially in the case of child workers. Furthermore, these children assume responsibilities in their homes that often take up most of their time and prevent them from enrolling in school, remaining there, or managing to learn there.

The said children are typically multicultural and multilingual, as attested to by the fact that 40% of them come from indigenous communities where 29 different Native-Mexican languages are spoken (Ministry of Social Development, Spanish acronym: SEDESOL, 2011) and children and adults from different parts of Mexico often mingle in the farms and schools.

For just over thirty years now, the education authorities have been taking different steps to satisfy the needs —and accede to the demands— of this population via the Elementary-education Program for the Children of Migrant Agricultural Day Laborers (Spanish acronym: PRONIM), which currently forms a part of the Program for Inclusion and Equality (Spanish acronym: PIEE), and also through the National Program for the Fostering of Education (Spanish acronym: CONAFE) and the services provided to the children of migrant agricultural day laborers by the National Adult-Education Institute (Spanish acronym: INEA).

Also, in order to provide education that is culturally and linguistically pertinent, efforts have been made, by means of Agreement 592 on Curricular Frameworks, to ensure that the education provided to children of migrant agricultural day laborers is characterized by equality and takes stock of diversity, while, in the area of social policy, SEDESOL, via its Program for Agricultural Day Laborers (Spanish acronym: PAJA), is granting scholarships to foster attendance at school and resources for the building of infrastructure, as well as providing daycare services, while the Ministry of Labor and Social Welfare is working hand-in-hand with different institutions to do away with child labor in the Mexican countryside.

Nevertheless, the academic results speak for themselves. According to the latest comparative data (SEDESOL, 2011), in 2009, the school-enrollment rate for day laborers’ children aged 15 or over was less than half the national average, in addition to which, only 46,000 of a total population of between 279,000 and 326,000 such children attended school during the 2014-2015 school year (INEE, 2016).

In this regard, it should be stressed that, despite various efforts to formulate a suitable policy vis-à-vis the children of migrant agricultural day laborers, the Mexican government has failed to take comprehensive, coordinated—and, above all, effective—action to tackle this social problem, with the result that 80 out of every 100 children of migrant agricultural day laborers do not attend school. Moreover, the first stage of the study revealed that:

a) there is not enough up-to-date information for us to carry out a timely diagnosis.

b) there is little knowledge of, or awareness about, the special characteristics and needs of children of migrant agricultural day laborers.

c) neither the courses nor the teaching provided to these children are pertinent or relevant to them, and the services aimed at preventing them from dropping out of school are equally inadequate.

d) the premises of the schools that they attend are inadequate and their working conditions are precarious.

e) there is a lack of effective coordination among the Ministry of Public Education (Spanish acronym: SEP), CONAFE and INEA aimed at serving this population.

f) the more committed and involved state-level government officials are, the more effective and abundant will be the efforts made at the local level, which are crucial to solving these problems.

g) We need to involve civil society and agro-businesses.

Different opinions about educational-policy evaluation

The main problems facing the group in question were identified by reviewing the available statistics, evaluations and studies and interviewing the different people involved in designing and implementing the courses offered to its members by the SEP’s Undersecretariat of Elementary Education, CONAFE,
INEA, the people in charge of the said programs in six Mexican states,\(^3\) education officials and school principals, as well as leaders of business organizations and members of NGO’s that are involved in aiding the migrant-day-laborer population.

The evaluation of policy yielded new information that was very useful for creating guidelines that were not only appropriate and in keeping with the input, but also feasible, revealing that:

- programs are structured mainly based on the demands of protagonists such as agro-businesses that seek courses for the children of their day laborers when they are very socially committed, when their profits allow, or when they want to show that there are no child laborers in their camps.
- having to comply with the General Law Governing the Professional Teaching Service (Spanish acronym: LGSPD) when providing schooling to the children of migrant agricultural day laborers engenders new challenges.
- there are many different School Control Systems with little liaison among them.
- the specific problems faced by the children of migrant agricultural day laborers have been obscured by the fusion of seven budget programs under the PIEE, so that it is now impossible to ascertain how much funding is devoted to providing education for the migrant-day-laborer population.
- the budget assigned to the PIEE has decreased considerably, since the budgets for 2014 and 2015 were less than half of those made available for the seven strategies that have made up the PIEE since 2014.
- we now have a better understanding of the role played by both the Mexican and international NGO’s that help to provide support to the families of migrant agricultural day laborers in states such as Sinaloa y Guerrero.

**Dialogues aimed at achieving participatory guideline creation**

Based on the findings of the policy evaluation and a review of the literature, an initial proposal for guidelines was drawn up and disseminated to NGO’s, public servants in the different educational institutions at the federal and state levels, teachers, school authorities, academics and specialists in education.

The first stage of this shared two-stage creation process included round tables with academics, representatives of NGO’s, state-level public servants responsible for implementing the migrant component of the SEP’s PIEE, state delegates, the people in charge of the CONAFE’s migrant service, and teachers from one of the states.

During the second stage, in the context of the National Educational Evaluation Policy (Spanish acronym: PNEE) Dialogues, the preliminary guideline document was shared with the federal and state-level education authorities, who have now sent us their comments and suggestions. Also, as stipulated in the INEE’s Governing Law, the said document was also shown to the members of the Consultative Social Council for the Evaluation of Education (Spanish acronym: CONSCEE),\(^4\) who have also made some observations about it, and, finally, it was shared with some ex-collaborators from PRONIM and CONAFE and some specialists in the area. The result of all this will be a final document containing well-grounded, appropriate guidelines that are feasible, workable at all levels of application, and politically realistic.

Among other things:

- we became aware of how necessary it is to analyze the materials and the proposed curriculum in order to ensure that they are relevant for those involved in day-to-day teaching activities.
- with regard to working conditions, stock was taken of the unplanned effects of the Professional Teaching Service (Spanish acronym: SPD), the centralization of the payroll, and the changes in the program-operating rules.
- we discovered that there is an urgent need to create mechanisms for interstate coordination that make it possible to foresee the educational needs of the migrant-agricultural-day-worker population before the latter arrives for the first time or returns.
- we ascertained that the aims of the Curricular Frameworks are not being achieved because the materials are very technical and mainly focus on the non-migrant indigenous population.

While many problems were detected during this process, on the positive side we:

- discovered and documented various successful local developments that included an on-line diploma course in the state of Michoacán, teaching sequences in the state of Baja California, and projects in the regular schools in the state of Guerrero.
- found out that some states provide funding for teaching the children of migrant agricultural day laborers, mainly to help pay teachers.
- ascertained that agro-businesses are now playing a bigger role in states such as Coahuila, Baja California, Baja California Sur and Sinaloa.
- confirmed the crucial role played by SEDESOL and the National System for Comprehensive Family Development (Spanish acronym: DIF) in promoting student attendance via the subsidies that they provide, above all in the area of nutrition.
- ascertained that interest exists in carrying out research aimed at providing better foundations for government action, and honed a research project that is already underway, via funding from the National Council for Science and Technology (Spanish acronym: CONACYT), in order to design teaching strategies.
- discovered instances of information exchange and joint coordination, for example between the local CONAFE offices in the states of Guerrero and Sinaloa, for the purpose of addressing daily back-and-forth migration.

Public policy is not a static phenomenon subject to a single, definitive analysis, but an ever-changing process, and, since these kinds of dialogue enable us to get a realistic, up-to-date idea of what it really entails to provide support to the children of migrant agricultural day laborers, participation and collaboration are not only essential if we are to keep abreast of the successes and failures of government actions, but also, according to public-policy theory, are ways of facilitating such actions.

While witnessing the magnificent work done by those who strive to ensure that the children of migrant agricultural day laborers have access to high-quality education and improved living conditions, we discovered that we still have much to learn —and a lot of research to do— if we are to fully under-
stand agricultural migration in Mexico and the latter’s origins and social impact, and thus achieve the innovations required in order to provide effective, relevant schooling to the children of migrant agricultural day laborers.

Hence, as well as yielding a rich harvest of shared intentions and opinions, the guidelines that the inee will be issuing constitute an invitation to ensure that the actions taken in compliance with them are at all times based on consensus, cooperation, effective intervention, and the same critical, constructive and proactive spirit that prevailed during their creation and the dialogues that made the said creation possible.

1 Article Three of the cpeum stipulates that the inee is the entity responsible for issuing guidelines.
2 This evaluation defines the six chapter of the inee’s inform 2016: La Educación Obligatoria en México.
3 The agricultural migration in the chosen states —i.e. Baja California, Sinaloa, Hidalgo, Morelos, Veracruz and Guerrero— varies with regard to intake and/or attraction zones, and there are also different agro-businesses in each state.
4 A collegiate consultative entity charged with examining evaluation results, the guidelines stemming from them, and their dissemination by the inee, and commenting and following up on them. Its current members are Mexicanos Primero, Coparmex, Servicios a la Juventud A. C., Fundación para la Cultura del Maestro A. C., Ririki Intervención Social A. C., Vía Educación A. C., Centro para el Desarrollo Profesional y la Investigación in Docencia Narciso Bassols, A. C., Colectivo para el Desarrollo Educativo Albanta, S. C., Educadores Somos Todos, A. C., Suma por la Educación, A. C., and Unión Nacional de Padres de Familia, A. C.
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The resources available for the Educational Reform from an equity viewpoint

Since “equitable distribution of resources for compulsory education” remains an unresolved issue” and “given the prevailing macroeconomic conditions in our country, spending should focus on helping the most vulnerable”, say the authors of this article, who propose a Conceptual Framework for the Use of Education-System Resources.

Article Three of the Mexican Constitution states that every Mexican has a right to education and affirms that the State must provide its citizens with high-quality elementary and secondary education characterized by “materials, teaching methods, school organization, educational infrastructure and teachers and school principals” that ensure maximal learning outcomes.

Educational quality cannot be divorced from equity, and Mexico’s General Education Law (Spanish acronym: LGE) defines the latter as congruence between aims, results and processes in terms of effectiveness, efficiency, pertinence and fairness.

Furthermore, the National Institute for the Evaluation of Education (Spanish acronym: INEE) sees equity as a sine qua non of high-quality education, defining it as a being composed of relevance, pertinence, fairness, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and suitability.

Given Mexico’s economic realities, the limited resources available for achieving the aims of the Educational Reform must be used with optimal effect, and, since a wide range of protagonists at all levels make competing demands on our National Education System (Spanish acronym: SEN), we need to redistribute the scant resources that are available equitably among different educational programs.

The effectiveness and efficiency of education policy lie at the heart of the aforesaid problem, the former having to do with the education system’s ability to fully achieve the aims set for it, and the latter with achieving the said aims at the lowest possible cost. As asserted by Scheerens (2000), efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agustín Caso Raphael</th>
<th>Head of the INEE’s Unit for the Dissemination and Promotion of the Evaluation Culture (Spanish acronym: UIFCE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:acaso@inee.edu.mx">acaso@inee.edu.mx</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Florencio García Martínez</th>
<th>UIFCE Area Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:fgarcia@inee.edu.mx">fgarcia@inee.edu.mx</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yuri Decuir Viruez</th>
<th>UIFCE Project Head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ydecuir@inee.edu.mx">ydecuir@inee.edu.mx</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diagram 1. Conceptual framework for the use of education-system resources


is effectiveness plus the additional need to achieve the latter in the least burdensome way possible, and the three basic factors that must be taken stock of in the effort to face this complex challenge are:

i) financial pressure arising from the global economic crisis.

ii) demographic trends that determine the size and make-up of student populations.

iii) the growing importance of education for Mexicans.

As we reach the halfway mark in the Educational Reform being carried out in the current 6-year presidential term, it is clear that various constraints are affecting the main programs that form a part of the said reform and obvious that the education sector’s financial structure needs to be reviewed, taking into account the viability not only of Federal funding, but also of the funding allotted by the Federal Government to the different states in the context of the Fiscal Coordination Law and the resources available in the said states for the purpose of achieving the aims set.

Mexico is not the only country facing this situation, and, indeed, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has developed conceptual models aimed at improving the distribution, use and management of resources so that the different countries can achieve as many of their educational aims as possible (OECD).

Conceptual framework for the use of Education-System resources

The conceptual framework that is presented below deals with the origin and use of education-sector resources based on the context, the environment and the Educational Reform.

The amount of the resources available for education, which are distributed in accordance with the priorities established by the Educational Reform itself, depends on their provenance either from one of the three branches of government or from the private sector, which origin determines their use at the system, subsystem and school levels, right down to the classroom level where they are spent on teachers and pupils. Finally, as shown in Diagram 1 below, the Educational Reform must yield results at the educational, employment and social levels.

Based on this conceptual framework, we address three topics that are relevant for compulsory education – i.e. resource assignment, resource distribution and resource equity.

1. What have the trends been regarding the resources available for compulsory education? As in previous years, the 2016 Program Infrastructure (21) confirms that there is still a great deal of inertia in resource assignment (affecting 80% of all the 2016 Budget Programs). While the Program Structure has indeed shown itself to be flexible and capable of adapting to meet the needs of compulsory education, the programming of educational spending has become progressively less linked to the aims and benchmarks that are established in several programs. In particular, in 2016 Programmable Spending on compulsory education has fallen below spending on National Defense (27), Public Education (11), Economic and Wage funding (23) and funding of the INEE (see figure 1), with this reduction in spending particularly affecting the Budget Programs that are crucial to the achievement of greater educational equity, as is particularly evident in the Program for Educational Inclusion and Equity (S244) that was set up in 2014 subsuming/bringing together seven other programs.

The results indicate that the increases in programmable spending do not match increases in the achievement of set goals or in the populations served. On the contrary,
spending is characterized by inertia, meaning that the budget-assignment trends pertaining to previous years remain the same, after adjustment for inflation, and, to overcome this inertia, the target, potential and currently-served populations, along with the progress achieved in meeting set aims and the available information about performance, need to be taken into account and used to guide budgeting.

2. How have Federally Assigned Resources been distributed among and within the states? The Educational Reform inherited an imbalance in the overall financing of the education system that has especially affected the Channeling of Federal Funding to the states via Branch 33.

By Federal Funding we mean the resources that the Federation transfers to the treasuries of the different states, Mexico City and, where applicable, the municipali-
ties, stipulating that the resources in question must be used to pursue and meet the aims that Article 25 of the Fiscal Coordination Law (Spanish acronym: LCIF) sets for each type of contribution.

The assignment of resources pertaining to the Education-Payroll-and-Running-Cost- Contribution Fund (Spanish acronym: FAEBFONE) has been uneven, favoring those states that have both a federal and a state-level system over those with only a federal system, in addition to which the states in general have been negatively affected because no resources have been assigned to pay off debts to third-party institutions (e.g. income tax) and non-institutional debts (e.g. various types of insurance coverage).

Most of the federally assigned funding that is devoted to spending on education at the municipal level within the states comes from the Contributions Fund for Elementary Education and Teacher Training (Spanish acronym: FAEBR), being transferred by the state-level finance ministries and proportionally assigned to all the municipalities according to the number of students enrolled and teachers employed there. However, the same treatment is proportionally afforded to municipalities with different socioeconomic conditions, where the teaching cost per student increases in line with how difficult it is to provide teaching services.

While it is acknowledged that the ongoing increase in the federal funding of compulsory education over recent years has tended to favor rural areas, given the accumulated lag that exists, the said funding still does not suffice rectify the existing imbalances between urban and rural areas, and, in this regard, the information contained in the comprehensive database on federal-government spending at the municipal level via Branch 33, and more specifically via FAEBFONE, enables us to analyze the distribution of public spending on compulsory education per geographic zone up to the aforesaid level.

An examination of the distribution of Federal Financing for compulsory education among rural and urban municipalities, grouped according to the number of school enrollments they have, enables us to appreciate the aforesaid imbalance. Graph 2, below, shows the said inequality that exists to the detriment of rural municipalities.

3. How have resources for compulsory education been distributed given current demographic and educational trends? Demographic change started in the last quarter of the XX century when birth rates fell, triggering a gradual change in the population's age distribution. One of the results of the aforesaid change was that the number of primary-school-age children started dropping in the year 2000, a trend that has continued during the following decades, while the number of youths eligible for upper-secondary education has increased.

The change in education is due to three phenomena: the increase in educational coverage, the higher absorption rate at all levels, and the decrease in student dropout rates at all the levels of the SEN, which means that, in each case, the number of students entering school and the number of students leaving school has increased over time.

Based on the trends that have been observed, it is very probable that the aforesaid changes will accelerate in the near future, with serious implications for the planning of education services.

The redistribution of spending aimed at meeting the needs of lower- and upper-secondary education is a topic that requires scrutiny, given the demographic and educational changes occurring in our country, and, in this regard, the convenience of estimating the possible redistribution of resources based on future education-service needs has been analyzed, with various spending scenarios for meeting future education-service demand—mainly for upper-secondary education and the latter's interaction with primary and lower-secondary education at the national, state and municipal levels—being posited.

The following analysis shows the funding needed to satisfy the future demand for education considering the alternatives of non-conversion (see figure 2) and conversion (see figure 3) of the idle installed capacity at the levels being analyzed. In general, the estimates show that, since 2015, the primary-level infrastructure has been bigger than needed and could hence be used both to improve the quality of education at the same level and also to satisfy the demand for lower-secondary education, in which coverage is still not universal, or that for upper-secondary education, which is growing. They also indicate that there will be a surplus of secondary schools in 2025.

Figure 2 shows how many primary schools would cease to be needed, expressed in negative numbers, while indicating, on the other hand, that more schools would be needed than existed in 2012 to satisfy demand at the pre-school, lower-secondary and upper-secondary levels.

Figure 3 shows a scenario where primary schools that existed in 2012 are made use of by converting them into lower-secondary or upper-secondary schools during the period analyzed.

The number of primary schools that need to be converted into lower-secondary or upper-secondary schools is determined by calculating the difference between the number of surplus primary schools and the number of lower-secondary and upper-secondary schools that is needed, based on the average number of students that can be served per school at each level. Figure 3 shows that no new schools need to be built to satisfy demand at the lower-secondary and upper-secondary levels, since there would even be a surplus of schools. While there would be a shortfall in schools at the upper-secondary level from 2020 on, this could be remedied by converting other schools not being used for secondary education.

Based on the model developed, spending on education is estimated by multiplying the outlay per student by the total number of student enrollments predicted for each level. Figure 4 shows spending on education in the period in question.

In figure 5 below, we calculate the difference between the estimated outlay per level in 2012 and the estimated outlay for the period, 2015-2030. The estimated saving is calculated by subtracting the surplus
outlay at the primary level from the outlay for the other levels to give us the percentage of outlay that would be required at each school level, along with the total percentage of the outlay required for the remaining levels that would be covered.

Based on the above results, we conclude that, in 2015, the surplus outlay at the primary level would cover 75% of the costs at the pre-school level, 95% at the lower-secondary level, and 50% at the upper-secondary level - i.e. 23% in all.

**Conclusions**

Given the prevailing macroeconomic conditions in Mexico, and considering how important the Educational Reform is, we should ask ourselves if the resources available for raising the quality of compulsory education could not be more effectively assigned in view of the long-term demographic and educational trends that oblige us to examine spending on education and focus on the school so as to properly achieve the aims that have been set at the lowest possible cost. High-quality education should be interpreted as being tantamount to congru-
ence with the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and equity of the National Education System’s aims, results and processes.

In short, the results stemming from the analyses that have been carried out of the information pertaining to the Branch-11 educational programs show that the changes in the assignment of funds for education do not match up to the changes that are occurring in terms of goals, populations currently receiving education, and potential ones in need of it, with the said outlay being characterized by inertia. To remedy this situation, which has characterized the education system for over 10 years now, the target, potential and currently-served populations, along with the progress achieved in meeting set aims, need to be taken into account when assigning educational resources, in addition to which resources should be assigned and distributed to favor the most vulnerable populations, taking into account the heterogeneous nature of our education system. This is especially important for those programs whose stated aim is to achieve equity and inclusion.

The assignment of federal funding to the different states is also characterized by imbalances that need to be rectified, in addition to which the said financing is precarious.

Furthermore, for over 10 years now, the distribution of the said funding within the states has been uneven, favoring urban municipalities over rural ones.

While the formula stipulated by the Contribution Fund for Elementary Education and Teacher Training (Spanish acronym: FAEB) has been applied, when distributing federally-assigned funding, without having any quality benchmark that makes it possible to afford preferential treatment to the states and municipalities where conditions are more precarious, the higher costs of providing education services in the more marginalized rural and urban areas have not been taken into account when distributing funds within the states.

Finally, it is important that funding for each level be redistributed based on demographic and educational changes, since changes in supply will free up resources at the primary and lower-secondary levels, while more funding will be needed at the upper-secondary level. Based on the trends that have been observed, it is highly likely that the aforesaid changes will speed up in the near future, having serious implications for the provision of education services.

Given the above, the equitable distribution of compulsory-education resources is a still unsolved issue. From a right-to-education perspective, it is essential that we plan how to adjust, redistribute and realign funding in order to help achieve high-quality education that takes stock of reality and brings about conditions where the said right can be exercised and all people are afforded the same opportunity to enroll in school and remain there, in accordance with Articles Seven, Eight and Thirty Two of the General Education Law.

Figure 2. Scenario 1, without conversion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Estimated number of schools</th>
<th>Difference vis-à-vis the number of schools that existed in 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>91 215</td>
<td>99 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>101 422</td>
<td>94 923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>121 866</td>
<td>91 451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>131 301</td>
<td>91 421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 3. Scenario 2, with conversion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>School conversions</th>
<th>Schools needed</th>
<th>Excess or missing schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From primary to lower-secondary</td>
<td>From primary to upper-secondary</td>
<td>Lower-secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3 766</td>
<td>2 308</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2 549</td>
<td>1 562</td>
<td>2 092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>6 803</td>
<td>4 170</td>
<td>1 972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>6 830</td>
<td>4 186</td>
<td>2 822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1 U015 Provision of education to groups at risk, U022 Education for the disabled, U042 Program for the underpinning of indigenous education, S033 Program for the Underpinning of Special and Comprehensive Education, S111 Elementary Education Program for the Children of Migrant Agricultural Day Laborers; S119 Program for Technical Consultancy and Education focused on social, linguistic and social diversity, and S152 Program for Strengthening the “Telesecundaria” distance-learning system.

2 For further information on this subject, see research journal No. 44, Spending on elementary and upper-secondary education: trends and inertias, published by the INEE, at:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pre-school</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Lower-secondary</th>
<th>Upper-secondary</th>
<th>Pre-school</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Lower-secondary</th>
<th>Upper-secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>73802723</td>
<td>208530625</td>
<td>136949011</td>
<td>130647485</td>
<td>5568747</td>
<td>-4188969</td>
<td>4412383</td>
<td>8328785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>79371470</td>
<td>204341656</td>
<td>141361394</td>
<td>138976270</td>
<td>5639753</td>
<td>3420843</td>
<td>4811076</td>
<td>22914977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>79442476</td>
<td>211951468</td>
<td>14176087</td>
<td>153562462</td>
<td>15187737</td>
<td>-443953</td>
<td>-7655904</td>
<td>37660136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>88990460</td>
<td>208086672</td>
<td>129293107</td>
<td>168307621</td>
<td>97259633</td>
<td>208540297</td>
<td>142370719</td>
<td>182202678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>97259633</td>
<td>208540297</td>
<td>142370719</td>
<td>182202678</td>
<td>23456910</td>
<td>9672</td>
<td>5421708</td>
<td>51555193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Figure 4. Estimated total outlay

### Figure 5. Percentage of outlay on primary schools that would be saved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pre-school (a)</th>
<th>Primary (b)</th>
<th>Lower-secondary (c)</th>
<th>Upper-secondary (d)</th>
<th>Excess % of outlay at the primary level vis-à-vis each educational level</th>
<th>Total (b/(a+c+d))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5568747</td>
<td>-4188969</td>
<td>4412383</td>
<td>8328785</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>5639753</td>
<td>3420843</td>
<td>4811076</td>
<td>22914977</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>15187737</td>
<td>-443953</td>
<td>-7655904</td>
<td>37660136</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>23456910</td>
<td>9672</td>
<td>5421708</td>
<td>51555193</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


http://publicaciones.inee.edu.mx/detallePublicacionP1C152

3 Projections of supply of -and demand for- Elementary and Secondary Education (INEE 2014).
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Striving for equality in a multicultural Mexico: Nuevo León, Tamaulipas, Guerrero and Veracruz

Who are the people who are striving to achieve educational equality in the mountains of Guerrero and on the coast of Veracruz, and how are they doing so? How is educational evaluation linked to the reduction of violence in Tamaulipas? Which strategies for achieving inclusion is civil society promoting in Nuevo León? Below, the people involved in the aforesaid struggles tell their stories.

Nuevo León: lessons in special education from civil society

In order to include disabled children and youths in education, it is essential that we acknowledge and respect their rights, enable them to become self-sufficient, and work resolutely together, Mary Carmen Escandón Minuti (MC), an educational coordinator at the Nuevo Amanecer ("New Dawn") Institute in Monterrey, and Noelia Medellín García (N), a teacher who coordinates the primary-level program at the same institution, tell us in the interview that is transcribed below.

Tell us about the project you’re involved in and its aims.

MC: “The Nuevo Amanecer Institute was founded 37 years ago in order to incorporate children and youths with cerebral palsy into society and provide them with schooling and jobs. Each year, we take in and teach around 500 students -ranging from babies to thirty-year-old adults- providing them with medical, rehabilitation and family-and-emotional-development services, as well as physical, occupational and speech therapy. Additionally, we have nine support programs that enable us to create and individual working program for each student and his/her family in order to foster learning and self-sufficiency while preparing our students to enroll in normal schools helping them to make this transition, and, once it’s completed, work with the teams from the Units for the Provision of Support Services for Normal Education (Spanish acronym: USAERS), with regular teachers, with school principals, and even with families, to support them”.

N: “Our most important tool is support technology. Along with the therapists, we teachers ascertain what the students’ strengths are and what support and intervention they need, using the aforesaid technology to help them to interact with their surroundings, develop mobility, learn, acquire skills, so as to make their day-to-day lives -i.e. using the bathroom, eating and communicating- less difficult”.

How do you evaluate the project’s results?

MC: “We have evidence. For example, without a smartboard, a child who can’t communicate would never be able to do so, while electric-powered wheelchairs enable many students to move around who would otherwise be completely immobile. Moreover, we have a self-sufficiency test that measure’s students’ performance in terms of how independent they are becoming”.

N: “Furthermore, at the start of the school year, we put together a customized curriculum for each student, stipulating his/her target performance in the areas of language and other forms of communication, mathematical thinking, etc., issuing the pertinent performance report at the end of the year. Much of the progress achieved is due to technical support, and, of course, to the different types of therapeutic support that we can provide, in addition to which we place fifteen students in normal schools every year, measuring our results in terms of how self-sufficient our students become”.

What are your proposals for achieving the inclusion of disabled students?

MC: “We need to have good macro-level policies, training and resources for schools at the local level, local authorities that give priority to the issue, accurate statistics regarding how many disabled students exist, which schools they are attending, and what materials they need, adequate school infrastructure, more training and awareness-raising to ensure that school principals and teachers aren’t afraid to have disabled students in their schools and groups, and specialized staff”.

N: “While there is now flexibility about adapting the syllabus to meet the needs of disabled students, the standardized tests are still not suitable. For example, the National Evaluation of School Learning Outcomes (Spanish acronym: ENLACE) fails to take stock of the needs of disabled students. While such students can have a customized learning program, they are subjected to standardized evaluation, and, since the results of such evaluation are unlikely to favor them, they are sometimes not given them”.

National Educational Evaluation Policy Gazette in Mexico
Veracruz: requisites for inclusive evaluation

Based on her experience working in Special Education Multiple Attention Center (Spanish acronym: CAM) number 72 and in Unit for the Provision of Support Services for Normal Education (Spanish acronym: USAER) number 103, Luz Areli Mendoza Méndez, a teacher with a bachelor’s degree in Special Education considers that there is not enough support, infrastructure, equipment, teacher training and suitable syllabi to provide adequate attention to disabled children and youths.

How are high-quality education and inclusive education related to each other?
The aim of inclusive education, which is a prerequisite for all learning environments, not just for those devoted to the disabled, is to ensure that everybody learns what is taught – i.e. to include rather than exclude.

While inclusiveness would seem to be needed only in the case of disabled children, it is actually a prerequisite for the learning environments and programs of all the students in every classroom and school, since it is tantamount to high-quality education.

In view of the above, evaluation should include, and take stock of, this principle when assessing the performance not only of disabled children and youths, but also of non-disabled students, teachers and school principals, and even when determining what should be done to achieve inclusive – and hence high-quality – education.

Guerrero: good practices vis-à-vis the agricultural school year

There are around 9,206,429 underage day laborers who work in the Mexican agricultural sector. In 2010, 10% of the population served by the Elementary-Education Program for the Children of Day-Laborer Families (Spanish acronym: PRONIM) was located in the states of Oaxaca and Guerrero.3 Melquiades Martinez Zamudio, a spokesman for the National Council for the Fostering of Education (Spanish abbreviation: CONAFE) talks about the situation in Guerrero.

What progress has been made with the intercultural model?
The Intercultural Education System for the Child Migrant Population (Spanish acronym: MEIPIM) that was administered by Conafe from 2000 to 2009 was a great contribution that turned out migrant children and youths who could read and write texts in their native indigenous language and in Spanish, and also understand their natural, social and cultural environment; in other words, important progress was achieved in the promotion of bilingualism and interculturality. An evaluation of student competencies was designed that made it easier to make plans and follow up on learning outcomes, greater continuity in school was achieved, and more migrant children got their primary schools certificates.

Though we are currently adhering to the community-education model, we have included in it some things that we learned from the MEIPIM so as to set goals regarding more pertinent education, improved attendance, increased continuity in school, and drop-out reduction.

We recognize the four Native-Mexican languages that are spoken in our state, including their different dialects, and, since we want the migrant students to continue learning Spanish as a second or “survival” language, we are running language-development workshops for our community teachers and helping the latter to draw up bilingual teaching programs.

Why are agricultural school years needed?
The migrant populations need flexible school years that accord with their mobility. In Guerrero we’ve split up the syllabus into two-month periods, adapting them the sewing and harvesting seasons so that the students in question neither interrupt nor repeat course contents, and can get the pertinent certificate when they finish their studies.

How can the necessary coordination among institutions be achieved?
We’ve set up coordination between CONAFE in Guerrero (the exit state) and Sinaloa (the entry state) in order to exchange enrollment records, student dossiers and evaluation results, and this has increased the continuance in school of the migrant students who come from the town of Ayotzinapa.

Also, jointly with the Intercultural University of the State of Guerrero, we’ve created teaching materials the Nahualt, Mixteco and Amuzgo languages to support the intercultural and bilingual study programs.

How do evaluations fit into this reality?
We’ve set out to foster ongoing learning and opted for a type of evaluation that accords with the movements of the approximately 16,000 migrant day laborers who visit our state. The National for the Evaluation of Learning Outcomes (Spanish acronym: Planea) doesn’t fit the conditions of these students, either in terms of time or in terms of conditions. It doesn’t take stock of the fact, since they are different from the pupils in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of service</th>
<th>Special education1</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Nuevo León</th>
<th>Veracruz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAM2</td>
<td>Students3</td>
<td>106 696</td>
<td>6 359</td>
<td>5 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers4</td>
<td>11 916</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schools5</td>
<td>1 657</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAER</td>
<td>Students3</td>
<td>456 768</td>
<td>44 823</td>
<td>17 693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers4</td>
<td>25 975</td>
<td>1 833</td>
<td>1 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support centers</td>
<td>4 241</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Serves students with special needs.
2 Includes elementary education, early education and courses devoted to Training for Life and Work.
3 Includes disabled students, students with special needs, and gifted children.
4 Includes school principals who teach.
5 Counted as schools.
6 Counted as support centers for schools.

Source: INEE UIFCE, 2016 based on Form 911 (2014-2015 school year), SEP-DGTEE.
normal schools, don't speak Spanish, and don't always go the schools intended. The PlanEA resulting can't be deemed conclusive.

**Tamaulipas: evaluating education in violent environments**

Silvia Guzmán García, a primary-school supervisor in Tampico, Tamaulipas, and Homero López Ortiz, a Primary-school Sector Head in Ciudad Reynosa in the same state, describe how violence and insecurity help to create environments that are inimical to learning, to the detriment of educational quality and equity and explain how educational evaluation helps schools to face these challenges.

**In what kind of context do schools function in Tamaulipas?**

The atmosphere of insecurity and violence has posed new challenges for schools, whose physical integrity has been threatened so that we now teach in classrooms equipped with security systems in case of emergency, surrounded by high walls and locked gates that prevent us from seeing the street outside.

The cities in Tamaulipas are empty, the schools have lost pupils, and the ones who remain are aggressive, while harassment, inequality, drug use and violence are becoming more common. In their classrooms, teachers should foster healthy coexistence, respect, solidarity, and other values that shield the school from these situations that are inimical to learning and result in dropouts and academic lag.

**What is the education system doing to diminish violence?**

Within the context of the Ministry of Education’s Basic Improvement System, we need to implement strategies aimed at: fostering formative coexistence, reducing dropout rates and academic lag, improving learning outcomes, and achieving minimal levels of normality in our schools, and we endeavor to do this both by promoting cultural, artistic and sporting activities aimed at reinforcing students’ sense of belonging and group identity, and also by monitoring our students’ behavior and paying special attention to those who need it. Additionally, we’re implementing the Ministry of Education’s student conviviality (Spanish acronym: pace) and Safe School programs.

**How has evaluation been used to change the current situation?**

In School District number 72, we’re once more using the civics exam that forms part of the 2015 PlanEA and ENLACE tests in order to foster peaceful coexistence in our schools and avoid dropouts engendered by violence. Based on the results of this exam, we’ve planned targeted strategies such as a courtesy-and-coexistence project aimed at addressing violent attitudes, settling conflicts peacefully, training students to make decisions, and fostering harmony and civic values.

---

**Middle Education, diversity and resilience to rebuild the future: public policy strategy in the case of Lebanon-Syria**

Directly from Lebanon, Gilbert Doumit talks about a strategy that managed to sit at the discussion table to the ministers, governors, education and policy specialist, un organizations and civil society leaders with one common propose: rebuilt a nation through education. The secret: reinforcing capacities of the young people through education and helping them to innovate in key areas for their country in a five years plan Equipping Refugees to Rebuild Syria Innovation Zone (ERRS EZ).

**Gilbert Doumit**
Beyond Reform & Development Director
Beirut, Lebanon
gdoumit@beyondrd.com

Across the world, issues of xenophobia, discrimination and security challenges call for immediate action to not only alleviate grievances but also to foster resilience locally and nationally. Many women, children and adolescents are affected for those situations not only in Middle East countries but in Latin-American and African ones.

Drawing on four years of experience, insights from the case of Lebanon are captured, while practical approaches and mechanisms for building resilience are highlighted. The article is comprised of four main parts. The first considers the intricacies of the case of Lebanon, the second presents a strategy on building resilience, the third the implementation of the ERRS EZ strategy and the last one provides some lessons learned.

It is to be emphasized that this article at hand is not meant to generalize an approach...
or a mechanism from the case of Lebanon, but rather to shed light on three key aspects of the Lebanese experience that can have implications elsewhere, in other countries facing migration and ethnical challenges.

This article will propose a framework to answer the following questions: a) How can resilience (educational, economic, social and cultural) be nurtured in times of crisis?, b) What are strategies and mechanisms to respond to educational, economic, institutional, cultural and social challenges triggered by the refugee crisis?, and c) What insights and lessons learned can be gained from the case of Lebanon?

Resilience and education.
Rebuilding a country: the context
The Syrian refugee crisis is one of the most challenging humanitarian ones in modern history. More than 4 million refugees are divided among the neighboring countries, Lebanon, Jordan, and Turkey, in addition to 6.5 million displaced in need of humanitarian assistance. Approximately 815,000 have requested asylum in European countries with more than 57% distributed mainly between Serbia and Germany, risking their lives, traveling long and dangerous routes looking for safety away from their home country.

Lebanon is a small country on the Mediterranean with its own history of internal conflict and socio-economic challenges. More than two decades after the end of its civil war, it still experiences security challenges and deep political polarization. At present, this country hosts the highest number of refugees per capita in the world. Now hosts more than 1.3 million refugees (as of January 2015) according to United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

Building between intricacies: the crisis in Lebanon
The political system in Lebanon — unlike other Arab governments — has experienced frequent elections since 1943. It boasts a form of democratic power-sharing that has remained resilient despite one of the longest civil wars in history, three decades of Syrian tutelage as well as public outcry against clientelism and the sectarian sector1. Lebanon's sectarian power-sharing formula requires consent among political elite on strategic country decisions. To that end, and in the absence of consent, prolonged periods of institutional and political deadlock prevail.

At the backdrop of the Syrian conflict, Lebanon postponed its parliamentary elections twice and has been without a President since May 2014. Largely illustrative of the absence of the state, the political deadlock transcends into all policy matters to include that Lebanon has not approved a national budget for more than five years; Municipalities have not received their reserved government funding until very recently following a garbage crisis that left local communities literally "in garbage".

Clientelism and rampant corruption have spread to public institutions at the central and local level since the end of the civil war. Political schisms, corruption and lack of resources have weakened the role of the public sector in development and provision of basic services. Lebanese citizens instead rely on an array of basic health, education and employment support from political elites in their region and based on their sectarian belonging.

Since the outbreak of the crisis in Syria in March 2011, Lebanon's public sector has suffered politically, socially and economi-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Quantitative Intricacies Identified as Crisis Triggers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Triggers of Tension</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48% of children aged 6-14 years were found to be out of school. In 2012-2013 refugee enrollment in public education was estimated at 40,000, or approximately 13.5% of the total public school population. In 2013-2014 it was estimated at 88,000, or approximately 30%. In 2014-2015 it was estimated at 106,735, or approximately 36%. 16% families withdrew their children from schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian displaced households spent an average of 18% of income on health. 70% of displaced households reported a child needing care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 to 91% believe the lack of legal residency impacts their safety. 27% of households among the Syrian displaced population count at least one member with a specific need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the end of 2015, 41% of the total displaced population was living in substandard shelter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Triggers of Tension</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some religious figures are trying to use the situation to enforce their role within local communities. There is a spread in charity and aid that is politically financed for some religious communities and not others among the refugees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanese and Syrian actors say they regard gender roles very differently. Syrian women are seen as working in prostitution to support their families. Intermarriages between Lebanese and Syrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanese and Syrian actors report that they feel discrepancies in social and cultural practices. There are deeply rooted historical reasons for not trusting the other community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Triggers of Tension</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost on government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD 7.5 billion - 1/3 of national GDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase from 11% in 2010 to nearly 20% in 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition over resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rapid and profound change in population has had major consequences for local communities' dynamics and for the management of power, resources, and tensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% of the total Syrians Displaced population live below the poverty line ($3.84/day) in 2015, compared to 49% in 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author-produced, Beyond Reform & Development.
cally. The Lebanese political elite is split into pro-regime and anti-regime supporters which has fueled negative tensions among decision-makers as to how to react to Syrian refugees.

Four-and-a-half years into the crisis and with a protracted war in Syria, Lebanon’s state policy towards more than 1.3 resident refugees has been almost completely absent. Lebanon now hosts the highest number of refugees per capita in the world, with one in five inhabitants a refugee, while its government plays a minimal role at best in responding to the needs of Syrians and of host communities. At the same time, a strong presence of international donors, charities and local non-governmental organizations has been facilitated by the Lebanese government. As a result, the created formal and informal means are a help and support to refugees and host communities across the country.

The public sector in Lebanon has failed to respond to the needs of its own citizens for decades and has not devised interventions to mitigate the crisis for refugees. At the same time, Lebanon exhibits forms of the three levels of resilience (solidarity, accountability and capacity) maintained through formal and informal networks that have allowed it to largely welcome refugees in dire but not in dying conditions. The overwhelming majority of refugees in Lebanon have been welcomed by the poorest and most vulnerable Lebanese communities. In fact, 86% of Syrian refugees live in communities where almost 70% of Lebanese are living on less than $4 a day. By the end of 2014, it was estimated that approximately 170,000 additional Lebanese were pushed into poverty and the unemployment rate doubled to above 20%, mainly among unskilled youth, as a result of poor governance and management of the crisis.

Municipal councils, about 950 of them, have had to bear the total grunt of refugee response with few resources, experience and capacity. The absence of national level policies left in their wake the immediate need for municipalities to have to house refugees, mitigate conflict, and to averse crisis. They had to do this without an equitable or timely support from the Independent Municipal Fund controlled by the Ministry of Interior and with little or no guidance from the Lebanese central government more generally. As such, although municipalities are able to somehow address local needs, they suffer from limited technical, human and financial capacities, competition over funds from donor agencies, weak basic services such as water, electricity and sanitation, a waste management crisis since summer 2015, and internal polarization and deadlocks.

In addition to these political realities and challenging conditions of local governments, consultations with stakeholders at the local level identified three potential triggers of tension. These triggers were seen as threatening the ability of communities to react to local needs and therefore would pose a threat to resilience.

Innovation Zone: design of the strategy
Is based on sources of data collected from more than 1,000 individuals as well as analyses that took place between 2012 and 2015. Empirical methods as data basis include:

1. Literature review of the concept of community resilience and its applicability to the Lebanese context.
2. Field research and participant observation in more than 30 communities over four years during projects and initiatives with Lebanese NGOs, United Nations (UN) agencies, and municipalities.
3. More than 35 focus groups with municipal members, civil society actors, local business, women and youth (n=525).
4. Consultation meetings and visioning retreats to conduct conflict assessments and set intervention strategies with more than 120 members of municipalities and key informants (in 24 municipalities).
5. More than 350 semi-structured interviews with experts, activists, government officials and business leaders.
6. Discussions in a round-table meeting with German experts, academics and public sector representatives to analyze case of Lebanon and its relevance to an international context.

A holistic strategy for building resilience
Resilience for Lebanon means the ability for communities, institutions, local economies and social fabric to persist despite shocks, disturbances, challenges and limited resources. To counter the negative effects of political polarization, government’s incapacity, and triggers of potential crises, we propose the following conceptualization of community resilience:

- **Buildings**: the educational socio-cultural element of resilience where communities use social capital for mutual empathy, respect and cooperation in the face of crisis.
- **Ensuring accountability**: the policy and practice aspects of monitoring, maintaining and reporting on levels of equity through evaluation, transparency and inclusion in the face of crisis.
- **Creating capacity**: the pursuit of creating and reinforcing human, technical and financial capacity to respond to crisis.

To address the need for community resilience in the aftermath of receiving hundreds of thousands of refugees in already challenging educational, social, economic and political conditions, we devised and have piloted the following strategy. The strategy comprises of three components and three mechanisms of action.

Participatory design: three components
Component 1: Analyzing the triggers of crisis within a community: the objective is to understand the local context, map stakeholders and analyze dynamics among them.

Component 2: Building consensus and partnerships: Consists of facilitating series of conversations and meetings to create a common understanding of the challenges, tensions and implications of the crisis on both host communities and refugees. The objective is to guarantee inclusiveness and ensure participation of all relevant stakeholders at the early stages, facilitate a trust-building process between them and start developing partnerships.

Component 3: Designing participatory mechanisms to solve problems: consists of developing mechanisms to deal with the educational, social, cultural and economic challenges triggered by the crisis, with all stakeholders’ participation, to allow higher ownership of the process and help them to solve imminent problems.

Three mechanisms of the strategy
Community resilience facing the Syrian refugee crisis requires building local capacity focused on younger generations, to deal with triggers of tension. To achieve that, partnership platforms between host community and refu-
gee stakeholders should design participatory methodologies and solutions, and engage decision makers to align policies, aiming at achieving social-educational inclusion, social cohesion and economic integration.

Each of the mechanisms are designed under the umbrella of local governments, includes a social council established with representatives from both ost communities, civil society actors, academics, youth, women and disabled. They includes the following components:

**Mechanism one: fostering social inclusion.** Its objective is empowering vulnerable groups by building their capacity, ensuring their representation in decision-making spheres and campaigning to guarantee their protection from the violations of their main human rights: education, health. The Social Council’s role was to continuously evaluate the needs, identify priorities of the most vulnerable, and design social programs to ensure their protection. Multiple women, youth, educational and disability empowerment programs were put in place, as well as capacity building programs and awareness campaigns in support of these objectives. The council negotiated regularly with the Ministries of Education, Social Affairs, and Youth and International Agencies to focus on the most vulnerable and adapt their programs to respond to the most eminent needs.

**Mechanism two: fostering social cohesion.** Its objective is promoting intercultural learning, respect and tolerance to ensure social cohesion between host communities and Syrian refugees. The Cultural Council included religious leaders, civil society actors, active women and youth, culturally influential figures. It designed a cultural monitor that provides early warning related to increased cultural tension. Also developed policy recommendations and organized regular meetings with the Ministries of Social Affairs and Interior Affairs in addition to the media to align their support and improve related policies.

**Mechanism three: economic integration.** The objective is promoting social youngers innovation as a vehicle to create jobs and launch social enterprises as a means of collaborative engagement in the community and economic development. The economic council was established bringing together private sector leaders, professionals and academics from both host communities and refugees. It launched a social innovation competition to motivate local populations, mainly youth, to collaborate in finding solutions to issues such as energy, health, education, environment, waste. It negotiated with the local government setting up an incubator for the youngers ideas to assist those entrepreneurs in launching their social enterprises. It also networked with financing institutions to provide different types of investments for the selected ideas. Within each village, a team of coaches and mentors was trained and provided with tools to help social entrepreneurial teams improve their business models, increase their financial capacities and support their business development. The council developed policy recommendations and met with the Ministry of Education for develop of teachers capacities, also Ministries of Economy, Labor and the Chamber of Commerce to align and feed into their policies.

**Policy makers’ public policy strategy for ERRS: Innovation Zone**

Policy makers in Lebanon have adopted a general consensus since the beginning of the crisis in Syria; the belief is that Syrians who have fled the violence and have arrived in Lebanon should return to their country as soon as the political and security situation in Syria allows it. It is believed that empowering Syrians education inside Lebanon will delay their return and incentivize them to stay in place. On this basis, Lebanon has been bearing the consequences of the Syrian refugee crisis at all levels especially on the economic one. These have become a major trigger of local tension and social instability. The suggested solution was titled “Equip Refugees to Rebuild Syria” (ERRS: Innovation Zone) as a vehicle to deal with the above challenges.

There are common trends in post-conflict countries where sectors with the potential to grow can act as the core economic component of rebuilding a nation. In the 1990’s, post-conflict Lebanon underwent a similar experience of reconstruction, such reconstruction included invest on teachers and education, social and financial services, food provision, infrastructure, transportation, energy, water and health. Investing in innovation in these sectors and equipping citizens and refugees to create capable businesses that will be best positioned to rebuild, is a forward looking solution to create innovation zones. It is an alternative to risking the country’s stability through rising poverty, by developing economy by incentivizing the private sector, particularly in rural areas, to invest and gain a competitive edge to play a role in rebuilding Syria and growing Lebanese economy, using local resources and talents of young students, irrespective of their identity or nationality.

The Innovation Zone will create an ecosystem that supports innovation and entrepreneurship, within a collaborative macro plan designed by the Lebanese government, the international community and private sector and civil society actors. ERRS Strategy must be undertaken for at least five years. The strategy must consider: a) sectoral focus — construction, energy, health, education, agriculture and transportation—, b)
provision of support services, c) guarantee of financing mechanisms, d) assurance of legal and tax incentives, e) Improvement of Local Infrastructure, and f) promotion of entrepreneurship education, to ensure enough demand, and entrepreneurial mindset.

10 steps for the implementation of ERRS

1. Adoption of Strategy as a policy by the government cabinet.
2. Create a committee including investors, academics, entrepreneurship experts, key ministers, NGO actors and international donors’ representatives.
3. Conduct a study on the sectors with the highest inequity and potential for the post-conflict reconstruction.
4. Design a five-year plan to ensure the maturity and sustainability of the ecosystem.
5. Pitch ERRS to international donors and countries to ensure funding.
6. Issue the necessary laws and decrees to ensure the implementation.
7. Establish a cooperation mechanism between all stakeholders.
9. Build capacity among the ecosystem’s actors who are ready to be involved including women and teachers.
10. Involve media institutions.

Rebuilt the future through education and resilience: lessons learned

In the case of Lebanon, a weak and paralyzed public administration needed the assistance of civil society in responding to refugees. In turn, civil society groups needed government to facilitate and allow their work to be financed and to continue despite a polarized environment, and often deteriorating security conditions. We derive from our experience lessons learned at the following three levels:

Key actors for building resilience

**Local governments**: Are the closest to communities and are the actors required to respond most immediately to crisis.

**Local businesses**: Businesses are important contributors to goods and services as well as to job creation to an educational-innovation labor market in crisis.

**Local civil society**: They can contribute significantly to the mediation of tensions, challenging stereotypes and delivering educational and basic services.

**International donors**: They can bring great know-how and resources to local communities.

Institutional framework for resilience

**Policies**: Both refugees and communities hosting refugees require a set of integrated policies to address the above mentioned educational-social, cultural, economic requirements for building resilience.

**Programs**: To empower and build capacity they should adopt a participatory and inclusive methodology. All relevant actors should be part of any program design and implementation.

**Framing**: Crisis prevention is about creating opportunities and likewise maintaining requirements for resilience.

General themes for resilience

1. Cultural tensions are not only global (East/West) phenomena, but can often occur on a local level, in any country.
ENGLISH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libano Republic</td>
<td>6 184 701 (July 2015 est.) 0-14 years: 22.1%</td>
<td>-1.1 migrant(s)/ 1 000 population (2015 est.)</td>
<td>2.6% of GDP (2012)</td>
<td>Total population: 93.3% Male: 96% Female: 91.8% (2015 est.)</td>
<td>Total: 14 years Male: 14 years Female: 14 years (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siria Republic</td>
<td>17 064 854 (July 2014 est.) 0-14 years: 32.49%</td>
<td>-19.79 migrant(s)/ 1 000 population (2015 est.)</td>
<td>4.9% of GDP (2007)</td>
<td>Total population: 86.4% Male: 91.7% Female: 81% (2015 est.)</td>
<td>Total: 12 years Male: 12 years Female: 12 years (2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Age 15 and over can read and write. ** Primary to tertiary education. *** Ages 15-24.


2. Economic resilience has to be about transforming practices and policies pertaining to hardship. Youth education and social entrepreneurship in that regard has proven an effective means to engage citizens in their communities, creating jobs and solving vexing problems.

3. Educational and social policies to address the needs of both refugees and host communities remains the most important requirement for resilience. There needs to be will, consensus and capacity among politicians to strengthen any role of the public sector in social protection.

Some risks of the ERRS strategy
a) Political consensus and decision making,
b) Duplication and lack of coordination,
c) Capacity of ecosystem stakeholders to scale up to the regions,
d) Financing size and access and,
e) Competitiveness and entrepreneurs in local communities.

4 Executive summary: Lebanon’s Economic and Social Assessment of the Syrian Crisis, World Bank, available at: http://goo.gl/2gY1Bc
5 Indicatively Lebanon is not a signatory of the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees.

School-age population by education level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School-age population by education level</th>
<th>Lebanon</th>
<th>Syria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-primary</td>
<td>220 016</td>
<td>1 473 931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>510 970</td>
<td>1 931 709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>600 578</td>
<td>3 678 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary *</td>
<td>535 279</td>
<td>1 911 326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-school children</td>
<td>45 102</td>
<td>No inscritos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-school adolescents (2012)</td>
<td>62 519</td>
<td>167 537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Refers to all post-secondary education, including but not limited to universities. The diverse and growing set of public and private tertiary institutions in every country (colleges, technical training institutes, nursing schools, research laboratories, centers of excellence, distance learning centers), institutions that support the production of the higher-order capacity necessary for development. World Bank.

Ghana and India:
Early testing for more inclusive programs:
 improve effectiveness before it’s too late

A justice education is the result of multiple factors. “How can we, as evaluators, help address these challenges?”, asks the author who explains in this article a strategy in Ghana and India on a program called Read To Kids to promote inclusion from the R4D mission: to development challenges that prevent people in low- and middle-income countries to improve their lives.

Molly Jamieson Eberhardt
Senior Program Officer
Results for Development Institute (R4D)
Washington, DC, USA
meberhardt@r4d.org

Whenever a new policy or program is proposed, conscientious decision-makers ask the question “How do we know it will work?” In educational evaluation, we want to know whether a program will achieve the intended outcomes of higher enrollment, increased attendance, better learning outcomes, etc. We can design rigorous studies to answer this question, but in reality, of course, the answer is rarely a simple “yes” or “no.”

There are many reasons that this is the case, but two in particular relate to issues of context and diversity: first, the program may have been effective in some sites, but not in others; second, the program may have led to positive results for some sub-groups, but not for others.

Good evaluations are able to capture these nuances by analyzing cross-sections of the data to understand where impact occurred, and where it did not. Great evaluations take a mixed-methods approach, using both quantitative and qualitative data to help us understand why the quantitative data reveal such differences in effectiveness for different sites or sub-groups—or why differences might be expected were we to try the intervention in a different context or with a different group of beneficiaries.

For example, a randomized controlled trial of the Teacher Community Assistant Initiative in Ghana demonstrated significant positive effects on children’s basic literacy and numeracy skills on average, but with large variations in effectiveness across regions of the country. The evaluation was able to link the variations in effectiveness to variation in implementation quality, with the intervention demonstrating less effect in regions that experienced implementation challenges such as irregular payment of teacher community assistants, poor monitoring, low attendance of teacher community assistants, and poor compliance by teachers in implementing the teaching methods in which they had been trained.

Another example of an evaluation revealing inconsistent impact is a randomized controlled trial of the Nali Kali Activity Based Learning program for children in grades 1-2 in Karnataka, India. The evaluation found that, on average, the Nali Kali program led to significant positive effects on students’ language test scores and leadership skills. However, this effect was limited to the improvement of very basic, below-grade level skills for students performing in the bottom half of the sample at the start of the study; there was no effect on students in the top half of the sample or in students’ performance on skills aligned to their current grade level.

So when an evaluation reveals that an intervention did not have the intended impact for a particular sub-group, then what? My colleagues and I at Results for Development Institute (R4D) are testing an approach to do just that.

The first questions that we ask our partners when we begin working together is, “What are your biggest challenges right now? What activities are you uncertain about the best way to approach?” Here are some of the answers we have received:

- We provide early childhood development services in urban slums and in temporary communities built for workers and their families surrounding construction sites. Our construction site program has been successful but we are struggling to see similar results in the urban slums where we work.
- We have been really successful at improving the reading outcomes of our average and above-average students. But we haven’t been able to improve the performance of our struggling readers.
- Our teachers are motivated, passionate people but have little formal education or training. Our short but intensive pre-service training program seems to be a good start, but we are not sure how to structure in-service training to continue developing teachers’ skills and knowledge. We also realize we need advancement opportunities and incentives for teachers to stay, but are not sure how best to provide these.
- Our early childhood development centers are doing well at providing 0-3 year olds with nutritious meals, child-centered learning environments, and important health services such as vaccinations. But we haven’t been able to instill the importance of such practices with parents; we worry that we will not be able to make the impact we aim for if children are only exposed to positive
practices during the hours they spend in our centers.

- We know that blended learning (incorporating computers in instruction) is the future, but we are not sure what it should look like in our schools. We don’t want to institute a full blended learning program without understanding the benefits, costs, and operational implications of various options.

- We did an impact evaluation and it showed that our students are doing better than students at comparator schools. This is the start to success, but we know we aren’t reaching the poorest children in our communities and want to find a way to maintain our outcomes while reaching more of the children at the bottom of the pyramid.

How can we, as evaluators, help address these challenges? Since many of them revolve around how to optimize the design of an activity, or how to design a new activity, a traditional impact evaluation may not be the answer. Those are more appropriate when an intervention...

But for the type of challenges described above, the objectivity of an external evaluation may be less important than the generation of quality data that specifically and rapidly answer implementers’ design and operational questions about the why and how behind an intervention’s effectiveness.

Our recent work in India is testing an approach we call “Adaptive Learning.” It incorporates structured experimentation into ongoing implementation and then uses monitoring and evaluation techniques to make design and implementation decisions based on the results of the experimentation.

Mobile Reading to Children in New Delhi, India

We are working with Worldreader in New Delhi, India, on a pilot program called Read To Kids that encourages parents to read with their young children using a free mobile app. The initial theory of change was that, if parents are given access to a library of engaging children’s stories, they will read with their young children more, which will lead to children’s improved pre-literacy and school-readiness outcomes.

We are working with Worldreader not to evaluate the intervention that relies on this theory of change, but to validate this theory and design an optimal intervention.

This began with a formative research phase including surveys to better understand the characteristics of the target population, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and a review of best practices from the literature. Led by the New Delhi-based Centre for Knowledge Societies, this phase was critical to ensuring that the eventual intervention design prioritized equity and inclusion: by including the population we are aiming to serve in the intervention design process, we are increasing the chances that the intervention will benefit them.

We learned that:

- The most likely readers to young children include older siblings as well as young adult caregivers such as aunts, uncles, and neighbors. This group not only spends significant time with young children, but is accustomed to using mobile phones and has higher literacy rates than parents.
- Mothers showed great interest in using the app to read with their children, but typically did not have access to their own mobile phone.
- Most caregivers are not aware of the developmental and education benefits of reading with young children who are pre-literate and pre-verbal.

This formative research revealed a critical gap in the theory of change—it was not just access to books that was keeping parents from reading to young children. It was also a lack of knowledge about the value of reading with young children. Any effective intervention would need to not only provide access to reading material, but also change their current beliefs and behaviors by educating caregivers about the benefits of reading with their young children, even before they can read and speak themselves.

Now, we are working with Worldreader and New Delhi-based implementing partners to experiment with several different channels to encourage parents. We are simultaneously testing the use of “reading champions” stationed at health clinics, community mobilizers meeting with parents one-on-one and holding parent meetings at early childhood development centers, youth volunteers hosting “reading leagues” for children and parents in their communities, and mothers’ association leaders holding sessions with women’s groups. Through careful monitoring that uses a mix of quantitative and qualitative data collection methods, we will learn which of these mechanisms seems to be leading to the greatest sustained use of the mobile reading app.

Of course, use of the mobile reading app does not necessarily indicate that the intervention has achieved its ultimate outcomes: improved pre-literacy skills and school-readiness for users’ children. So instead we focus on the proximal outcome of sustained use of the mobile app—a necessary but insufficient link in the theory of change to get us to our ultimate outcome down the road.

Critically, the data we will collect will ensure that we learn early on about issues related to equity and inclusion: are there some segments of our target population that we are not able to effect, either because the activities are not reaching them or because something about the nature of the activities is limiting their effectiveness with that group? We want to know these things sooner rather than later, so equity and inclusion can be built into the intervention design and tested during this pilot phase. Ultimately, this should foster the development of an intervention that is more impactful and more inclusive. In essence, we can strengthen the intervention as we are piloting it, rather than waiting until after a traditional evaluation to learn what did and did not work, and only then start thinking about how it could be improved to reach more people more effectively.

Implications for decision-makers

The Adaptive Learning approach I have proposed here will not always be appropriate depending on the type of information that decision-makers need. When an intervention needs to be evaluated for accountability purposes, more traditional evaluation approaches are needed. But in the early stages of program design and testing, when the goal is to design an intervention that will have the desired impact on the desired population, and there is uncertainty about the best way to generate that impact, this approach can help decision-makers and implementers get to better programs, faster. It will also lead to earlier understanding of the influences of context and diversity: Where are we seeing early signs of success? About which sub-groups should we be concerned? At which sites are there obstacles to success that require a change of approach?
Panama: low-cost schools as an alternative for equity

In the interview with the Gazette that is transcribed below, Martín Krause and Irene Giménez summarize the conclusions of a study on the springing up of low-cost private schools in Panama, arguing that the State needs to start subsidizing demand rather than supply, that each school should choose how it functions, and that each family should choose its children’s school.

Background and context
Panama’s Strategic 2015-2019 Government Plan (Spanish acronym: PEG) asserts that, “notwithstanding the increased outlay on education over recent years, there are still weaknesses in education and the development of human capital, constituting one of the biggest obstacles to equality. Though Panama had recently made some progress in education, especially in the area of preschool and elementary school coverage, raising retention levels for school-age children and young people, the same is not true when it comes to quality and equal opportunity in education”.

Against this backdrop, Martín Krause, a professor of Economics at the University of Buenos Aires and associate professor at the Cato Institute, and Irene Giménez, the general manager of Goethals Consulting, decided to carry out a study in Panama as part of the global project directed by James Tooley, who was recently awarded the gold prize in the first International Finance Corporation/Financial Times Private Sector Development Competition for his research into low-cost private education in India, China and Africa.

In 2105, the aforesaid study -entitled “A New Vision for Education: Market Solutions for Improving Academic Performance” and carried out by Panama’s Institute of Studies for an Open Society (Spanish acronym: ISA), Goethals Consulting and the Embassy of the United Kingdom- evaluated the impact of market forces on education with a view to: 1) developing an up-to-date overview of the status of education in Panama; 2) creating a diagnostic tool to ascertain how the aforesaid low-cost private schools function in Panama and evaluate their coverage and quality; and 3) ascertain what role the said schools might play in any radical reform of the education system.

Research structure and findings
The aforesaid research was split into the following three sections: 1) a historical review of education in Panama, covering its development and results, as well as evaluations of it and private-sector participation in it; 2) a nation-wide survey to see how the poor are managing to enroll their children in school and keep them there; and 3) a proposal as to how to support government policymaking focused on alternative solutions.

In section (2) above, Krause comments that James Tooley found such schools even in the poorest parts of India, though nobody knew -or, indeed, believed- that they existed: “This phenomenon is widespread. If we look, we’ll find this type of school in the poorest neighborhoods of the different Latin American countries, but what happens is that they’re below the radar and nobody pays attention to them”.

The wide range of low-cost private schools in Panama
While there’s a formal association of private schools in Panama, the above-mentioned survey focused on poor neighborhoods.

“When we carried out the survey,” says Giménez, who has worked as a consultant in several international firms and public-sector-oriented, “we discovered some interesting things, such as the fact that low-cost private schools are satisfying the needs of the poor in Panama”.

Martín Krause, who has also taught at the Escuela Superior de Economía y Administración de Empresas (‘Higher Institute of Economics and Business Administration’; Spanish acronym: ESEADE) in Buenos Aires, Argentina, and been a visiting professor at the Francisco Marroquín University of Guatemala, asserts that “there is an enormous
number of voluntary and private educational projects that educational policy fails to take stock of,” and describes how the said projects are structured:

“There are different types of schools, both traditional ones and ones that are started up by a few teachers who start with a small group of children and are then asked to open more and more levels by the parents. There are non-profit projects such as kindergartens and schools run by religious groups or associations of different types. In Panama, mothers organize themselves in order to provide pre-school education to their children. For example, there’s a Teacher-Mother Program in which mothers cooperate in order to supplement public education”.

“Low-cost schools are basically small initiatives in which a very committed teacher provides education on the understanding that his/her clients have very low incomes. There are even schools that grant scholarships, and ones that charge parents based on how much they can afford to pay. They don’t get any kind of grant either. We’ve found some that have very little contact with the Ministry of Education, being in what we might call a grey area, since they’re not totally informal. The Ministry knows that they exist and may not have the proper permit, but it approves the diplomas that they issue. These schools tend not to be officially approved because fail to comply with some regulation or other regarding the height of the roof, the size of the windows, etc., and this makes their principals reluctant to go on investing in them, since they never know whether they’ll be closed the next day”.

**Low-cost private schools get better results**

After surveying the supply of private education that is available to poor families, the researchers compared achievement levels in the following 8 school districts in different parts of Panama, choosing one or two schools in each district: 1) Ciudad Jardín Las Mansanitas; 2) Urbanización San Juan; 3) Pedregal Villalobos; 4) Pedregal; 5) Las Cumbres; 6 & 7) Tocumen; and 8) Urbanización Los Ángeles.

“Based on the above,” explains Giménez, a lawyer who specializes in economic-legal analysis for public policymaking, “we focused on the issues of whether to afford priority to educational processes or educational results, given that we had formerly evaluated education in terms of regula-

| Table 1. Language results, **TERCE tests – sixth grade of primary** |
|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| **Pruebas TERCE - Lengua - Sexto grado** | | |
| Rural state schools | 1859 | 1.842388 |
| Urban state schools | 582 | 2.091065 |
| Private rural schools | 13 | 2.357143 |
| Private urban schools | 1030 | 2.735209 |

**Source:** Goethals Consulting. Sistema Nacional de Evaluación de la Calidad de los Aprendizajes (SINECA), Panama.

| Table 2. Mathematics results, **TERCE tests – sixth grade of primary** |
|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| **TERCE TEST - Mathematics** | | |
| Tests | 1758 | 1.260523 |
| Urban state schools | 607 | 1.345395 |
| Rural private schools | 13 | 1.571429 |
| Urban private schools | 1032 | 1.903195 |

**Source:** Goethals Consulting. Sistema Nacional de Evaluación de la Calidad de los Aprendizajes (SINECA), Panama.

**Figure 1. Enrollments and students in low-cost schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private-school enrollments</th>
<th>Primary: According to the Ministry of Education, from US$500 to US$5,500 per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US$30 per or more month, according to the CGC census.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“*The ratio in 2010 was 17 students per teacher […], the average ration in government schools was 18 students per teacher, while it was 12 students per teacher in private schools.*

**Source:** Goethals Consulting. Sistema Nacional de Evaluación de la Calidad de los Aprendizajes (SINECA), Panama.
tions about school uniforms, curricula, class length, teachers, and so on, though, in the end, the results are the same, and we decided to concentrate on educational achievement.

James Tooley joined Kaiser and Giménez in Panamá in order to compare the latter country’s education system with those of other countries studied, and they found a lot of similarities. For example, the Program for International Student Assessment Program (PISA) shows a clear difference not only between public and private schools, but also between urban and rural ones, and this difference entails many other ones, with private schools in urban areas outperforming public ones there, private rural schools outperforming both rural state schools and state schools in general, and, indeed, also surpassing urban public schools (See Tables 1 and 2).

In this regard, the study yielded some significant findings: “Low-cost private schools always achieved better learning outcomes than public schools, even surpassing public schools in the capital,” says Giménez, who also teaches in the department headed by Dr. Martín Krause in the Faculty of Law of the University of Buenos Aires and also in the one headed by Dr. Benegas Lynch, adding: in other words, what we call “market” initiatives are outnumbering state ones.

As can be seen below, this panorama influences family spending decisions.

Families invest in educational quality
“We discovered that people with limited resources find ways to send their children to schools that they perceive to be better,” explains Giménez. “Not having any government support, they change their family spending patterns and endeavor to rescue their children from poverty via education (See Table 1), creating their own system in order to do so.

Low-cost schools solve problems of access and equality
Giménez explains that Tooley studied the case of Malala Yousafzai, the youngest person ever to win the Nobel Prize (2014), who championed low-cost schools having attended one herself because, unlike government schools in her native Pakistan, they accepted girls:

“If we transfer this scenario to our education systems in Latin America, we will find children who will probably attend schools that, while not necessarily adhering to the official curriculum, do, indeed, satisfy their needs and aspirations. This is because schools that are fully regulated by the government have a standard curriculum imposed on them, though we all know that each person is different. Government education systems are slow to adapt to today’s fast technological change and are not preparing their students for new professions or equipping them for the jobs that are available in today’s world, which is why we need to focus on educational results rather on processes”.

“Since education policy favors processes over results,” says Kaiser, “it is often hostile to private schools, which are the ones that get the best results. While the private sector only satisfies between 14% and 20% of the demand for education, it appears to get better results than the public one, at least when one considers that it produces 25% of all secondary-level graduates.

Elaborating on the Panama study, Giménez adds:

“the public schools are dominated by the unions, as is usual in Latin America, so it’s a waste of time expecting them to produce good results. Though all Panamanian children are entitled to free education, the Constitution allows parents to choose their kind of school they go to, and all children receive a mandatory scholarship, which is used by the poorest families to buy school supplies, uniforms and other items. In our findings, we propose other uses for this subsidy.

Policy proposal: focusing on results rather than processes
Based on the findings, Krause and Giménez propose the following “initiatives for finding new solutions to the problems in the area of education that are shared by other Latin American countries”:

1. Total deregulation of kindergartens, primary schools and other pre-secondary schools.
2. Nationwide tests to evaluate results based on experiences in the use of PISA, SERCE and TERCE in public and private schools.
3. Achievement of a minimum level.
4. The use of the evaluation in middle-level education for purposes of admission to university or certifying certain professions.
5. Freedom of evaluation in universities.
6. Universal scholarships that cover both public and private education.

“We propose a change in the way education is subsidized,” says Giménez. At present, supply is subsidized – i.e. a budget and a general curriculum are drawn up, funds are assigned, and all the public schools operate in the same way. Among other things, we propose that demand be subsidized. It’s incumbent on the State to pay for people’s education and let parents choose the school they want their children to go to. Instead of giving money to the unions, the authorities should give it to the parents who are already investing in their children’s education, as occurs in Panama”.

According to Giménez, this different outlook creates competence, “and competence always produces high quality”, though it doesn’t exonerate the state from its obligation to finance public education:

“We propose a turnaround in financing,” continues Giménez, “i.e., opening the process up, deregulating so that each school can choose how it teaches, and focusing on results. Not to put too fine a point on it, it doesn’t matter whether the school has more or less walls or windows. What’s important is the students’ learning outcomes in mathematics, the social sciences or languages. That’s what we need to worry about, rather than the processes and formalities that government bureaucrats are always concerned with”.

The criteria for implementation and measurement
Giménez explains that this proposed change of focus doesn’t mean breaking with what’s one before, but, rather continuing and improving it:

“We don’t want to throw the baby out with the bathwater and start again from zero. What we’re proposing is a nationwide evaluation of every student, designed and carried out by the Panamanian government, as the only yardstick that is really used in schools, rather than compliance with traditional regulations. The minimum level that every school must reach is established on the aforesaid test. In the beginning, some schools won’t reach that level and so they need to be supported for a year while they adapt. Once that’s been done, each school and teacher collective should be free to decide how to get the desired results, which would free up the private sector from a lot of obstacles and make the public schools compete with it to a certain extent, since parents and children would be able to choose between the two. Both types of school would have to attract parents and students, and get above-minimum results. In this way, a lot of different learning paths would be available.

Conclusions and recommendations
Finally, Giménez and Krause, who is a member of the Mont Pelerin Society, stress the importance of the research that was carried out and recommend that a similar one be implemented in Mexico:

“What’s new is that the study shows a difference in performance and results between private and public schools. We included schools for poor families, finding that these also got better results, and believe that this sector offers a world of opportunity, because it’s also doing a good job – sometimes a better one than the State itself.

“If Mexico embarked on the type of research we carried out in Panama, it would probably get the same surprise. Since the different education systems in Latin America all have similar problems, they might all benefit by moving the focus from processes to results”.


Interviews by María Magdalena Alpizar Díaz

Further information about GCC can be found at: http://www.goethalsconsulting.com/

Further information about MEDUCA Panama can be found at: www.meduca.gob.pa/
Intercultural education and the need for inductive, contextualized evaluation

“Since an intercultural, inclusive focus requires innovations in teaching that redefine the teacher-student dynamic, a standardized examination that produces a one-off certification of given competences is of no use; we need input from educational research and information about successful projects,” asserts Gunther Dietz in the interview transcribed below.

Supported by social anthropologist, philosopher and philologist, Gunther Dietz, the Intercultural University of Veracruz (Spanish acronym: UVI) has developed three exemplary projects within the University of Veracruz (Spanish acronym: UV): i.e. a Model for Intercultural Higher Education, an Undergraduate Program in Intercultural Management for Development, and a Reflective Ethnographic Methodology.

Based on a lengthy, wide-ranging talk with Dietz, a research fellow in the UV’s Research Institute and a member of the Faculty of Intercultural Studies, the National System of Researchers, the Mexican Council for Educational Research, the Mexican Academy of Science and the International Association for Intercultural Education (acronym: IAIE), we present his ideas on crucial aspects of interculturality, divided into seven areas - i.e. (i) the concept of interculturality and its uses, (ii) its implementation in the UVI, (iii) the learning outcomes yielded by it, (iv) the need for a flexible, inclusive curriculum, (v) the pressing need to do away with standardized teacher evaluation, (vi) the longstanding educational-policy challenges that need to be faced, and (vii) based on all the preceding points, a message to the people who have our country’s educational fate in their hands.

The right concept and the distorted message

Behind the distinction between multiculturality and interculturality lie two different propositions. The Anglo Saxon version of multiculturality sets out to deal with differences via quotas and the acknowledgement and combatting of discrimination, as occurs in Canada, New Zealand, Australia and the United States. In Latin America, and specifically in Mexico, because of our colonial and post-colonial history, we prefer to base our practices on the normative definition of multiculturality that was formulated by Sylvia Schmelkes, setting out to achieve diversity in our classrooms, schools and teachers, build bridges, and establish rules aimed at fostering interaction *among* those who differ from each other. Our challenge in the area of education consists in starting out from this de facto interculturality – i.e. from the many different asymmetric, unequal relationships that characterize our society.

In this regard, the existence of an indigenous subsystem structurally excludes the majorities. This is one of the main challenges facing the bilingual, intercultural educational subsystem that is primarily aimed at the indigenous peoples - which, of course, is important, since it sends the distorted message that interculturality is the job of native Mexicans, when, in reality, it is something that all Mexicans need to work towards.

We, for our part, are trying to overcome this longstanding, segregating concept of indigenousness through pilot projects such as the one aimed at making Regional Language and Culture a subject in all secondary schools, added to which we need to bring topics and methodologies with an intercultural focus into our non-indigenous primary and secondary schools.

An autonomous, flexible model of intercultural higher education

The intercultural higher-education subsystem sprang from the demands of the indigenous peoples, and those of African descent, to have access to relevant education in their own regions, dating back to the agreements reached in San Andrés Larráinzar, in the state of Chiapas, based on the educational reforms, implemented in 1996, that gave rise to the intercultural university programs.
In the case of our state, we developed the UVI -which is autonomous vis-à-vis the state government- within the UV, and this has given us the independence, flexibility and innovative capacity that we need in order to pilot new programs at different levels. The UVI is unique in this regard. New intercultural universities start from nothing, based on agreements between the Ministry of Public Education (Spanish acronym: SEP) and the state-level governments, while the UVI is part of an already established public university that is autonomous and has regional campuses.

The undergraduate program in Intercultural Management for Development

Over 500 graduates from the seven classes that have completed this program since 2007 are currently working as mediators, document-processing agents, translators and interpreters, acting as intermediaries in legal and other procedures with the Ministry of Social Development (Spanish abbreviation: Sedesol), the National Commission for the Development of Indigenous Peoples (Spanish acronym: CDI), and the NGO’s, as well as serving as both translators and cultural intermediaries between their communities and the outside world.

Formative diversification

There is a growing need for experts in health, law, languages, communications and sustainability who have intercultural skills, and an undergraduate program in law, with an emphasis on differences between legal systems, will be launched next year, attesting to the fact that the undergraduate program in Intercultural Management for Development is gradually beginning to sprout other programs.

Moreover, via the University of Veracruz’s Institute for Educational Research (Spanish acronym: IIE), we are setting up postgraduate study programs that produce professionals, such as the master’s-degree program in Education for Interculturality and Sustainability, which is enrolled in the Register of High-quality Post-graduate Programs kept by the National Counsel for Science and Technology (Spanish abbreviation: Conacyt).

The Reflective Ethnography Project

The InterSaberes (‘interknowledge’) program, which provides systematic ethnographic support to young people from the moment they enter university until they enter the labor force and become professionals, is aimed at recording where the participants fail and where they succeed, where they lacked some sort of tool, and what changes need to be made to the syllabus, thus directly feeding into curriculum reform. This spiral feedback process is necessary because, given that the fields of activity in question are still taking shape, since, apart from interpreting in a hospital or a court, these people are acting as lawyers, defense attorneys or intermediaries. Reflective ethnography sets out to help graduates explore what’s happening in these interactions, and think about the new community roles and job opportunities that exist for graduates of an intercultural university.

Learning about intercultural educational practices

Acknowledging the manifold sources of diversity

We have learned not to limit ourselves to a narrow definition of what is meant by indigenous, intercultural or diverse. “Are you indigenous?” is a personal question and, in the UVI, we don’t ask it. Since we work with different competencies as of the first semester, we find that, while a lot out students are bilingual in Nahuatl and Spanish, Popoluca and Spanish, Teenek and Spanish, etc., they don’t own to being indigenous due to the years of discrimination that they’ve suffered, above all during their upper-secondary education.

What makes intercultural higher education so rewarding is this dialogue between mixed-race speakers of indigenous languages, monolingual Spanish speakers, bilingual people and people who are relearning a lost ancestral language – i.e. one that is spoken by the student’s grandparents but not by his/her parents because s/he was classified as “indigenous” and encouraged to speak only Spanish, subsequently discovering, thanks to intercultural higher education, that s/he can speak –or at least understand- an indigenous language that can, in fact, be recovered.

By not stigmatizing a whole system as indigenous, we are able to exploit cultural and linguistic diversity much more effectively. For example, there are children of Mexicans who migrated to the United States who return to our country speaking Spanish and English, rather than Spanish plus an indigenous language, and this shows us that it’s important to exploit different types of diversity - rather than merely focusing on indigenous languages and culture- in order to implement the current officially sanctioned focus on inclusion.

Let’s not forget, for example, that the National Institute for Statistics, Geography and Computing (Spanish acronym: INEGI) has reported that most indigenous people, or speakers of indigenous languages, no longer live in the communities where they were born, but rather in big cities where there are very few schools with a bilingual Spanish-cum-indigenous-language focus, since indigenousness is wrongly thought to be limited to rural areas or communities. Since elementary indigenous education is becoming less and less limited to such areas and communities, we need to extend intercultural and bilingual education to cities and areas where there are migrants.

Valuing gender equity as an important source of diversity

The UVI transforms power and gender relationships in Veracruz’s indigenous communities because young women in many families are now aware of their rights and know how to change gender relationships that have traditionally been violent and male-dominated. These young women are empowering their mothers and grandmothers, with whom they are developing projects in their own communities and creating networks to defend the right of women to live a life free of violence and male dominance.

Taking stock of experience

In order to render the education system intercultural, it is important not to equate interculturality with indigenousness, and to acknowledge the different sources of diversity.

Inclusive education that sets out to exploit the whole range of abilities, differences and educational resources can learn from these experiments and from the progress achieved by intercultural higher education.

One of the main tasks facing the National Education System is that of forging closer links among the different subsystems and school levels, for, while not replicating higher intercultural education in other areas, we can learn from it in order to achieve much-needed reforms in bilingual elementary ed-
ucation. The most backward area is that of upper-secondary education, where there are very few projects with such a focus.

Fostering collaboration
It is very important that our schools cease to be closed off from the outside world and involve parents and local communities.

We need civil society to participate in education and imbue it with diversity, and, in the UVI, we have managed to gather together government representatives, members of regional advisory councils and dissident groups around a table and let them know that, since it's a matter of striving to improve education, they have to see eye-to-eye on some issues. Of course, there are many areas where links can be forged and a lot of convergence, but we have to sit down and listen to each other in order to find them.

We in the intercultural universities have realized that we need to do more to involve -and consult- the private sector and potential employers, rather than just working with government authorities. We have to leave behind the kind of feigned participation that has often characterized indigenous education and a lot of other government programs, and begin to engage in this real participation whereby people contribute wisdom and ideas that benefit our educational projects.

In order to make the curriculum more inductive, local and regional, we clearly have to involve local people and organizations in the communities and municipalities, since it is in these places that our graduates will have to live and work.

The need for a flexible, inclusive curriculum
Fair education begins with real conditions. For example, a curriculum that claims to be intercultural, flexible and inclusive cannot be standardized, but, rather, has to be renegotiated and redefined from the bottom up. It's a matter of adopting an inductive approach, rather than a deductive one, of basing ourselves on reality to define what knowledge and knowledge the school can contribute in a rural area such as the Sierra de Zongolica, where the young people have different needs than those in Chalco. Why should we impose the rigid constraints of a national curriculum on all this diversity?

However, in order to create and implement such a diversified curriculum, the teacher, the technical-pedagogic adviser and the school supervisor must play an important role in policy-making, becoming planners and programmers. This obliges us to change our teacher training, which, for many decades, has produced specialists in text books and in the homogeneous, de-contextualized use of the latter. Now we're asking our teachers not only to undergo continuous evaluation that is somewhat standardized, but also to become local researchers, planners of their own curricula, and evaluators of their own teaching-learning processes.

The challenge is very great, and neither a class teacher nor, indeed, a school district, can tackle it alone. It's something that all of us -including researchers and academics- have to do together, starting from the bottom up, which is why it's so important that the teacher not lose interest in these innovative processes. Due to the way that the Educational Reform has occurred, starting with a change in the system for hiring teachers rather than first dealing with changes in teaching methods and systems and in the classroom, I'm particularly afraid that we may be unable to involve the teachers in these processes, for there isn't a single country that has successfully reformed its education system against its teachers' will.

We have to recover this potential for innovation -at the rural and urban level and in all the systems- and exploit it to implement self-evaluation processes that help teachers to improve their teaching, doing so not in order to punish or penalize people or to determine how much they are paid, but rather for the purpose of informing planning. This must be the starting point, and, I repeat, it cannot be achieved using standardized instruments, since the latter always end up being unfair. Teachers, in their context, must play a key role in their own evaluation.

The urgent need to do away with standardized teacher evaluation
There are several teachers' unions that are demanding evaluation based on their members' real working conditions, and such contextualized evaluation is needed in the bilingual-intercultural-education subsector of the indigenous subsystem.

While it is very important that the whole Mexican elementary-education system be evaluated, I doubt that it is possible to evaluate a wide range of different situations in the same way and with the same instrument, since evaluation cannot be standardized.

Evaluation needs to be carried out in conjunction with the teacher, in his/her context, rather than via the filling in of standardized questionnaires that cannot possibly reflect the many different situations that teachers work in and the knowledge and skills that they contribute.

We need to review both the way in which teaching positions are assigned and also the suitability of the profiles pertaining to the said positions. For example, one of the main challenges for intercultural education is posed by teachers who don't belong to the communities or cultures in which they teach. If the teacher does not seek the position of his/her own accord, because s/he identifies with the community or region, or doesn't even speak the language or language variant spoken there, then any intercultural bilingual educational project is, of course, destined to fail.

This is not a static situation, where the teacher rests on his/her laurels once s/he receives a positive evaluation. S/he needs to take ongoing training and engage in evaluation that constantly informs the said training and feeds back into it.

Since the intercultural, inclusive focus requires didactic innovations that substantially redefine the role of the teacher vis-à-vis his/her students, a standardized examination that certifies the possession of given competencies "once and for all" is of no use. Input from educational research is needed, along with the dissemination of information about successful projects, so that the teacher can engage in ongoing innovation instead of dreading a standardized evaluation that does not do justice to the conditions s/he faces every day, such as inadequate school infrastructure or malnourished students, among many other things.

A proposal for evaluation with a diversity focus
I do not oppose standardized evaluation for purposes of making nation-wide comparisons, but such evaluation doesn't help me, as teacher, to improve my teaching, and hence it should be complemented by other peer- and self-evaluation mechanisms, such as peer evaluation and evaluation by the whole school or local community, which make much more direct use of instruments and ideas that can help teachers to change the
way they teach. Of course, this is a slower, and perhaps more expensive, process that forces everybody to access a digital platform and answer certain questions, but in the long run it leads directly to learning and innovation.

In standardized evaluations, evaluation per se and the implementation of teaching practices are often divorced and do not feed back into each other. Like private-sector ones, such evaluations only serve to rank schools, and any student of statistics will point out that this is useless, since one is comparing “apples with pears”.

Furthermore, there are a lot of bottom-up experiences of how to learn by sharing self-evaluation results. While it might not be possible to upload this information to a national platform, it can indeed be shared among teachers and schools. The system has not taken maximum advantage of the positive experiences stemming from pilot projects, in different parts of the country and abroad, in which teachers are delighted to engage in self-evaluation because this serves as a mirror for them, just like the occasions when they video your class and then you sit down and look at yourself and say “Oh yes, I’m engaging in a 30-minute monologue” or “I’m only letting the boys speak, and not the girls”. These things don’t currently happen because everybody is trying to pass a standardized examination, instead of training him/herself by participating in seminars or taking diploma or other courses.

What we often fail to talk about here in Mexico is the fact that educational research still hasn’t shown that standardized teacher evaluations result in better student performance. There is no international study that can show a cause-and-effect relationship between the two, which is why the suspicion often arises that there may be “other interests that make them want to punish us, rank us and split us up into different levels”.

For this reason, we prefer to use internal micro-evaluations, because we can analyze them quickly in order to see how much our students’ performance has improved over a year or two.

**International experiences of evaluation for diversity**

In Germany —where there are standardized evaluations whose results are not broken down per school when published, in order not to lead to ranking— the school community evaluates itself every year, focusing on practices in the teaching of set subjects, “project weeks” and other activities. The results of these self-evaluations never go beyond the school, being seen only by the educational community, in order to engender trust.

This type of evaluation is much “cheaper” than the National Evaluation of Academic Achievement in Schools” (Spanish abbreviation: Enlace), and it’s more productive to invest teachers’ time in them and encourage the school community to decide what to evaluate, asking questions such as “How are we going to visit each other’s classrooms?” or “What are we going to write down during these visits?”

This type of internally used document is consulted by school supervisors when they set out to describe the impact that self-evaluation has had on student performance, which the SEP, of course, has every right to evaluate.

Doing these means changing the education culture, since the teacher is no longer reduced to being the lowest member of the SEP hierarchy, the one that implements innovations planned at higher levels, instead becoming a key player in his/her own educational policymaking. Thus conceived of, evaluation become part of a teaching project, first at the personal level, and then at the school one.

**The longstanding challenges that need to be faced in educational-policy design**

In addition to the above, we have to acknowledge another challenge that the National Education System is currently facing —i.e. the ongoing inequalities in the resources assigned to the different types of schools at the regional and state levels. We need to learn from those education systems that distribute resources based on the problems faced, rather than on enrollment numbers.

Also, we should not forget that there is a big residual imbalance, engendered by colonialism, between the country and the cities, and between the indigenous and non-indigenous populations. Mexican society owes a big historical debt to the indigenous peoples, having underinvested in them for centuries. The fact that now, for the first time, we have university graduates from among these indigenous peoples is just a first step in rectifying the aforesaid inequalities.

By overcoming these cultural, linguistic and economic challenges, we will be able to really exploit the competencies that these young people bring with them when they enter formal public education.

**A message to the people who have our country’s educational fate in their hands**

I want to mention something that sounds easy, but is difficult. Though the six-year presidential cycle sometimes engenders pressure to carry out short-term evaluations, such evaluation is not sustainable; give yourselves a chance to become familiar with pilot projects that have been successful.

For example, why not award points to teachers who leave their region to find out how they teach in the Sierra Norte of the state of Puebla? Currently, teachers are neither awarded points for meeting-and-learning from each other, nor encouraged to do so.
Teachers need a rest from this six-year evaluation cycle and also from the educational reforms that likewise occur every six years, changing the ground rules each time, and, at the end of the day, forcing them to feign acceptance. I suggest that some sort of “moratorium” be declared on educational reform in order to establish a less hasty rhythm that matches the learning patterns of young people rather than furthering the political aims of certain officials.

It is very important that the National Institute of Educational Evaluation (Spanish acronym INEE) play a key role in these processes and encourage educational research that allows us to play a part in them, since it is crucial that all these learnings be taken on board by the different systems, rather than being limited to a single educational level, a single region, or a single period, and also that good experiences gradually translate into good practices, which do indeed exist.

It isn’t true that all our schools are bad, even those in rural areas, or that we Mexicans have lower performance levels than those in other countries. It’s a matter of looking for good practices and learning from them, instead of using bad performance as an excuse for constantly imposing new models and standards.

The INEE needs to maintain an ongoing dialogue with the academic world and with teacher trainers. We are more than willing to take part in this process of cultural exchange—which, I insist, is necessary—in order to create an evaluation culture of our own that is participative and bottom-up, and thus gradually get rid of the punitive evaluation that has been going on for decades and will not raise the quality of public education.

Interviewer: Mary Carmen Reyes

Educational justice as an essential component of social justice

In order to achieve educational justice, Latin America must overcome the tendency whereby learning outcomes are determined by social status, asserts Juan Carlos Tedesco. Convinced that any effective diagnostic study “must [also] identify the strengths that make it possible to solve the problems,” Tedesco, an Argentinian specialist, lists the public policies that are needed in order to achieve inclusive, high-quality education.

Among many other posts, Juan Carlos Tedesco, director of the program for the Improvement of Teaching of the General San Martín National University, has held the position of Director of UNESCO’s International Education Office (1992-1997), as well as founding the regional bureau of UNESCO’s International Institute for Education Planning (IIEP), heading Argentina’s Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (2006 to 2007), and being the latter country’s Minister of Education from 2007 to 2009.

In the interview transcribed below, Tedesco, who, in the 1990’s, argued that educational conditions were deteriorating in Latin America as a result of growing poverty and increasing social inequality, asserts that educational justice is a part of social justice in general and consists in providing high-quality education for all—i.e. he affirms that, since there can be no educational justice without equitable distribution of income, and greater access to housing or healthcare, the said educational justice is a crucial factor in the building of more just societies.

Starting out from the above affirmation, and based on a long interview with Tedesco, below we present his views and his proposals for achieving educational justice, which consist of facing cultural challenges, coming up with a plan for creating a just soci-
Facing cultural challenges

“Latin America faces the challenge of overcoming the tendency for learning outcomes to be determined by social status. All the tests and empirical findings relating to learning outcomes show that students’ living conditions constitute the variable that is most directly related to the said outcomes”.

“In order to put an end to this social determinism, we need not only to change traditional teaching-learning strategies, institutional school-organization models, and education-system-management modalities, but also to address the challenges inherent in bringing about cultural change, not only in our teachers, but also in our students and their families, since the latter, often impoverished, believe that their children are incapable of learning, thus justifying the latter’s academic failure, which they deem to be normal”.

“In some cases, anti-dropout and anti-exclusion policies are working, and there are a lot of programs aimed at building bridges between the school and the outside world so as to encourage dropouts to go back to school, which implies fostering cultural change in those involved in education”.

“Demand for education is very great. Nobody fails to go to school of his/her own free will, and there are very few groups that don’t want, or need, to do so. In this regard, each policy needs to be contextualized and adapted to the specific situation and the type of problems that need to be tackled. Indigenous populations are not the same as impoverished urban or rural populations, and we must carry out good diagnostic studies in order to come with the right strategies for each context”.

“There have been some relative, very slow, changes over the last decade – i.e. the number of poor people has decreased in absolute –but not comparative- terms, and there has been a relative, but very slow, improvement in the extent to which students entering schools are fitted for education. If it continues at the same rate, Latin America will take over a century to achieve fair, high-quality universal education. In order for all our students to succeed, we need to speed up the processes aimed at making them more fitted for education when they enter school”.

Coming up with a plan for achieving a just society

“Generally speaking, only a few of our educational policies or practices have succeeded; if they had, we wouldn’t be facing the challenges that we’re facing now. Nevertheless, we should push those policies that have proved to have potential and to be feasible – e.g. the ones aimed at expanding early education, those that set out to provide financial support to low-income families so that they can send their children to school better equipped, and those aimed at providing universal access to the new technologies”.

“However, it’s hard to tell which of the aforesaid policies stem from evaluation, since educational results are the product of various factors, rather than just one. While our evaluations reveal learning outcomes, the strategies aimed at improving the said outcomes have to be systemic and all-embracing. However, systemic doesn’t mean simultaneous. In this regard, it’s essential to come up with change sequences, which may not be the same in Mexico, Argentina, Honduras and Guatemala, or in all the different regions of a given country, since no sequence is universally valid”.

“The big challenge for educational-policymaking consists in coming up with the right sequence. For example, you can start by changing the curriculum, but if you do that without modifying the school infrastructure, equipment, working conditions, teacher training or teacher pay, you won’t have any real impact on reality”.

“Decisions about where to start and how to continue have to be contextualized. In order to be successful, and educational changes must be part of a social plan that includes changing income-distribution patterns. Our region has more inequality than any other, and, to change the income-distribution pattern, we need to make structural changes and implement fiscal reforms in order to levy more taxes on those with the highest incomes and distribute the said revenue among the poorest sectors, which means putting in place a social, rather than merely educational, plan. Making education fair is part of building a fair society, and there are no universally valid sequences for that either, since different countries have different models”.

“The big challenge for Latin America is that of modifying income-distribution patterns so as to enable people from the poor-est sectors of society to get decent, well paid jobs and break out of the vicious circle of inequality that has prevailed there for many decades”.

Linking macro- and micro-plans

“As to the kind of inclusion methods that should be used in such different situations –i.e. with indigenous or marginalized populations– I believe that the first step should be to become aware of the need to act and respond to it, since there’s a lot of lip service but little real action. Discrimination and stereotypes prevail in many of our societies, though nobody admits it. Our educational policymaking should be based on an educational model whose main principle is that of living together. Rather than having ghettos, or a sui-generis kind of education for indigenous peoples, it’s a matter of adopting an educational plan whereby we can learn to coexist with, and respect, our fellows, and also of seeing diversity as enrichening rather problematic”.

“It’s essential that we make the aim of “transforming educational policy into State policy” –which everybody pays lip service to, but nobody puts into practice– a reality in our macro-policy, not subjecting it to political periods of office, and, in order to do this, we need agreements, negotiations and consensuses. One way to achieve this is via ten- or fifteen-year plans where the achievement of aims can be checked, thus forcing governments to maintain continuity”.

“At the micro-political –i.e. classroom– level, we need to set up networks of schools that enable students to have contact with those who are different from themselves, as well as promoting sporting and cultural activities that take them outside the walls of the classroom. There are many ways in which our teaching lends itself to encouraging contacts with students in other schools or members of other cultural groups”.

“Though all the countries in our region have curricula whose contents –both specific and cross-curricular– have to do with training for citizenship (previously called education for democracy or civics), whereby students can learn all about their rights and duties as citizens, research has shown that the latter’s focus is purely theoretical or cognitive, being limited to the citing of data”.

“We all know that training for citizenship involves a lot more than the handling of information, comprising values, attitudes
and roles. Students should gain experience in exercising their rights and responsibilities as citizens and participating in democracy so as to play a full role in society, and these things can’t be learned from books on civics or via the rote learning of laws and constitutions.

“All the school subjects can help to prepare students for citizenship. For example, training in science is a kind of preparation for citizenship, since, when students engage in discussions about the environment, health, economic policy or whatever else, they need scientific logic and an ability to reflect, as well as data. To make training for citizenship more than a mere school subject, we need to involve students in coexisting with others and in the peaceful settlement of conflicts, which are an inevitable part of social life, via dialogue and negotiation, rather than violence and coercion”.

“We face particularly big challenges in this regard in our secondary schools, where we need to introduce contents and activities that enable our young people to leave school with democratic convictions and competencies that help them to exercise citizenship in ways that strengthen the democratic systems that our nations have fought so hard to build, and which are now being eroded”.

“Hence, we should encourage the teaching of pacific conflict settlement in our secondary schools, since we know that the said schools are the last link in a chain that begins very early, with discrimination, symbolic violence and academic failure. If we fail to take preventive action, it will be much more difficult to deal with the conflicts that break out later”.

“While it’s very important that we train our teachers to deal with these issues professionally, we also need to establish systematic policies, and take concerted actions, that involve them, rather than placing all the responsibility on their shoulders. It’s a matter of fostering professionalism at the collective level, so that our teachers can act as part of a group”.

“At both the micro and macro levels, we need not only to promote both educational policies and training aimed not only at preparing people for citizenship, but also at enabling them to coexist peacefully”.

Planning with a policy focus
“It’s important that educational evaluation and research examine the real problems facing education and propose feasible solutions, rather than being merely descriptive or critical”.

“As well as pointing to problems, shortfalls, deficiencies and weak points, any research that is committed to suggesting solutions should identify strengths that make it possible to solve the aforesaid problems. Today’s researchers and teachers bear a lot of responsibility for proposing and piloting learning strategies aimed at addressing the problems of the most vulnerable sectors of society”.

“It’s incumbent on educational theorists and teacher trainers to make Latin America the region, par excellence, where educational research makes it possible to solve the learning problems of the poorest sectors of society, which are also our problems. While the developed countries manage to provide schooling to their whole populations and to more or less get them to the end of the educational path, the very poor countries don’t even manage to provide universal coverage. Though we in Argentina succeed in enrolling our children in school and keeping them there for a relatively long time, they learn nothing or very little, which is why our educational evaluators and researchers face enormous challenges, and why the priority for our research centers is to solve learning problems”.

“We must revisit educational planning and give it a policy focus as the product of processes of evaluation, negotiation, dialogue and agreements that make government policymakers feel less isolated and more in touch with society and its needs, rather than being forced to pay exclusive attention to corporate exigencies. In this way, the said policymakers will be able to make decisions more confidently”.

Changing people’s concept of what is prestigious
“Many of our countries have the same problems. In Mexico, Argentina, Brazil and Colombia, our teaching practices are failing to solve our students’ learning problems, while Mexico obviously has more specific problems stemming from its heterogeneous cultural makeup”.

“The future educational challenges that we will have to face if we want to build more just societies have to do with the two big core issues of learning to live together and learning to learn. To deal with the first of these, we need to achieve social cohesion, unity and respect for cultural, ethnic and linguistic diversity, doing so without creating ghettos. The big challenge in this area is how to respect diversity while at the same time fostering social cohesion, and this is where the idea of learning to live together applies. In the second area, since knowledge is now so fast-changing, and what we learn today at school, and the information we receive there, may well be obsolete tomorrow, education faces the challenge of being ongoing, and hence our schools have to teach students how to continue learning throughout their lives”.

“The only thing that can prepare people for this fast-changing world is good elementary education, since the foundations of our academic disciplines and our values remain essentially the same. This implies a complete turnaround in the way we assign prestige to the different levels of our current education systems, given that we operate in accordance with the idea that the less elementary the level, the more prestigious it is, viewing first degrees as less prestigious than graduate ones, university qualifications as more prestigious than secondary-school ones, secondary-school studies as more prestigious than primary ones, and the last years of each study cycle as more important than the first ones. We have to change this and, in elementary education, give priority to reading, writing and scientific logic”.
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