

# **EDUCATION DATA QUALITY MEASUREMENT**

**Report from a workshop**

**13 – 14 January, 2009**

**Education Data and Policy Center  
Basic Education Coalition  
Washington, DC**

## **Acknowledgements**

This workshop was offered by the Basic Education Coalition (BEC), which is based in Washington, DC, and the Education and Data Policy Center (EPDC), which is based at the Academy for Educational Development (AED). The workshop was designed in response to emerging concerns around the world about how to measure outcomes and impact of investments in education, and particularly, Education for All (EFA). Support was provided by USAID's EGAT office and AED. Organization and other support were provided by EPDC.

This report was drafted by three people based on the input of all the participants: George Ingram of EPDC, Margaret Meagher of CARE, and Mary Joy Pigozzi of AED. The content comes from the participants who are listed in an attachment at the back. The three authors also wish to express their gratitude to Craig Smith and Sabrina Hervey, both of AED, for their support throughout the conference and in finalizing this report.

This report and the attachments may be downloaded from <http://epdc.org/workshops/MeasureQualityWorkshop.aspx/>.

## Table of Contents

Executive summary.....	ii
<b>1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Program description .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3 Processes for getting data that are analyzed in this report.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>4 Areas of Consensus .....</b>	<b>1</b>
4.1 <i>Build a stronger data culture in the education sector .....</i>	2
4.2 <i>Begin collaborative work on clarifying indicators and definitions .....</i>	4
4.3 <i>Find ways to include data on ALL learners.....</i>	5
4.4 <i>Take EFA Goal 3 Seriously.....</i>	6
4.5 <i>Support integrated, participatory, national development plans. ....</i>	7
4.6 <i>Focus on learning outcomes .....</i>	8
4.7 <i>Further explore the utility of projection models.....</i>	9
<b>5 Conclusions.....</b>	<b>11</b>

### Attachments

<b>1 List of participants</b>	
<b>2 Program and presenters</b>	
<b>3 Data</b>	

## Executive summary

The text of this report is a brief summary of two days of intensive work by 65 specialists—in essence, more than 3 person months! The discussion pointed to the enormous need for different and better ways to address education data in its multitude of forms. Indicators remain elusive in terms of being sure that educators use the right ones for the right purposes and interpret their manipulation correctly.

There were two very strong admonitions that emerged from the workshop that should not come as a surprise—other than they are critical issues that remain to be addressed. These are to ensure that there is data available on all learners so that education is genuinely inclusive and for the education community to quickly and seriously focus on EFA goal 3 (access to learning and life skills).

Learning outcomes remain a priority across the globe, yet there is not a great deal of agreement about defining and assessing them. There are proponents of international tests, proponents of developing national testing systems, proponents of classroom continuous assessment, and proponents of developing a system that links multiple levels of testing. While it is recognized that these do not have to be mutually exclusive, there are opinions as to which should come first and significant concerns about the investments that doing any or all of these in a quality way would involve.

Projection models are seen as useful, but as only one tool that should be promoted for planning in education. There were more cautionary notes from the participants on this topic than on any of the others.

What does this mean for moving forward? While a number of issues remain to be addressed, it is clear from the workshop that several actions, some of which can be concurrent, can move the agenda forward. A few of these are:

- Undertake a series of actions to demonstrate the value of/demand for quality data. These could include a communications campaign, studies demonstrating the utility of data, and promotion of good data in documents such as the EFA Monitoring Report;
- Experiment with and document incentives and dissemination approaches to increase the use of data;
- Document how bottlenecks to a data culture have been overcome;
- Consider analytic capacity in education—what does it really mean? How is it developed? What mechanisms exist to put it in place?
- Conduct a serious debate on whether currently used indicators measure what we think they do. Considerations might include: 1) the meaning and cost of core indicators (to whom and at what cost?), 2) an indicators framework as an alternative to core indicators, and 3) how to engage in indicator definition and selection at the local level;
- Challenge data specialists on the uncounted;
- Begin work on EFA goal 3. This probably includes international debate on life skills, going beyond health-related skills to the full component of ‘21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills’;

- Document from various perspectives the advantages, disadvantages and costs of international learning achievement tests, national assessments, and continuous student assessment; and
- Identify good studies that address cause and effect in education so as to better inform the assumptions underlying projection models.

These are a few of the actions that, if taken seriously and shared in the education community and beyond, could quickly make a significant difference to education data quality measurement and use.

## **1 Introduction**

The purpose of the workshop was to reach a common understanding among diverse stakeholders and experts on the key issues in the measurement of education quality and actions needed to close the gaps in data, in order to provide policy makers with evidence-based guidance on identifying and securing the data needed to better understand results of development education sector support. The two-day workshop involved 65 experts in education and data with a diversity of backgrounds – from G8 donor agencies, international organizations, civil society organizations, academia, and business. The list of participants is provided in Attachment 1.

## **2 Program description**

The workshop was comprised of four half-day sessions. The four topics were:

- secondary data indicators of country-level education quality
- grade-level learning standards and measurement of learning outcomes
- human capital knowledge, skill, and education needs for growth and poverty reduction
- projected development impact of alternative education intervention

Each session was introduced by a panel of experts who made presentations based on current experience. The panels focused on critical and emerging problems that are being experienced in the education sector during implementation. Among the reasons for holding the seminar were concerns regarding decision-making that may not always be based on evidence; issues of accountability, especially where funds are pooled; donor-driven priorities; and a desire for cross-nationally comparable data and indicators. The program and presenters are contained in Attachment 2.

## **3 Processes for getting data that are analyzed in this report**

Each session was structured with a beginning plenary panel of experts addressing the data needs of the topic for that session, followed by small group discussion (six groups). Finally, the rapporteurs for each of the smaller discussion groups met to consolidate the reports (recorded on data item cards in each small group), and a single report was presented back to plenary. The process for consolidating the reports from the six discussion groups involved the six rapporteurs identifying common subject matters and integrating the relevant recommendations, findings, comments, and cautions under each topic. It is this ordering of comments from the small group discussions, put forward as recommendations that reflect consensus, which was used in the construction of this report. The consolidated recommendations from each session were vetted by the plenary.

## **4 Areas of Consensus**

The detailed data on which this part of the report is based maybe found in attachment 3 where the data are provided by session and listed in order of frequency of comments. What emerged

from the four sessions were seven (7) key themes that the participants considered as priorities for the international community to consider and act on so as to be better partners on the ground, to use resources more effectively, and to be more accountable, both in terms of spending and in terms of making well-considered decisions.

Several areas emerged from more than one session. These are consolidated in this part of the report. The report also breaks some of the topics down into sub-topics with a view to increasing understanding and to facilitating action. The areas are listed in order of the frequency in which they came up—this is not necessarily the order in which they might be addressed as action items. Participants were invited to cost their recommendations, but few costings were provided.

In the final wrap-up it was clear that while the group saw challenges, members saw no insurmountable barriers. They raised many issues and qualifiers, especially on topics where there were tensions resulting from different approaches or perspectives. These are included as cautionary notes.

#### **4.1 Build a stronger data culture in the education sector**

The participants were in agreement that a starting point for enhancing evidence-based policy making is developing a culture in support of and demand for the collection and use of data. Such culture and demand need to encompass the full range of stakeholders, from the ministries of education to the community level.

A point the participants felt was essential was to increase **data access and availability** generally, and especially with regard to civil society, which could influence the demand for data, data quality, and accountability in its analysis and reporting. Part of the process of building a culture of data is creating an understanding of the value of sharing data and information, and of constructing accessible knowledge management (vs. simply “data”) systems.

It is important to **close the knowledge gaps on cause-effect relationships** between various elements of, and inputs to, education, as well as the impact education can have on development in different country contexts. A dedicated task force or think tank – combining policy makers, practitioners, and academics – could be convened to think creatively about what gaps in education data and knowledge of drivers need to be filled over the next five-ten years such that, in time, more accurate projection models can be developed. Use of models can also help to identify gaps and problems with data, and determine whether it is cost-justified to invest to improve the quality of data and data collection.

While all countries do have data, there was a general call to increase **data collection and use** with a general sense that how the data is used is as important as the data itself. A country’s development plan ought to articulate the goals and needs that will serve as a guide to determine what data is needed. This objective can be advanced by studying the factors that have led to increased use and consumption of education data and the accompanying incentives. A comparative analysis of existing data collection instruments can help inform whether agreement

can be reached on a core set of indicators and other issues related to the use and validity of models.

There were several suggestions on the ways to increase attention to using data, particularly with regard to the role of the international community. For example, the G8 should be a major consumer of data for evidence-based decision-making and seek guidance on the importance of and ways of using education indicators, and should require setting clear standards and frameworks. The international donor community can work to standardize the approach to collection of data on school management and other issues. It also can support indigenous reform-oriented civil society organizations to collect and use data and increase national accountability.

Decision makers must come to understand the value of data, and **incentives** must be created to raise the motivation to use data. Incentives to collect, report, and use data on education indicators will differ among stakeholders – the benefit to international, national, and local stakeholders will differ and will influence the nature of the incentives.

Incentives to get buy-in can include: demonstrating how student performance can serve to attract investment and link the interests of the ministry of labor to the education system; demonstrating the relevance of sub-national data; conditioning assistance; creating case studies on the value of assessment and its use by civil society organizations; linking improved learning outcomes to benefits in local economies, health, stability and/or overall quality of life; and making assessment tools simple and use of outcomes locally relevant.

It is also important to develop methods for **dissemination** of data and analysis to different stakeholders. This should include using information from teachers in school evaluations on student learning more effectively (e.g. link to continuous assessment at the learner level). Finally, it is important to the establishment of a “culture of data” to disseminate information on existing data sets and repositories, develop a communication strategy, and create appropriate presentation formats for different audiences

With regard to data **analysis**, two key points were made. Good studies and analysis are as important as the data itself, and duplication of effort in data processing and representation must be minimized. It was also suggested that data and its analyses must be presented in “easy-to-read” formats. Funding support for data presentation, visualization, and dissemination needs to be found.

The **capacity** of national entities -- statisticians, politicians, media, business community, civil society -- to collect, process, and use education data should be strengthened. A network of sub-regionally focused “help desks” may be one constructive approach to pilot in order to provide capacity building and assistance to governments and civil society for improved appreciation and use of data and projection models.

Cautionary notes:

- Efforts to improve data use and collection need to account for the Fast Track Initiative (FTI) and other frameworks.

- Bottlenecks include: inadequate local capacity, costs, existing norms and data cultures, tensions between national and international norms, tensions between country ownership and international demand, disincentives created by high stakes indicators, the difficulty of developing incentives for domestic entities to provide data, and political commitment.
- Even household surveys typically do not reach the poorest of the poor – marginalized groups need special attention.
- Obstacles to developing a culture of data include: reluctance to share data; difficulty in communicating the results; limited time and resources; country reluctance to participate in some kinds of testing; concern with the utility of international/national data other than mean score.
- Providing the different kinds of data for different levels of use could be a challenge.
- Collecting data on non-formal education will be very difficult.
- Absence of a culture of using evidence-based approaches, and concern over intellectual property and reluctance to share data, are constraints to the validity and use of models and to convincing people to contribute to a clearinghouse of impact studies.

#### 4.2 Begin collaborative work on clarifying indicators and definitions

There is a strong imperative to bring clarity to education indicators, but there is some tension around what it is about education indicators that should be clarified. This cluster of data from the groups included recommendations on collaborative efforts toward core/ common indicators; simple, common indicators; relevance/ linkages to local context/ capacities; and increasing capacity around data in countries. Because of the tension, the recommendations do not necessarily follow one from the other.

Among the participants there was significant interest in arriving at a set of **global core indicators**. This interest was not unanimous, however. The suggestion was that a panel of experts could identify 20-30 indicators on which data could be collected on a cyclical basis. There was a general consensus that a few indicators need to serve as a foundational or common core. Although there are promising efforts across several organizations in this direction, including a high level working group recently formed by UNESCO, much remains to be done. One aspect of this would be to strengthen the role of UNESCO and its working group.

Among the remaining tasks is the major one of agreement on the key indicators to use, **their definition, and an understanding of their proper use**. This calls for a serious research and consensus building agenda across stakeholders (e.g., policy-makers; development practitioners; educators; economists; civil society and the business community). The agenda would involve better analysis of existing indicators.

This work should be guided by the concepts of simplicity and local relevance. The indicator framework must be kept simple but flexible so as to be relevant to different regions, populations, districts, communities, etc. Data quality and capacity/systems should be developed through institutions at the regional and national level.

Concern with **local relevance** raised equally strong interest among the participants—that indicators should be meaningful at the village level. Several related issues emerged. First, rather than specific core indicators, albeit difficult, having a **standard framework of indicators** is important. It was suggested that reviewing best practices as well as global frameworks of educational quality could help develop the indicator framework. This led to the argument that, perhaps, the indicator framework developed should be regionally-based rather than global.

A second area of concern regarding local relevance related to the need to focus at every level—village or global — on the **meaning of indicators**. In this regard, three specific sub-issues were raised. There is concern that an indicator be seen and used not just as a metric but as something that has particular significance (akin to the difference between information and knowledge). In addition, current emphasis on comparability means that sometimes there tends to be a ritualistic use of indicators for project-based monitoring or reporting rather than using the resultant data to improve such things as program performance or learning achievement. And, finally, the difficult question of what proxy indicators correlate with specific positive learning outcomes was raised but not addressed in detail.

There was agreement on some of the difficulties existing at country level with regard to indicators. Lack of capacity or other problems suggest the need to include a study of bottlenecks to data collection and availability. In this regard, agreement is needed on the expertise and experience required to generate standardized definitions for education statistics.

Cautionary notes:

- What is the ultimate value of investing in a common set of indicators – can outcomes and inputs be linked worldwide?
- Segmentation of data by sub-national regions might not yield expected results.

### **4.3 Find ways to include data on ALL learners**

Three areas of concern were outlined by the participants. Existing data sources need to be better mined for information on marginalized children, including such data as expenditures by households that can be captured through household surveys.

This is not sufficient, however, as most existing education data collection instruments miss marginalized populations such as pastoralists, the homeless, and refugees. As a result, most education data only represent those who are enrolled in school and not those of school age who are not reached. Additionally, existing and new data endeavors need to collect data on all learners, not just those in school, including adult learners. Household surveys offer promise in addressing this shortcoming but need to have regular, standardized questions on education.

Cautionary note:

- The evaluation community needs lower cost means to gather and incorporate data about hard-to-reach communities and population groups.

#### 4.4 Take EFA Goal 3 Seriously

EFA goal number three—to promote learning and life skills for young people and adults – is a critical goal that has been largely ignored in the efforts to achieve the EFA goals. It needs to be taken more seriously because of its importance. It is significant because it speaks to the key set of knowledge, skills or competencies, attitudes, and behaviors that are essential for life and for learning throughout life.

There are certainly several reasons why it has not been sufficiently addressed, but among participants there was a sense that promoting EFA goal 3 is made problematic by the fact that UNESCO and ministries of education do not have adequate tools in the area of skills development and are compromised by the absence of relevant data.

With regard to data, it is important to determine what data is required, what data already exists, and what new data is needed. The issue of absence of data points to a larger issue that emerged and that is also listed below under the cautionary notes, but is one that rests at analytic/philosophical levels as well. That is, there is considerable debate around the purposes of education. One of the major divides in this debate is between those who see education as having many purposes, including having value in its own right, and those who see the primary (or only) purpose of education as a driver of economic growth. In this regard, there is a fundamental difference in the way the term “skills” is defined.

Acknowledging the above difficulties, the participants suggested a possible way forward. They recommended first steps to include several concrete proposals that could be undertaken, at least partially concurrently:

- A group of experts could be tasked with developing consensus on defining life skills and how to measure them<sup>1</sup>. Going back to the importance of understanding the concept, however, was a desire on the part of participants to underscore that it is important to first get the basics correct, e.g., literacy, numeracy, problem solving.
- Another useful action would be to research countries that have benefited (economically or otherwise) from a concerted focus on skills development (broadly defined) and analyze how they did so. Further research is needed on how to easily measure soft skills such as learning agility required for life-long learning.
- Those concerned with the relationship between education and economic growth argued for a measure of employability such as KLEMS (Kapital, Labor, Energy, Intermediate Materials Scale), and also proposed that an indicator on education could be included in the annual World Bank report *Doing Business*.

Cautionary notes:

- Be wary of trying to engineer a central worker skills development plan.
- Tensions exist between proponents of Educational for All, with a focus on relevant, quality education as a basic human right, and proponents of Education for “What,” with a focus on education to develop skills to serve the global labor market.

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that UNESCO has led a group that began this task several years ago as an inter-agency activity.

- In-country operational obstacles between education and employment, e.g., between business and government, and within government—between ministries of education and labor, for example—need to be broken down. Examples of public/private partnerships can be used to identify how to link education to employment, economic growth, and to generate skills.
- Attention must be paid to the structure of the labor market in both the formal and informal sectors. The informal sector needs to be linked into existing training infrastructure.
- Breaking down the obstacles between education and employment is made difficult by: the cost of scaling up pilot programs on skills development; connecting the business community to the formal education system; the gap between the classroom and reality of the workplace – between skill needs and development; and the time needed to create successful public/private partnerships.
- Existing vocational education systems lack capacity to provide “employability” skills.

#### **4.5 Support integrated, participatory, national development plans.**

The discussions about data, and its ownership and use, raised the question of the roles and responsibilities of “outsiders” in relation to national data issues. There was a strong emphasis on the importance of country-led activities that take place under a national education strategy that is developed and implemented by nationals.

The components of a national education strategy, and a government’s role in economic growth, including the enabling environment, should be framed within the larger development goals of a country. Ideally, a national development plan should be created through a national inter-sectoral and multi-stakeholder dialogue. This dialogue should be evidence-based through access to relevant data, solid research and analysis, including in-depth analytic work to assess binding constraints to economic growth and evaluate policy decisions pertaining to education in the short-, medium-, and long-term. The dialogue should produce a model for a national development plan that identifies key roles of the education sector and other sectors in continued growth, and clarifies operational definitions and the functions of different stakeholders. Learning assessment is a critical component of a national education plan.

The requirements for data should flow from the national development plan, which should include articulation of the need for regularly updated statistics. The data could populate a decision logic model for the plan. Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) are prior efforts at national plans that were not sufficiently embedded in the countries. The international donor community should help resource the development of national development plans.

Cautionary notes:

- Expect a gap between expectations and performance;
- The inter-sectoral, multi-stakeholder process will be complex;
- The plan and process must be country driven;
- Strong leadership and political muscle are required to keep the process on track.

## 4.6 Focus on learning outcomes

As with the discussion of EFA goal 3 (See 4.4), this topic was one that surfaced at least two key tensions. The first instance is between strong interest in having all countries participate in internationally comparable assessments and equally strong support for countries developing robust national assessment systems that are linked to continuous assessment in the classroom. The second tension relates to the high value that some attach to the importance of linking assessment data to human rights, enabling comparisons that raise issues of equity and other concerns, and promoting the use of such data for rights-based public dialogue.

The other main areas around which the discussion focused were building local capacity, ownership, and accountability. Not surprisingly, there were significant overlaps with the topic of data culture, particularly with regard to building a culture of assessment, which is discussed here.

Promoting an understanding and appreciation of learning assessment is an important part of developing a culture of data. A **culture of assessment** can be promoted through an international program of benchmarking that can lead to a policy dialogue with government. Part of this effort could be identification of an indicator of the availability and application of diagnostic/continuous assessment (discussed below). Development of national assessment plans and capabilities can be supported through regional pools of technical and policy support and should involve a range of stakeholders. Donor investment in national tools and capacity can help promote a culture of monitoring and evaluating student learning. A useful tool would be a typology of data gaps and the drivers behind those gaps in order to understand why particular countries do not participate in broad-scale learning assessments

Two different views of the relationship between **international and national level learning assessments** emerged from the discussions. One perspective was that the international community must garner the evidence as to the local, regional, national, and international benefits of assessment and encourage and support countries to participate in use of regional and international assessment instrumentation as training and capacity building for national efforts. It was also argued, however, that country comparisons inherently limit learning to what is measured in exogenously driven assessments and are not useful for national policy.

An alternative perspective was that the international community can help countries transition into participating in international/regional assessments through sub-national and national assessment, expanding the base of familiarity with these instruments, developing an appreciation for assessing learning, and providing local training and technical assistance. It is important to focus attention on the purposes and outcomes of multiple levels of assessment and to acknowledge that, while the purposes and utilities of data will vary across levels (e.g. enhancing policy at the national level compared with improving teaching pedagogies and methodologies at the teacher and learner levels), the overall benefit of improved education data is universal. Further, assessment should be the focus of attention in early grades/ developmental levels in any national education system.

Additionally, the national assessment structure should include or be coupled with assessment at the level of the classroom and learner for **continuous assessment**. Participation in international and/or regional assessment should be encouraged, and instruments from these levels may be adapted for classroom-based continuous assessment. Assessment of the quality of student learning should target literacy and numeracy, but also cover life skills and a wide range of cognitive processes. Assessment tools should be grounded through a national dialogue on life skills and learning outcomes. By linking processes to all levels, communities can demand appropriate, relevant assessments aligned with improving learning outcomes.

Creating the **capacity** to use learning assessment information is the most critical part of the process. The level of effort required to achieve this goal should not be underestimated. Enhancing ownership of data, which will help improve its use and impact, can be achieved through participation in developing national assessment instruments; coupling these with tools for continuous assessment at the learner level (see above); demonstrating the relevance of the data at multiple levels; and helping countries define relevant subgroups.

While international assessment instruments can serve as tools for learning about assessment, and regional assessments can be useful as a starting point, capacities for national assessment should become the norm. The international community should encourage and support capacities for national systems of measuring learning outcomes.

Assessment systems must be **accountable**. The data and assessment structures must be transparent and accessible. Accountability can include random observation of conditions in schools through quick surveys and reports on schools. The international community should provide a catalogue of best practices.

Cautionary notes:

- Flexible means of funding assessment efforts must be found that allow for changing circumstances and identifying gaps over time.
- Funding for work on assessments should be based on data, open competition, and formula funding.
- Development of assessment involves not only good psychometrics, but also is influenced by political perspectives and interests.
- There may be disinterest in admitting equity and patronage issues.
- Do not leave out the early primary school population.
- Conditionality is problematic; it needs to involve more than just the international community demanding good assessment.
- Relevance for FTI—regional and international assessments are on set cycles, that need to be planned and budgeted for.

#### **4.7 Further explore the utility of projection models.**

Projection models can be very useful, but they must be rigorous in their conceptualization and construction, be linked to an implementation plan, and treated as but one component in a planning toolbox that includes negotiations, workshops, and consensus building. Presentation of

projections should be accompanied by baseline data, disclosure of their hypothetical nature and the underlying assumptions of cause and effect and the data quality, and an easy-to-understand explanation of the drivers of change. It must be understood that projections that suggest particular results or impact do not guarantee results—with models one needs to recognize a degree of uncertainty.

Education projections and the use of models should begin with a consensus picture of where a country wants to be developmentally and include both solid historic trend data and realistic analysis. Key pre-conditions for useful models are (1) the evidence-based underlying theory, (2) solid cause and effect assumptions, and (3) access to and use of good data. During the design phase of education models, a useful guide would be analysis of how data is used in high-performing countries in education-for-development decision making processes. Better understanding of learning outcomes, both qualitative and quantitative, needs to be integrated into education projection models if the estimation of impacts is to be credible.

This leads to a conclusion that the most pertinent aspect of modeling is the skills and attitudes of the users. It is important to teach users not just how to operate models, but also to ask the right questions and to employ skepticism to better strengthen the model's potential to predict more accurately.

There was a general sense that it is valuable for the professional development community to advance the use of projection models, but not without some caveats. The need to use existing research, as well as better assessment and impact studies, to inform assumptions and relationships was seen as a high priority. Another emphasis was the importance of including better data. This being said, it is also necessary to recognize that there is likely to be a threshold of diminishing returns if ongoing refinement of predictive models is not sustained. Models must be revisited regularly to validate their cause and effect assumptions and to be tailored to different country contexts and vetted at the country level.

A useful contribution to good modeling would be a clearinghouse that brings together in one place existing impact studies that can provide useful information on the coefficients needed for reliable projections. Once successfully developed, projection models need to be made easily accessible to policymakers, donors, and education practitioners as part of education reform packages.

Cautionary notes:

- Models have difficulty reflecting context-specific reality and do not include an explanation of how variables are weighted.
- It is important to understand a model and what is behind it.
- The lower into the education system the model reaches, the more useful the information.
- For maximum accuracy, it is important that education impact projection models incorporate data on the hardest to reach populations and accordingly adapt tools and methods to account for marginalized populations.
- Projections may omit important contextual information or additional information on intervening and confounding variables that affect outcomes, and alternately, simplistic models provide too little information.

- Forecasting potential impacts of education too far into the future is less useful.
- Projections are vulnerable to misuse, including political manipulation.
- Models are only as good as the cause-effect assumptions underlying them, and the data (timely and relevant) that go into them.
- Effective use of an education impact projection model will require ownership at the local level and a local champion/home.
- Projections are limited by the validity of the drivers of decisions and the quality of the data. To improve the predictive validity of models, change should be triangulated and verified by other data sources.

## 5 Conclusions

A number of conclusions can be drawn from this workshop. Three of the key ones are that data and its quality is increasingly important (for both technical and political reasons); that there is no shortage of work to be done by all partners at all levels; and that costing our recommendations in the short time period was close to impossible.

While the Executive Summary suggests some of the areas where it is possible to begin work to advance the agenda of improving the quality of the measurement of education data, there are also several topics that deserve serious, ongoing reflection, a few of which are outlined in this conclusion.

There is an underlying tension regarding the question of data/indicators/frameworks for *whom* and for *what* purposes. Different perspectives on the related issues may all have sound arguments, but it has to be recognized that the underpinnings of the perspective will determine the desired outcome and the approach taken to reach it.

This tension leads to considerations of the respective roles of host countries, other partners, and how decisions are made regarding the allocation of national resources. Linked to this, is how decisions are made regarding the allocation of external resources if host country and external partner priorities are not sufficiently aligned.

In turn, this points to issues around “negotiated agreement,” in terms of both priorities and perspectives. It would seem that there is a lot of work to be done in this domain, and that determining who to include at the table to participate in this conversation would require significant reflection and openness.

As the reader considers the range of opportunities for action that emerged from the workshop, it becomes very clear that certain kinds of actions require significant planning and lead time. This could be a major constraint if short term timelines are a reality. There are other actions that could begin and could yield some results both short term and for the longer term. Some of these are addressed in the Executive Summary.

A final and significant conclusion; while there is recognition of the need for and importance of capacity development, the participants were unanimous in the importance of “getting it right.” There was little interest in training programs as exogenous capacity development and a major

interest in learning by doing the real work based on endogenous demand driven from the country (defined broadly) and not donors.