



NEWSLETTER

# ANTRIEP

Vol. 19 No. 2, July-December 2013 – Vol. 21 No. 2, July-December 2015

Bi-annual

## Education of Marginalised Groups : Policies, Programmes and Challenges

The present volume comprises articles on "Education of Marginalised Groups: Policies, Programmes and Challenges" presented in Regional Workshop organised by National University of Educational

### *In this issue...*

Pro-Poor Incentive Programmes in Education : Transparency and Accountability Issues	3
Education of the Marginalised Groups: Policies, Programmes and Challenges in Sri Lanka	5
Struggling with Equity in Education in Australia	6
BRAC Initiatives and their Impact in Tackling Educational Marginalization	7
Education of Marginalized Groups in Bhutan	7
Education of Socially and Economically Marginalized People in Fiji	8
Equity and Inclusion in Education in India: Policies, Programmes and Challenges	9
Equal Access to Education in Malaysia	10
Education of Scheduled Tribes in India: Policies, Programmes and Progress	11
Education of Marginalised Groups: Policies, Programmes and Challenges in Indonesia	12
Education Policies for Marginalized Groups in the Maldives	13
Inclusive Education in Myanmar	14
Education of the Marginalised Groups in Nepal: Policies, Programmes and Challenges	15
Marginalised Learners in the Philippines	17
NMM Scholarship Scheme :Alternative Action for Equity in Secondary Education	18
The Education of Marginalised Groups in South Korea	18
Achieving MDG : Elementary Education from Gender Perspectives in India	20
News from Member Institutions	21

Planning and Administration (NUEPA), in New Delhi during March 25-27, 2015. The definition of marginalised groups encompasses ethnic groups/ indigenous people, minorities, slum dwellers, poor etc.

The paper on "Transparency in the Management of Pro-Poor Education Incentives" based on study of seven projects implemented worldwide demonstrates that some models pose greater challenges to transparency and accountability than others namely targeted, in-kind, and locally managed or community based. The capacity of such programmes to promote equal opportunities or change-ingrained pattern of behaviour, however, remains contestable.

The paper on "Struggling with Equity in Education in Australia" explains the efforts made by federal and state governments to improve national education system by accommodating varied experiences of different states and population groups including Aborigines.

The article on "Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee Initiatives and their Impact on Education of Marginalised Groups" explicates several methods adopted to improve educational opportunities for the disadvantaged and people in remote areas.

The paper on "Education of Socially and Economically Marginalised in Fiji" presents reforms in education policies and programmes and continued affirmative action and support through several concessions, institutional facilities and incentives to poorer sections of the society.

The paper on "Education of Scheduled Tribes in India" describes policies and programmes for education of scheduled tribes and extent of educational progress made and issues and challenges. Consequent to Constitutional provisions, several measures of affirmative action have been adopted. Flexible policies

and relaxed norms have helped to improve access and participation of children in predominantly tribal areas.

The papers on “Overcoming Marginalised Status of Girls in Education” discusses several efforts made in India through several programmes to bridge the gender gap. The paper on “Equity and Inclusion in Education in India: Policies, Programmes and Challenges” explains the convergence of diversity and inequality at caste and class levels resulting with inter and intra-group disparities.

The paper from Indonesia on “Education of Marginalised Groups” explains the wide diversity of ethnic groups, languages and habitations in 13,000 islands which poses several challenges and constraints in providing education. The government of Indonesia through Constitutional provisions ensure & special provisions and incentives for education of marginalised groups. Some of the initiatives include scholarships for poor students, Indonesian Smart Card, school operational cost assistance, incentives to teach in remote areas etc.

Malaysia has made great development in education including increased access to primary and pre- school education. However, the most critical challenge is to ensure access to all free and good quality and compulsory primary education. The Malaysian government had targeted the poor families, children living in remote areas and the indigenous people through financial support, a comprehensive programme of Asli and Penanthat for aboriginal children.

Maldives with a group of more than one thousand islands faces unique challenges in providing education services to people. Due to lack of many quality educational institutions, remote island people and girls are constrained to access better quality schooling. Government interventions attempt to address problems faced different categories of disadvantaged groups.

The Government of Myanmar has introduced different programmes for inclusion of ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities, children living in slums, street children victims of trafficking, drug addicts etc. The new National Educational Law of the country provides several provisions for free and compulsory school education till lower secondary level.

In Nepal, the Constitution ensures non-discrimination of marginalised and disadvantaged to access and participate in education. In Nepal marginalised groups are made in to five categories and several special measures have been made to address issues of each

group. Important intervention was to create gender balance among teachers and making education more joyful and the use of mother tongue for disadvantaged and marginalised groups. However, the experience of the decade shows that the task of equity and social inclusion are not an easy task.

The paper on “Marginalised Learners in the Philippines” highlights some of the issues related to education of indigenous people, minorities and other poor sections. The paper presents details of government interventions through several special programmes and policies to promote education among the disadvantaged groups. Intensified efforts are also being made towards EFA particularly reaching to unreached. In South Korea, marginalised groups include multi-cultural families, North Korean defectors, and people from rural communities, maladjusted students and low-income groups. Education welfare policies were started for fair distribution of educational opportunities. A project called Priority Region of Education Welfare Investment has been adopted to improve learning and quality of education. The paper from Sri Lanka explains efforts made by national and provincial governments for education of disadvantaged groups of different categories.

Despite variation in levels of socio - economic development and geographical and political contexts, there are common problems and issues related to education of disadvantaged groups in different countries.

The articles in this issue may be found useful for researchers and academics.

**Editor**

For Editorial correspondence please contact:

**Professor K. Sujatha**

**Editor**

**ANTRIEP Newsletter**

**National University of Educational Planning  
and Administration (NUEPA)**

**17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi - 110 016, India**

Tel: (+91 11) 26544800, 26565600

Fax: (+91 11) 26853041, 26865180

E-mail: [ksujatha@nuepa.org](mailto:ksujatha@nuepa.org)

[sujakalimili@yahoo.com](mailto:sujakalimili@yahoo.com)

## Pro-Poor Incentive Programmes in Education: Transparency and Accountability Issues

### Background

In order to meet the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), education authorities are faced with the major challenge of ensuring access for, and retention of all children, regardless of their socio-economic background, location, or gender. Achieving equal opportunities in education remains a challenge for decision-makers and educational planners, experience showing that more of the same is an inadequate response to the requirements and circumstances of the poorest. Indeed, it is imperative, not only to introduce flexibility in standardized procedures and uniform provisions, but also to change the inherent attitudes of both service providers and their beneficiaries.

Within this context, a wide variety of incentive programmes have been developed for those most in need, to help provide additional resources, and to create adequate conditions for their schooling and academic success. Such programmes attempt in particular to compensate for both direct and indirect costs of schooling, by redirecting resources to geographical areas, schools, or populations most in need, and by providing, for instance: additional funds to schools located in the poorest areas; scholarships or cash to pay for school costs, or other household expenses; free food or transportation for children to encourage school attendance, etc.

### Challenges

The capacity of such programmes to promote equal opportunities or change-ingrained patterns of behavior, however, remains controversial. While some experts believe that they can successfully contribute to the achievement of education for all goals, others argue that their impact is limited due to a variety of factors, including: possible errors of inclusion (resources allocated to people outside the targeted population), or of exclusion (not all people, who should be, are served by the programme); opaque and unfair distribution of resources to beneficiaries; and also risks of fraud and

corrupt practices. These risks may include falsification of data or records, collusion between administrative staff and beneficiaries, and capture of resources by the local elite.

In this context, the pros and cons of various models of incentives (universal versus categorical targeting; cash versus in-kind transfers; conditional versus non-conditional allocations; top-down versus community-based approaches; etc.) are subject to debate. It led the International Institute for Educational Planning (UNESCO-IIEP) to conduct a study to compare different models for the design, targeting, and management of educational incentives, in order to identify those that have proven to be more/less successful in maximizing transparency and accountability, and in minimizing the likelihood of errors, fraud, and corrupt practices.

### Case studies and variables

Seven pro-poor incentive programmes in education were selected, according to key variables identified empirically. These variables, seen as critical in influencing the degree of transparency and accountability of the programmes under analysis, are as follows: (i) selection of programme population (targeted vs. universal programme); (ii) focus of incentives (beneficiary-focused vs. school-focused); (iii) nature of incentives (cash-based vs. in-kind); (iv) granting of incentives: (conditional vs. unconditional); and (v) mode of implementation (centralized vs. decentralized).

The programmes included in the research are as follows: the National School Feeding Programme (Brazil); the Juntos conditional cash transfer programme (Peru); the Quintile Ranking System (South Africa); the Scholarship Programme of the Cambodia Education Sector Support Project (Cambodia); the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan programme (India); the Opportunity New York City conditional cash transfer programme (United States); and the Primary Education for Disadvantaged Children project (Vietnam).

### Pros and cons of different models

The study compares all seven programmes vis-à-vis several variables that characterize them, emphasizing the pros and cons, that their implementation involves, from a transparency and accountability perspective. It shows that some designs may pose greater challenges than others, namely those that are targeted, in-kind, conditional and decentralized or community-based:

- *Targeted* incentives tend to be more complex than universal ones, and involve many technical challenges to select and reach the targeted population; targeting may be subject to errors and manipulation;
- It may be longer for *in-kind* incentives to reach beneficiaries, as compared to cash-based incentives; the definition of needs appears, sometimes, subjective and vulnerable to manipulation;
- *Conditional* cash transfer schemes raise technical difficulties as regards the verification and enforcement of compliance criteria; they rely heavily on the existence of accurate and objective data;
- Several programmes, under study, demonstrate that *community involvement* can fall short of expectations in terms of transparency, or of the democratic nature of community participation.

### Promising approaches

Simplified targeting, legal definition of responsibilities, robust evaluation frameworks, frequent and publicized report channels for active community participation, establishment of local transparency committees, use of school display boards, appeal mechanisms, informal whistle-blowing, social audits – these are among the various solutions presented in the above-mentioned cases that tend to enhance transparency and accountability. The Cambodian programme, for instance,

emphasizes the importance of publishing programme regulations; organizing awareness and training activities; excluding the children of local management committee members from the list of beneficiaries; and organizing ‘transparent ceremonies’ in the distribution of money.

Public access to information is also presented as essential to increase social control over the allocation and use of pro-poor incentives. The importance of information is illustrated through several examples. The role of the District Information System for Education (DISE) whereby information is made available online to the public after undergoing consistency checks, is highlighted in the Indian case. To improve the quality and to strengthen the reach of DISE data, the government has mandated that DISE data be publicly displayed in each school and read out loud to the local community during SMC meetings.

### Conclusions

The study concludes that actions taken to confront existing risks to transparency and accountability is more important than the adoption of specific incentive models. By planning, monitoring and evaluating incentive programmes, based on an anti-corruption framework, policy-makers can greatly improve their returns on investment, ensuring that resources reach and serve those that need them most. The value of ‘mutual accountability systems’, whereby all actors are mutually accountable and subject to checks and balances, is emphasized in this context.

### Reference

Poisson, Muriel (Ed.). 2014. *Achieving transparency in pro-poor education incentives*. Series: Ethics and Corruption in Education. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

**Muriel Poisson**  
IIEP-UNESCO  
Paris, France  
Email: [m.poisson@iiep.unesco.org](mailto:m.poisson@iiep.unesco.org)

## Education of the Marginalised Groups: Policies, Programmes and Challenges in Sri Lanka

Sri Lanka, with 92.3 percent of literacy, occupies the highest position in South Asia and is a country having the highest literacy in Asia. Education plays a major part in the life and culture of the country. Despite the availability of wide facilities in formal education, it is evident that there are children from marginalized groups in Sri Lanka who are unable to get the full benefits of this system. Children from the indigenous community, culturally- affected groups, war- affected children, children in the natural disaster areas, socio – economically disadvantaged groups, plantation community and also children with special needs are the vulnerable groups in Sri Lanka.

In an effort to overcome problems and challenges, the National and provincial governments have adopted several policies for marginalized groups such as free primary, secondary and tertiary education in state institutions from 1947 without socio – economic gender differentiation; free text books for grade 1 to grade 10; free uniforms for all school children; subsidized transport facilities to school children; compulsory education for 5-14 age groups; compulsory attendance committees; provincial, zonal and division- wise Non- Formal Education Units; school mid-day meal programme implemented in disadvantaged schools; protection of the rights of person with disabilities (1996); National policy on disability for Sri Lanka; a unit was established in Ministry of Education and National Institute of Education to cater to vulnerable groups; awareness programmes to identify disabilities; established nine special Education Resource Centres and vocational training institutes.

While providing these facilities, a number of problems and challenges had been encountered. These included health and nutrition issues of children from marginalized groups, hazards of staying in remote habitations having wild animals and elephants, need to walk long distances to reach educational facilities, shortage of teachers and

lack of incentives for them to teach in the remote and difficult areas, disparities in infrastructure facilities, and inequitable distribution of teachers.

Some of the measures that need to be adopted are: a) implementation of compulsory education regulation up to 16 years; b) develop teacher as a facilitator who empathises with children; c) revisit and formulate the national level policy for special needs' children; d) affirmative action measures to address the disparities in education levels of marginalized children; e) increased financial provision for marginalized groups; f) introduction of proper monitoring mechanism; g) adopt curriculum and materials to promote critical thinking on social and cultural issues; h) implementation of labour laws effectively to prohibit child labour; i) measures to provide education opportunity for street children; j) enhance child-friendly activity based participatory teaching for joyful learning; k) make arrangements for developing of programme to ensure equitable distribution of resources for disadvantaged places; l) motivate related officials to implement programmes for marginalized groups and implement catch-up programmes to assist vulnerable groups.

The issues in relation to the level of the vulnerable groups have been clearly discussed. The common issues on socio-economic factors as also other factors should be thoroughly discussed in order to educate marginalized groups.

**S. Dunaisingh**  
National Institute of Education,  
Open School Unit,  
Maharagama , Sri Lanka  
Email: [dunai2008@gmail.com](mailto:dunai2008@gmail.com)

## Struggling with Equity in Education in Australia

### Introduction

Australia is a large island continent with a relatively small and increasingly diverse population. Inhabited for more than 40,000 years by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander or Indigenous people, migration to Australia by the British started in 1788 with the establishment of a penal colony in Sydney. The population today is overwhelmingly migrants or descendants of migrants from around 200 countries who have made Australia their home since this time, with the Indigenous population of the country around 0.7 million, just 3 per cent of the total. Over the last 20 years, the population of Australia has doubled, and more than half of this growth has been due to net overseas migration, including large numbers from Asia and increasing numbers from the Middle East and Africa. Around one-quarter of the Australian population (26%) was born overseas and a further one-fifth (20%) had at least one overseas-born parent. The rapid increase in population and changes in ethnic mix have put pressure on the education system to adapt and keep up.

Australia does not have a single national education system. States and territories are each responsible for their own education administrations, although overall structures are similar. While the Commonwealth government has no formal responsibility for education, it provides large amounts of funding to the states for education. This increasing financial power and policy influence, along with the new national curriculum, suggest that any differences will narrow further in the future. Policy collaboration takes place in joint governmental councils that include the federal, state, and territorial governments. State education departments recruit and appoint the teachers in government schools, supply buildings, equipment, and materials, and provide limited discretionary funding for use by schools. In most jurisdictions, regional offices and schools have responsibility for administration and staffing, although the extent of responsibility varies across jurisdictions. Central authorities specify the curriculum and standards framework, but schools have autonomy in deciding curriculum details, textbooks, and teaching methodology, particularly at the primary and lower secondary levels.

In 2008, the federal government and state education ministers agreed to a framework of reform in education—the National Education Agreement. Concurrently, the ministers of education also agreed to the Melbourne Declaration on the Educational Goals for Young Australians, which outlines future directions and aspirations for Australian schooling and supports the National Education Agreement, and the National Assessment Plan (NAP), which measures progress towards the Goals. The NAP is centered around literacy and numeracy tests (collectively known as NAPLAN) administered yearly to students in grades 3, 5, 7 and 9; additional national sample assessments in science, civics and citizenship and Information and Communications Technology (ICT) literacy which are administered every three years, and participation in international assessments: the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) and the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). Now that both the national curriculum and NAP have been developed, Australia is working to ensure that the two systems are aligned, creating common educational standards for all students. In 2011 the Australian curriculum was adopted. Developed in a rigorous, consultative national process by the Australian Curriculum and Assessment Reporting Authority (ACARA), the Australian Curriculum sets consistent national standards to improve learning outcomes for all young Australians. It sets out, through content descriptions and achievement standards, what students should be taught and achieve, as they progress through school. It is the base for future learning, growth, and active participation in the Australian community.

Australia's marginalised groups:

The Melbourne declaration identified educational goals aimed at increasing equity in the Australian school system. These were:

- To ensure that the learning outcomes of Indigenous students improve to match those of other students;

- To ensure that socioeconomic disadvantage ceases to be a significant determinant of educational outcomes
- Reduce the effect of other sources of disadvantage, such as disability, homelessness, refugee status and remoteness.

Despite several policies and programs aimed at achieving these goals, evidences show little progress has been made.

**Sue Thomson**  
*Australian Council for Educational Research  
 (ACER)  
 Camberwell, Australia  
 Email: sue.thomson@acer.edu.au*

## BRAC Initiatives and their Impact in Tackling Educational Marginalization

### Introduction

The Government of Bangladesh is committed to provide basic education to all children in the country. Some affirmative actions have been taken in line with this commitment. Stipend to poorer sections of students, fee-exempt education and free textbooks to all students are among the major initiatives. As a result, school enrolment rate has increased and the drop-out rate has declined. The gender gap in access has also been eliminated. However, a section of children continue to remain out-of-school.

BRAC launched two very special initiatives to address educational marginalization. One of these was for the extreme poor households while the other was for children from remote rural locations. The first one was an asset transfer programme for extreme poor households where BRAC intensively nurtured the targeted households for two years with subsequent follow up action. There was an education component to it, which sought to enrol the children of programme households in existing schools and supporting them in continuing

their education till completion of primary education. The second one was purely an education programme in eight marginalized sub-districts. Here, BRAC itself opened its non-formal primary schools and cooperated with local NGOs to operate similar schools. Studies reveal that school enrolment has significantly improved in both the cases as a result of the BRAC initiatives. While the BRAC strategies worked in these cases to enhance enrolment, it was not possible to bring all children to schools. The programmes were costly compared to BRAC's general programmes. The need of households for having their children engaged in income-generating activities, unattractive school environment, inadequate expansion of programmes are some of the barriers in the process.

**Samir Ranjan Nath**  
*Educational Research Unit,  
 Research and Evaluation Division, BRAC  
 Dhaka, Bangladesh  
 Email: nath.sr@brac.net*

## Education of Marginalized Groups in Bhutan : Policies, Programmes and Challenges

The EFA Global Monitoring Report 2010 defines marginalization as “a form of acute and persistent disadvantage rooted in underlying social inequalities”. The most disadvantaged sections of society are considered to be girls and women, hard-to-reach groups like ethnic minorities and highlanders, poverty prevalent villages, individuals with disabilities, rural populations,

those afflicted by HIV and AIDS, and children of street working parents. They are always marginalized because of their social difference, economic disadvantages and different forms of disability.

Marginalization in education is a global phenomenon and remains as the greatest challenge to many

countries. If education is focused on the market principles of demand and supply in the labour market, it will only become a means of increasing social disparities. It will affect specific population groups with different forms of disability, older age and inadequate qualifications and experience. Not considering affordability of education will also adversely affect the economically disadvantaged groups. Considering affordability of education is one of the most appropriate means of addressing equity in providing education, as it is the main cause of marginalization in many parts of the world.

Marginalization is one of the main causes which creates poverty. Education is, therefore, only the means of

breaking the vicious circle of poverty. It is very important to use all the means of motivation to provide education for all those marginalized groups. These could include providing a system of special measures, mainly in areas of equitable education through social protection, economic provisions, improving access and quality, infrastructures, security, etc.

**Tshewang Jamtsho**  
*Policy and Planning Division*  
*Ministry of Education*  
*Thimphu, Bhutan*  
*Email: tshewangj@gmail.com*

## Education of Socially and Economically Marginalised People in Fiji

The Fijian government has, in the recent past, allocated a substantive portion of its budget into the education sector. This is a testimony to the fact that the government is committed to making education accessible, affordable and equitable to all students in Fiji.

These reforms in the education sector have consolidated the government's efforts to build and support social cohesion in schools. The Ministry of Education, Heritage and Arts has secured the second highest allocation in the 2015 budget. This is to ensure that every parent's dream come true and for every student to enter primary, secondary and universities without worrying about paying fees. The Ministry of Education will be responsible for the development of all Fijian students to their full capacity so they can secure a better future.

The increase in squatter settlements in urban areas and the migration of families from the rural to the urban centers are problems affecting the quality education provision. This has a major impact on education services in trying to meet the needs of these populations in places where they reside.

The Ministry has aligned its initiatives and reforms to the 2013 Constitution of the Republic of Fiji. Initiatives and reforms, that have been launched before 2015 like the transport assistance scheme, zoning policy for urban

schools and fee- free grants, have continued to be implemented in 2015. This has eased the burden of paying school fees and bus fares for low- income parents in the informal settlements and villages too.

Moreover, the focus for 2015 will be on the establishment of technical colleges in the education divisions; distribution of milk to year one students; issuance of the Ministry of Education prescribed textbooks, written by the Curriculum Development Unit Officers, to all schools for all students from year 1 to year 13; training of teachers on OHS and Basic Counselling Skills; and examinations for year 6 and year 10 students. The establishment of Technical Colleges will encourage students to develop their career in the technical field, where there is a demand in Fiji and other countries. The recent budget has also proposed that free education will now extend to early childhood education.

The Ministry for Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation also assists students of marginalized families in providing school bags and stationery. However, the state also provides Scholarship Loan Scheme to tertiary students whereby students pay back on their employment subsequent to completion of their study.

The major challenges and issues faced by this marginalized group to participate in education are identified as transport, meals, uniform, stationery, peer influence, family and health.



The government faces several challenges and issues in providing educational opportunities for marginalized groups. Such issues include late issuance of bus vouchers; teachers' role in monitoring attendance and attitude towards these marginalized children; and school counselling for tackling bullying and peer influence.

Targeting the most vulnerable children in the society cannot be done by the ministry or schools alone; community organisations play a vital role too. The Ministry should develop standards and procedures to provide a minimum standard for organizations that work with schools. The Ministry of Social Welfare can also come on board to undertake their own assessment and provide necessary assistance. Outreach Programmes for the community could be organized by District Education Office in collaboration with other key sections of ministry and the schools. Chronic absenteeism by children is a major problem so EMIS will be a useful tool to highlight this data but this will only be useful if teachers and

school management follow up with the students directly and develop strategies to engage them effectively in schools.

It is noted that poverty of parents and parent educational level pose a real challenge to the initiatives taken by government towards providing free education to all the children in Fiji. Support from parents has been an issue that continues to affect the quality and retention of children in schools. If Fiji as a nation has to grow in wisdom and strength, then every child should be able to realize his own highest possibilities.

**Mereoni Tabaiwalu Matanitobua**  
Ministry of Education  
Suva, Fiji

Email: mereoni.matanitobua@govnet.gov.fj

## Equity and Inclusion in Education in India: Policies, Programmes and Challenges

Issue of equity and inclusion in education in India is inextricably linked to the nature of diversity of the Indian society and corresponding socio-economic disparities. India represents one of the most diverse countries of world in terms of socio-cultural and economic composition of population. India represents not only a complex case of diversity but also deep rooted inequality corresponding with differential location of groups and communities. There appears to be substantial degree of convergence between diversity and inequality. Convergence of diversity and inequality is evident in variety of contexts. Inequality in educational opportunities is one such site of convergence. Inequality of educational opportunities is linked to variety of social locations such as caste, tribe, religion, region, language etc. It is also determined by one's class position measured in terms of income, occupation and residential location. The convergence of diversity and inequality poses serious problems in the way of transforming the professed constitutional principle of equality of opportunities into practice. It may be recalled that equality of educational opportunities is one of the most important professed principles of constitutional democracy in India. The state is constitutionally obligated to ensure that no one is discriminated and

excluded merely on the ground of social origin and location. This guarantee becomes important given the nature of Indian society. Creating a condition of equal opportunity for access and participation in education has necessitated active intervention of the state through an array of public policy and programmes in education sector. Towards this endeavour, the State in India, at various levels and its myriad institutional forms, has initiated a number of policies, programmes and actions. Despite state's endeavour and intervention towards expansion of educational facilities though a number of policies and programmes, intergroup disparities in educational attainment and unequal access to educational facilities at all the levels and sectors of education remain a serious problem. The goal of attaining equality in educational opportunities in its substantive sense and enhancing the space of equal participation of all irrespective of their social belonging and location remain to be realised.

One can easily identify intergroup and intra-group disparities in education. Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, non creamy layers of Other Backward Castes, Muslims, and Girls constitute major sections of Indian society who lag behind the others on various indicators

of educational development. Many ethnic and linguistic minorities also face situation of exclusion in education on account of their geographical location or surrounding population of majority communities. Among many others, social belonging, socio-cultural identity, economic status, geographical location etc are important determinants of educational access and participation.

Keeping in view various impeding factors of equal access and participation different kinds of enabling provisions and affirmative action programmes have been initiated over past many years both at the level of the union and the state. Intervention of the union government through variety of centrally sponsored schemes and incentives along with state specific programmes have been instrumental in terms of creating enabling environment for the marginal groups be it SCs,

STs, OBCs, ethnic and linguistic minorities or girls. The attempts have been directed towards bridging the social, gender, geographical locational gaps in access and participation of groups in education. The gap has not been bridged to the extent that it requires but the achievements cannot be just brushed aside.

It is in this context that the paper attempts to capture the issue of equity and inclusion in education in India through the lens of policies, programmes and challenges.

**Kumar Suresh**

*NUEPA, New Delhi, India*

*Email: profkumarsuresh@gmail.com*

## Equal Access to Education in Malaysia

Malaysia has made great progress in education on many fronts, including increased access to pre-school and primary education. The most critical challenge in Malaysia is to ensure access for all to a complete, free, good quality and compulsory primary education. In this mission, Malaysia had targeted the group of poor families in urban and rural areas, children living in remote areas, children with special education needs, the indigenous population and undocumented children, children living in plantation estates and refugees. Malaysia has also outlined a number of initiatives in order to achieve the goal including Financial Support Programmes to help the families who could not afford to come and finish their schooling as well as providing a programme for special children called Programmes Targeting Special Education Needs Students. In addition, Malaysia has devised a most unique and interesting strategy through its Special Programme for the Orang Asli and the Penanthat, as a comprehensive programme to help aboriginal children with their education. These strategies include The K9 Comprehensive Model School, Training of indigenous teachers and also the design of a special curriculum of Orang Asli (KAP). In addition, Alternative Education Programmes (AEP) for street children, undocumented children, and children of plantation workers besides the School for Street Children (BJK) also performed for homeless children. And lastly, there is a special school catering to undocumented children through the programme for Undocumented Children. Due to the

commitment of the National government to achieve the goal of every child completing basic education, there has been a steady growth of both intake and enrolment of students in primary as well as secondary education. The intake rate has increased from 95 percent in 2000 to close to 98 percent in 2013, but with substantial annual fluctuations. As a result, the number of children not entering Grade 1 has declined to fewer children. However, the targeted efforts to reach some of the marginalized groups through specially designed programmes had a positive effect. Despite all the initiatives, number of children particularly street children could not be enrolled in basic education. The challenges to face the special education for Orang Asli too needs a multi-dimensional approach that calls for attention to the curriculum, pedagogical skills of teachers, the socio-cultural environment and how to reduce the risk factor of this Orang Asli to drop out from school. But for sure, Malaysia is committed to reaching out to the poor and other disadvantaged groups for improving their access to quality education.

**Mazlan Samsudin**

*Institute Aminuddin Baki (NIEM)*

*Malaysian Ministry of Education*

*Kompleks Pendidikan Nilai*

*Malaysia*

*Email:mazlan@iab.edu.my*

## Education of Scheduled Tribes in India: Policies, Programmes and Progress

India has the single largest tribal population in the world numbering 102 million (2011 Census) while constituting 8.6 per cent of the total population of the country. They are recognised and listed as Scheduled Tribes (ST). Constitution of India envisages special measures for socio-economic development of STs. There are 574 individual tribal groups, with diverse socio-cultural life in different parts of the country. Most of the tribal communities have their own language that is different from the language spoken in the state where they live. There are more than 275 such tribal languages but without script. The tribes in India are at various levels of socio-economic development, with different degrees of exposure to modernity and social change. One of the distinguishing features is that the majority of them live in scattered and small habitations located in remote, hilly and forest areas of the country.

Recognizing that STs count among the most deprived and marginalized sections of Indian society, a host of welfare and developmental measures have been initiated for their social and economic development, particularly for their educational development. Special policies and programmes have been adopted to provide equal opportunity, to overcome socio-economic constraints and also to motivate people to participate in education. The policies and programmes include free education at all levels, flexible norms to provide access to schooling facilities, preference in appointing local teachers, provision of incentives and support materials, scholarships to overcome economic hurdles, special institutions like hostels and residential schools

Access to elementary education has significantly improved in tribal concentrated areas in most of the states, although there are variations among the states. Small size, poor quality and inadequate infrastructure, irregular attendance of teachers, a large gap between the number of children enrolled and the actual attendance of students characterizes the schools in tribal areas. The literacy rate among ST has increased steadily from 29.60 percent during 1991 to 58.96 percent in 2011. The educational progress of STs varies widely among different states and among different ethnic groups.

The content of textbooks, medium of instruction, the school schedule, vacation and holidays adopted in most

states remain far from the socio-cultural and linguistic needs of tribal people. Interestingly, majority of parents have significant levels of awareness about special provisions for education of the tribes and also on how education is important and beneficial to the children, family and the entire community at large. Their perceived returns from education include occupational mobility, the employment in government sector, economic development, better life style, social-upliftment, better ability to negotiate with developmental agencies and non-tribes. Ironically, despite parents attach such importance to education, they still could not dispense with the opportunity cost of children and engage the children in cattle - grazing, collection of forest produce, cultivation, household work, baby-sitting etc. Thus, parents could not show commitment towards the education of their children. The governments need to focus on improving the delivery mechanism of education and also a need to compensate the opportunity cost of their children.

The recent empirical research study conducted in nine states with predominantly tribal population highlights the perspective of tribal parents. Despite low levels of educations, most of the parents were well aware of the incentives, facilities and special provisions that are provided for education of their children. Tribal communities bestow high value towards education spelling out social, economic and psychological benefits to individuals, family and community. Parents also have evinced serious concern about inadequate and poor infrastructure facilities of schools, teachers' attitude and competencies and language issues in teaching their children. Despite having the awareness, parents failed to send their children to schools. The parents voiced several constraints with regard to the education of their children and suggested for improving financial incentives, providing attractive school environment including better infrastructure facilities, teaching in their language, close monitoring of functioning of teachers and schools etc.

**K. Sujatha**

**Aashna Kaur**

*NUEPA, New Delhi, India*

*Email: sujakalimili@yahoo.com*

## Education of Marginalised Groups: Policies, Programmes and Challenges in Indonesia

Indonesia is one of the most populous countries in the world, accounting for a total population of around 250 million, of which 60 percent live in Java Island. The rest of the population live in around 13.000 islands have over 700 languages and belong to 1.340 ethnic groups. Median age of the population is 28.2 years. By 2014, Indonesia's poor population i.e. those with per capita income of upto Rp 302.732 per month numbered 28.28 million (12%). In the context of the 30 percent of the population with the lowest well-being, there are about 75 million people who lived below the poor line. In order to cater to children's education, Indonesia has the formal and non-formal education systems. Based on Law No. 20 of 2003 on National Education System, the formal education starts with two years of pre-school, followed by six years of primary school, three years of junior secondary school (JSS), three years of senior secondary school (HSS), and up to nine years higher education (1 – 4 years' diploma programme, 4 years' bachelor degree, 2 years' master degree, 3 years' doctoral degree). Non-formal education is held equivalent to formal education.

Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) was 104.20 percent for SD/MI, 89.18 percent for SMP/MTs, 67.88 percent for SMA/SMK/MA, and at 18 percent for university level. Meanwhile, the Nett Enrolment Ratio (NER) was 92.43 percent for SD/MI; 70.73 percent for SMP/MTs, 51.35 percent for SMA/AMK/MA and 13.28 percent for university.

Marginalised groups in Indonesia are the people or community groups facing various types of difficulties covering economic, cultural, geographical, and other public services including education.

There are some policies to provide education for marginalized groups. These are: The Indonesian Constitution UUD 1945, Law No. 23 of 2002 on Child Protection, Law No. 20 of 2003 on The National Education System and the decrees from Ministry.

Many programmes have been launched to increase the number of children enrolled in education from among

marginalised groups. Such programmes include scholarships to poor students (BSM), Programme Retrieval, Indonesia Smart Card (KIP), School Operational Cost Assistance (BOS), Education Operational Cost Assistance (BOP), incentives for teachers in remote areas (Gudacil), a one-stop education development (SATAP), enacting a non school conventional (SMPT; Programme Packages A, B, C; "Sistem Guru Kunjung"; SD Pamong, SD Kecil), inclusive education, and Undergraduate Teaching in areas lagging behind, forefront, Remote (SM3T). Policies and programmes have reduced the burden of parents in financing their children's school education.

Economic factors of families poses a major constraint for marginalised groups to participate in education. Lack of proper road and transportation facilities, and the Government not fully meeting the expenditure on education in private schools by way of fees and other requirements result in children from marginalised groups not participating in education. Unequal distribution of teachers, both in a qualitative as well as quantitative sense, also is a cause of the participation deficit of children from marginalized groups in education. Meanwhile, from the government's side, the decentralization issue in education poses a challenge considering that sometimes the policies and programmes of the Central Government are not in line with those of the Local Government.

The new strategy to increase participation of marginalised groups in education is to start development from the suburbs, villages, remote areas, border, eastern Indonesia. These areas are the areas that are lagging behind in various sectors of development. The new President also launched the compulsory education until Senior Secondary level.

**Yendri Wirda**

*Center for Educational Policy Research*

*Jakarta, Indonesia*

*Email: yendriburhan@yahoo.com*

## Education Policies for Marginalized Groups in the Maldives

Maldives consists of 1192 islands grouped into ring-like atolls; 188 of these islands are currently inhabited with a population of 341,256. Over one-third of the population reside in the capital city of Male', an area that is less than two square kilometres. Due to the geographical nature and structure of the country, as well as its population distribution, Maldives faces unique challenges in providing services to the community, including that of education.

The education system in Maldives has undergone many changes through the years. Historically, Maldivian children would go to houses called 'edhuruge' where they would learn the national language 'Dhivehi' as well as Arabic. This semi-formal method of schooling was superseded in 1945 by traditional schools named 'maktab' in each inhabited island, which covered lower primary level education. In 1960, two English medium schools were established in the capital city of Male' and, in 1978, two government schools were established in each atoll.

Although there has been an increase in the number of educational institutions in the atolls, the two atoll schools in each region are still the best available options for students in those regions to attain high quality education. As such, children often travel from their resident island to the ruling atoll island in order to attend one of the two atoll schools. Furthermore, many families decide to move to the capital city of Male' and/or send their children to Male' in order to attain the best quality of education. Such migratory trends for the pursuit of education make these students more vulnerable, as they are forced to live away from their families which carry its own risks; young girls and women may also be placed at additional risk in such circumstances. Although there is no significant gender disparity in student enrolment in the country, the difficulties linked to travelling and/or moving to another island may reduce the options available for girls to get a better education. Consequently, young girls and women in rural

communities are a marginalized subset in terms of their access to education, and the regional disparities in education indicate that people living in rural communities are a marginalized group.

People living with disabilities are a marginalized group in Maldives, in terms of education. Special needs classes are provided in three public schools in the capital city, and special needs' units are found in atolls, which are overseen by the National Institute of Education (NIE) of Ministry of Education. However, early identification and comprehensive assessment of people living with disabilities are lacking in the country, which makes it more difficult for them to access specialized education services. As such, students go through the education system without getting the support that they need to excel in their studies.

Another group of students, who often do not get the support needed, are low achievers. Often, these students stop coming to school regularly and/or drop out of school altogether. There are no general policies in place for long-term absentees and there are difficulties in obtaining data about actions taken in cases of long-term absenteeism. The lack of guidelines in helping long-term absentees re-integrate into the education system is an obstacle for such students in attaining an education. This is also the case for juvenile delinquents, who struggle when they come back to school. The lack of school-based policies for such students hinders them from actively participating in class and as a result they often exhibit long-term absenteeism and low achievement. Consequently, students who are low achievers or long-term absentees are another group of marginalized people.

**Mariyam Faraha Amjad**

*UFAA Programme Office,  
Ministry of Education,  
Maldives*

*Email: mariyam.faraha@moe.gov.mv*

## Inclusive Education in Myanmar

The structure of the education system and the core responsibilities of the MoE are laid down in the Basic Education Law (1973). Basic education consists of primary, middle and high schools in a 5-4-2 structure. Primary education is of five years duration (Grades 1-5). Entry to primary school is at the age 5 years. However, in practice, there is both underage and overage enrollment, especially in rural schools. Middle schools (lower secondary) comprise four grades (6-9). High school (upper secondary) comprises grades 10-11. Thus, Basic Education in Myanmar is an 11-year cycle (not including ECE). According to 2014/15 data, over five million students were enrolled in primary schools and over 20 million in lower secondary schools. If upper secondary enrolment is included, about one million children are in Myanmar's basic education schools.

Based on the Salamanca Statement, Myanmar is now trying for the inclusion of these excluded groups like physically and intellectually-challenged children, children belonging to ethnic, linguistic and religious minorities, children living in poverty/slums, street children, victims of trafficking, drug addicted and children in correction centres, children affected by HIV, etc. and children with special needs.

According to the First Myanmar Basic Disability Survey (2008-2009), the national disability prevalence of Myanmar is 2.32 percent (1,276,000 persons) out of general population (about 51 million), and one in every two persons with disabilities (PWDs) has never attended schools. Myanmar has initiated inclusive education for children who are mentally or physically handicapped, deficient in sight and hearing, or socially excluded and those who have difficulty attending school or who have dropped out of school before completion of education. They are accepted in basic education schools as well as in the NFPE programme, at monastic schools in addition to special schools for the blind and the deaf. In academic year 2011-2012, there were 9,738 students with disabilities in basic education primary schools, 11,536 in basic education middle schools, and 47 in basic education high schools. If they live in a large

city, they may attend specialist government schools, which are well meaning but segregate them from their larger peer group. There is also the option for attending private schools, but in the absence of government financial support for either such children or such schools, the latter remain out of reach for most families. They may be allowed to attend mainstream schools, but there is no obligation and schools can refuse an entrant if they feel they cannot support them. If a child is accepted, then there is hardly any support given to schools have no funding or special training to genuinely accommodate those with disabilities.

Myanmar adopted all-inclusive education in 2001 and this policy was reinforced by Deputy Minister. The Education for All National Action plan, started in 2003, aimed for all children having access to free and compulsory education by 2015. It is clear that this goal has not been achieved. Moreover, Myanmar education system does not adequately provide for children with disabilities. A 2010 survey, conducted by the Ministry of Social Welfare, found that almost half of those with disabilities in Myanmar never attended school. Both regionally and globally, Myanmar is falling further and further behind on the issue. Poverty is a major challenge for Myanmar. Findings from the *Integrated Household Living Conditions Survey in Myanmar (2009-2010)* showed that 26 percent of the population is living below the national poverty line. The new government, which was formed in March 2011, has initiated reforms in various sectors. In June 2011, the government introduced a Rural Development and Poverty Alleviation Strategy, which reaffirmed the commitment to lower poverty levels from 26 percent to 16 percent by 2015 in line with the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 1. The newly-formed Myanmar Council for Persons with Disabilities, an independent body, appears set to become an important national voice, bringing together groups from around the country. The government appears supportive of disability rights and inclusive education. In 2011, it ratified the International Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which places disabilities and inclusive education within

a human rights context. In line with the Framework for Economic and Social Reform (FESR), which was formulated in 2013, educational reforms are being implemented. The government has increased education expenditure since academic year 2011-2012, while striving for free and compulsory primary education, and has launched free lower secondary education recently. A new law on the rights of persons with disabilities is being drafted in parliament, with inputs from disability activists, and is likely to incorporate inclusive education. There is also hope that the amended National Education Law will address the issue.

In conclusion, in view of the National EFA Goals and strategies, many education projects and activities have been implemented for the development of education sector. While focusing on 'free and compulsory primary

education' and 'free lower secondary education' at present, Myanmar will make continued efforts in future to improve access to quality education in accordance with the basic principles and policies laid down in the new National Education Law after it is enacted. Therefore, all the school age children, especially, marginalized groups will be able to study in compulsory primary education in coming years.

**Cho Cho Win**

*Yangon, Myanmar*

*Email: winwin2025@gmail.com*

## **Education of the Marginalised Groups in Nepal: Policies, Programmes and Challenges**

The statistics relating to enrolment and completion in different levels indicate serious disparities that exist between the privileged and under-privileged groups. The under-privileged groups comprise the socially-excluded and marginalized groups.

According to the National Population Census 2011, Nepal has a population of 26.49 millions comprising people from diverse social, cultural and ethnic backgrounds. The census identified 125 social groups, 100 languages, and 59 indigenous nationalities which were considered as the marginalized or disadvantaged groups from the mainstream of national development. This was based on indicators relating to population, language, access to education, economic conditions, social status, cultural and religious minorities, and geographical location. These have been categorized into five marginalized groups such as endangered, highly marginalized, marginalized, disadvantaged, and advanced groups.

The Constitution of Nepal (1990) ensures non-discrimination among citizens with regards to all services

and entitled rights, including the right to education. Based on the Constitutional proclamation against discrimination and the right to education, the government has declared different policies to provide the opportunity for education to the marginalized groups. Provision of free education, scholarship programme, food for education programme, oil distribution, child-friendly school environment are some of the major initiatives of the government to increase the enrolment of marginalized and girl children in school. In addition to these, alternative education provision, literacy classes and distance education are among the other initiatives that stand to benefit the marginalized and excluded groups. There are clear directives and mechanisms in place to implement the policies and programmes. Different level committees are envisaged for regulating the programme.

Non-formal education also plays an equally important role in increasing the literacy rate. This type of education is undertaken through conducting literacy classes, and through alternative modes particularly targeting the

marginalized and deprived groups as the Country's Human Development Index (HDI) is determined by educational status of the people.

There has been noted improvement in universal basic education in Nepal as adequate investment was made to creating child-friendly environment and sustainable improvement of access particularly for marginalized groups. Realizing the primary responsibilities of government to capacitate human resource development initiatives in the changed context, the government of Nepal has implemented various programmes such as extension of equitable access to education, quality improvement and capacity enhancement of marginalized people through the MOE and its line agencies. Important programmes that have been implemented for education access of marginalized groups are: basic or pre-primary education, early child development programme, community participation in school management scholarship programme at different levels for expanding equitable access of students from marginalized groups to improve the rate of retention and meaningful teaching opportunities for female and marginalized groups. Multi-lingual, multi-grade and multi-level teaching, open education, vocational education and training, food for education have been some of the strategies adopted.

With these policies and provisions, enrolment in pre-primary, primary and secondary levels has slightly increased. However the improvement in completion rate, continuation of education at different levels is yet to reach a satisfactory level. The attainment in the school varies across ecological belts, and from region to region as well as in different social groups. Even within the elite group too, girl children are deprived from education due to cultural beliefs, economic status, security perspectives are perpetuated as challenges of educational attainment in spite of underpin the government policies and programmes. Though the government has made efforts to attract the marginalized and excluded group, hand-to-mouth plight of poor families, access to school, quality education are other major challenges that inhibit the involvement of the group in the educational programme.

However, the experiences of the decade indicated that the achievement of the goals was not an easy task at

the implementation level. There remain some problems of improving access of marginalized groups to quality education like the inability to make education inclusive in line with expectation, lack of coordination in the work, highly politicized environment, and lack of reliable education statistics of the marginalized groups. The increasing concern for ensuring inclusive, equitable and quality education and making use of available opportunities are also not at a satisfactory level. It is strongly realized that more consolidated efforts and commitments are needed to achieve the goals and targets of education of marginalized groups. Thirteen Three Year Plan Approach Papers (2013/14-2016/17) emphasize on ensuring that all children of marginalized groups have quality primary education in a caring and joyful environment and receive primary education especially in their mother tongue without having to feel prejudices in the form of cultural, ethnic or caste discrimination. Besides, the Approach Papers also stress the need for schools and educational places to have gender balance in terms of teachers' posts and students' enrolment. It is envisioned that almost all adults will not only become literate but will also link education with a way of life by establishing inter-linkages between skill and work. This can be achieved through adopting a variety of appropriate vocations that are contextual and directly beneficial for the youth and adults.

The people belonging to marginalized communities constitute a larger proportion of the population. As such, the major challenges in meeting the goal of universal access to education include reaching out to marginalized and disadvantaged communities who inhabit in inaccessible areas, removal of inter-group disparities and addressing specific problems of different deprived groups, bonded labour, conflict affected people, endangered ethnic, occupational groups.

**Kabi Prasad Pokhrel**  
CERID, Kathmandu, Nepal  
Email- drkabipokhrel@gmail.com  
&  
**Devina Pradhanang**  
NCED, Kathmandu, Nepal  
Email: devina\_365@yahoo.com



## Marginalised Learners in the Philippines: A Slow Journey out of the Fringes

Throughout the developing world, considerable inequities exist with regards to access to quality of basic education, with students from poorer families, young people from the rural areas, and minority and specific ethnic groups often at most risk of being excluded from the system (UNESCO, 2010). Bringing education to these out-of-school and marginalized children is a major goal under EFA. In the Philippines, the reality that many segments of society are still marginalized and disadvantaged has posed serious challenges to the achievement of EFA. These are the children from the indigenous people, the Muslims, those from poverty-stricken families, the ones affected by natural disasters and conflicts, those with disabilities, the street children, the working children, those who live in remote areas, the ethno-linguistic minorities, and the migrants. Children from these sectors are prone to becoming unprepared for school, unschooled, insufficiently schooled, and poorly schooled.

The current overall Philippine policy environment for the education of the disadvantaged, however, is a supportive and enabling one. Relevant Philippine laws have laid the foundation for the adoption of a right-based approach in education that not only recognized education as a basic right of all citizens but also provided mechanisms for inclusive education, respect for cultural and religious differences, and the recognition of the unique learning needs of children in difficult or special circumstances. Numerous Department of Education's (Dep Ed) Orders of ranging from broad to specific policy statements have also underscored the government's resolve to provide all types of learners with access to education regardless of delivery mechanisms, address the disparity between girls and boys in school, protect the learners from all forms of abuse and bullying, and establish a conducive and child-friendly learning environment. Other programs were introduced to improve internal efficiency such that systems and processes at all levels get to be redefined, streamlined

and standardized. These reforms have put the welfare of the learners at the center. The government has also implemented convergent initiatives such as the Conditional Cash Transfer program that combine basic education, technical-vocational education, higher education and poverty alleviation into a single, quality-assured framework. These initiatives utilize an inter-agency approach in addressing specific sectoral problems. The Department of Education likewise advocates for community-based education activities and conducive learning environments through policies on child protection and on child-friendly school system, among many. Innovative and non-formal initiatives have also been instituted and upscaled by the Department of Education – some in partnership with non-government or private organizations — in order to reach out to more marginalized and underserved children. One of these is the *KaritonKlasrum* or the Pushcart Classroom as popularized by Efren Penaflorida, CNN's 2009 Hero of the Year.

There are also intensified efforts to implement the EFA catch-up or acceleration plan. This plan, as formulated and executed by the Department of Education has broad major strategies such as focusing on 'reaching the unreached' through special education delivery programs; adopting operational 'inclusive education' policy by establishing Madaris education as a sub-system in the current education system, and implementing the National Indigenous Peoples (IP) Education Policy Framework, among others; and broadening the reach of the Alternative Learning System (ALS).

However, despite all these policies and program initiatives, many children continue to suffer from their inherited disadvantages because structural disparities and unequal power relationships that are associated with wealth, ethnicity, language, disability, location/ geography and religion which are still not being

adequately addressed. As the population of the Philippines continues to rise, the number of poor families has as well. Poverty is aggravated by the onslaught of natural disasters and human-induced conflicts. The share for education relative to the GDP is still low. The implementation of the law and policies continues to be a challenge. Thus, in order to sustain and further the good initiatives and the gains thus far, the government and the many education stake

holders need to be committed in ensuring education quality, relevance, and more inclusive education.

***Elaissa Marina E. Mendoza***

*Senior Associate Research Studies Unit*

*SEAMEO - INNOTECH*

*Manila, Philippines*

*Email: lai@seameo-innotech.org*

## **National Means cum Merit (NMM) Scholarship Scheme: Alternative Action for Equity in Secondary Education**

The National Means-cum-Merit Scholarship Scheme (NMMSS) is one of the programmes initiated by the Ministry of Human Resource Development (2008), for the poorest of poor students studying in government and private aided schools, who excel and achieve outstanding academic performance. The scheme aims to motivate meritorious poor students to continue secondary and higher secondary education without drop-out.

Under the scheme, 100,000 scholarships are given to meritorious students whose parents' annual income is not more than INR 150,000. Under this scheme, each state and district are awarded fixed number of scholarships based on population size. Students who have obtained 50% or more marks in Grade VIII and hailing from lower income group families are eligible for entrance examination for the NMM scholarship. Those who clear the entrance test, have to apply through their school to state education department which in turn forwarded to the Ministry of Human Resource Development. The National Government prepares the final list of selected students and scholarship amount is paid through bank account. The selected student would get INR 6000 annually credited to the student's bank account on quarterly basis.

An evaluation study conducted in six selected states shows that offering the scholarships continuously for four consecutive years, enables the poorest of the poor students completing their school education successfully. Most of the students who received the scholarship utilized the amount on text books, stationary items and so on, which has direct effect on education performance of the student. Many of scholarship recipients performed better in public examination and joined in higher education. Some of the students save the scholarship money to pursue higher studies. The students felt that the scholarship helps to reduce economic burden of the parents. The scholarship scheme has reduced the dropout rate of secondary and senior secondary students. However, several issues and challenges including constraints in obtaining necessary documents, unawareness about the norms, local administrative issues delay the renewal of the scholarship. In view of limited number of scholarships, competition has increased and coaching for eligibility test has become common among the schools. Lack of adequate administrative system, delay in communication hamper the implementation of the scheme.

***V. P. S. Raju***

*NUEPA, New Delhi, India*

*Email: vpsraju@nuepa.org*

## **The Education of Marginalised Groups in South Korea: Policies, Programme and Challenges**

In Korea, the school system covers six years of elementary school, three years of middle school, three years of high school, and four years in university. The Nursery schools or kindergartens are operated for children aged 3 to 5 years and covering the pre-

elementary school period. There is also a provision for lifelong education after the higher education. With regard to education policies in Korea, elementary and middle school education are compulsory. In addition, the policy on the equalization of high schools has been enforced since 1974 for providing equal opportunity in education.

In Korea, marginalized groups include multi-cultural families, North Korean defectors, and the disabled, people from rural communities, maladjusted students, and low-income groups and so on.

The education of marginalized groups was not a matter of concern until 1990s. And subsequently, the term 'education welfare' has begun to be used. In the early 1990s, when the national income reached approximately \$5,000, education welfare policies started to be enforced with the objectives of fair distribution of education opportunities and compensation for marginalized groups. And, since 1997, after the foreign exchange crisis, education welfare policies supporting disadvantaged groups have been carried out continuously. Many policies for this purpose have been initiated by the government.

For the disabled, the Korean government has established and increased special education institutions, enhanced vocational education, and strengthened the system of special education administrative support centre. In addition, for the education of low-income families, the government has expanded support for industry-affiliated schools, classes and school expenses. The government has raised education awareness for educationally-alienated groups such as drop-out students, strengthened career path education for students not going to next-level-school, and offered supplementary classes for students with underachievement.

The reasons for being categorized as marginalized group in education are as follows:

- Given educational opportunities, their conditions or situations are unfavourable for their learning.
- There is little meaningful learning for them in the process of education; and as a result, they are likely to become academically underachieved, disadvantaged to attain fully and use their competencies from undergoing such processes of education. Not all the people from low income groups and people residing in rural areas can be considered as marginalized group for education. However, they are in a disadvantaged situation, especially during their childhood and adolescent phases.

The Korean government has been making sustained social and political efforts for marginalized groups. Nevertheless, many issues still remain. For example, the government still has to bear considerable social cost

due to unsatisfactory investigation and identification of current status or for the establishing of insufficient facilities and support systems and so on.

New strategies adopted to have equity and secure fairness in education include the Project for the Priority Region of Education Welfare Investment. The main task of this project is to provide programmes for learning, cultural experience, emotional psychological development, and caring services, based on the diagnosis of learners from marginalized groups.

The second strategy is the vitalization of environment and correspondence middle and high schools. In fact, many policies which help drop-out students to continue their studies have some limitations (despite their many positive functions), such as the limited budget or problems with recognition of the learning experiences.

Suggestions have been made to consider needs of individual child to provide meaningful learning experience.

Education of the marginalized groups should be addressed as a subject and not an object of the policy. One should understand education from their perspectives. Based on such understanding about their lifestyle or culture, we should help them to be respected and to experience meaningful learning.

Secondly, an integrated support system should be established. The Ministry of Education and Ministry of Health & Welfare have brought forward a variety of education and welfare policies in order to address the gaps in quality of educational opportunities and academic achievement.

Thirdly, the policies for marginalized groups should be established as a system, and not as a kind of project. Currently, identifying marginalized groups and providing support programmes are considered as an additional task. Necessary systems are to be instituted to help meaningful learning experiences for every student through after-school activities. It would promote mutual communication and integration of all the members of school. This is not only for disadvantaged learners but also for all the people in general. The fair system, that guarantees integrated relationships with mutual communication, would enhance public awareness as well as have a positive effect on the learner group.

**Park Kyun Yeal**  
KEDI, Seoul, Korea  
Email: pk724@kedi.re.kr

## Achieving Millennium Development Goal ( MDG ) : Elementary Education from Gender Perspective in India

Promoting gender equity in and through education has been a major concern since the year of 2000 to fulfil goal number three. It has been mentioned by a recent government report (2014), that, “MDGs have helped in bringing a much needed focus and pressure on basic development issues, which in turn led the governments at national and sub national levels to do better planning and implement more intensive policies and programmes. Government has made special provision for girls’ education by implementing special scheme like Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalaya (KGBV), the residential schools for drop-out girls in educationally backward areas in addition to free uniform, scholarship, MDM, textbooks, etc.

Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalaya (KGBV) scheme is being implemented in 28 States/UTs of India for educating adolescent girls. KGBVs provide for a minimum reservation of 75% seats for girls from SC/ST/OBC and minorities communities and 25% to girls from families that live below the poverty line. As many as 3,593 KGBVs were functional covering 0.3 million girls. Gender sensitisation of School Management Committees for tackling gender issues and making resources available for girls, developing gender friendly schools etc. are also being taken up by several states. Efforts are also being made to sensitise teachers particularly in educationally backward areas to address gender issues in classroom. All these initiatives might have impacted on girls’ enrolment and participation in schools.

A recent report tracking the progress of implementation of MDGs in India has mentioned that, “in respect of some indicators, India is expected to reach close to the target level by 2015 if not actually meet the target level like ratio of girls to boys in primary and secondary education. It is evident that, along with enrolment, the gender parity index (GPI) at the elementary level has shown gradual improvement over the years. However, as compared to primary and upper primary levels, the GPI at the secondary (0.90) and higher secondary levels (0.89) is much lower indicating less number of girls than boys at these levels.

Despite enormous expansion of the system and increased participation of children of 6-14 years age group, major challenge still remains to bridge the gender gap in different levels of education. Though girls are increasingly gaining physical access to schools, they become educationally disadvantaged in case these schools are not gender friendly and devoid of basic facilities i.e. girls’ toilets and female teachers.

*Madhumita Bandyopadhyay*

*NUEPA, New Delhi, India*

*Email: drbdmadhu@gmail.com*

### For further details on ANTRIEP activities contact

International Institute for Educational  
Planning (IIEP)  
7-9 Rue Eugene - Delacroix  
75116 PARIS, France  
Fax: + (33) 1 40728366  
E-mail: a.de.grauwe@iiep.unesco.org

National University of Educational Planning and  
Administration (NUEPA),  
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg  
NEW DELHI-110 016, India  
Fax: + (91 11) 26853041, 26865180  
E-mail: ksujatha@nuepa.org

## News From Member Insititutions ( July 2013 -December 2015 )

### **International Insititute for Educational Planning (IIEP)**

*Paris*

- In collaboration with the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), IIEP published in 2015 two updated guidelines to help ministries in charge of education transform their processes and operations to meet the challenges of a changing world.
- Advanced Training Programme (ATP) celebrated its 50th anniversary in 2015. This flagship 12-month course at the Master's level combines both the Education Sector Planning (ESP) course and the Specialized Courses Programme (SCP) to address issues of the entire education sector, focusing particularly on recent educational developments and reforms.
- IIEP launched a new research initiative in 2015 on teacher career structures and management. The overall goal of the research is to provide government policy-makers with a variety of policy options for how to better organize and manage teacher careers.
- Bringing together nearly 60 higher education experts and stakeholders from around the world, IIEP organized a Policy Forum in Paris on 'Planning Higher Education Integrity' in March 2015.
- Published in 2015 "Planning Education with and for Youth", which outlines the current obstacles facing youth participation, the many benefits of including youth and examples of how to leverage youth in the processes of educational planning.

### **IED, Aga Khan University,**

*Karachi*

- A research study on Role of Civil Society institutions (CIS) in Promoting Cultural Diversity and Pluralism in Chitral District of Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa. Was conducted to explore this relationship with a special focus on the contributions of CSIs in developing the concept of pluralism and acceptance of diversity in

the mountainous region of Chitral. The research evidences revealed that CSIs had a great contribution in improving infrastructure, enhancing economic conditions, capacity building of local people, developing awareness, and more importantly providing a plate-form for people from different geographic, ethnic, and religious backgrounds to work together on their common interests and needs.

### **Shanghai Institute of Human Development (SIHRD)**

*Shanghai, China*

- Entrusted by the Ministry of Education of P.R.C Shanghai Academy of Educational Sciences has developed indicator system and its' description, research report, analysis report on the national and provincial level, etc.
- Provided professional consultation on the adaptation and localization of toolkit for development of Child Friendly School program and implemented monitoring activities every six-month in 240 schools from the five counties that participated in the UNICEF program.
- Entrusted by the Department of Basic Education of the Ministry of Education, analyzed the status of education resource allocation for primary and secondary schools to check the disparity with the national standards and regulations, such as, the National Standard of Construction of Primary and Secondary Schools. The program used the school data from the national educational enrollment statistics, and it was a first attempt of its kind. The program estimated the extent of educational resources requirement

## SEAMEO-INNOTECH

*Manila, the Philippines*

- Thirty one school leaders from 10 SEAMEO countries attended *SEAMEO Educational Development Fund (SEDF) Program on Excellence in Managerial Leadership for School Heads in Southeast Asia*, held from 3 to 10 December 2015. The program aims to train the school heads, as well as those in the Ministry of Education, in the management of their school's finances, people, programs, and projects.
- 14<sup>th</sup> International Conference of SEAMEO-INNOTECH was organised 8-9<sup>th</sup> December, 2015 to bring together new ideas and diverse perspectives and experiences from education stakeholders in the region and beyond. The conference focused on the youth, hearing out their ideas on the current issues of education and possible ways to achieve education for all. A total of 140 participants representing 15 countries from all over the world joined the conference.

## Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI)

*Seoul, South Korea*

- Conducted a comparative study on "Space Organization of Middle School in Korea and Japan". The purpose of this study is trying to provide the development direction of subject classroom system in Korea by comparing and analyzing creating space and actual condition of subject classrooms in Japan. Unlike in Korea where the government adopts the subject classroom system to entire middle schools, in developed countries such as USA, Europe and Japan have experienced the subject classroom system for a long time. As shown on the survey about satisfaction, Korean students showed dissatisfaction about location of the classroom, width of corridor and storage space. Korean teachers evinced dissatisfaction with size of space, storage space, teaching aids and equipment.

- Conducted a study on "History and Conceptions of Liberal Education in France: From Liberal Arts to Civic Education". This study reviews the history and current landscape of the liberal education in France to uncover the fundamental conceptions employed as well as the implications for education in general. The study covers origin of the liberal education system in early French universities, and tracks its changes until the present.
- KEDI of Korea, the National Institute of Education Sciences of China, and National Institute for Educational Policy Research of Japan had signed Memorandum of Understanding during a meeting of leadership for educational cooperation on 25 November, 2015 in KEDI, Seoul, Korea.
- A delegation from Ethiopia had visited KEDI during 15<sup>th</sup> September, 2015.
- A delegation from Ministry of Education, Mongolia and Mongolian universities visited KEDI on March 19, 2014.

## National University of Educational Planning and Administration

*New Delhi, India*

- **National Awards for Innovations in Educational Administration:** NUEPA has instituted National Awards for Innovations in Educational Administration for District and Block Level Officers. The programme was launched in 2014 with the objective to recognise innovations in educational administration and management for improving the functioning of the public system of education; and to instil a sense of confidence among the education officers working at the field level. In 2015, 62 District and Block Education Officers have been given award. The selected innovations cover arrange of areas of educational administration form use ICT to resource mobilisation and community support system and improving teaching learning

and creating trust on public school system. The selected innovations were documented for dissemination. The national award function was preceded by a conference to share the innovations among large section of educational administrators.

- Launched Post Graduate Diploma in Educational Planning and Administration from 2014. The delivery of the Programme includes face to face training and distance mode online courses.
- XXXI th International Diploma in Educational Planning and Administration has been successfully completed and 29 participants from 14 countries attended the programme.
- National Centre for School Leadership has launched one year part time Diploma Programme on School Leadership.
- A Unit for School Standard and Evaluation (Shaal Siddhi) has been established in NUEPA by Ministry of Human Resource Development. A comprehensive and holistic school evaluation and School Standard and Evaluation Framework is being developed by identifying seven key performance areas and forty five core standards as reference points for evaluation and action for improvement. An interactive web portal has been developed to facilitate each school to provide consolidated evaluation report along with priority areas for improvement. The web portal also has facilities to receive feedback from parents and other stakeholders.
- The CPRHE has initiated several research projects on themes of Equity and Diversity; Financing; Governance and Management; Teaching - Learning; Quality; and Employability.
- The Centre has initiated two important publications series – a) an annual publication titled *The India Higher Education Report*; and b) *CPRHE Research Papers* series. The first in the series *India Higher Education Report 2015* is published in 2016.

- National Seminar on “People’s Participation and Decentralized Educational Governance: Policy Reforms and Programme Practices” was held in February, 2015. Researchers, Academicians, Administrators, NGO functionaries and State representatives participated in the Policy

**Faculty of Educational  
Leadership Development and  
Management (CELD),  
National Institute of Education**

*Colombo, Sri Lanka*

- To enhance the management and Leadership capacities of educational managers to strengthen and improve the quality of education, the Faculty of Educational Leadership Development and Management has restructured recently by adding Department of Professional Development and Educational Management, Department of Graduate Studies, South Asian Centre for Teacher Development and Aesthetic Academy. The main task of the faculty include conducting professional development courses ranging from M.S.C level to Diploma level.

Some of the important special programmes conducted were :

Principalship training programmes for principals and deputy principals of 1000 secondary schools; capacity building programmes for educational leaders, post graduate diploma in Education Administration for SLEAS officers and Bachelor of Education Management Degree (International).

## ANTRIEP Member Institutions

1. Academy of Educational Planning and Management (AEPAM), Ministry of Education, Taleemi Chowk, G-8/1, P.O. Box 1566, ISLAMABAD, Pakistan (<http://aepam.edu.pk>)
2. Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER), 19 Prospect Hill Road, Private Bag – 55, Camberwell, Melbourne, VICTORIA-3124, Australia ([www.acer.edu.au](http://www.acer.edu.au))
3. Balitbang Dikbud Centre for Policy Research (Puslit Penelitian), Office for Educational and Culture Research and Development (Balitbang Dikb) Ministry of Education and Culture, Jalan Jenderal Sudirman, Senayan, JAKARTA – 12041, Indonesia.
4. Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC) 75, Mohakhali Commercial Area, DHAKA – 1212, Bangladesh ([www.brac.net](http://www.brac.net))
5. Campaign for Popular Education (CAMPE), 5/14, Humayun Road, Mohammadpur, DHAKA – 1207, Bangladesh ([www.campebd.org](http://www.campebd.org))
6. Centre for Multi-Disciplinary Development Research (CMDR), D.B. Rodda Road, Jubilee Circle, DHARWARD - 380 001, Karnataka (INDIA) ([www.cmdr.co.in](http://www.cmdr.co.in))
7. Centre for Education Leadership Development, (CELD), National Institute of Education (NIE), Meepe Junction, Padukka, Sri Lanka ([www.nie.lk](http://www.nie.lk))
8. Institut Aminuddin Baki (National Institute of Educational Management), Ministry of Education, Sri Layang 69000, Genting Highland, PAHANG, Malaysia
9. International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), 7-9 rue Eugene-Delacroix, 75116 PARIS, France ([www.iiep.unesco.org](http://www.iiep.unesco.org))
10. Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI), 92-6 Umyeon-Dong, Seocho-Gu, SEOUL 137-791 KOREA, ([www.kedi.re.kr](http://www.kedi.re.kr))
11. National Academy for Educational Management (NAEM), Dhanmodi, DHAKA – 1205, Bangladesh ([www.naem.gov.bd](http://www.naem.gov.bd))
12. National Centre for Educational Development (NCED), Sanothimi, BHAKTAPUR 2050, Nepal ([www.nced.gov.np](http://www.nced.gov.np))
13. National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT), Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi - 110 016 (INDIA) ([www.ncert.nic.in](http://www.ncert.nic.in))
14. National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA), 17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi –110016, India ([www.nuepa.org](http://www.nuepa.org))
15. Research Centre for Educational Innovation and Development, Tribhuvan University, P.O. Box 2161, Balkhu, Kathmandu, Nepal, ([www.cerid.org](http://www.cerid.org))
16. Shanghai Institute of Human Resource Development (SIHRD), 21 North Cha Ling North Road SHANGHAI - 200 032, China
17. South-East Asian Ministers of Education Organisation Regional Centre for Educational Innovation and Technology, SEAMEO INNOTECH P.O. Box 207, Commonwealth Avenue, U.P. Diliman, Quezon City 1101, Philippines ([www.seameo-innotech.org](http://www.seameo-innotech.org))
18. State Institute of Educational Management & Training (SIEMAT), 25 P.C. Banerjee Road, Allenganj ALLAHABAD, Uttar Pradesh, India
19. The Aga Khan Education Service, Pakistan (AKES,P) House No.3 & 4, F-17/B, Block VII KDA Scheme 5, Clifton, Karachi-75600, Pakistan ([www.akdn.org/akes](http://www.akdn.org/akes))
20. The Aga Khan University-Institute for Educational Development, (AKU-IED), 1-5/B-VII, F. B. Area Karimabad, P.O. Box No.13688, Karachi-75950, Pakistan (<http://www.aku.edu>)

Edited by K. Sujatha on behalf of the Focal Point, ANTRIEP and published by the Registrar, National University of Educational Planning and Administration, 17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi - 110 016 and processed/printed by the Publication Unit, NUEPA at M/s Anil Offset & Packaging, New Rajinder Nagar, New Delhi-110060, India