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I. Introduction:

CRC. General Principles and Articles 28. and 29. “Education as a Basic Human Right”

The issue: Between 2 to 10 % of children at compulsory elementary school age are excluded and not benefiting from education.

CEE/CIS (Central and Eastern Europe and Commonwealth of Independent States):
29 countries

All of the countries in the region, with the exception of Turkey, have undergone a major transformation since the 1990s mainly associated with political, social, and economic transition, war and conflict in the region, desegregation of the Soviet Union economic transformation and by difficulties in gaining access to new markets. The education system was not spared. Economic pressures and poverty have shifted the focus of the states and the families from education towards survival. Education was given much less priority than before.

As a consequence of the situation, GDP decreased significantly in 1990s. Some improvements started as of the year 2000 with GDP per capita growth ranging from 5.4% in Bosnia and Herzegovina to 10.1% in Georgia in 2004-2005 year, there has also been a case of negative GDP growth (-0.5% in Kosovo in 2002-2003), but however it is still very low as shown in the graph below.¹:

![Figure 1.3: GDP per head US$ PPP, 2005](image)

Source: IMF World Economic Outlook database.

Growth in output and in average income per head has, however, been accompanied by a spectacular increase in inequality in many countries, as Figure 1.4 shows. These data

---

¹ All data are based on the Education for Some More Than Others, UNICEF Regional Study, 2007.
should be treated with caution, since they come from differing original sources with differing definitions, but the picture they give is consistent with what can be observed on the ground. The growth in inequality, was the first fruit of the transition for many middle-income and low-income CIS countries. For the Central and Eastern European and Baltic countries that have joined the EU, inequality advanced more gradually but has accelerated in recent years.

Figure 1.4: Trends in inequality - Gini coefficients, 1989 & 2004

Source: For Russia, Mitra and Yemtsov (2006: Table 1); for other countries, TransMONEE database.

Especially in the poorest countries, there is a pattern of poverty-based exclusion from primary education, a pattern that is made to look respectable by policies of privatization, decentralization, and parental choice.

**Birth Registration:**

The CEE/CIS region has always presented relatively high birth registration figures. However, there continue to be certain population pockets in which lower proportions of children are registered. (Right at Birth: UNICEF CEE/CIS Regional Study, 2008)

**Preschool Education**

Preschool education is still satisfactory in most countries as a heritage of the previous system, however it varies between countries (10% in Macedonia, 25% in Turkey and 85% in Belarus). It is particularly low for the most disadvantaged groups who would benefit most (34% for average versus 3,9% for Roma children, in Serbia MICS 2005).

Some progress was made in the **provision of pre-primary education** between 1999 and 2005, with increases in the average pre-primary GER from 49% to 59% in Central and Eastern Europe and from 22% to 28% in Central Asia.
Primary Education

All countries on average have managed to revive their basic education enrolment rates, after initial falls, to around or above their 1989 levels, as Figure 3.3 shows. Most of the EU member and candidate countries have gross rates of over 100 per cent (as does Russia). In the other sub-regions, all countries report rates of 94 per cent or more, except Bosnia/Herzegovina (85 per cent), Armenia (87 per cent) and Turkmenistan (80 per cent).

Although there is almost a full coverage in primary education, between 2 to 10 percent of children are out of school. These percentages are constant over decades and the real
situation might be even worse considering the available data is based on the sources collected through the official records of the institutions.

According to the Regional Overview on CEE and Central Asia from the 2008 UNESCO Global Monitoring Report.

- Central and Eastern Europe had around 1.9 million **out-of-school children** and Central Asia about 380,000 in 2005.
- More than 80% of **children not enrolled in school** in that region are found in the Russian Federation, Turkey and Ukraine. With more than 900,000 out-of-school children in 2005, Turkey alone accounted for about half the region’s children not in school.
- In addition to gender, **characteristics** such as place of residence, household income, ethnicity and disability significantly affect the likelihood of children having access to school.
- Some **gender disparities** remain, particularly at secondary level, in Albania, Bulgaria, Mongolia, Turkey, Tajikistan and Ukraine. For example, in Turkey and Tajikistan, many more boys than girls were enrolled in secondary education in 2005 (GPI of GER 0.82 and 0.83, respectively).

**Who are the children left behind?**

- Children in poverty
- Children with disabilities
- Ethnic minorities/children who do not master language of instruction
- Refugees/ IDPs/asylum seekers
- Children who are not enrolled on the right age
- Children without birth registration
- Children living in rural/remote areas, particularly girls
- Children at risk (working children, children in conflict with the law)

Children with disabilities and Roma children are among the most deprived. All across the region less than 80% do not complete primary education. (Roma Education Fund-REF, 2007)

As a consequences of conflict in the region and economic instability, there is a high number of refugees, IDPs, and children who leave the school to work.


As per problem tree analysis, following root causes were identified:
- State in transition/Fragile state
- Unstable political environment
- Poverty (hard to reach services)
- Non-existence/weak legal/operational framework and regularity mechanisms
- Non-existence/weak desegregated data and tracking system.

II. Policy Options:

- Relevant policy framework to address the issue of exclusion developed/harmonized/adopted
- Information data base on excluded children and resources in place/improved
- Universal birth registration system enhanced
- Pre-primary education is enhanced
- Second chance education provided
- Schools are fully accountable for quality education of all children, not only those enrolled
- Access to basic social and health services for excluded children improved and intersectoral cooperation in place
- Economic incentives/affirmative measures introduced
- Community participation increased and formulated through legal and administrative mechanisms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
<th>Hard to implement</th>
<th>Easy to implement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low cost</td>
<td>High cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Impact</td>
<td>• Relevant policy framework to address the issue of exclusion developed or harmonized/adopted</td>
<td>• Pre-primary education is enhanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Economic incentives/affirmative measures introduced</td>
<td>• Second chance education provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to basic social and health services for excluded children improved and</td>
<td>• Information data based on excluded children and resources in place/improved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
intersectoral cooperation in place
- Community participation increased and formulated through legal and administrative mechanisms.

**Low Impact**

### III. Key Strategies and Interventions:

- Advocacy to keep the out-of-school children high on the social and political agenda
- Strengthening public/private partnership including civil society
- Setting up the system for capacity development of duty bearers and linking it with professional promotion
- Empower and enable excluded right holders to demand for education
- Encourage innovative models to reach hard to reach
- More qualitative and quantitative data on out-of-school children accessible for evidence based decision-making
- Strengthen school community partnership
- Strengthen school guidance and counseling
- Establish a monitoring system enables all right holders to monitor progress

### IV. Costing and Financing:

In terms of rights-based education for all, the gap between promise and performance remains – with implementation of EFA and MDG 2 now not expected until 2015, if then. Meanwhile, governments increasingly pass the funding burden to local communities and families: as a result, compulsory education is not free but is essentially a “traded service”, requiring families to pay not only for writing paper and pencils, but for admission, exams, textbooks, heating, and even – officially or in the form of so-called “gratitude payments” or paid tutoring – for teaching.

- While half the countries in the former spent 4.9% or more of GNP on education in 2005, the median share of **public expenditure on education** in GNP in the latter region was much lower, at 3.2%. Some countries in Central Asia allocated a very small share of their national income to education, including Azerbaijan (2.8%),
Georgia (2.8%) and Kazakhstan (2.5%); at the other extreme. Variations among countries were also large in Central and Eastern Europe, ranging from 3.8% in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to 6% or more in Belarus, Slovenia and Ukraine.

- Total public expenditure on education as a percentage of GNP increased between 1999 and 2005 in the majority of countries.
- In 2005, the median **share of education expenditure in total government expenditure** was 13% in Central and Eastern Europe (against the FTI benchmark of 20%), with important variations among countries, from less than 10% in Croatia and the Czech Republic to 21% in the Republic of Moldova. In the three countries in Central Asia with data, the shares of education expenditure in total government expenditure were 13% in Georgia, 18% in Tajikistan and 20% in Azerbaijan.

**Policy Option A:** Second chance education provided  
**Country:** Turkey  
**Number of out-of school boys and girls between 10-14:** 200,000  
**Annual cost per student (purchasing power parity):** 698USD  
**Number of teacher needed for second chance education:** 5000 (2 shifts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second chance education provided</th>
<th>Investment cost (USD)</th>
<th>Recurrent Cost (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessment study</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of condensed curricula</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of teaching materials (done by teachers)</td>
<td>20teachersx4monthsx1000=80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of teacher in-service training program (done by teachers)</td>
<td>20teachersx 1monthx1000=20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of provincial training teams (300 TOT)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of teachers (5000)</td>
<td>300 TOT x 1monthx1000=20,000</td>
<td>250,000 (second year and afterwards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing of teaching materials</td>
<td>500,000 (first year)</td>
<td>250,000 (second year and afterwards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bussing of students</td>
<td>10USD(monthly)x 50.000x 6 months=3M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td>20USD(monthly)x 50.000x 6 months=6M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>6monthsx5000 teachersx12 months= 360,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ supply</td>
<td>20USDx50.000=1M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>925,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,610,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for 4 years</strong></td>
<td><strong>925,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,240,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43,365,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit cost per child</td>
<td><strong>217</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Results and Indicators:

- % of out of school children decreased by 30% by 2012.
- Number of children benefiting from second chance education increased by 10% by 2012.
- 30% of teachers apply inclusive and cultural sensitive education and are provided assistance by school inspectors.
- Legislative measures(policy, strategy paper) for promotion of education of excluded children adopted-to be specified per country- (number of advocacy materials, number of campaigns launched)
- Number of PTAs and school boards operational in x number of municipality schools
- Private sector partnership and investment increased by 30% (Number of MOU, number of PCA)
- Increased x% of GDP for education
- Data base on education that is internationally comparable, nationally standardized, locally specific is fully accessible and operational (Dev-Info)