



**Strategies to Achieve Pro-Poor Growth  
in Brazil, China, India and Europe:  
*The Case of the Education Sector***

International workshop, Berlin, 10–11 December 2009

## **Reflections on Day 2**

**Markus Loewe**

German Development Institute /  
Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE)

### **Questions of the day**



**1. Why do education policy outcomes and impacts differ substantially between countries / federal states – even when they are similar in terms of framework conditions, per-capita income and the level of education spending?**

**2. How can we avoid these effects?**

**Where do we move from here?**

*(this afternoon: group work)*

## Explanations (1): structure of education system



significant **private/public divide** intensifies gap in education outcomes

massive **decentralisation** has increased inequalities for two reasons:

divergence of state policy implementation between schools in different municipalities

coincidence of state and municipal schools

(municipal schools are not equally able/ willing to implement state education policies as federal and state schools)

lack of **vertical co-ordination** between different public administration bodies (e.g. different ministries responsible for education)

**multiple tier education system**

splitting students at very early age into different tracks providing for different education and employment opportunities

© 2009 d.r.e

3

## Explanations (2): priority of spending



**fast achievements in education quantity** have led to deteriorations in average education quality and particularly the distribution of quality education

lack of **pre-school education**

(which is particularly important for children with lower socio-economic or migration background)

lack of special support for **students with deficits** in teaching language

priority for primary, then secondary, then tertiary education

lack of **demand orientation** in curricula formulation

© 2009 d.r.e

4

## Explanations (3): monitoring



lack of well-defined quality standards of education /  
universal compliance to standards not well monitored

lack of control for corruption

lack of accountability in education policies

no transparency in policy formulation

tax payers -- who finance public education -- are not using it

users do not dare to criticize because they do not pay

lack of participation of pupils / parents in decision making at  
school and policy level

## Explanations (4): demand



demand for and interest in education among students

lack of information on labour market for policy makers and  
students

structure of demand

rate of return to education

## EXplanations (5): political framework



commitment of policy-makers

**ideology** (different parties)

necessity of **political legitimisation** by good education policies

determination of **individual policy makers**

© 2009 die

d·i·e



Deutsches Institut für  
Entwicklungspolitik German Development  
Institute

### Strategies to Achieve Pro-Poor Growth in Brazil, China, India and Europe: *The Case of the Education Sector*

International workshop, Berlin, 10–11 December 2009

## Working groups

**Markus Loewe**

German Development Institute /  
Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE)

© 2009 die

## working groups



### Group 1

What changes are needed for education policies to become more pro-growth and more pro-poor?

Why haven't these changes been made so far?

### Group 2

What are the main news from the workshop for education policy making?

What does it take to institutionalise a more pro-poor and pro-growth education policy making?

### Group 3

Which are the main factors making the implementation of education policies pro-poor (pro growth) or not?

To what degree can this insight be transferred to other policy fields?

***Thank you very much  
for your attention!***

**www.die-gdi.de**