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FOREWORD

LUIS ALMAGRO
SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

At present, unfortunately, if we know where a person lives, if we now their zip code or address, we can probably predict their educational trajectory. In addition we can probably forecast a person’s opportunities for social mobility and their potential to develop a dignified life or lead the transformation of their communities and their countries.

According to the latest data from UNICEF, Latin America and the Caribbean has 193 million children and adolescents, of whom 70 million live in poverty. Of these children, rural, indigenous peri-urban and Afro-descendant populations suffer the most from poverty and its consequences. Data on inequality in terms of access to economic, social and cultural rights, and educational inequality reveal an alarming situation. In the region, 2 out of 5 children are not guaranteed at least one of their rights. Nearly 5.9 million children suffer from chronic malnutrition, mainly in rural areas, with chronic malnutrition 4 times higher in children from the poorest households. About 6.3 million migrants are under the age of 18 in the Americas. Educational exclusion affects about 1.4 million boys and girls in the region. For example, children who reside in remote areas with mothers whose schooling is limited are considered the poorest; and are at greater risk of experiencing developmental delays in infancy. The percentage of boys and girls out of school in the first years of secondary education is almost four times higher than in the developed countries. More than 8 million children under the age of 14 have a disability and at least 7 out of 10 children with disabilities do not attend school, putting them at greater risk of being excluded. In urban areas, 3 out of 10 children live in extremely precarious conditions. Only 20% of young people with lower income have completed secondary school, compared to 80% of those with higher income. If we analyze all these variables certainly many of these children suffered malnutrition, come from poor families, had to work while going to school, did not have access to decent housing or health services, among other important shortcomings relevant to their educational development.

Other than the different sides of the same issue, a lack of access to basic human rights is one of the most important causes of educational inequality, which as I have mentioned conditions and shapes people’s lives reproducing and often deepening their social vulnerability. For this reason, educational inequality is therefore one of the outstanding debts of our democracies. At the same time, it is undoubtedly an obstacle to regional integration, not only in economic terms but fundamentally from a social, cultural and, therefore, political standpoint.

In this context, where equity promotion policies are at stake the question then is: How is our vision of education contributing today to our goal of overcoming inequalities and generating more inclusive societies? Thinking about this is essential so that education continues to be valued socially as an essential tool for human development.

It is time to rethink what has been done so far, and to reconsider the theoretical approaches and working models, including the technical cooperation arrangements between regional and international organizations, and between these entities and the countries. It is time to see what has and has not worked in these areas, and to make this information available to decision-makers and the general public. It is appropriate also to review how educational policies and the promotion of equity policies are developed so that, in addition to continuing to deepen the massification of education and equal access, we also achieve equity and quality education with lasting outcomes. Even with good teachers and an excellent curriculum, if we cannot ensure that our children have proper nutrition, access to health services, proper housing, safe drinking water and other basic services, it is very difficult for
them to be able to learn and to live with a decent standard of living, and for us, to achieve equal opportunities and educational benefits.

The OAS has the capacity to liaise and articulate actions so that universal rights are expanded and to continue promoting the recognition of the right to equality and non-discrimination in the region. Our work is based on the experience we have supporting Member States in the promotion of political dialogue and cooperation, traditional areas where the Organization has made had impact. Since my inauguration as Secretary General, we have adopted the slogan “More rights for more people” giving priority to an equity and social inclusion perspective that innovates our approach to address the most pressing challenges in the region. Unquestionably, equity has to be a cross cutting pillar in our vision on education, in our public policy actions, and in the media, in order to achieve equitable social growth, guarantee people’s full enjoyment of their human rights, and promote a shared prosperity and opportunities for all in the Americas.

Recognizing its esteemed reputation in the educational field and its influence in the region, we entrusted the Inter-American Dialogue with the elaboration of this Interamerican Guide on Strategies for Reducing Educational Inequality. I trust that this document will contribute to the discussion of the way forward to achieving quality, inclusive, and equitable education, and to creating a common vision with a humanistic, holistic, multi-sectoral and inter-institutional approach. I am convinced that this guide will contribute substantially to the Member States in their efforts to design public policies with a comprehensive and inclusive approach, complementing their existing in the education field, and ensuring that the endeavors deliver positive results and “leave no one behind”.
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INTRODUCTION

The world’s governments have a duty to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to develop to their fullest potential. To that end, on September 25, 2015, world leaders agreed on a set of comprehensive objectives for eradicating poverty, protecting the planet, and promoting the common good. Adopted at a historic United Nations summit, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development encourages all countries to take steps to end poverty and promote economic and social development by addressing needs such as health, education, social protection, and employment opportunities. Because the SDGs aim to improve the lives of all people without distinction, they strongly emphasize equity. It is well known that one of the keys to achieving social equity is to ensure that all children receive a quality education. Thus, Goal 4, which focuses on education, sets a target of ensuring an equitable, effective, and relevant education for all children, one that equips all children and young people with the knowledge and skills they need to be successful.

Sustainable Development Goal 4 seeks to “ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all.”

This recognition is also incorporated into the common principles of the countries of the region as defined in the OAS Charter that establishes that “The education of peoples should be directed towards justice, freedom and peace.” (OAS Charter, 1948).

The OAS Member States have also agreed that education is a human right and a cross-cutting factor that directly impacts the political, social and economic development of the region. There is wide consensus in the hemisphere that “everyone has the right to education without discrimination” and that access to quality education at all levels and modalities is crucial to achieving greater equity, improve living standards, promote sustainable development, develop human capital, reduce poverty, strengthen democratic institutions, convey civic and social values, develop responsible citizens committed to society and promote the social inclusion of all. This recognition is reflected in several inter-American instruments such as the Additional Protocol to the American Convention on Human Rights in the area of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, known as the “Protocol of San Salvador” (PSS) in force since 1999, which places special emphasis on the right to education in three dimensions: a dimension of the right to education “per se” that obeys the nature and normative scope that derives from international human rights instruments, national constitutions and local laws, the dimension related to the realization of all human rights in education, which obeys the promotion and guarantee of respect for all human rights in the educational process, and the dimension that refers to rights for education; dimension that obeys the role of education as a multiplier of rights, that is, the importance of education to facilitate greater enjoyment of all rights and freedoms (OAS, 2015). Likewise, the Social Charter of the Americas enshrines the right to education without discrimination and embodies the commitment to ensure equitable and universal access to quality primary and secondary education and promote access to education at all levels with an inclusive approach within the framework of internal legislations. Within the OAS, there are also a series of instruments that protect the right to education, particularly dealing with children and young people in vulnerable situations. These instruments include the Inter-American Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities, adopted in 2001, and the Program of Action of the Decade of the Americas for the Rights and Dignity of Persons with Disabilities (2016-2026) fostering the full

---

1 In this Guide the term “children” refers inclusively to boys and girls unless gender is specified.
2 AG/DEC. 89 (XLVI-0/16) Declaration on the extension of the Decade of the Americas for the rights and dignity of persons with disabilities and Consolidation of the Program of Action for the Decade of the Americas for the Rights and Dignity of
integration of people with disabilities in society. In addition, in the Plan of Action for the Decade of Afro-Descendants in the Americas (2016-2026)\(^3\), the OAS Member States have committed themselves to gradually adopt and strengthen policies, programs and projects that promote the recognition, and protection of the rights of people of African descent in the Americas. The OAS Member States have also committed to promoting special measures, including affirmative action policies for access to quality education at all levels for Afro-descendant populations. In the same way, the American Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples\(^4\), approved in 2016, establishes a series of commitments regarding the education of indigenous people, particularly indigenous children. This declaration protects the right of indigenous peoples and individuals to all levels and forms of education without discrimination, committing Member States to take steps to reduce educational disparities between indigenous and non-indigenous peoples and to adopt measures that effectively ensure that indigenous people living outside their communities, especially children, have access to education in their own languages and cultures. The purpose of this instrument is to promote harmonious intercultural relations through the creation of curricula in public education systems that reflect the pluricultural and multilingual nature of their societies, promoting respect and knowledge of the various indigenous cultures. In addition, this statement aims to promote intercultural education that reflects the worldview, histories, languages, knowledge, values, cultures, practices and ways of life of indigenous peoples.

Equity is a particularly important challenge for the countries of the Americas, where high social inequality is putting the region’s development at risk and hindering people’s full exercise of their rights. For the OAS, inequality refers not only to inequality in the distribution of income and wealth, but also to inequality in the access to and quality of goods and services such as education, as well in people’s opportunities for development and social mobility (OAS, 2016). Inequality, then, implies an unequal exercise of human rights across all spheres, including civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights. This conception of inequality also includes other types of inequality that result from discrimination and social exclusion based on a person’s age, ethnicity, race, culture, religion, language, gender, sexual identity or orientation, as well as other forms of intolerance that prevent, annul or reduce people’s full exercise of their rights. One of those rights is the access to education, an education that prepares people to lead a worthy life and to participate actively as citizens in the development of their communities and their countries.

Therefore unequal access to high-quality, equitable and inclusive education is limiting the potential for development, professional performance and well-being of millions of children and young people in the region, particularly those living in poverty and in vulnerable situations\(^5\). At the same time, educational inequality is not unrelated to access to other human rights. Their indivisibility and interdependence require us to consider that educational inequality is related to the failures of the effective exercise of democracy following the Inter-American Democratic Charter (Inter-American Democratic Charter, OAS, 2011).

Although the countries of the Americas have reached near universal enrollment in primary education, and have considerably increased rates of enrollment in pre-school and secondary education, many children living in poverty and in vulnerable situations do not attend school. Furthermore, the supply of high-quality education varies immensely within countries, thus creating enormous learning differences, as reflected in standardized test results (see Box 1). As a result, millions of children are being denied their right to quality education, a fundamental right.

---

\(^{3}\) AG/RES 2891 (XLVI-O/16), Plan of Action for the Decade of People of African Descent in the Americas (2016-2026) (Approved at the second plenary session, held on June 14, 2016), 46 Period of Sessions of the OAS General Assembly

\(^{4}\) AG/RES. 2888 (XLVI-O/16) American Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Adopted at the second plenary session, held on June 14, 2016), 46 Period of Sessions of the OAS General Assembly

\(^{5}\) In this Guide, with the term “children living in poverty and vulnerable situations” we refer to children that fulfill at least one of these two conditions. Our concept of poverty and vulnerability goes beyond income to encompass sociocultural and democratic factors that affect social exclusion and lack of access to quality education.
that the Member States of the OAS have committed themselves to protect through educational policies aimed at generating equal opportunities for all persons (Inter-American Convention against all forms of discrimination and intolerance).

In order to achieve SDG 4, in 2017 the Ministers of Education of the OAS Member States adopted the Inter-American Education Agenda\(^6\), the culminating result of a historic process of consensus-building between countries to address the region’s educational challenges. One of the Agenda’s three priority areas is to achieve “quality, inclusive, and equitable education,” by promoting the exchange of ideas and innovative experiences and the development of new projects aimed at improving learning.

In the hopes of guiding the OAS Member States in their efforts to address educational inequality and strengthen their capacities to develop public policies that contribute to advancing the SDG 4 goals at the national level, this document presents ten policy strategies that have been proven effective in reducing educational inequality. These policy strategies seek to achieve equal opportunities and effectively respond to different needs and/or include populations that have been historically excluded or discriminated against. The analysis of these strategies, their challenges, and lessons can be analyzed and serve as an input to the OAS Member States when rethinking, reviewing and defining their own strategies.

Within SDG 4, we focus directly on goals 4.1 and 4.2, which address quality and equity in early childhood, primary, and secondary education. Each chapter of the document is aligned with one of these two goals.

---

It is important to note that this document does not expect to provide a systemic response to educational inequality, this document but rather makes available specific policy strategies that have produced favorable results in reducing educational inequality in their respective national or local context. This document also does not address strategies for improving civics education or other forms of education to cultivate the principles of justice, freedom and peace for democratic coexistence.

In each chapter, the content is organized as follows. First, we provide an overview of the state of educational inequality in the corresponding educational level, including the most recent available data such as enrollment, repetition, or dropout rates and academic performance on national and international assessments. Our goal in this overview is to provide readers a better understanding of the severity of inequality at each level, the factors associated with inequality, and a sense of the sub-regions or countries where the issue is most severe. Next, we discuss the implications of this inequality for the Americas.

For example, we ask: “What impact does poor physical development in early childhood have on subsequent educational outcomes?” or “Why should we be concerned about repetition rates in primary school?” Lastly, for every education level, we offer three or four strategies that have been shown to have a positive impact on equality in academic performance. These strategies generally contribute to equity by improving the development, school attendance, and/or academic performance of children living in poverty or in vulnerable situations. For each strategy, we report the findings of impact evaluation studies, provide specific examples from different countries in the region or beyond, and draw lessons from these experiences.
BRIEF OVERVIEW

It is a great achievement that the countries of the Americas have increased enrollment rates at all educational levels over the past twenty years—especially at the preprimary and secondary levels. For example, the percentage of the region’s children who attend preschool increased from around 50% in 2000 to almost 70% today (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2018), and regional secondary school attendance rose from only 65.4% of young people to 76% in 2015 (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2018). This major achievement is the result of laws that have made preschool and secondary school enrollment mandatory and policies aimed at increasing supply and demand at these levels of education. However, within countries, there are still large attendance differences between social groups. At both the preprimary and secondary levels, the gap in attendance between the poorest and the wealthiest children is almost 20 percentage points—63% versus 82% in preschool and 65% versus 84% in secondary school. In contrast, at the primary school level, many countries have achieved universal education, and attendance differences associated with income level or geographic location are less marked. However, there are still populations of children who do not attend primary school, or who do attend school but do not have an education suitable to their needs. In particular, indigenous children and children with disabilities or with specific educational needs have very low school attendance and academic performance levels.

Children living in poverty and in vulnerable situations not only attend school in fewer numbers, they also receive inadequate instruction. The poorest children attend schools with generally fewer resources. An analysis of the results of the most recent Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), found that principals who work in schools that serve lower-income children were more likely to perceive hindered learning in their school due to the quality and quantity of educational materials and teachers (IDB, 2016). In addition to providing low-quality education overall, many schools are not meeting the specific educational needs of all their students. Despite the importance of giving underperforming students individualized attention to improve their performance, many schools do not have tracking systems to identify students at risk of failure or dropout, and many teachers do not have the time or the training to meet their needs. This is also true for populations such as children with disabilities or with specific educational needs, indigenous children, and afro-descendant children.

Unequal access to quality education is reflected in the region’s educational performance. UNESCO’s Third Regional Comparative and Explanatory Study (TERCE by its Spanish acronym), which was administered in 2013 to students in 15 Latin American countries, showed a strong correlation between children’s scores and their income level, ethnic origin, gender, school location (urban or rural) and school type (private or public) (OREALC/UNESCO Santiago, 2015). Similarly, among secondary school students, the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) found that Latin American students in the poorest quintile performed almost two and a half years below their wealthiest peers in math, science, and language (IDB, 2016). In short, our education systems are failing children living in poverty and in vulnerable situations who most need a quality education to develop their full potential.
Chapter 1: EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

Early childhood is a critical period for interventions that seek to reduce educational and social inequities and poverty in general. The first years of infancy are vital for children’s subsequent physical, cognitive, and socioemotional development since they promote or delay the development of life skills that will help children continue to learn throughout their lives. Many children do not develop to their full potential because of poor nutrition, insufficient stimulation in the home, and/or lack of access to quality child care centers or preschools. Inadequate physical, cognitive, psychosocial, or affective development at this age is particularly harmful and is predictive of health and learning problems in later years, making this an opportune window of intervention (Naudeau, Kataoka, Valerio, Neuman, and Kennedy Elder, 2011). The region’s children have the right to full development from the start. This is why SDG 4 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development gives priority to ensuring “inclusive and equitable quality education” and promoting “lifelong learning opportunities for all.” (United Nations, s.f.a).

Target 4.2 of SDG 4 specifically addresses early childhood and seeks to “ensure that all girls and boys have access to quality early childhood development care and preprimary education so that they are ready for primary education.” (United Nations, s.f.b).

The indicators that measure progress towards this target are:

- **4.2.1:** Proportion of children under 5 years of age who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being, by sex
- **4.2.2:** Participation rate in organized learning (one year before the official primary entry age), by sex

Early childhood development is also one of the priority action areas of the Inter-American Education Agenda adopted by region’s education ministers at the Ninth Inter-American Meeting of Ministers of Education of the Organization of American States that took place in The Bahamas in February 2017. In addition to prioritizing quality, inclusion, and equity in education and the strengthening of the teaching profession, the Agenda also makes comprehensive early childhood care a thematic priority and promotes the exchange of policies, programs, and experiences in this area.

Although the region has made progress on improving opportunities for very young children, much remains to be done to meet this target. This chapter describes the major gaps in early childhood development and participation in quality education, presents the types of policies that have been effective in this area, including regional and international experiences, and offers lessons drawn from these experiences.
Current Situation

More of the region’s young children are now on track for physical, cognitive, and socioemotional development and growing numbers are receiving early childhood education. However, we know that early childhood development levels vary among and within countries, depending on different factors including socioeconomic level, race and ethnicity, mother’s educational attainment, and location in the region. It is the interaction of these factors that makes inequality and exclusion so severe.

In terms of children’s physical development, the countries have made great progress on a number of early childhood health indicators. For example, chronic malnutrition (stunting) in children under 5 declined from 24.5% in 2016 to 11.1% in 2016, which is half the current global average (23%) (UNICEF and WHO, 2017). Similarly, the mortality rate for children under 5 plummeted from 54.5% to 17.9% placing the region below the developed countries, East Asia and the Pacific (World Bank, 2016).

However, not all children reach their development potential, especially if they come from poor and vulnerable households. For example, in eight countries for which we have comparable data, children in the poorest households have a rate of childhood mortality two times higher and a malnutrition rate five times higher than children in the wealthiest households (USAID and DHS s.f.)⁷. Similarly, children from rural areas and minority ethnic groups are more likely to have low development levels. Children in rural areas are 35% more likely to die before age 5 and 80% more likely to be stunted, which suggests that they are not getting micronutrients necessary for development or are sick more often (USAID and DHS, s.f.). This can cause lifelong physical, cognitive, socioemotional, and affective problems to children. As an example of existing gaps, in Guatemala 58% of indigenous children under age 2 are chronically malnourished, compared to 34.2% of non-indigenous children—a gap that has remained almost constant for the past thirty years (Guatemala Ministry of Public Health, 2017).

---

⁷ The data comes from DemoChartic and Health Surveys of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), for the following countries: Colombia (2015), Dominican (2013), Guatemala and Perú (2014), Haiti (2012), Honduras (2011), Guyana (2009), and Bolivia (2008).
In addition to having lower levels of physical development, poor and children in vulnerable situations also develop weaker language, cognitive, and socioemotional skills from a very early age. UNICEF’s Early Childhood Development Index, one of the instruments commonly used to measure these skills, assesses age-appropriate development in four domains: literacy-numeracy, physical, social-emotional, and learning (see Chart 2 for the region’s results in the literacy-numeracy domain). In the 11 Latin American countries where this index has been measured, on average only 40% of children aged 3 to 5 are developmentally on track for literacy and numeracy, while 80% are on track for socioemotional skills. There are major differences attributable to family socioeconomic status in both domains, but the greatest cause for concern is in the literacy-numeracy domain, where the difference is almost 20 percent points, indicating that the children will probably start school without the conceptual foundations they need to succeed.

---

**Chart 1**

Chronic malnutrition rates in children under 5 by wealth quintile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Q5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

### Chart 2

**Percentage of children aged 36-59 months developmentally on track in the literacy-numeracy domain in UNICEF’s Early Childhood Development Index**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belice</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Another study the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (TVIP for its Spanish acronym) measured the language ability gap between the region’s poor and wealthy children in five countries (Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Perú, and Nicaragua). The study found wide gaps between the linguistic development of young children in rich and poor families that did not close when the children entered school (Schady et al., 2014). Another study, conducted by the Inter-American Development Bank in Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Paraguay, and Peru, found substantial differences in language, cognitive, and motor development in children aged 2 to 5 years. For example, the study found that on their fifth birthday, children in the lowest social economic status trailed their peers in the highest status by two months in the cognitive dimension, nine months in the motor dimension, and 16 months in the language and communication dimension (Verdisco, Cueto, Thompson and Neuschmidt, 2015). Moreover, evidence shows that these gaps widen substantially over time, suggesting a cumulative impact on development (Meghir, Varela, Grantham-McGregor, Attanasio and Rubio-Codina, 2014; Schady, 2011).

What causes these inequalities? They are largely the result of the situation of poverty and vulnerability in which many children grow up, which does not create the environment needed to develop their full potential. In terms of nutrition, for example, we know that there are wide socioeconomic gaps in the area of children fed the four food groups (11 percentage points) and the minimum meal frequency (14 percentage points) (USAID and DHS, s.f.). There are also differences in how parents encourage and discipline their children (USAID and DHS, s.f.). For example, according to studies in Latin America using the Home Observation Measurement of the Environment (HOME), poor parents are more punitive (that is, they yell at or strike their children more often) and less responsive or emotionally sensitive to their children (Berlinski and Schady, 2015). Furthermore, surveys in 12 countries in the region find that parents who are less educated use more severe corporal punishments than parents with more education. Harsh
corporal punishment is associated with poorer learning outcomes once children enter school as well as a higher probability of mental health problems (Berlinski and Schady, 2015).

These factors are compounded by the fact that fewer poor and children in vulnerable situations attend preschool. This is a problem, since the stimulation provided in child care programs and preschools is critical for overcoming the disadvantages with which the poorest children contend. According to UNESCO data, enrollment in preprimary education has grown at a surprising pace since 2000, from 50% to almost 70% on average, more than at any other level of education (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2018). But the attendance gap between the poorest and the wealthiest children is wide (63% versus 82%) and has shrunk little in recent years from 25 percentage points in 2006 to 19 percentage points in 2015 (IDB, s.f.). The urban-rural gap (71% versus 62%) is lesser and has been reduced by almost half in the same period, suggesting that today there are more preschools in remote areas, but that they do not always reach the most poor and children in vulnerable situations (IDB, s.f.). Even with increased availability, cultural resistance and lower social valorization of institutional child care services often limit coverage, especially given the role that mothers and family networks play in child care. However, the availability of public-offered preschool is beneficial to mothers because it implies the opportunity for entering the labor market and impacting household poverty.

In addition to being less likely to attend preschool, poor and children in vulnerable situations often attend preschools with fewer quality resources, with teachers who are less prepared and poorly compensated. Moreover, community preschools, which capture a large part of the preprimary school population in some countries—at least 40% in Honduras and 70% in Nicaragua—are particularly weak in some countries because they do not receive the same degree of institutional support and public sector oversight (FEREMA and Interamerican Dialogue, 2017; Castillo Bermúdez, 2010). And for indigenous children, for whom early childhood education in their own language is important for subsequent language learning, there is a shortage of indigenous preprimary school teachers and educational materials in native languages (UNESCO, 2010; UNICEF, 2014). Even though preprimary education is the level which has attracted the most international attention in recent years, it continues to be the weakest.

9 The current comparison year is equivalent to the period between 2010 and 2015.
Why is reducing inequity in early childhood important?

As we have said, inequalities in early childhood are of particular concern because of their impact on subsequent health outcomes, academic, and occupational performance. With regards to health, childhood nutritional status correlates strongly with cognitive and academic outcomes throughout a person’s life. For example, children who are chronically malnourished before age 2 are more likely to start school late and to demonstrate poor academic performance, including lower grades and lower cognitive ability scores (Grantham-McGregor et al., 2007). In the psychosocial area, delays in early childhood development are predictive of subsequent learning problems. For example, a study in Ecuador found that children with low language ability scores on the Spanish language version of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (TVIP) were more likely to repeat a grade and to score lower on math and reading tests in primary school (Schady, 2011).

Fortunately, we know that it is easier to correct developmental delays in early childhood since most of the brain architecture is wired in the first five years of life. Even functions that continue to develop in later years (such as numerical ability and peer social skills) are easier to modify in the first four to five years of life (Naudeau et al., 2011). Early childhood development interventions yield surprisingly positive results: better educational outcomes, improved physical and mental health (and thus decreased reliance on the health care system), and reduced engagement in high-risk behavior such as substance abuse (Naudeau et al., 2011). More generally, they also promote economic and social integration and help children access more rights and exercise them fully.
There is a possibility to implement remedial measures (such as special education, therapy, and tutoring) later in a child’s life, but they are more expensive and less effective. In fact, interventions in the early years provide better return on investment than interventions with older children or adults (Carneiro and Heckman, 2003). According to a recent study, society pays a very high cost for not intervening to combat growth and language delays at an early age. This cost, known as the cost of inaction (COI), rises with the benefit-cost ratio per child affected and the number of children affected (Richter et al., 2017). In Latin America, one study estimates the cost of inaction on eliminating receptive language delays at 4% of GDP in Nicaragua and 3.6% in Guatemala (Richter et al., 2017). Another study, on the economic cost of global malnutrition (wasting) in Central America and the Andean countries, calculates losses due to malnutrition at 1.7 to 11.4% of GDP (Martínez and Fernández, 2007; Martínez and Fernández, 2009). The productivity losses due to higher death rates and lower levels of education account for up to 95% of the COIs. (Martínez and Fernández, 2007; Martínez and Fernández, 2009). These estimates illustrate the importance of early intervention to ensure that children are on their developmentental track.

In the following pages, we present three strategies that have proved effective for reducing inequity in early childhood. We describe each of them, summarizing their results, additionally providing both regional and international examples of their use and offering lessons drawn from these experiences.
Strategy 1
Home visiting programs

Summary: Many children in poor and vulnerable households develop physical, cognitive, and psychosocial delays in part because their parents do not provide adequate stimulation, instruction, and health care. Home visiting programs are designed to provide parents with the support and information they need to adopt effective parenting practices for early childhood development. The success of these programs depends on the quality of the mother-visitor relationship, fidelity to the program curriculum, and the programs’ ability to attract and retain high-risk families.

Young children spend most of their time at home within their family environment, so the family is the factor that most influences their development. Young children depend on their parents or caregivers for care, stimulation, and food, which are critical to their well-being. However, because of poverty, lack of education, or other social factors, many parents are inadequately equipped to provide their children with appropriate stimulation or a healthy diet. As a result, children in poor and vulnerable households trail more wealthy children in physical, psychosocial, and cognitive development. For this reason, many early childhood development policies now focus on parent education and improving the quality of the home environment.

What are home visits?

Home visits are a type of parental support intervention that targets poor and children in vulnerable situations and their caregivers seeking to change parenting practices and improve child development outcomes. These parental support interventions vary widely. Meetings may be individual, in groups, or a combination of both, and they may take place in the home, a community center, or a health facility. Home visits stand out as the most studied and one of the most popular strategies across the region for reaching at-risk households. With home visiting programs, trained visitors go to the homes of participating families periodically to provide mothers with the information, support, and materials they need for effective parenting. The home visitor follows a protocol or curriculum to model and practices appropriate behaviors, talks with the mother about her child’s development, and encourages her to practice these new techniques between sessions.

Home visiting programs vary in their focus, scale, target population, and human resources. In terms of focus, there are primarily two types of program in the region (Leer, López-Boo, Pérez-Expósito and Powell, 2016). The programs with a focus on improving stimulation and early care, where the home visitor practices effective play activities, discipline, and teaching and helps to identify developmental deficits. The second type of programs focuses on improving child health (or maternal health in the case of pregnant women). The home visitors then offer advice and nutritional handouts to mothers, usually after weighing the child, and sometimes the advice is complemented with the provision of dietary supplements. In addition to nutrition, visitors cover topics such as vaccination, hygiene habits, and pregnancy or postpartum warning signs. Health-focused home visitors can also connect mothers with health facilities by referring sick children or promoting regular preventive checkups.
The curricula/protocols and types of activities used by the home visitors, such as visit frequency (weekly, bi-weekly, or monthly) and visit duration (one or two hours), the types of materials delivered, and the level of formal education of the visitors (professional or paraprofessional) may vary, depending on the focus of the program (Leer et al., 2016). All programs share the common goal of changing parental behavior and reaching as many high-risk households as possible.

**What are the results of these programs?**

Studies show that home visiting programs have major impacts on mothers and children. On one hand, they improve parenting practices. An analysis of 20 international studies found improvements in mother-child interactions and parenting skills for fostering learning; increased use of books and toys for stimulation; and improved maternal mental health (Koltiarenco, Gómez, Muñoz and Aracena, 2010). According to another recent study involving Servicio Acompañamiento a Familias (SAF), the home visiting service of Peru’s Cuna Más program, children in participating households played more with adults and had more store-bought or homemade toys in their homes. The researchers also observed fewer violent practices such as yelling, insulting, and hitting turned into more positive practices such as verbal praise in reward for children’s positive behaviors (Ministry of Economy and Finances of Perú, 2016).

In the case of health and nutrition focused visits, the mothers receiving visits adopted better dietary and hygiene practices, have better medical knowledge (for example, they can identify pre-and postnatal warning signs), and use health facilities more regularly.

By improving parenting practices, the programs also have tangible positive impacts on child development. In two of the most internationally recognized programs, the Nurse-Family Partnership (NFP) and Early Head Start (EHS) (both in the United States), children who received home visits had better language and number skills even years after the program had ended. In the region, one of the most studied programs was a pilot intervention in Jamaica that provided early stimulation through weekly visits and nutritional supplements to malnourished children aged 9 months to 24 months. After two years in the program, children in both groups had improved locomotor, language, and hand-eye development, but over the years the effects of the nutritional rehabilitation disappeared, while the effects of the stimulation visits persisted. Even at age 22, individuals who had received stimulation through the program had better cognition and reading habits, higher educational attainment, fewer symptoms of depression, and reduced violent behavior than those who had not (Walker, Chang, Powell and Baker-Henningham, 2012). Other similar programs in the region, such as the adaptation of the Jamaican program in Colombia and Programa de Atención Integral a la Niñez Nicaragüense (PAININ) in Nicaragua, have also improved verbal and numerical skills in children (Attanasio et al., 2014; López-Boo, Palloni and Urzúa, 2014).
What lessons have we learned?

- **Quality is critical for a program’s success.** The quality of home visiting programs determines how useful they are for improving parenting practices and child development. Although there is no single definition of home visits quality, the literature recognizes three core variables to define the quality of home visits: dosage, in other words, visit frequency and duration; content, which refers to the curriculum covered by home visitors and their fidelity in carrying out all of the stipulated activities in the assigned time; and interpersonal relationship, in other words, the quality of the relationship between the visitor and the child’s caregiver (Paulsell, Avellar, Sama Martin, and Del Grosso, 2010). Of these, the latter is the most important, and it is often the most difficult to measure. High quality visitor-caregiver relationships in other words, respectful, warm, responsive, and encouraging relationships that take the mother’s wishes into account are more successful in changing the caregiver’s behavior and thus have greater impact on early childhood development.

- **Much remains to be done to improve quality.** Many improvements are needed in these areas, both regionally and internationally. With respect to frequency, even in successful programs, there are discrepancies between the stipulated number of visits and the actual number. For example, in the Nurse-Family Partnership program in the United States, families were found to complete less than 70% of the scheduled visits. Visits fail to take place for a variety of reasons, including logistic complications and absence of the family at the time of visit. With respect to content, a recent Inter-American Development Bank study of seven home visiting programs in the region found that, despite what was specified in the curricula, less than half of the monitored visitors devoted appropriate time to reviewing the activities of the last meeting or explained developmental activities to the caregiver. Only a third stressed the importance of language development, and only a quarter properly presented the activities to the child (Leer et al., 2016). With respect to the visitor-caretaker relationship, the same study found that mothers and visitors have warm relationships but that visitors do not invest enough during the meetings to create a space that encourages mothers to express their opinions and ask questions or to give them positive feedback (Leer et al., 2016).

- **Improving quality is particularly important to reach the most vulnerable.** Low program quality is a matter of concern because it affects not only parent or child outcomes but also participation and retention rates. Most programs in the region use specific poverty criteria to determine a mother’s eligibility and the visit focus areas, which are often the same criteria used in other public or cash transfer programs. However, since participation is voluntary, not all eligible mothers who are offered assistance (through another program or a health facility, for example) choose to participate. Additionally, not all of those who participate finish the program or complete each scheduled visit. Studies in the United States show that the mothers most likely to drop out of home visiting programs are poorer, less educated, and more likely to have mental health problems (Goyal et al., 2014). The most frequent reasons for dropping out involve the quality of the visits or the relationship with the home visitor, for example discontent with the visitor or the program, irrelevant program content, distractions in the home during the visit, or difficulty reaching the visitor by telephone among others reasons (Roggman, Cook, Peterson and Raikes, 2008; Holland, Christensen, Shone, Kearney and Kitzman, 2014).
家庭访问者需要遵循一个强大的课程，但它们也应具有灵活性。为了确保质量，需要从一个良好的课程或协议开始。课程是指家庭访问者在会议中应涵盖的内容，他们应带来的玩具和材料，以及他们在每个活动上应花费的时间。项目应具有设计良好、基于证据、评估的课程，以推广所需的信息，尽可能标准化每个家庭提供的内容，并能够记录和评估在每次会议中使用的时间。使用基于证据的课程特别重要，对于以健康为主题的访问，因为使用错误的信息存在危险。例如，最近在美国农村健康委员会（CSRA）实施的安第斯农村健康理事会（CSRA）在埃尔阿尔托，玻利维亚的一个营养家庭访问项目的研究发现，这些访问对慢性营养不良没有影响，反而增加了超重的可能性（12.5%）。这些结果可能归因于课程中对儿童体重过快增加的强调，以及访问者推广新食物而不鼓励运动或消除不健康食物（Gertner, Johannsen y Martinez, 2016）。这些例子说明了开发课程时精心编排信息的重要性。虽然需要遵循既定的课程以最大化影响，但访问者需要能够根据家庭的愿望和需求灵活实施。两个研究团队发现，在美国的“护士-家庭伙伴关系”项目中，家庭参与度最低的护士是那些适应了必要的课程，并且更加灵活地安排会议时间（O’Brien et al., 2012; Ingoldsby et al., 2013）。这需要一个高水平的培训，所有项目都必须为访问者提供培训。观察工具对评价和持续改进有帮助。为了衡量课程传递的各个方面，有多种观察工具可以帮助访问者和监督者监控质量并评估课程实施的忠实度。这些工具根据观察方法（现场、录像或两者结合）和预期用户的不同而不同。例如，它们可以用于由访问者作为监控工具，由培训的监督者提供反馈和培训，或者由外部人员评估项目的有效性。最近的一项研究描述了用于评估项目所使用的工具的范围，其中最常用的是家庭访问评定量表系列（HOVRS, HOVRS-A, 和 HOVRS-A+）。同一研究建议，由于录像和编码训练人员的成本在某些区域设置中可能很高，因此需要开发成本效益更高的工具，以便于在持续的基础上指导培训活动（Schodt, Parr, Araujo y Rubio-Codina, 2015; Leer et al., 2016）。良好的社区关系也很重要。另一种提高项目质量的策略是加强项目和社区之间的联系。在美国，俄亥俄州和肯塔基州的一个家庭访问项目发现，使用社区基础的增补策略显著减少了访问的缺失和提高了保留率。这些策略包括创建社区指导委员会，每月与项目会面；组织母亲支持小组会议；并任命一个社区协调员跟进频繁缺席的孕妇（Folger et al., 2016）。另一个成功的项目在该地区与强烈社区联系的是巴西的Infancia Melhor（PIM），目前为55,060个家庭提供服务，通过小组会议和家庭访问（Verch, 2017）。社区活动包括社区会议与孕妇会议；以及家庭社区活动“增强社会联系”（UNESCO, 2008; Verch, 2017）。这些实践可以帮助使项目在社区中广泛认可和重视（Leer et al., 2016）。
Home visitors need supervision and ongoing training. Home visitors in many of the region’s programs have low education levels. In some programs, they are only required to know how to read and write or to have a secondary school diploma. International studies show that while both professional and paraprofessional home visitors can be effective for improving development outcomes, paraprofessionals have a greater need for ongoing training. Some experts have argued that one of the most important components of visitor training is performance-based feedback. Two trials in the United States, in which mentors provided training workshops combined with individualized feedback (in one of the trials, by email, and in the other, by telephone or videoconferencing), led to significant improvements in the visitors’ practices (Marturana and Woods, 2012; Krick Oborn and Johnson, 2015). This finding demonstrates the importance of good supervisors, an appropriate supervisor-visitor ratio, and well-designed observation instruments to inform training, as well as of exploring the use of technology to provide visitors with timely, consistent, and cost-effective feedback.

Ties with health facilities should be strengthened. Some health-focused home visiting programs have been effective in encouraging mothers to use health facilities for preventive or acute care. Although this often happens indirectly (for example, when a home visitor encourages vaccination, preventive checkups, or institutional childbirth), a number of experts have recommended that programs should design stronger ties between visitors and health facilities in the form of referral networks for complex cases. A number of home visiting programs with referral networks have reduced neonatal mortality, expanded early intervention for children at risk of developmental delays, and increased the number of children with disabilities receiving treatment (Kirkwood et al., 2013; Schwarz et al., 2012; Nesbitt, Mackey, Kuper, Muhit and Murthy, 2012). One of the world’s best known programs is the Lady Health Workers program in Pakistan. Each Lady Health Worker, who is ascribed to a health facility, receives training and medical supplies from this facility to provide counseling and basic medical services to the population. The health workers also learn to identify and refer serious cases. They also collect information on health status and services usage that is later incorporated into the national health statistics. In other cases, sessions for parents may be held in the health facilities. A study in three Caribbean countries (Jamaica, Antigua, and Saint Lucia) measured the impact of a program that used short films, demonstrations, and handouts offering parenting guidelines for mothers in the waiting areas of children’s health facilities. The results, showed significant benefits in terms of the cognitive development of the children and the mothers’ knowledge of child development and good parenting (Chang et al., 2015).

Referrals to health facilities should be backed by systems to monitor and facilitate compliance. Given the many obstacles that can prevent mothers from attending health facilities, health facility referral systems should be designed to monitor and facilitate compliance. In the Lady Health Workers program in Pakistan, health facility referrals were found to be successful when the patient was already familiar with the facility, knew someone who had been referred, understood the reason for the referral, or received a follow-up visit from the Lady Health Worker (Afsar, Qureshi, Younus, Gulb y Mahmood, 2003). Similarly, another home visiting program in Uganda found that mothers of newborns referred to health facilities were more likely to follow through if the home visitors paid a reminder visit. Another program in Bangladesh that referred neonates to hospitals found that providing transportation and covering the cost of the visit promoted attendance (Darmstadt et al., 2010; Nalwadda et al., 2013). In short, both referral systems and home visitor training must be designed to facilitate the transition from home to health facility.
Home visiting programs are high impact, relatively cheap interventions. Home visiting programs are one of the best investments in children. They are less expensive than child care and preschool-based programs because they do not entail large infrastructure investments or high food costs. An Inter-American Development Bank study puts the annual cost per child of parenting support programs at $247, compared to $1,239 for child care programs (Araujo, López-Boo and Puyana, 2013). Another study found that for every dollar invested in home visiting programs, there was a three dollar-return in developmental improvements, a higher return than for child care programs and almost the same as for preschools (Berlinski and Schady, 2015). It should be noted that all types of interventions are important since they meet different objectives. For example, one of the strengths of home visiting programs is that they link families with health, child care, and education services, while child care centers and schools give mothers an opportunity to enter the labor market. For this reason, we need to maximize impact by moving towards interventions that integrate home visits with health, education, and child care aspects.
SAF: The home visiting service of Peru’s Cuna Más program

Administration: The Cuna Más program is allocated under the Ministry of Development and Social Inclusion (MIDIS) and is a component of the Incluir para Crecer national strategy.

Description: In 2012, the Government of Peru established SAF (Servicio de Acompañamiento a Familias) as an arm of the national Cuna Más program. Its mission is to improve the physical, cognitive, linguistic, and socioemotional development of poor and extremely poor children under the age of 3 years. SAF targets rural areas and provides weekly home visits during which a facilitator works with the mother and her child on psychosocial stimulation activities. In addition, it offers monthly group socialization and peer learning sessions for the mothers to reinforce practices and share experiences.

Outcomes and lessons:

- The main results of the SAF impact study show that the program has a significant impact on development, especially in the cognitive and communication dimensions.

- It was also found to have an impact, although smaller, on fine motor and personal-social skills. The impact was equivalent to reducing the socioeconomic gradient in problem-solving and communication skills by 18% and 35%, respectively. When the effects on different home variables were evaluated, participation in the program was found to increase the frequency of play activities at home as well as

- In the area of disciplinary practices, a reduction in violent practices such as shouting, verbal abuse, and whipping was found as well as an increased tendency for parents to reward positive behavior with verbal praise or nonverbal language such as handclapping. SAF has the biggest impact on children from poorest households with least educated mothers.

- As in other programs, the better the quality of interactions, the better the outcomes. Higher facilitator scores for “practices” and “family involvement” were associated with better problem resolution.

- However, the study found that much more could be done to improve the visits, including encouraging closer and more active involvement of the mothers and being more responsive to their interests.

- Another contributing factor in the program’s success is that it operates on a community co-management model, with community-based steering committees lending their services and the program providing technical assistance, training, and funding. This approach promotes community involvement and social accountability.

**Strategy 2**

Child care centers

**Summary:** Quality child care centers for children not yet in school or after-school care can boost the cognitive, socioemotional, and physical development of poor and vulnerable children. These institutions contribute to reducing the gaps that these children typically have when entering school and help decrease educational inequalities throughout life. For this reason, governments have an important role to ensure their quality and accessibility for the children who need it most.

What are child care centers?

Another environment in which children develop outside the home is child care centers. Child care centers provide a variety of services for preschoolers. They generally offer other services to promote all-round development for children and in addition to care and teaching, they provide other services such as meals, growth and health monitoring, and information workshops on different topics for parents. As a result, they can help improve the development of poor children or in vulnerable situations. Furthermore, since they typically operate in schedules when parents are at work, they also facilitate their entry into the labor market, particularly of mothers.

There are predominantly two child care models in the region: community and institutional (Berlinski and Schady, 2015). In community child care centers, services are provided in homes or community buildings, and caregivers tend to be mothers from the community who work for free or for a small fee but are not formally employed by the program. These programs are generally linked to family-related public agencies or ministries of social development (Berlinski and Schady, 2015). The institutional model operates through larger centers. Caregivers tend to be more qualified (generally teachers with a degree in early childhood education) and are formally employed by the program. Since these programs rely on educators, they tend to be linked to ministries of education. Also, while the programs may provide the services directly, in other cases they are subcontracted to third parties.

What are the results of these programs?

Participation in high quality child care programs can have positive impacts on children’s health and cognitive, social, and motor development, especially in the case of children from vulnerable households who might not otherwise receive the same levels of stimulation and nutrition at home. In the United States, studies of recognized programs such as the Abecedarian Project, the Perry Preschool Project, and the Early Head Start programs - all targeting poor and children in vulnerable situations - have found that participating children enjoyed better health and cognitive development in the short and long term. For example, even at twenty one, young adults who had been enrolled in the Abecedarian Project scored higher on intellectual and academic measures, had attained more years of education, and were more likely to attend university than those who had not (Campbell, Ramey, Pungello, Sparling and Miller-Johnson, 2002).

In the Americas, the few existing studies have also shown positive impacts on participating children. A study of a Bolivian project Programa Integral de Desarrollo Infantil (PIDI), which funded community-type centers in poor urban areas, found significant positive impacts on a number of cognitive and psychosocial measures among children.
who had attended the centers for at least six months and greater gains among children who had attended longer (Behrman, Cheng y Todd, 2004). Similar results were observed among children who attended child care centers as part of the program Chile Crece Contigo. Here, participating children demonstrated improved coordination, language skills, and general cognitive development (Urzúa and Veramendi, 2011). The programs that also offer food have been found to improve children’s health. In Guatemala’s Hogares Comunitarios community-model child care program, established in 1991 by the Secretariat of Social Works of the First Lady of Guatemala, children who attended the centers consumed 20 percent more calories, proteins, and iron and 50% more vitamin A than children who did not attend, largely because they ate more animal-based meals at the centers than they did at home. (Ruel, Quisumbing, Hallman, de la Brière and Coj de Salazar, 2006). Similarly, in the case of Colombia’s community child care centers, the Hogares Comunitarios de Bienestar (HCBs), which have operated as a program of the Colombian Family Welfare Institute (ICBF) since 1986, an impact study found that the program, which provides meals, reduced the likelihood of chronic and global malnutrition by 2 to 3 percentage points (Bernal et al., 2009).

However, positive impacts are not seen in all cases. Two studies, in Canada (Quebec) and Australia, found that the children enrolled in child care centers demonstrated increased hyperactivity, aggressiveness, inattention, and in the long term, emotional and health problems (Baker, Gruber y Milligan, 2008; Yamauchi y Leigh, 2011). In Ecuador, a study of children participating in child care centers subsidized by Fondo de Desarrollo Infantil (FODI) showed that the centers did not improve motor or social development and had negative effects on memory and language, especially in children over three years old (Rosero and Oosterbeek, 2011). The authors suggest that the lower quality of the centers (compared with centers in the developed world) might explain these results. This indicates that enrollment in child care centers alone does not guarantee improvements in early childhood development.

What are the lessons learned?

- **Quality is essential.** Despite the positive effects seen in the Americas and elsewhere, we know that the impact of child care centers depends to a large extent on the quality of the centers and how this quality compares to the level of attention and stimulation that children would otherwise receive at home. Various studies in places such as South Korea, Bangladesh, and East Africa have found positive correlations between indicators of high quality and children’s motor, social, and cognitive skills. Other studies have documented negative correlations between low quality and socioemotional outcomes such as aggressiveness, inattention, hyperactivity, and other problems, even in the long term (López-Boo, Araujo and Tomé, 2016).

If quality is so important, how do we define quality in a center? There is no one formula for achieving quality. However, consultation with subject experts identified six critical components of high quality in centers: the nature, frequency and intensity of interactions between caregivers and children; the provision of nutritious food, a safe and clean environment; a monitoring system for quality; an optimum child-adult ratio; good training for caregivers and teachers; and availability of stimulating activities and play resources (López-Boo et al., 2016). This agrees with a review of quality standards for child care and preprimary education in Latin America, which found that national standards generally focus on staffing qualifications and size; infrastructure; safety and furniture standards; and feeding programs (Marco Navarro, 2014). Experts also agree that quality must be across the board; in other words, efforts must address not only education but also cognitive and emotional development, health, nutrition, and parenting. (Marco Navarro, 2014).
Human resources are crucial for quality. The most significant variables for quality in child care centers are human resource-related. For example, classes with fewer children per caregiver are associated with better development outcomes and increased participation in cooperative, positive conversations since caregivers are able to provide more individual attention. Similarly, staff levels of education and training in early childhood education correlate highly with positive development outcomes since they give caretakers better tools for encouraging learning (Phillipsen, Burchinal, Howes and Cryer, 1997). In Latin America, where almost all child care center personnel are caregivers (non-teachers) with limited education, one way to strengthen capacities is through continuous supervision and training. In Colombia, for example, an initiative that provided in-class training and a certificate in early childhood development for caregiver mothers in the HCB program improved the quality of care (as measured by the FCCERS) and had a positive impact on some measures of cognitive development (Berlinski and Schady, 2015). Contrary to a HCB reform which focused on the construction of new larger centers that neither improved child care quality (as measured by three different scales) nor outcomes in the new centers. This suggests that improving structural quality alone does not necessarily improves quality. Lastly, we know that higher caregiver wages correlate with better outcomes. In the United States, for example, two studies found that teachers’ wages were more predictive of center quality than other structural indicators such as education level and teacher-child ratio (Phillips, Mekos, Scarr, McCartney and Abbott-Shim, 2000; Phillipsen et al., 1997). In the context of community-based centers, which have the highest levels of caregiver turnover, increasing wages can also help to improve employment stability. Caregivers in community-model centers should be adequately compensated, but the reality is often far distant.

Centers should implement curricula to promote development. Teacher quality does not ensure center quality if teachers do not have a good curriculum to guide their activities, or if they do not implement the curriculum correctly. Among other criteria, a good curriculum should be age-appropriate; contain activities that support communication, language, and social-emotional skills; take into account different ways of learning, including play; and encourage physical movement. However, at the moment some curricula are weak, irrelevant, and not evidence-based (Araujo, Fiszbein and Mateo Díaz, 2017). Curricular frameworks should be strengthened by (i) adopting pedagogical frameworks that establish competencies and specific learning and development goals by age in different areas (cognitive, linguistic, socioemotional, and motor); (ii) creating teaching materials and curricula that are in line with the goals for each area; (iii) emphasizing the development of skills through play; (iv) developing structured guidelines that can help center staff in low-capacity contexts; and (v) offering support to personnel for improving their skills through training and mentoring among others (Araujo et al., 2017).

Poor children in vulnerable situations benefit the most. Studies consistently show that low income children and with less educated mothers benefit the most from early interventions and child care centers. Most of the reliable evidence about the impact of child care programs comes from programs with a focus on low-income populations. However, we also know that higher rates of participation come from highly income and educated households. In other words, children who need the services the most are the ones who attend the least (Araujo et al., 2017).
Program focus should be improved. In the Americas, ensuring that child care centers serve children from the poorest households continues to be a major challenge. Most of the region’s programs identify beneficiaries on the basis of poverty and social risk criteria and the presence of a working mother. Very few explicitly use rural location, which may explain why, in practice, most centers give priority to urban zones (Araujo et al., 2017). As for the instruments that programs use to measure these criteria, a study of a sample of programs found that 70% used a socioeconomic sheet to assess household situation. With few exceptions, these instruments are created by the actual programs – a process that is not only expensive but also very easy for program employees to manipulate (Araujo et al., 2017). One way to reduce these problems is to make greater use of targeting systems developed in various countries by integrating them in the beneficiary selection process. Two such systems are SISBEN, used by the HCB program in Colombia, and the Single Socioeconomic Information Questionnaire used by Instancias Infantiles in Mexico (Araujo et al., 2013; Mateo Díaz and Rodríguez-Chamussy, 2016).

Child care centers are more expensive than other interventions, but they are an effective strategy for poor and vulnerable populations. In general, we know that the costs of child care centers are higher than those of interventions such as home visits. However, given their benefits for poor and children in vulnerable situation and in terms of labor inclusion of parents, allocating public resources to child care centers can be a good investment, provided that the beneficiaries are well targeted, and that quality is good. One analysis estimates the annual cost per child of 28 institutional and community programs in the region at US$1,240, while another puts the average annual cost per child for institutional centers at 2,396 international dollars (PPP) (Mateo Díaz and Rodríguez-Chamussy, 2016). Nevertheless, there is also evidence that the value they create for society exceeds their cost (Mateo Díaz and Rodríguez-Chamussy, 2016). In the United States, the economic benefits of three large programs—the Perry Preschool Project, the Chicago Child-Parent Center Program and CPC Expansion, and the Abecedarian Project—were 8.6, 7.1, and 3.7 times greater than their costs. Child care centers create value for society in part by helping more women enter the labor force, which has a major impact on economic growth, productivity, and equity. In Latin America, access to inexpensive child care has resulted in a 2 to 22% increase in the likelihood of mothers being employed and a sizable increase in the number of hours worked (Mateo Díaz and Rodríguez-Chamussy, 2016). In Mexico, for example, access to a child care program was associated with an 18% increase in the probability of mothers being employed and a six-hour increase in weekly working hours (Angeles et al., 2011). In Chile, daycare location and operating hours compatible with working hours correlated positively with an increase in women’s labor force participation (Contreras, Puentes and Bravo, 2012). In addition, child care centers create economic value by improving child development, which promotes better educational outcomes, increased productivity at work, higher wages, and better health. More generally, child care centers facilitate the social inclusion of children from an early age by equipping them with the skills necessary to succeed in life and in school and by helping them to fully exercise their rights.
Governments have a critical role in ensuring access to quality child care centers. The state has a responsibility as a provider of services, a regulator and funder of child care centers, to ensure that poor and children in vulnerable situation have access to quality child care centers. As the provider of services, the state may work through agencies, ministries or even coordinating bodies that are directly responsible for these programs, but as we have seen, the state does not always provide these services directly. As the regulator, the state’s role is to ensure that all centers provide quality care, regardless of the service provider. In order to do so, the state must build effective quality assurance systems that include standards, monitoring mechanisms for compliance, and a system of rewards and punishments to encourage excellence. However, some experts warn that certain quality assurance methods, such as accreditation and regulation, can increase operating costs to the point that smaller or community providers are out of business in disadvantage of the poorest (Berlinksi and Schady, 2015). Thus, there is a need to explore monitoring systems that raise quality while maintaining affordability. Lastly, as we have seen, in their role as a funder, governments are required to invest in child care services in a sustained manner and to prioritize this investment of public resources in benefit of children in the most vulnerable situations.
HCB Program (Colombia)

Administration: The Hogares Comunitarios de Bienestar (HCB) program was established by the National Council on Economic and Social Policy (CONPES) of Colombia in 1987 and is administered by the Colombian Family Welfare Institute (ICBF), which is the agency responsible for the protection and well-being of children.

Description: The HCBs are child care centers for children under 6 years of age who come from poor families or families that are economically, socially, culturally, nutritionally, or psychologically vulnerable. Each HCB has between 12 and 14 children and is run by a mother who looks after the participating children in her own home. The mother, who is chosen by members of the community and approved by the ICBF, is known as a community mother. She is required to have completed at least nine years of school and to be trained in child care by the National Learning Service (SENA). Families of participating children pay the community mother a monthly fee equal to approximately 37% of the minimum daily wage.

Services include psychosocial development activities, food that should provide between 50 and 70% of required daily calories and nutrients, monitoring of nutritional and health status, health promotion and illness prevention, and registration of participating children in growth and development programs run by health agencies.

Outcomes and findings:

- An impact study by Bernal et al. (2009) found a positive impact on chronic and global malnutrition of approximately 2 and 3 percentage points. This impact was limited to children from 2 to 4 years who had been enrolled in the program from ages 5 to 15 months.

- The study did not find a positive impact on younger children (0 to 2 years) or children older than 4 years of age. In the first group, this may be related to the start of supplementary feeding and the possibility of infection when children came into contact with a group. In the second, it may be associated with the fact that children over 6 were receiving inadequate portions, which demonstrates the importance of adjusting servings appropriately.

- Factors linked to positive impact: HCB mother’s training, quality of the HCB floor, and HCB compliance with hygiene guidelines.

- Factors linked to positive cognitive impact: Availability of learning resources, good-sized recreation area, and HCB mother’s knowledge of child development.

Strategy 3
Improved access and quality in preprimary education

Preprimary education, which provides a bridge between home and school, is critical for laying the foundations of learning and development in young children. It can improve the skills of children from disadvantaged households, who generally enter primary school less prepared and it is useful for leveling learning opportunities. In the Americas, the preprimary level is increasingly a priority, but there are still problems with access, quality, and teacher training.

In addition to child care programs, another way that countries can help to equalize the early skills of children in vulnerable situations is through good preprimary education. We know that poor children and children in vulnerable situations enter primary school with weaker cognitive, language, and social skills than wealthier children for a number of reasons, including insufficient stimulation at home and inadequate nutrition, among other factors. This learning delay worsens as they grow and becomes much more difficult and expensive to reverse. The preprimary level, when children first enter the education system, presents a window of opportunity for laying the foundations for school learning. To the extent that preprimary education can make up for the learning disadvantages that poor children or children in vulnerable situations have, it is a strategy that deserves greater attention in the countries of the region.

What is preprimary education?

Preprimary education, sometimes called nursery school, kindergarten, or preschool, is the first level of formal education. Its purpose is to promote children’s all-round development by fostering socioemotional, language and communication skills, mathematical thinking, and exploration and creativity, so that they enter primary school with proper preparation and curious to learn. In the Americas, the theoretical age ranges for preprimary education goes from ages 3 to 5 generally divided into two levels with the second level corresponding to age 5. The trend has been to make the second level mandatory and promote universal enrollment. Thanks in part to laws requiring preschool attendance above a certain age, enrollment in preprimary education has grown more than at any other level of education, from 50% to almost 70% (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2018).

The availability of preprimary education varies widely across the Americas. Schools differ in terms of model (formal or informal), sector (public or private), and even organizational structure: schools attached to primary schools, autonomous schools (reporting to independent authorities), or clustered schools (sharing authorities) (Berlinksi and Schady, 2015). In many countries in the region, particularly in the Caribbean and Central America, a percentage of preprimary enrollments is in community preschools, which operate in houses, primary school buildings, churches, and other community spaces and are staffed by volunteer teachers without professional qualifications. Given their low cost and high incidence in rural or poor areas in countries such as El Salvador, Mexico, Bolivia, and Honduras, states have incorporated them into their legal frameworks and early childhood education plans and have stepped in to improve them. Regardless of its form, early childhood education is important for young children’s development and school readiness.
What are the results of these programs?

Regional and international evidence indicates that, like child care centers, preprimary education has positive impacts on children’s development and readiness for primary school, thereby promoting their rights to full and equal access to education and to development. Preschool attendance has major effects on performance throughout school. In Argentina, for example, a study found that one year of public preschool for children between the ages of 3 and 5 increased children’s third grade math and Spanish scores by 8% and also improved behaviors such as attention, effort, class participation, and discipline (Berlinski, Galiani and Gertler, 2009). There have been similar findings in other developing countries, including Botswana, Mozambique, and Bangladesh, where children who attend preschool do better in their first years of primary school; because they are equipped with the skills they need to learn more easily the following years (Taiwo and Tyolo, 2002; Martinez, Nadeau and Pereira, 2012). Furthermore, improvements in academic performance persist over time. In an analysis of the 15-year-olds who participated in the PISA 2012 international standardized assessment, those who had attended preschool scored much higher than those who had not, even among students of the same socioeconomic status. In Brazil and Mexico, for example, attending preschool gave children an advantage equivalent to an extra year in school (Bos, Ganimian y Vegas, 2014). In addition to improving performance, preprimary education increases the chances of educational attainment and earning potential. For example, a study of Uruguay found that, by age 15, young people who had attended preschool from ages 4 to 5 had accumulated 0.8 more years of education and were 27% more likely to continue studying in comparison with young people who had not attended preschool (Berlinski, Galiani and Manacorda, 2008). Another international study has estimated that raising preprimary enrollment to 25% in developing countries such as Yemen and Ethiopia would lead to future wage income 6.4 times greater than the cost per student by providing access to preschool. (UNESCO, 2012)

What are the lessons learned?

- **Coverage is still far from sufficient.** Early childhood education coverage varies enormously across the region, from more than 90% in Chile and Cuba, for example, to less than 50% in Belize, the Dominican Republic, and Paraguay (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2018). Within countries, there is a wide attendance gap between the poorest and the richest children and between rural and urban areas. In fact, the attendance rate for the richest children is 20% higher on average than for the poorest. In some countries, such as the Dominican Republic and El Salvador, the percentage of poor children in preschool is half that of wealthier children. This disparity is partially due to a problem of supply since most of the programs prioritize urban and higher income areas (Araujo et al., 2013).

- **Expansion of the preschool supply should focus on the poorest areas.** Given that non-attendance is partially due to insufficient supply, expanding the supply, using appropriate criteria and instruments, is an effective way to boost attendance among the poorest children. In Uruguay, for example, as part of the educational reform implemented during 1996-2000, the government set a goal of expanding preprimary coverage for 4 and 5-year-olds by building new preschool classrooms (almost all attached to existing schools in order to reduce costs). The construction plan specifically targeted low socioeconomic areas, areas where demographic growth had created a shortage, and border areas where it was necessary to strengthen cultural identity (Mullin and Vairo, 2015). Mostly as a result of this initiative, coverage increased from 65% to 85% between 1995 and 2000 and was highest for the poorest children in the country’s urban interior. For example, in 1991, the enrollment gap between the poorest and the richest children was 33 percentage points, but by 2007 it had shrunk to just 5 percentage points. A similar strategy was used in Argentina, where, to expand coverage, the Ministry...
of Education built 3,724 preschool classrooms between 1994 and 2000, prioritizing areas with unsatisfied demand. According to a study, the construction of these classrooms had a major impact on enrollment and explained half of the large growth in enrollment during those years and also improved primary school performance, particularly among the poorest children (Berlinski et al., 2009).

- **Alternative models are useful, but they should be supported and evaluated.** Where public preschools are unavailable, alternative models of preprimary education already enroll a substantial portion of preschool-aged children. Community centers are the primary alternative, but others include accelerated learning, remote learning, and homeschooling. These models offer fast, cost-effective options for increasing coverage and have been shown to produce good results, but still require attention and regulation by the educational authorities in order to ensure quality, which is a challenge in many countries. One example of community centers that have received government support is the Centros Comunitarios de Educación Pre-Básica (CCEPREBs) in Honduras, an initiative launched in 2000 by the local nongovernmental organization FEREMA and later joined by the Secretariat of Education. The CCEPREBs, which target five to six-year-olds in poor rural and urban areas without formal preprimary schools, use community spaces and volunteer teachers. Since 2012, the Secretariat has worked with FEREMA to build more than 2,000 new centers, equip them with teaching materials (including a methodology guide consistent with the national primary curriculum), and train the volunteer teachers. Today there are more than 6,000 Centers operating under the umbrella of a program to universalize preprimary education, which aims to reach 22% of unserved children through this model (Asociación de Municipios de Honduras, 2016).

- **Teacher quality is critical for learning, but teacher training resources are weak.** As in child care centers, in preschools, the greatest determinant of a school’s quality and the children’s success is the quality of the teachers. For example, a study in Ecuador measuring teacher quality with the widely used Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) found that students who had better teachers (teachers who demonstrated better instructional support, emotional support, and classroom organization) scored higher in language, math, and executive function skills (Araujo, Carneiro, Cruz-Aguayo and Schady, 2016). Studies in other countries have also found that the quality of instruction and stimulation predicts how well students obtain academic and social skills (Burchinal et al., 2008). Unfortunately, teacher training resources, which directly affects quality, is particularly weak at the preprimary level. In general, fewer professional qualifications are required to teach at this level of education than at other levels, and they vary from country to country, ranging from a university degree to a technical secondary diploma. In addition, many teachers teach without the minimum required degree. According to UNESCO data, the percentage of unqualified teachers ranges from under 10% in Colombia and Costa Rica, to 50% in Paraguay and Honduras, to almost 80% in Panama and Ecuador (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2018). Other weaknesses in teacher training are low quality and irrelevant curricula, limited evaluation of training programs - especially in private institutions - and failure to update programs and curricula regularly. In general, states need to develop a profile for preschool teacher that considers the requirements needed and use this profile to update the training programs, as well as to monitor and evaluate periodically teacher training institutions.
Providing Teachers training can improve learning. In addition to better training resources, educators—particularly nonprofessional educators—should receive coaching and mentoring support. Chile’s Un Buen Comienzo program, which provided training for preschool teachers in 64 schools in Santiago, is a good regional example of teacher support. The teachers received a combination of instructional training (with content-based strategies) and coaching putting into practice good practices demonstrated by the coaches. After two years, moderate improvements were found in teaching quality as measured by the CLASS Teacher-Child Observation Instrument (Yoshikawa et al., 2015). A smaller intervention used a participative teacher training model in which the coaches worked one on one with preschool teachers in their classrooms, observing their practices and modeling language teaching strategies. The children whose teachers received coaching later demonstrated better ability to identify and pronounce words (Pallante and Kim, 2013). In the United States, other interventions combining teaching workshops and contact with mentors or coaches have also increased classroom quality and preschooler development (Bierman et al., 2008; Landry, Anthony, Swank and Monseque-Bailey, 2009). In addition, teacher training can help teachers improve classroom behavior, which is necessary for learning. In Jamaica, for example, a behavior management training program, the Incredible Years, reduced conduct problems in children and improved their social skills (Baker-Henningham, Scott, Jones and Walker, 2012). Overall, experiences in the region indicate that teacher training should be a priority in early childhood education.

Curricula and teaching should be culturally appropriate. In addition to well-prepared teachers, quality early childhood education requires solid curricula rooted into what children are able to relate. Specifically, in regions with indigenous populations, curricula should take into account not only the values of the different cultures but also the children’s primary language. Various studies have shown that in early years, children who learn in their primary language obtain greater academic advantage. Preschoolers who learn their primary language well are able to absorb a second language more efficiently since the linguistic skills developed in their first language helps them with the second one. In Latin America, some countries have made great strides in this area, incorporating intercultural bilingual education (IBE) into laws and educational requirements as well as in developing curricular frameworks with an IBE perspective. However, UNICEF and UNESCO studies indicate that there are still many deficiencies, including the emerging use of indigenous languages in school activities, the actual shortage of indigenous teachers and teachers qualified in preprimary intercultural bilingual education, and a lack of methodological tools for IBE (UNESCO, 2010; UNICEF, 2014). Mexico has recently made progress in this area. As part of their 2012 curricular reform, it established a teacher training curriculum on preprimary intercultural bilingual education in normal schools, created new university degrees in preprimary IBE, and adopted new curricular frameworks for preprimary IBE. In practice, however, much remains to be done in Mexico and elsewhere to improve curricula implementation, provide support for teachers in indigenous schools, promote teaching as a career in indigenous communities, and more generally, strengthen the political will to improve interculturalism in preprimary education.
Preprimary education policies should prioritize the role of the parents, with special emphasis on parents from vulnerable households. Parental support is critical for increasing preprimary attendance and preschool quality for poor children and for children in vulnerable situations. We know that lower preprimary attendance is due in part to the relatively lower cultural value society attaches to this level of education and to some parents’ belief that the preschool-age children are still too young for school (particularly if a level is not mandatory). For this reason, governments need to raise parental awareness of the importance of preschool through information campaigns, incentives, or other social mechanisms. In respect to quality, we know that the home learning environment is still the most influential factor in children’s cognitive outcomes (Melhuish et al., 2008). In homes of limited education, time, or finances prevent parents from teaching their children; it is important to help them reinforce what their children learn in preschool. An international example of this type of intervention is the Head Start preschool program in the United States of America where teachers visited preschooler parents at home to talk about their children’s development and work out strategies for the parents to reinforce their children’s learning (Sheridan, Knoche, Kupzyk, Pope Edwards and Marvin, 2011). Children who participated in the intervention scored higher in reading and writing. Other studies have also demonstrated that greater parental involvement in preschool activities leads to better child behavior and academic achievement (Powell, Son, File and San Juan, 2010; Galindo and Sheldon, 2012). Therefore, early childhood education strategies in all countries should give due consideration to the role of the parents and the support they can provide at home.
Teacher Profesionalization Program, A good beginning, Chile (Un Buen Comienzo en Chile)

Administration: It was led by a U.S. research team, the Oportunidad Educational Foundation, and the Center for Comparative Policy in Education (CPCE) at Diego Portales University, in consultation with an Interagency Technical Roundtable involving public officials, leaders, and preschool education teachers.

Description: A good beginning (Un Buen Comienzo) was an experimental intervention that sought to improve the quality of preschools in poor municipalities of Santiago through a teacher professionalization program. For one year, preschool teachers in the selected schools received training in a series of modules consisting of a didactic workshop (where they learned content strategies) and two tutorial sessions with a tutor and an assistant tutor. In the first tutoring session, the tutor modeled good practices to the teacher and the assistant tutor, and in the second session, the assistant teacher and tutor implemented the strategy while observing the tutor, who then gave immediate feedback. The content of the modules, established in collaboration with the Technical Table of relevant actors, focused on three areas: oral language and early literacy, social-emotional development, and coordination with health services.

Results and Lessons:

• Thanks to the program, teachers significantly improved their 1) emotional support skills, 2) classroom organization, and 3) teaching support, as measured by the international CLASS instrument.

• However, no improvements were found in children’s learning. The researchers suggest that this is because in the trainings the tutors were not specific about how often or for how long the teachers had to use the different strategies, and therefore, the time they spent in language teaching did not grow much.

• On the other hand, children’s high absenteeism may have influenced teachers to improve their teaching but not to see results in children. It was concluded that in order to improve training, tutors should be more prescriptive with the use of time in the classroom, and attendance should be improved.
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Chapter 2

PRIMARY EDUCATION

Primary education is a critical level of the education system offering. Early childhood (ages 0 to 5) is the most important period for human brain development; it is in primary school that children lay the foundations of academic knowledge, learning such essential skills as reading, writing, and basic math, which are important to prepare them for more advanced learning and life in general.

Free and compulsory primary education is a universal human right. States’ recognition of this right is reflected in a series of international agreements, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and the World Declaration on Education for All. Many states that have ratified these treaties have committed themselves in various ways to implementing this right. As a result, almost all children in the Americas attend primary school, with many countries reporting close to 100% net enrollment in primary education. However, there are still large segments of the primary age population that do not attend school (10% of the population or more in some countries). This problem is particularly acute among poor children and children in vulnerable situations, indigenous and afro-descendant children, and children with disabilities or with specific educational needs (SENs).

Furthermore, while a number of countries have made progress on improving levels of learning, many international and national assessments indicate that a large proportion of primary school students are not learning at high enough levels. For example, almost 40% of third-grade children in the region cannot solve basic addition or multiplication problems (OREALC/UNESCO Santiago, 2014). Low learning levels are a problem that disproportionately affects poor students, rural students, public school students, and ethnic and national minority students (OREALC/UNESCO Santiago, 2015).

Although achieving universal primary education in the region is a milestone, more must be done to ensure that schools teach children the skills needed in order to develop their full potential as individuals and exercise their rights fully and effectively.

Hence the Sustainable Development Goal 4 states:

**4.1** By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable, and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes.

The indicator for this target (indicator 4.1.1) is as follows: Proportion of children and young people (a) in grades 2nd/3rd; (b) at the end of primary; and (c) at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics, by sex (UNESCO, s.f.).

In view of the above, in the following chapters we propose strategies for achieving SDG 4 target 4.1 and the Inter-American Education Agenda goal of “quality, inclusive, and equitable education” in the Americas. Chapter 2 focuses on primary education and Chapter 3 on secondary education.
Current Situation

Primary school enrollment is almost universal.

Having the vast majority of the region’s children in primary school is a major achievement. National efforts to increase access to primary education and promote universal primary education have boosted net enrollment in primary school from 89% in 1980 to 90% in 1990, 94% in 2000, and 93% in 2015 (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2018). For example, between approximately 1990 and 2015, Costa Rica increased primary school enrollment from 88% to 96%; Panama, from 87% to 93%; and Nicaragua, from 68% to 96% in 2010 (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2018).

However, many children are still excluded from the education system.

While the primary school attendance in Latin America and the Caribbean is still above the global average, the coverage gaps that remain reflect the difficulty of reaching the most socioeconomically disadvantaged segments of society, which the recent economic slowdown may have accentuated. Many countries are still struggling with a significant proportion of out-of-school children. In some, the enrollment rate remains below 90%, Bolivia (85%), the Dominica Republic (86.9%), Paraguay (88.5%), Guatemala (85.5%), Puerto Rico (82.0%), Saint Kitts and Nevis (78.4%), and Venezuela (89.9%), for example, and in others, it is barely 90% (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2018). The fact that one-out-of-every 10 children is not in school in so many countries represents a critical problem that must be addressed.

Who are the children that still are outside the system? Surprisingly, poor, wealthy, rural, and urban children have almost the same attendance rates. The average urban-rural gap is between 1% and 3% according to three different calculations, by the Inter-American Development Bank, ECLAC, and USAID, while the socioeconomic gap (difference between the wealthiest and the poorest quintiles) ranges between 1% and 8% according to these same sources (IADB, CEPALSTATS, s.f.; USAID and DHS, s.f.). This represents progress over earlier years, but there are still countries where the socioeconomic gap is very wide, particularly in Central America: for example, Guatemala (7%), Nicaragua (8%), and Honduras (11%). This difference is due to countless factors including lack of access to schools, child labor, parental level of education and valuation of education, as well as malnutrition (in countries like Guatemala), among other factors that affect school attendance.

The widest gaps occur when rural location and extreme poverty coincide, or when they combine with other demographic characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, race, and presence or absence of disability. In fact, among children with more limited access to school, two populations are disproportionately affected: indigenous children and children with specific educational needs and/or disabilities (both populations discussed below). With respect to the first group, the region’s countries have made substantial progress in the past decade by enacting education laws that address cultural and indigenous identity. As a result, indigenous attendance has increased since 2000 in a number of countries (for example, from 73% to 83% in Brazil and from 78% to 92% in Panama). However, the attendance gap remains large, especially in rural areas and in countries with smaller, diverse, and scattered indigenous populations such as Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, and Venezuela (see Chart 4) (World Bank, 2015). Although there are various reasons for this gap, the primary factors are school expenses, distance from school, and need to work (World Bank, 2015).
Regarding children with specific educational needs, we know that children with disabilities are the segment of the child population most widely excluded from the education system. At the global level, only 10% of all children with disabilities attend school, and only half of those who start primary school manage to finish it. This means that only 5% of children with disabilities around the world have completed primary school (Peters, 2003). While we do not have comparable data for the Americas, the results of several recent national surveys give us an idea of the seriousness of the problem. For example, El Salvador’s 2015 national disability survey found that 22% of children under age 12 and 44% of children aged 13 to 18 were not in school and the figures were higher for rural areas (CONAIPD, 2016). In Peru, the 2012 national survey on disability found that 40% of children with disabilities aged 6 to 11 were not in school (National Institute of Statistics and Information Science of Peru, 2014). Other countries present a more positive picture. In Chile, the 2015 national disabilities study found a slight difference in net enrollment rates for children with disabilities at the primary level (88.7% versus 95.8%) and a more pronounced gap at the secondary level (49.9% versus 82.0%) (National Disability Service, Chile, 2016). Regionally, low enrollment is due in part to the fact that, although legislation guarantees all children access to regular schools (as opposed to special schools) in the primary education system, in practice many schools do not admit children with disabilities or children with particularly severe disabilities, according to reports from multiple press and civil society sources in the countries.
Learning outcomes have improved over the years, but they are still low and unequal.

Being able to reach all children in society is a challenge. In addition, their low-average learning levels reflected in their learning achievements show the large inequalities between enrolled children. Both national and international studies have shown academic performance in the region to be weak and uneven, despite improvements over past years. The tests most widely used to measure learning at the regional level were developed by the UNESCO-affiliated Latin American Laboratory for Assessment of the Quality of Education (LLECE). In 2013, LLECE conducted its Third Regional Comparative and Explanatory Study (Tercer Estudio Regional Comparativo y Explicativo, TERCE) among 67,000 third and sixth graders in 15 countries in the region. The students were tested in reading, writing, mathematics, and natural sciences (the first three subject areas at both grade levels and natural sciences only in sixth grade).

This study found progress in comparison with the Second Regional Comparative and Explanatory Study (Segundo Estudio Regional Comparativo y Explicativo, SERCE), conducted in 2006. The regional average score improved significantly over SERCE in all grades and subject areas; in other words, the percentage of students scoring in the lowest level (Level I) dropped, and the percentage scoring in the higher levels rose. For example, in third grade mathematics, the percentage of students at Level I or lower fell from 51.5% to 36.75%.

However, the results still show low levels of learning. Almost 30% of children performed at Level I or lower in all grades and subject areas; in other words, they did not even reach the minimum level of competency (Level II). For example, in third grade reading, 27% of children were low-performing. This means that they cannot locate explicit elements of the text if they are not flagged, repeated verbatim, or isolated from other information and cannot recognize reformulations of simple sentences—skills which they should have at this age (OREALC/UNESCO Santiago, 2015). Furthermore, children’s scores were strongly conditioned by their sociodemographic characteristics. The variable most associated with academic achievement was the school socioeconomic index (average socioeconomic level of the school’s students); an increase in this index was associated with an increase of 36 points in reading and mathematics and 29 points in natural sciences, an even stronger association than with the socioeconomic level of the individual student (OREALC/UNESCO Santiago, 2015). This finding reinforces the idea that economic segregation in schools has a significant impact on learning.

---

10 Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, and Uruguay, plus the Mexican state of Nuevo León.
In regards to TERCE, other characteristics associated with performance differences were ethnic origin, gender, school location (urban or rural), and school type (private or public). Indigenous children scored from 13 to 80 points lower on the TERCE tests, depending on country, grade, and subject area (OREALC/UNESCO Santiago, 2015). When we consider the relationship between performance and socioeconomic status – that is, when we compare indigenous and non-indigenous children with the same household income – the correlation is weaker but still significant in many countries (18 to 43 points). For example, in Panama, indigenous children score almost 50 points lower in language than non-indigenous children in sixth grade, but for income level, they score somewhat more than 30 points lower (OREALC/UNESCO Santiago, 2015). This is because many indigenous children attend poor quality schools with less prepared teachers and lower quality teaching materials (Schmelkes, 2013; UNESCO and OEI, 2011). Furthermore, many indigenous children (particularly members of minority indigenous peoples) attend schools where their teachers only speak Spanish or an indigenous language other than their own. This situation is problematic, since according to various studies, young children should ideally be taught in their primary language (see discussion on intercultural bilingual education below).

Gender differences are much less pronounced, although girls score better than boys in reading and worse than boys in math. These differences are greater in sixth grade than in third, which suggests that cultural expectations may weigh more heavily on performance as children grow. Lastly, in almost all countries, children in private schools score higher than children in public schools, and urban children score higher than their rural peers. However, in all cases, if we eliminate the effect of socioeconomic level (that is if we compare children of the same socioeconomic status and only change, for example, school location), performance differences are much smaller. This indicates that poverty is the factor that explains most of the educational inequalities among different populations.

Another international test which shows low learning outcomes is the Caribbean Primary Exit Assessment (CPEA), administered by Caribbean Examinations’ Council (CXC) to all sixth graders in 16 countries. While regional results are not published, some national data suggest that average learning is low. For example, in Grenada, 88% and 85% of students passed the exams in 2016 and 2017, respectively, but the minimum passing score was only 50% (Government of Grenada, 2016). In Anguilla, 80% of students passed the exams with more than 50% in 2014, but the average was 63%, and only 17% of students answered more than 80% of the questions correctly.

The national assessments of various countries also reflect low, uneven learning. In Peru’s 2016 student evaluation census (Evaluación Censal de Estudiantes), for example, we see three general trends: student learning is low in general, children in fourth grade score lower than they did in second grade (and even lower in the second year of secondary school), and the gaps between different groups are greater in fourth grade than in second. For example, the public school-private school gap for satisfactory performance in reading is minimal in second grade (50.4% of students versus 51.8%) but significant in fourth grade (30.8% versus 42.6%). In Honduras as well, we see student performance decline with years and rural school disadvantage grow year after year (see Chart 6). This is why policies should seek to ensure equity from the earliest age.

**Chart 6**


Why is reducing educational inequality in primary school important?

Education is a fundamental human right of all children and one of the most influential factors in the advancement and progress of individuals and societies. Education is necessary to achieve greater social well-being and economic growth, to help young people get better jobs (thereby promoting social mobility), and to develop the civic values that build social capital and strengthen the rule of law. To break free from socioeconomic inequality, it is vital to strive for equity in because it gives all children the same ability to improve their chances in life.

The primary level is especially important for achieving educational equality. International evidence shows that children’s skills in the first years of primary school largely predict their performance in later years (Sahn and Glick, 2010; Nordström, Jacobson and Söderberg, 2016). Furthermore, grade repetition in primary school, which many education systems use to rectify the developmental delays experienced by some children, correlates strongly with low secondary school performance and dropping out of secondary school. For example, among adolescents taking the PISA tests in 2013, those who had repeated a grade in primary school were six times more likely to have low scores on the math portion of the exam (OCDE, 2016). The teaching of subjects such as math and reading is becoming increasingly complex, and teachers seldom teach differently to children who are more challenged. Children who had a weak understanding of basic concepts at an early age find it very hard to keep on learning. It is imperative for children to have the opportunity to equalize their learning before reaching their last years of primary or secondary school.

In this chapter, we present four strategies that have proved effective for equalizing student learning opportunities. First, we look at strategies for improving learning among low-achieving students: student-centered learning (SCL) programs and early grade reading programs. Next, we look at strategies for improving access and completion in the two most educationally disadvantaged subpopulations: inclusive education for children with disabilities and specific educational needs, and intercultural bilingual education for indigenous children.
Strategy 4
Student-centered learning

Summary: One strategy for replacing the passive route instruction commonly used in the region with teaching that truly encourages learning and critical thinking is student-centered learning (SCL). SCL teaching methods shift the focus of instruction from the teacher to the student, giving the student greater autonomy in how, when, and what to learn. SCL stresses active, collaborative, thoughtful learning through methods such as problem-based learning, inquiry-based learning and student collaboration. It also emphasizes instruction tailored to the level of each student and flexible promotion systems, which are particularly relevant in rural schools, where one teacher often teaches students of different ages. The success of SCL seen in some countries include, student attitude towards school, and student retention—particularly in low-resource schools. Incorporating SLC in education systems for the Americas may heighten the impact for improving academic performance.

A major reason why learning outcomes are low and unequal in the Americas is because teachers are not using the most appropriate teaching methods for learning. Teachers in the region tend to rely on mechanical teaching methods: students learn by memorizing facts and processes (Näslund-Hadley, Loera Varel and Hepworth, 2014). More than 20% of class time is devoted to “passive” instruction, such as taking notes or individual desk work (Chart 7) (Bruns and Luque, 2015). Students have few opportunities to practice critical thinking skills, and teachers tend to simplify complex problems, often asking basic questions and expecting students to fire back answers (Näslund-Hadley and Bando, 2015). This pedagogical approach does not account for the multiple interpretations students may have and has been linked to difficulties in the acquisition of problem-solving skills and subsequent learning gaps (Näslund-Hadley and Bando, 2015). Weak teaching happens because teachers do not have enough tools to make learning relevant and interesting to the students. SCL tools includes in classroom training, materials, supplemental resources and classroom management strategies that are more relevant and in tune with international research.

Not surprisingly, then, teachers find it very difficult to hold students’ attention and keep them engaged. In fact, they are unable to hold all of their students’ attention for more than 25% of class time (Bruns and Luque, 2015). Teachers clearly need to improve how they teach by giving priority to active learning methods. This is why Student-centered learning (SCL) has become a widespread movement within the international educational community (U.S. Department of Education, 2010; Miller, Gross and Ouijdani, 2012).
What is student-centered learning?

The teaching methods used in student-centered learning, also known as “active learning”, changing the dynamic of the authority-based teacher-student relationship, giving students a much more active role in their own learning. With this mode of teaching, classrooms are organized according to the students’ needs. Students have more control over what and how they learn, providing them insight on their learning/acquisition processes. Integration of new concepts with ideas relevant to the students’ lives are emphasized through the use of interactive spaces are organized for exchanging ideas and peer teaching, and teaching methods. The theory behind this mode of learning arose out of constructivism, which states that people construct their own understanding of the world by experiencing things and reflecting on those experiences. Thus, in SCL, the teacher’s role is not to transmit knowledge but to guide the students as they achieve the learning goals themselves.

In practice, SCL implies major changes in traditional pedagogy. For example, instead of the teacher spending most of the time talking in front of the blackboard, the children learn in small groups through discussion and experimentation. Instead of simply presenting information and expecting the students to memorize or practice it, the teacher uses inductive teaching methods such as inquiry-based learning, problem-solving, case-based instruction, and discovery, all of which have demonstrated surprising results. And instead of all of the students learning at the same pace and in the same way, students learn at different speeds and, where possible, in the way they find most appealing.
There are already a number of student-centered learning initiatives in the Americas. Of them, the most widely recognized internationally is Escuela Nueva, which began in Colombia as a pilot project in multigrade rural schools and was later adopted by the Colombian Ministry of Education as a national policy for rural areas. Through Fundación Escuela Nueva Volvamos a la Gente (FEN), this schooling model has been implemented in various countries in and outside the region. The most recent SCL initiatives in the Americas have focused on improving math and science outcomes at different levels of education and often used to teach math. They include Tikichuela in Paraguay, Mimate in Peru, Matemática para Todos Plan in Argentina, and Visible and Tangible Math in Belize. In fact, the main message of a recent Inter-American Development Bank study was “mathematics and science achievement improves when students are at the center of the learning process” (Näslund-Hadley and Bando, 2015). However, SCL has proved effective in subject areas as diverse as language, philosophy, and physical education.

What are the results of these programs?

Student-centered learning has succeeded in improving student learning outcomes in the Americas. In Colombia, empirical studies conducted from 1982 to 1997 confirmed that third to fifth graders in the Escuela Nueva program outperformed their traditional school counterparts in math and Spanish (Psacharopoulos, Rojas y Velez, 1993; McEwan, 1998). The impact was greater among lower income children, indicating that this schooling model promotes equity directly. An urban adaptation of the model in 20 low-resources, low-performing Bogota schools saw a 40% increase in language skills and a 69% increase in math skills in local testing. These schools had higher scores than the average for the 2,500 Bogota schools evaluated (Colbert y Arboleda, 2016). In Peru, a study of the USAID AprenDes project, which reached more than 16,000 students from 2003 to 2009 using the SCL model, found that after four years of implementation, mastery of grade-level subject matter in language had increased from 5% to 18%. AprenDes students also did better in math than students who were not in the program (USAID, 2010).

This confirms what has been seen in programs that are not necessarily a part of the Escuela Nueva or Escuelas Activas networks but use student-centered methodologies. In Guatemala, for example, a study of effective pedagogical methods in rural schools found that when more time was devoted to practices associated with student-centered learning—for example, when students worked in groups and then went to the blackboard—the percentage of correct test answers increased by 10 to 15% (Marshall and Sorto, 2012). In the United States, a multitude of studies confirm that students who receive active-learning pedagogy outperform students in traditional classrooms (Taraban, Box, Myers, Pollard and Bowen, 2007; Tiwari, Lai, So and Yuen, 2006).

SCL also has been shown to improve indicators such as grade repetition and dropout. The first Escuela Nueva studies demonstrated that, on average, fewer fifth grade students dropped out of Escuela Nueva schools than out of schools that did not have active learning (Psacharopoulos, Rojas and Velez, 1993). The Escuela Nueva implementation in Guatemala, Nueva Escuela Unitaria (NEU), which operated as a joint USAID-Ministry of Education project from 1989 to 1996, found that the program reduced grade repetition rates and increased transition to secondary school. In 1992, 62% of NEU first graders went on to second grade, in comparison with 52% of first graders in traditional schools (Kline, 2000). In NEU schools, 21% of students completed primary school in the standard six years, compared to 10% in other schools. While this was still a very low completion rate, it represented a substantial improvement.

Lastly, active pedagogies also have a positive effect on the development of noncognitive skills. In studies of the NEU project in Guatemala, NEU students demonstrated democratic behavior—they were more helping, expressed their opinions more often, and participated in student government compared to students who were not enrolled
in active-learning schools (De Baessa, Chesterfield and Ramos, 2002). Active pedagogies also improve student attitudes towards subject matter. Various studies have found that problem-based learning, a type of SCL, improves student attitudes in areas such as science and mathematics (Ferreira and Trudel, 2012; Uygun and Tertemiz, 2014). This is particularly useful in the Americas, where poor children have been found to have higher levels of math anxiety (IADB, s.f).

What are the lessons learned?

One of the biggest challenges for student-centered learning is changing teacher paradigms and attitudes. It is very difficult to change teachers’ traditional pedagogical practices. In the active pedagogy programs mentioned in the Inter-American Development Bank report All Children Count, 90% of teachers preferred working as a large group or class to having students work in small groups (Näslund-Hadley and Bando, 2015). The main reason for this attitude was that the teachers were afraid that they would lose control of their classrooms and that lessons would become noisy and unstructured. Resistance is even greater when teachers have been teaching in a certain way for years. It was therefore not surprising that many opposed rearranging desks to facilitate group work (rather than leaving them in rows). In the Mimate program in Peru, for example, researchers found that it could take time to get teachers to give individualized instruction based on each student’s progress (Näslund-Hadley and Bando, 2015). However, encouragingly, with time and training, the teachers came around to structuring their classrooms and lessons to promote group work.

This is why teacher training is essential. Teacher training is crucial for the implementation of student-centered methods. In addition to teaching teachers the necessary pedagogies for following the SCL models, it increases their confidence in their ability to teach the subjects well, which is in itself linked to better learning outcomes. In the Mimate program in Peru, for example, teachers trained by the program were more likely to say that they had enough time to cover all of the material in the curriculum (71% of teachers in the program compared to 48% of teachers in other schools) and that they were well prepared to teach math (23% of teachers in the program compared to 7% of teachers in other schools). In Belize, teacher training for the Visible and Tangible Math program, which uses an inquiry and investigation-based approach to teach students math, has significantly increased teachers’ self-efficacy with respect to their own teaching practices and their students’ participation (Hull, Booker and Näslund-Hadley, 2016).

Teachers training should be ongoing and should itself use student-centered learning pedagogies. What is effective teacher training in student-centered learning? Various practices are recommended in the literature. For example, it is suggested that training should be ongoing, timely, and based on the performance and specific needs of the teachers. One form of training that has been well received by teachers in SCL programs is “just in time” training, in which they receive model lessons (taught using SCL methods) shortly before they give their own lessons, so that it is easier to translate the training into classroom practice (Näslund-Hadley and Bando, 2015). Individual or group coaching is also used to provide support for a specific lesson or activity. The coaches may be senior professionals or more experienced peers. Peer-to-peer observation is also useful for improving teaching. For example, in Escuela Nueva schools, teachers receive ongoing training and have the opportunity to observe experienced Escuela Nueva teachers and to be observed by and get feedback from them. For this type of teacher-to-teacher collaboration to work, school leaders must schedule time for the teachers to meet, establish the rules for collaboration, and network with other schools. This also has implications for how the school is organized and administered.
SCL requires changing not only teaching methods but also student evaluation. One of the principles of student-centered learning is differentiated instruction tailored to the needs of the individual child. This model is particularly useful for rural schools in the Americas since a large proportion of the schools are single-teacher and multigrade; in other words, one teacher teaches a group of children in different “grades,” with different learning levels. This has important implications for student assessment since teaching children at the appropriate level—one that is neither too easy nor too hard (a process known in teaching theory as “individual scaffolding”)—requires teachers to evaluate all of their students’ knowledge on an ongoing basis. For this purpose, various experts recommend “formative evaluation,” which is conducted periodically, provides students with more feedback, and gives teachers a basis for modifying their teaching to improve learning (Näslund-Hadley and Bando, 2015). There are computerized tests that can give teachers immediate feedback on their students’ progress, but it is also possible to develop simpler, inexpensive tools. In the Mimate program in Peru, for example, teachers pulled aside one or two students during every lesson to conduct a five-minute formative evaluation using flash cards. Their responses told them exactly what needed practicing (Näslund-Hadley and Bando, 2015). Other forms of SCL-related evaluation that countries should use more frequently are observation-based assessment (which is more about evaluating interactions than knowledge); peer assessment (which can produce results comparable to a teacher’s evaluation if accompanied by rubrics, scales, and other instruments and also encourages reflection and feedback); and self-assessment (which is critical to the idea of student autonomy, a central pillar of SCL) (Gibson and Shaw, 2010). These assessments are intended to complement, not replace, traditional testing. In addition, traditional testing should be improved to capture not only what students know but also how well they can use their knowledge to solve problems.

Taking SCL to scale requires systematizing and defining the components of the model. To implement SCL in a number of schools and maintain quality at the same time, mechanisms must be introduced to systematize the model’s processes. For example, one of the keys to expanding the Escuela Nueva model to all rural schools in Colombia was the development of a teachers’ handbook and student guides for use in all schools. The first teachers’ handbook used in the first teacher trainings was introduced to the teachers using the same methodology they were expected to use with their students. Demonstration schools to teach teachers were established in several regions and made it possible to exercise some quality control over how the Escuela Nueva model was implemented (Colbert and Arboleda, 2016). Students handbooks were also developed, which are a cross between textbooks, workbooks, and teacher’s guides with a sequence of steps for answering questions individually, in pairs, or in small groups. The handbooks are based on the Learn, Practice, and Apply (LPA) methodology: “What I learn, I practice, and what I practice, I apply.” First, teachers present new subject matter through the self-instructional guides. Second, they ask students to practice the subject individually and in groups. Third, they encourage students to apply the subject matter to situations of their own context (Mogollón and Solano, 2011). The guides provide guidelines for the students to work independently. Since they are organized by subject area, they also ensure that all of the contents of the Colombian national curriculum are taught using this pedagogy. According to the founders of Escuela Nueva, expansion to scale would not have been technically viable without them. However, it should be noted that implementation and content must still be adapted to the local context. For example, the success of the NEU project in Guatemala, which was based on the Colombian Escuela Nueva model, is attributed in part to the fact that the implementers respected the fundamental principles of the Escuela Nueva model while adapting it to the project regions—in particular, by developing bilingual materials for use in areas with large indigenous populations (Kline, 2000). In summary, it is necessary to strike a balance between flexibility and systematization in order to scale up while maintaining quality, which is also central to the SCL philosophy.
Escuela Nueva Program in Colombia

**Administration:** Escuela Nueva is a program of the Ministry of Education of Colombia that begun as a pedagogical innovation in the 1960s. It was later adopted by the Ministry of Education and expanded to all rural schools. It has also been exported and implemented to 2 other continents and 16 countries around the world.

**Description:** Components and principles of the Escuela Nueva model

- Instead of having a teacher teach from the blackboard, students learn in small groups or pairs.
- Learning may occur in or outside the classroom, in common areas, in the community, or at home.
- Evaluation is periodic and formative rather than occasional.
- Democracy and autonomy are encouraged through the establishment of student councils.
- School-community ties are fostered through activities involving the parents.
- The children learn using self-instructional guides that facilitate the implementation of this model and serve to incorporate the national curriculum and to introduce new subjects when necessary (recently published guides include guides on the Colombian peace process).

**Outcomes and findings:**

- In general, there is evidence that Escuela Nueva third and fifth graders outperform their peers in math and language.
- Escuela Nueva students also have better-developed civic skills than their peers. During implementation, it was found that one way to generate enthusiasm and acceptance among teachers was by establishing demonstration schools, which showed them the surprising results that could be achieved with this methodology.
- Implementation of the model differs both within and between schools since all schools do not incorporate all Escuela Nueva components. However, the Escuela Nueva model works best when fully implemented. It was found that one of the factors in this loss of quality control was that the program’s expansion overlapped with the decentralization of Colombian schools system. This highlights the importance of working closely with the local entities.

**Source:** Colbert, V., and Arboleda, J. “Bringing a student-centered participatory pedagogy to scale in Colombia.” *Journal of Educational Change* 17(4) (2016): 365-410.
Strategy 5
Early Grade reading

Summary: If students do not achieve a certain degree of reading fluency and comprehension before the end of the early primary grades, they remain behind their age peers since academic success in the higher grades depends increasingly on basic reading abilities. Poor and children in vulnerable situations are at high risk of not learning to read. For this reason, early grade reading programs attempt to eliminate these inequalities through a variety of interventions. Systematic skill assessments and explicit standards are required to ensure that poor and children in vulnerable situations are well prepared and acquire essential reading skills on time. In addition, students need to master the individual components of reading, while teachers and administrators need special training in reading instruction methods.

Both national and international learning assessments show that students in the region are not reading as well as they should. This is a critical problem since reading is essential for learning and, later on, for exercising citizenship and succeeding in the labor market (Mcintosh and Vignoles, 2001). Early grade reading programs and interventions seek to improve reading performance while children are still at the optimum age for learning to read. These programs encompass a wide range of possible methods, including individual or school-level interventions, teacher training, and even campaigns to raise awareness of the importance of reading in everyday life. If students finish the early primary grades reading fluently and understanding what they read, they will be better prepared to continue learning and to confront the challenges of the twenty-first century.

What is early grade reading?

In the broadest sense, early grade reading is simply the process by which students learn to read in the early primary grades (normally defined as first to third grade) (USAID and LAC Reads Capacity Program, 2016). In the majority of the developed countries, this process begins in preprimary school and continues through first or second grade. However, in the Americas, most students cannot read adequately after several years of formal education. Early reading programs seek to address this problem through a variety of interventions including: assessing students’ reading skills, training teachers in the explicit instruction of reading, providing students with suitable texts, developing reading policy documents, and promoting reading in and outside the classroom.

Unlike learning to talk, learning to read and write is not an intuitive human activity. To develop their reading skills adequately, students need to be explicitly taught the various components of reading (see Box 2 below) (Bulat et al., 2017; Vargas and Villamil, 2007; National Reading Panel, 2000). Early reading instruction aims to develop these skills so that students have a strong foundation for the rest of their school career. It involves not only direct instruction in the different reading skills (although this is an essential part of it), but also the integration of component parts through constructive activities such as reading for a specific purpose or learning new things.
Box 2: Components of reading

- **Conciencia fonológica**: Es la capacidad de un estudiante de percibir y manipular los sonidos distintos del habla, incluyendo sílabas y fonemas. Los fonemas son las unidades de sonido más pequeñas de un idioma que pueden cambiar una palabra en otra (por ejemplo los sonidos “o” y “a” en español, que determinan la diferencia entre “pero” y “pera”). La conciencia fonológica se desarrolla escuchando y no leyendo, pero aun así es una base esencial para aprender a leer.

- **Decodificación**: Es la capacidad de asociar una letra escrita con su sonido respectivo y combinar los sonidos discretos para leer una palabra. Es esencial para que los lectores puedan pronunciar y leer las palabras que no conocen.

- **Vocabulario**: Es el conjunto de palabras que una persona sabe y entiende. Las capacidades de conciencia fonológica y de decodificación valen poco si el estudiante no entiende lo que lee debido a un vocabulario escaso. Para ampliar el vocabulario, los estudiantes no solo deben poder definir las palabras sino también emplearlas de manera natural y apropiada tanto en la escritura como en el habla.

- **Fluidez verbal**: Se refiere a la capacidad del lector de leer un texto en voz alta sin cometer errores, de corrido y con una expresividad que aumenta la comprensión del texto. Los lectores que no pueden leer con fluidez enfrentan varios retos puesto que es sumamente difícil entender lo que lee si le cuesta mucho el solo pronunciar las palabras. Varios expertos sugieren un estándar mínimo de 30-60 palabras por minuto con pocos errores al final del primer grado.

- **Comprensión**: Es la capacidad de entender el contenido del texto y de emplear estrategias de verificación para confirmar la interpretación del mismo. La comprensión lectora requiere la utilización no solamente del significado literal de las palabras, sino también del conocimiento previo y el contexto. Más allá de esto, la comprensión es esencial cuando los estudiantes pasan a las etapas avanzadas de la lectura y utilizan la lectura como herramienta para aprender.

**Fuente**: National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching Children to Read: An Evidence-Based Assessment of the Scientific Research Literature on Reading and Its Implications for Reading Instruction*. National Reading Panel. Recuperado de https://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/pubs/nrp/Documents/report.pdf

Learners move through six different stages of reading development (see Box 3 below). Early grade reading coincides primarily with stages 1 and 2. However, because of factors such as poverty, insufficient stimulation, or a lack of access to quality preprimary education, many children in the region enter primary school without having completed stage 0, emerging literacy. For this reason, early grade reading interventions should focus on strengthening the basic reading skills that children have not developed in time while promoting rapid acquisition of more complex skills. Early grade reading interventions and programs may focus on only one aspect of reading (for example, fluency) or on various aspects. In addition, they may target various levels of the education system, from the classroom to curriculum planning and all the rest. Although each early grade reading intervention or program may have its own objectives, the ultimate goal of any program should be for all students to be able to read independently at the appropriate level and speed and to understand what they read (Bulat et al., 2017).
## Box 3: Stages of reading development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Readers...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 0</strong>&lt;br&gt;Birth to 1st Grade</td>
<td>Emergent literacy</td>
<td>Grow in their control of speech, depend heavily on drawing to “read”; pretend to read; recognize rhyme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;Beginning of 1st Grade</td>
<td>Decoding</td>
<td>Become aware of sound-letter correspondences; focus on printed symbols; try to “break the alphabet code”; use decoding to guess words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2</strong>&lt;br&gt;End of 1st Grade to end of 3rd Grade</td>
<td>Confirmation and fluency</td>
<td>Develop reading fluency; recognize patterns within words; monitor the meaning of what they read; recognize a group of words at a glance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 3</strong>&lt;br&gt;4th to 8th Grades</td>
<td>Learning the new (single viewpoint)</td>
<td>Use reading as a tool for learning; apply reading strategies; expand vocabulary; understand a single viewpoint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 4</strong>&lt;br&gt;Secondary school and early college</td>
<td>Multiple viewpoints</td>
<td>Analyze what they read; read critically; understand various levels of facts and concepts; understand multiple viewpoints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 5</strong>&lt;br&gt;Late college and graduate school</td>
<td>A worldview</td>
<td>Develop a well-rounded view of the world by reading.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### What are the results of these programs?

Early grade reading interventions demonstrate that with dedication and directed instruction, students can rapidly make significant gains in reading. A study conducted in Costa Rica, after only twenty-one 45-minute tutoring sessions, the students made significant progress in letter recognition and knowledge of printed texts (for example, they could recognize the title of a book) (Rolla San Francisco, Arias, Villers and Snow). In the Philippines, after only six months, second graders participating in a program that incorporated reading in all subjects increased their reading comprehension by 316% and their reading fluency by 106% in comparison with nonparticipating peers (USAID, s.f.) Another successful intervention was an intensive program with students in Texas who were learning to read Spanish using the Read Naturally (RN) practice, which combines the use of repeated reading, teacher modeling, and student’s monitoring. A study found that student oral reading fluency and comprehension improved after only 12 weeks (De la Colina, Parker, Hasbrouck and Lara-Alecio, 2001).
A number of interventions have also demonstrated the critical role of teachers in reading achievement and the importance of teacher training for improving reading skills. A meta-analysis of early grade reading programs found that programs designed to train teachers in the reading instruction process were more effective than programs designed to raise students’ reading levels through technology or changes in the curriculum (Slavin, Lake, Chambers, Cheung and Davis, 2009). The United States Agency for International Development (USAID), for example, has promoted teacher training as a central part of its early reading programs. Projects in Egypt, Jordan, Kenya, Malawi, Rwanda, and elsewhere have trained teachers in specific strategies for teaching reading and its components with very positive results (Kelly and Graham, 2017). In Chile, in a program implemented by the College of Education of the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile (in collaboration with the Foundation for Comprehensive Early Literacy Learning-CELL), which provided professional development to teachers of five and six-year-old students. The participating children demonstrated very positive progress with respect to knowledge of the alphabet, emergent writing, and word recognition (Villalón et al., 2011). Lastly, in Mozambique, students in the Aprender a Leer (ApaL) reading program displayed development after only six months and were still improving after one year. ApaL combines teacher training with vocabulary-building, decoding, reading fluency, and comprehension activities, books at appropriate reading levels, and professional development for school administrators (USAID Mozambique, 2015).

Other interventions have produced promising results by giving students more time to read, whether in or outside school. In Brazil, a study of the use of the Paired Reading technique with first grade children and their parents found very positive effects on student comprehension and oral fluency, even though the parents had received no instruction on how to use the evaluated technique (Murad and Topping, 2000). It is worth noting that the language of instruction is a very important consideration in any early grade reading intervention or program since it can have a critical impact on the results (Roskos, Strickland, Haase and Malik, 2009). This subject is covered below in the section on intercultural bilingual education. The good news is that there is more than one way to improve the early reading achievement of low-performing children. Moreover, once children read fluently and automatically, they are no longer likely to forget how to read. This is why well-implemented early grade reading programs can be considered a vaccine against illiteracy (Abadzi, 2008).
What are the lessons learned?

- If students have not attained a certain level before the end of first grade, they are already behind their peers, and the gap will continue to grow. Several studies have shown that a student’s future academic achievement can be predicted with some certainty from his or her performance at the end of first grade (ACDP Indonesia, 2014). This is because students reading below grade level at the end of first grade are generally still reading at a minimal level, even years later (Gómez, 2008). These students are at greater risk of failing classes, repeating grades, and, potentially, dropping out of school (RTI international, s.f.). In later grades, reading serves as a tool for learning, and teachers teach under the assumption that all of the children read fluently and understand what they read. However, international assessments have demonstrated that this is not the case. Both national and international assessments reveal major differences in reading performance between students of different socioeconomic levels. For example, on the reading test in UNESCO’s Third Regional Comparative and Explanatory Study (TERCE), the best predictor of student academic performance was the school socioeconomic index (OREALC/UNESCO SANTIAGO, 2015). The results of administering the Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) in a number of Latin American countries, including Honduras and Nicaragua, also show a wide reading gap between students of high and low socioeconomic status. It is essential for students—and in particular poor students and students in vulnerable situations—to read well enough to be able to “read to learn” before the end of third grade. Otherwise, they are unlikely to attain the same level of academic achievement as peers who have high or better reading skills (Abadzi, Crouch, Echegaray, Pasco and Sampe, 2005). These students require appropriate intervention from an early age to ensure that they are not left behind.

- Reading skills should be assessed routinely and consistently (Kudo and Bazan, 2009). Early grade reading assessments take two forms and can serve two purposes. The first type is administered internationally or regionally and is used to measure the severity of the situation and bring it to the attention of the public and decision-makers. For example, in Peru, a World Bank sponsored early grade reading assessment of low socioeconomic status children found that only 25% of first graders and 41% of second graders could read one or more words in a text by the end of the school year, and 75% of first graders could not read at all (Abadzi et al., 2005). In the absence of such evaluations, many second and third grade teachers would probably assume that their students start the year knowing how to read at least single words and simple sentences, when in fact they cannot (Abadzi et al, 2005; Gómez, 2008). Perhaps the most well-known assessment of this type is the Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA), which has been used in various early grade reading projects and programs around the world. This test, which takes only 15 minutes per student, provides information on reading skills and indicates which reading components have or have not been mastered. It can be used as a diagnostic of the current situation (as in Guyana, Haiti, Nicaragua, and Peru), as an outcome measure to assess the impact of an intervention (Guatemala and Honduras), as part of school administration and school effectiveness studies (Guatemala, Honduras, Peru, and Jamaica), or as a tool for classroom-based assessments (Argentina and Brasil) (USAID AMD EdData II, s.f.). The second type of assessment takes place in the classroom and is administered by the teacher to obtain an accurate measure of the students’ reading levels and specific strengths and weaknesses. These assessments help teachers plan their classes and are used to track student skill acquisition over the course of the school year (Gómez, 2008). Examples of this type of assessment used in the Americas include DIBELS - Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills - and Reading A-Z. DIBELS consists of five timed tests which can be used to determine inexpensively, efficiently, and effectively if a child is having trouble with the basic reading skills. It can be used to measure (1) letter-
naming fluency; (2) word segmentation fluency; (3) nonsense word fluency; (4) oral reading fluency; (5) retell fluency; and (6) word use fluency (Good and Kaminski, 2007). Reading A-Z is a system of assessments and leveled books with activities to support reading fluency and comprehension (reading A-Z, s.f.).

The development of specific indicators can ensure that children achieve adequate reading proficiency in early grade school. Evaluating student reading achievement is not enough. If students do not reach a certain level of oral fluency and reading comprehension during the early primary grades, it is very difficult for them to improve their academic performance later on. There are already various indicators for measuring reading ability. One of these is oral reading fluency, determined by the number of words read correctly per minute. A study conducted by the World Bank with the collaboration of the Peruvian Ministry of Education found a minimum fluency of 45 words per minute to be an indicator of functional literacy thus a good indicator of early reading proficiency (Kudo and Bazan, 2009). Although there is no consensus on exactly how many words per minute students should be able to read by the end of first, second, and third grades, everyone agrees that fluency and comprehension should increase every year (Kudo and Bazan, 2009). In any case, Latin American students perform far below standard. In Honduras, for example, a study using the EGRA assessment found that students could only read an average of 36 words per minute by the end of second grade, which implies that most of them cannot read and understand a simple sentence (Abadzi, 2011). For low-income students, the results are even more alarming. In Peru, an assessment of disadvantaged students found that they could read only nine words per minute at the end of first grade and only 29 words per minute at the end of second grade.

To be effective, teachers need to be trained in specific reading instruction techniques. Because literacy is not an ability that people develop intuitively and is also a rather complex process, teachers need explicit training in teaching reading skills. Many teachers currently lack this very essential training. A report on the state of literacy in Honduras indicates that teachers “lack specific skills and knowledge for teaching children how to read successfully” and in a survey conducted in Guadalajara, Mexico, none of the teachers surveyed reported any formal training in reading instruction methods (RTI International, 2015; Gomez 2008). A study in Costa Rica found that merely offering teachers literacy resources without teaching them how to use them had no impact on children’s reading development (Rolla San Francisco et al, 2006). Yet there is significant evidence that teacher training can have a very positive impact on student reading performance. Specifically, continuous in-classroom training is more effective than simply attending professional trainings (Comins, 2015; garet et al, 2008). In Chile, a study of the primary-level reading, writing, and math program AILEM (Aprendizaje Inicial de Lectura, Escritura y Matemática), in which teachers at low-resource schools received initial training and yearlong in-classroom coaching, had a positive impact on student knowledge of the alphabet, emergent writing, and visual word recognition. While the intervention targeted both first and fourth grade students, only the first graders made very significant progress. This difference once again demonstrates the importance of early intervention for achieving the best outcomes.
Students benefit from spending time reading every day, in and outside class. While high quality teaching is important, children need time to read to become good readers (Comings, 2015). In the TERCE study, students who reported certain reading habits such as reading for fun, to learn, to be informed, or for schoolwork performed better not only in reading but also in math and science. Furthermore, for most countries, these positive effects were even greater for children of lower socioeconomic status, emphasizing the potential of reading to make up for socioeconomic inequalities among students (OREALC/UNESCO Santiago, 2015). Children need to practice reading regularly in order for it to become automatic, which is an important step in developing fluency and improving decoding (Abadzi, 2008). Reading practice should occur both in and outside the classroom and can take many forms. In Liberia, the impact study of an early grade reading program found a positive relationship between the availability of books to take home and student reading fluency (King, Korda, Nordstrum, and Edwards, 2015). In the Philippines, as part of the “Sa Akinat Sisikat” program, a “read-a-thon” was promoted to motivate students to read as many books as they could in 31 days. It had a positive impact on students reading skills as well as their motivation to read outside class, but the gains diminished after several months, emphasizing the importance of continuously strengthening reading skills throughout children’s education (Abeberese, Kumler and Linden, 2014). Similarly, a study of the effects of a school improvement program in Jamaica found that the most effective improvement was the introduction of additional reading materials (Lockheed, Harris and Jayasundera, 2010). In many cases, access to books and student reading level are interrelated and create a virtuous circle: the students who have greater access to books spend more time reading, which develops their reading ability, which in turn makes them seek out more books to read, which develops their reading ability even further (Stanovich, 1986).

It is never too early to start. Many students’ first experience with formal education is in first grade since preprimary school coverage, while growing, isn’t universal. Children enter school with or without various reading skills such as oral expression and alphabet awareness. Their level of literacy skills predicts their academic performance with reasonable certainty. In other words, the students who start first grade with strong reading skills are the same ones who finish it at or above grade level (Guevara Benítez, Rugerio Tapia, Delgado Sánchez and Hermosillo García, 2010, Guevara Benítez, López, García, Delgado Sánchez and Hermosillo García and Rugerio, 2008). The best way to close these gaps is by intervening early—before children enter primary school. A study in Brazil determined that, although an early grade reading intervention generated positive outcomes, it was not as effective as early childhood education (Costa and Carnoy, 2015). Although reading programs in the early grades can make very encouraging inroads into educational inequalities, they should be implemented in conjunction with other effective programs. As indicated in Chapter 1, preprimary education has many profound benefits because reading skills are developed from a very young age. Therefore, although it is important to include early reading programs in early primary school, they should start in preschool.
Pacto pela Alfabetização na Idade Certa (PAIC) in the State of Ceará, Brazil

Administration: Brazil’s PAIC (Pacto pela Alfabetização na Idade Certa) is administered jointly by the Secretariat of Education of the State of Ceará (Seduc) and the municipal governments.

Description:
- The program was launched in 2007 to improve the reading skills of six to eight-year-old students in the state of Ceará public schools.
- It has five interrelated strategic axes:
  1. Promote reading
  2. Support municipal reading strategies
  3. Improve municipal administration
  4. Support early childhood education
  5. Generate external assessment of learning
- The implementation involves three main activities:
  1. Training teachers and school administrators
  2. Mobilizing municipal networks of schools to share best practices in the teaching of reading
  3. Providing books to students

Outcomes and findings:
- As measured by the Prova Brasil national assessment, PAIC has had a positive impact on participating students, especially in the areas of Portuguese and math (although math was not a specific focus).
- The effects were more robust than with interventions focused exclusively on teacher training.
- It did not close the gaps between students who attended preschool and students who started school in first grade.
- The high math scores suggest that improvements in school administration and the promotion of excellence in teaching in general were more effective for early reading than the direct intervention itself.
- After seeing the results in Ceará, the Brazilian Ministry of Education decided to expand PAIC by establishing a national literacy program, PNAIC (Pacto Nacional pela Alfabetização na Idade Certa).

http://journals.sagepub.com.proxygw.wrlc.org/doi/pdf/10.3102/0162373715571437
Children with disabilities or with specific educational needs are a particularly vulnerable population within the education system. While progress has been made on including them in the regular system, as yet very few children in this population attend school. When they do, the schools they attend do not always have the capacity or the will to adapt their structures, processes and instruction methods to meet their needs or their particular situation. Education systems should promote the acceptance and inclusion of all children. To ensure the universal right of all children to a quality education, these systems should empower and prepare schools to respond to the particular needs of all students.

One of the populations historically excluded from conventional education is children with disabilities or specific educational needs. According to recent UNICEF data, the disability gap in school attendance is 30% in the primary and secondary schools of 15 developing countries; worse, more than 85% of children with disabilities in primary age are out of school or have never been in school (Mizuno, Mitra and Yamasaki, 2016). In Latin America, the results of recent national surveys show significant attendance gaps between children with and without disabilities, especially in rural areas. These gaps are due to the countless barriers that prevent children with disabilities from receiving a quality education. They include the absence of legislation, policies, or plans for including children with disabilities and transform exclusive school structures; the lack of mechanisms for enforcing such legislation, policies, or plans; and/or the absence of sufficient funding for school systems and schools to serve the needs of all children. At the level of the school, there are other barriers: rigid curricula, pedagogies and evaluation systems, teachers who are ill prepared to meet the needs of children with disabilities, and inadequate school facilities for children with physical disabilities, not to mention the negative attitudes and low expectation of teachers and other students for children with disabilities. At the level of the home, parents’ apprehension about sending their children with disabilities to school constitutes an additional barrier to attendance.

Worldwide, early efforts to provide education children with disabilities or with specific education needs were generally through separate special schools, usually targeting specific impairments, such as schools for the blind. These institutions reached only a small proportion of those in need and were not cost-effective. Usually in urban areas, they tended to isolate individuals from their families and communities (World Health Organization and World Bank, 2011). This situation has recently begun to change: inclusion of children with disabilities in the mainstream education system is beginning to be required by law. The United Nations Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities recognizes the right of all children to be included in the general education system and to receive the individual support required, and the final report of the World Conference on Special Needs Education that took place in Salamanca, in 1994 urges governments to meet students’ educational needs within ordinary schools (United Nations, s.f; UNESCO and Ministry of Education and Science of Spain, 1994). Within the framework of the OAS, the Inter-American Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities, which entered into force in 2001, fosters the full integration of persons with disabilities into society, committing States parties to adopt legislative, social educational, and employment measures or any other measures to comply with this commitment. In addition, the States Parties to the Convention have undertaken to adopt measures to progressively eliminate discrimination and promote integration by governmental authorities and/or private entities in the provision or supply of goods, services, facilities, programs and activities, such as education, among others. In 2013, leaders of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) held a high-level meeting on persons with disabilities...
whose outcome document, the Declaration of Pétion Ville, Haiti, reiterates the 15 member countries’ commitment to promoting the social and educational inclusion of children with disabilities, and to implementing the international instruments protecting their rights (Association of Caribbean States, 2013). In short, there is now a consensus that children with disabilities have a right to quality education in an inclusive environment.

However, in the Americas, the prevailing trend is to send children with disabilities to special schools rather than inclusive mainstream schools. In Argentina, for example, 56% of children with disabilities in the education system attend a special school. This varies with respect to the child’s disability level (Pallardo, 2017). In Uruguay, 35% of children “with permanent visual impairment” attend a regular school, 33% attend a special school, and 29% do not attend school (Meresman, 2013). Among children with “permanent difficulties to understand or learning disabilities,” 18% attend a regular school, 51% attend a special school, and 30% do not attend school. The situation for children with motor disabilities (“permanent difficulty walking”) appears even worse: 23% attend a regular school, 36% attend a special school, and 38% do not attend school (Meresman, 2013).

In general, children with disabilities, especially the most severe disabilities, are not in the system, and when they are, they are often not in an inclusive environment.

What are inclusive schools?

Inclusive schools are regular schools that have been adapted to meet the diverse needs of students with different abilities, paces of learning, cognitive universes and learning processes. These schools have students with disabilities and without disabilities, make curricular and evaluation methodologies adjustments when necessary, and provide appropriate infrastructure and accessible pedagogical resources for all children to be able to go to school (ramps, handrails, restrooms, braille textbooks, audiobooks, simple flashcards with pictures, information and communication technologies, equipment, sign language interpreters, and teachers with sign language skills). Inclusive education is achieved through programs and resources that support the inclusion of children with disabilities or specific educational needs in ordinary schools. Inclusive education also requires participation in the policy decision making that integrate families and students with disabilities. These programs vary from country to country, but in general they provide individual and institutional support from a collaborative perspective and participation of the education community for all students to have the help they need at school.
What are the results of these programs?

The impact of inclusive education has been studied since the middle of the past decade. While much of the early research was inconclusive as to the relative impact of inclusive education, most recent research indicates that children with disabilities or with specific education needs who attend inclusive schools demonstrate better cognitive and socioemotional outcomes than those who attend special schools or segregated schools. For example, a study in England found that children with Down syndrome in mainstream schools achieved significantly higher vocabulary, grammar comprehension, and digit span scores than those in special schools, while another study found that one of the predictors of good academic performance in children with Down syndrome was having attended ordinary schools. Studies of children with different disabilities have shown similar results. Two studies found that students with intellectual disabilities who attended regular schools had better academic performance and better alphabet skills, respectively, than their peers in special schools, while another study reports similar results for children on the autism spectrum who attended inclusive schools (Peetsma, Vergheer, Roeleveld and Karsten, 2001).

The benefits that an inclusive school may have over a special school depends on how “inclusive” is the school and the additional specialized support provided for students within their regular classroom. This may explain why researchers have found relatively similar educational outcomes in both types of schools in other studies. Thus, a study in England finds that children with autism spectrum disorders (ASD) performed almost equally in inclusive and special schools, but that a specific factor—access to speech and language therapy—improved their outcomes in mainstream schools (Waddington and Reed, 2016). In many countries in the Americas where inclusive education in mainstream schools is only just beginning, it is particularly important to pay attention to inclusive support, in order to evaluate their impact.

Contrary to popular belief, the inclusion of students with disabilities or specific education needs is generally not considered to have a negative impact on the educational performance of students without disabilities. A meta-analysis of 26 international studies found that, in 81% of cases, the peer impact of children without disabilities or specific education needs in mixed classrooms was neutral (58%) or positive (23%) (Kalambouka, Farrell, Dyson and Kaplan, 2007). In Canada, for example, it was determined that the number of children with disabilities or Specific Education Needs in third grade classrooms did not affect their peers’ scores in mathematics, writing, or reading, regardless of what type of disability or specific need that their classmates had (Demeris, Childs and Jordan, 2007). In addition, studies that have found positive effects report better socioemotional outcomes such as cooperation and acceptance of diversity (Kalambouka et al, 2007). Overall, research tells us that inclusive education is beneficial for all children.
What are the lessons learned?

- **Inclusive education starts with a change in attitudes.** UNICEF considers that the precursor to the implementation of programs and policies on inclusive education is the sensitization and awareness of the importance of inclusion (World Health Organization and World Bank, 2011). Nowadays, negative attitudes remain the biggest obstacle to the education of children with disabilities in all levels of the education system. At the school level, some teachers and administrators do not consider themselves obligated to teach children with disabilities or have low expectations about their learning abilities and potential academic achievement, which affects their performance. For example, surveys of teachers in Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago found that teacher attitudes “can best be described as ambivalent which suggest[s] that while they are not necessarily opposed to the idea of integrating students with specific needs they do have real concerns about the suitability of the general education setting for meeting the educational needs of these students” (Blackman, Conrad and Brown, 2012). At the community level, the stigma attached to disability is a factor that discourages parents from sending their children with disabilities to school.

- **Inclusion programs that have sought to change attitudes towards inclusive education have been successful in bringing more children with disabilities into the mainstream education system.** For example, a project by Catholic Relief Services and the Center for Special Education (NIESAC) of Vietnam used teacher trainings, educational materials for teachers and community members, public service spots, and community leadership groups to increase acceptance of inclusion. Subsequent surveys found much higher community support for inclusive education, and the project succeeded in boosting the mainstream school enrollment rate for children with disabilities from 30% to 86%. In the Americas, similar efforts have been launched to increase the value of diversity. At the community level, ministries of education have worked successfully with NGOs and civil society to increase public support for inclusion through campaigns promoting the acceptance and inclusion of children with disabilities. And at the school level, teachers have been made more aware of the importance of inclusion in the classroom. For example, the Peruvian Ministry of Education promotes inclusion through its Escuelas Valora competition, which recognizes and rewards public schools that demonstrate the best inclusive practices (Ministry of Education of Peru, 2017). Initiatives such as this one not only promote inclusion in schools but also raise public awareness of its importance.

- **Schools need initial and continuing assessment systems, backed by information systems.** The first step in implementing inclusive education policies and programs is to identify and evaluate children with more severe difficulties through comprehensive interdisciplinary assessments conducted at regular intervals. In Chile, for public schools to enroll in the inclusive school program (Programa de Integración Escolar, PIE), which allows them to receive technical and financial support from the government, they are required to perform an assessment of children with out-of-the-ordinary learning difficulties, not only to determine the specific needs but also to identify the accommodations necessary for them. These assessments must be performed by an interdisciplinary team of professionals in education, health and social services, and the results are entered into the Ministry of Education’s online registration form. Schools must schedule continuing assessments to monitor the progress of mainstreamed children, and the children are reevaluated every two years to determine whether they should remain in the program (Ministry of Education of Chile, 2013; Fundación Chile, 2013). Likewise, in the United States, public schools are required by law to develop a document called the Individualized Education Program (IEP) for every child detected with a disability. The IEP indicates the child’s current level of performance, sets learning goals, describes progress towards the goals, and identifies the necessary accommodations, modifications, and specialized services to be provided by the school. IEPs, which
have been well received by parents and educators, are produced by a team that must include the parents, a regular education teacher, a special education teacher, a psychologist or specialist, and a representative of the school district. Government oversight of the implementation of such plans is essential. For example, a UNICEF study found that, in Barbados, although the Ministry of Education promotes the use of individualized education plans, these plans were only used in one out of the four special needs schools included in the study. Instead, teachers had adopted unstandardized approaches to assessment, and there was little parent or specialist participation. The report therefore recommends the development of a support structure for the IEP teams (UNICEF, 2014). In short, it is vital for states to promote and monitor the use of detailed, regularly updated records of the progress of children with disabilities and with specific education needs in mainstream schools and for all of the adults involved in a child’s education to be brought into the process, including the parents and the students themselves.

**Inclusive education requires curricular and instructional flexibility.** It is the school that needs to adjust to human diversity and not the other way around. Instructional adaption to the specific needs of all children is an essential component of inclusive education. The literature indicates that adaptations are associated with a series of positive outcomes, including improved student motivation, productivity, and attention in class (Kurth and Keegan, 2014). Adaptations may be curricular adaptations (the teacher adapts the content of instruction by supplementing, simplifying, or adjusting what is taught or by teaching something completely different) or instructional adaptations (the teacher adapts the form of instruction by adjusting the format, methods, or materials used) (Janney and Snell, 2006). Some countries have made great strides in promoting curricular adaptation for inclusive education. Legislation in countries such as Mexico, Colombia, Costa Rica, and Chile requires schools to use appropriate methods with children with disabilities and with specific education needs, and these countries have developed official handbooks on curricular adaptation to guide the process in the classroom (Public Education Secretary of México 2016; National Education Ministry of Colombia, 2009; Elections Supreme Tribunal of Costa Rica, 1996; Ministry of Education of Chile, 2015). However, it is unclear to what extent this guidance is actually being followed in the classrooms.

**One way to adapt teaching and learning mechanisms is by using information and communications technology (ICT).** ICT in education encompasses a variety of tools, ranging from optical aids (e.g., magnifying lenses, special screen readers) to customizable software applications. Literature in the developed countries indicates that using ICT to adapt curricula has a positive impact on children with disabilities (Adam and Tatnall, 2010; Martínez Suriá, 2001; Drigas and Loannidou, 2013). However, a 2012 report on the use of ICT in Latin America and the Caribbean finds that its use for inclusive education is still only emerging (Samaniego, Laitamo, Valerio and Francisco, 2012). Technology is limited to computer classes and is seldom employed as a pedagogical tool for curricular modification. Moreover, the educational packages that do exist (e.g., programs on CDs) do not support adaptive technologies (Samaniego et al., 2012). A UNESCO-organized expert conference on the subject has recommended that countries develop national and school-level ICT plans that include guidelines for accessibility (UNESCO, 2011).

**Inclusive education also requires flexibility in classroom organization and in school organization in general.** For example, one teaching method that has been promoted in recent years and has produced good results internationally is co-teaching. With co-teaching, two teachers—a regular teacher and a special education teacher—teach in a classroom with students without disabilities and students with disabilities in order to provide support for the inclusion of children with disabilities or with specific education needs. There are variations on the traditional co-teaching model, including station teaching, in which the special education teacher helps small learning groups within the classroom, and parallel teaching, in which teachers teach the
same or similar content in separate classrooms. A meta-analysis of 32 studies found co-teaching to be effective in inclusive education, while a recent study in Greece concluded that it had positive impacts on children with specific education needs in inclusive schools (Scruggs, Mastropieri and McDuffie, 2007; Strogilos and Avramidis, 2016). Alternative teaching models such as these require good administrative planning, and in fact teachers who co-teach identify “administrative support” as their most important need (Scruggs et al, 2007). As an example of administrative support for flexible school organization, the Province of Buenos Aires has adopted a primary education curriculum (Diseño Curricular de Primaria) that allows for individual instruction, multigrade instruction, integrated classes, and other options and has also enacted legislation on flexible school organization (Cobeñas et al., 2017).

Inclusion support units that can provide schools with specialized services and advice have been proven successful. In addition to teachers and administrators trained to meet the needs of all children, countries should have services that provide both specialized support for students and technical advice for schools. In Ecuador, for example, each of the country’s 140 school districts has an inclusion support unit with a multidisciplinary team of specialists (therapists, psychologists, and others) that conducts psycho-pedagogical assessments, provides specialized supplemental attention, and guides the mainstreaming process (Ministry of Education of Ecuador, s.f.). These units are also responsible for advising and guiding teachers in regular schools on support methods and curricular adaptation (Problemas de aprendizaje, 2014). Similarly, in Peru, special education centers provide specialized support for children with specific education needs enrolled in mainstream schools, their families, and their teachers through the Special Educational Needs Support and Advisory Service (SAANE) (Ministry of Education of Peru, 2010). However, according to some reports, there is a shortage of special education centers or trained SAANE personnel. This highlights the importance of planning the system to ensure access to specialized support, and the need to encourage more career specialization throughout the country (Defensoría del Pueblo, 2016, “De 57 mil estudiantes”, 2015).

Teacher preparation is critical for creating inclusive classrooms. There are indications that teachers do not feel prepared to teach children with different abilities. In a survey of public school teachers in Central America, 71% of those surveyed reported that they had received very little or no information on inclusive education (OEAI, IDIE and MEDUCA, 2009). In Bogota, another study found that on average only 22% of teachers felt prepared to teach children with a physical, sensory, or cognitive disability (Padilla Muñoz, 2011). Findings such as these are troublesome, given the importance of preparing teachers for inclusion and the international evidence of the impact of training on teachers’ attitudes and expectations for students with disabilities or with specific education needs. It is vital to incorporate inclusive education into general teacher training curricula, and to create opportunities to specialize in inclusive and special education. This is particularly important if we want to increase the number of support teachers in classrooms. In countries such as Peru, Colombia, and Chile, a number of universities and teachers’ colleges offer degrees in inclusive education for students of education and teachers, often in coordination with the ministries of education. It is important for governments to create incentives such as scholarships, professional development spaces, and remote-learning options so that practicing teachers have access to these opportunities (Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, s.f.; Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, s.f.; Secretary of Education of Antioquia, 2016).
The sharing of experiences is an important component of teacher education and continuous improvement. Various experts have written about the importance of peer learning for sharing experiences with inclusive education within and among schools. An existing tool for facilitating sharing among teachers within a school is the Index for Inclusion, which was developed in London but has been implemented in countries such as Australia, Brazil, India, and South Africa (Farrell and Aimecow, 2013). The index process involves collaboration among teachers, parents, and administrators and encourages self-review through a detailed examination of 45 inclusion indicators. The data collected through this index is highly valuable, since it can assist the development of continuous-improvement plans and provide a hub of shared experiences among teachers. Given that teacher training and peer learning take time from the teacher’s schedules, policies should set aside times for these opportunities. For example, the Ministry of Education of Chile has stated its intention to assign more nonteaching hours in the PIE program for joint teacher-specialist planning. This is a practice that can be applied to other forms of teacher collaboration throughout the Americas (Ministry of Education of Chile).
School Integration Program in Chile (PIE)

**Administration:** PIE (Programa de Integración Escolar) is a program of the Ministry of Education of Chile. It was launched in 2009 in response to Supreme Decree No. 170 establishing rules for the distribution of special education subsidies.

**Description:** PIE is an education system strategy for encouraging the participation and success of all students, especially those with SENs. Through PIE, additional human resources and materials are provided to schools with SEN children that apply and are accepted into the program.

**Outcomes and findings:**
- In the social dimension, mainstreaming has had a positive impact on children with disabilities or with specific education needs feel more supported and parents back the program.
- In the academic dimension, vulnerable schools that adopt PIE do better than similar non-PIE schools on the SIMCE Test in Chile.
- The program suffers from inequities due to the socioeconomic status, geographic location, or administrative district of schools. For example, not all schools have access to specialists, which affects the types of assessments available to them. Therefore, there should be more incentives and supports for rural and low-resource schools.
- There is also the problem of the per-grade limit on specific education needs students. Many of the students eligible for PIE cannot participate in the program because of a per-school limit. More research is needed to be able to ensure access to PIE for all students who need it while maintaining a good distribution of children with disabilities and children without disabilities in the classroom. Thus, promoting the social inclusion of children with disabilities or with specific education needs equally.
- Lastly, there are plans to redefine the admission criteria for students, which currently focus on individual assessments and primarily clinical and medical considerations, relegating the students’ social and family environment to secondary importance. The approach should be more holistic and context-based, which requires interdisciplinary assessment teams.

**Source:** Fundación Chile and Research Center of the Ministry of Education of Chile. *Análisis de la Implementación de los Programas de Integración Escolar (PIE) en Establecimientos que han incorporado Estudiantes con Necesidades Educativas Especiales Transitorias (NEET).* (Study summary, 2013).
OAS Program for the Promotion of Inclusive Education in the Americas

Description

This program is currently being implemented by the OAS through the Department of Social Inclusion in collaboration with the International organization of Teletones-ORITEL in 9 countries of the region (Paraguay, Uruguay, Chile, Perú, México, Colombia, Honduras, El Salvador and Nicaragua).

The program seeks to promote the discussion and spaces for dialogue between teachers, parents, school principals, decision makers and public authorities, students with or without disabilities with regards to recommendations for the implementation of the Inclusion Index (Tony Booth, Mel Ainscow, UNESCO, 2000) as a tool to evaluate inclusion and transform the education system to serve all students. The Inclusive Index is a tool that allows schools to conduct a self-assessment of their management and evaluate their status on serving the students diversity needs, strengths and opportunities for improvement in order to set priorities and take decisions on learning conditions, community participation and coexistence.

Strategy 7  
Intercultural bilingual education

Summary: The indigenous population of the Americas is one of the poorest and most vulnerable in the world due to centuries of discrimination and forced assimilation. However, in recent years, many of the region’s governments have supported the right of indigenous peoples to have a culturally relevant education that affirms their language and values through intercultural bilingual education (IBE) regulations and programs. These interventions have produced promising results to the extent that they are well managed and implemented. However, many indigenous children still do not receive quality intercultural bilingual education due to a lack of trained teachers, insufficient instructional materials, or absence of programs in the areas where they live.

The indigenous population of the Americas is one of the most diverse in the world in terms of culture, language, and history. Unfortunately, it is also one of the most marginalized and oppressed. There are currently approximately 42 million indigenous persons in Latin America, representing 8% of the region’s total population (World Bank, 2015). Among them are hundreds of ethnic groups (from 400 to more than 800, according to different sources) and indigenous languages and dialects (from 420 to 850, according to different calculations) (SITEAL, 2012). However, these peoples are in great danger of losing their languages, cultures, and customs, and they continue to be marginalized both in and outside the education system (World Bank, 2015). In this context, intercultural bilingual education (IBE) plays an important role in addressing the longstanding marginalization and stigmatization of indigenous peoples in the Americas, by offering them an educational model that meets their specific needs while preserving and promoting their language and culture.

What is intercultural bilingual education?

Intercultural bilingual education (IBE) is an educational model that acknowledges the right of indigenous students to a quality education that affirms and promotes their own language, worldview, and culture of their people. To that end, it adapts academic curricula and programs to include traditional indigenous knowledge and values. IBE model aims to meet basic learning needs and to draw the school even closer to the indigenous community (UNICEF s.f.). The pedagogy of intercultural bilingual education gives equal importance to the two pillars implied by the name: interculturalism and bilingualism. Therefore, it is not only to simply translate the standard curriculum into another language since the indigenous culture and worldview must also be incorporated as an essential component of the curricula (López and Küper, 1999). In this way, IBE seeks to halt the assimilation of indigenous peoples into the hegemonic European culture and, thus, to save and revitalize the region’s indigenous knowledge and languages (OREALC/UNESCO SANTIAGO, 2017).

In addition to preserving the indigenous languages and cultures of the Americas, IBE protects the human rights of indigenous students, which have been defined in numerous international, regional, and national instruments, including the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the International Labor Organization 169 Convention concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries, at the interamerican level in the American Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and in the national constitutions of many countries, including Argentina, Bolivia, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru, Ecuador,
Nicaragua, and Colombia (ECLAC, 2014). Today, most countries in the Americas have some form of public policy that establishes a formal system of indigenous education, usually under the authority of the ministry of education (ECLAC, 2014). However, the development and implementation of IBE programs remains very uneven; for example, coverage for indigenous children who qualify for IBE programs ranges from 15% to 100%. In addition, bilingual classes are often available only at some levels, and schools do not always have educational materials in indigenous languages. These inequalities stand in the way of providing a quality education for indigenous peoples that truly conforms to the ideals of IBE (World Bank, 2015).

Apart from preserving indigenous cultures and protecting the human rights of the most vulnerable peoples in the Americas, IBE programs also have a scientific basis. Many studies of bilingualism have found that children who develop their ability to speak, read, and write in their first language from an early age demonstrate better cognitive development and have superior ability to learn a second language (Dutcher and Tucker, 2005). Furthermore, these benefits transfer to other academic areas such as math and science. Evidence from a study of bilingual programs in the United States indicates that academic instruction in the first language in the primary grades results in better academic outcomes in the long term (Thomas and Collier, 1997). There are different versions of IBE models which vary in the duration of instruction in the primary language, the extent to which the curriculum incorporates indigenous knowledge, and the level of community involvement in development and implementation. However, all IBE programs are dedicated to teaching indigenous languages and preserving minority cultures (Zavala, 2007).

What are the results of these programs?

There is evidence that IBE programs are effective for improving both the school enrollment and the academic performance of indigenous children. With respect to enrollment, a study in Mexico found that indigenous students who participated in intercultural bilingual education programs stayed in school longer and had lower dropout and repetition rates than those who did not (Viveros-Márquez and Moreno-Olivos, 2014). In Guatemala, a study of the National Bilingual Education Program (Programa Nacional de Educación Bilingüe, PRONEBI) demonstrated similar outcomes. Specifically, the promotion rate was 9% higher for students in PRONEBI schools than for indigenous students in traditional schools (in other words, those who were taught exclusively in Spanish) (Patrinos and Velázquez, 2009). Similarly, in Bolivia, the IBE program of the Ministry of Education (Programa de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe, PEIB) had positive effectiveness. In five years, the student dropout rate declined from 8.4% to 5.7%, and the repetition rate declined from 12% to 2.8% during the same period (López, 2005). Given the high repetition and dropout rates of indigenous communities, these successes are very important, but a lot of work has yet to be done to eliminate the educational attainment gap between indigenous children and the rest of the population (ECLAC, 2014).

In terms of quality and academic performance, IBE has reduced the gaps between indigenous and non-indigenous students. A study by the organization CARE of the impact of IBE programs in Ecuador, Bolivia, and Peru found very positive learning outcomes (Zavala, 2007). Furthermore, a study of EDUBIMA (New Bilingual and Multicultural Education in the Andes), a community curriculum development and empowerment project involving Quechua-speaking communities in Peru, found that indigenous students had made learning gains not only in Quechua but also in Spanish and math (CARE, 2007). Similarly, a longitudinal study of the IBE program in Bolivia found that intercultural bilingual schools had better outcomes than schools teaching only in Spanish (D’Emilio, 1996), and that children who would have had to repeat in the traditional system performed satisfactorily in the bilingual classroom (D’Emilio, 1996). Successful outcomes such as these suggest that IBE can help to preserve, revitalize, and elevate the endangered languages, traditions, and cultures of the indigenous communities of the Americas.
The IBE model has a particularly significant impact among girls. Nationally and regionally, most of the countries of the Americas have achieved gender parity in school enrollment rates, and in some cases, girls even surpass boys in attendance. But within indigenous communities, girls attend school less and for less time. While improving, this imbalance is more severe in rural areas. Studies of IBE programs in Peru and Ecuador have found that bilingual education can increase school enrollment (Peru) and attendance (Ecuador) among girls (López and Küper, 1999). Furthermore, a study of the Guatemalan IBE program, PAEBI, found that it had a positive impact on girls’ progression rates. However, the same study showed that girls had lower completion rates and test scores than boys, indicating significant but insufficient progress (Rubio, Vásquez, Rego and Chesterfield, 2005).

In addition to academic benefits, IBE programs have had positive impacts on the affective development of indigenous students. A study of the Bolivian IBE program determined that IBE students had significantly higher self-esteem than students in the control school sample (Abram, 2004). The same study also found that IBE students were more adaptable and demonstrated higher tolerance for frustration (López and Limachi s.f). In a study of the IBE program in Peru, indigenous students reported that they liked speaking in Quechua more often than indigenous students in monolingual schools, indicating that IBE program students had more positive attitudes towards the language (Back, 2004). These affective abilities, particularly self-esteem, are very important for indigenous peoples. Especially since they have historically been the victims of Europeanization, which has helped to stigmatize their languages, traditional costumes, and cultures.

What are the lessons learned?

- **IBE programs are seriously underfunded and lack both basic and bilingual educational resources.** Many IBE programs are underfunded and poorly managed, which has negatively affected the distribution of educational materials and the administration of projects. For example, a study of the Ecuadorian program found that for every $148 spent by the government on Hispanic students, indigenous students received only $133 (Oviedo and Wildemeersch, 2008). There is also evidence that intercultural bilingual schools do not have access to necessary teaching and learning resources. On the Atlantic coast of Nicaragua, 75% of the schools in the IBE program lacked basic equipment such as textbooks or classroom furniture (Catter, 2012). In Mexico, a study of the IBE program found the lack of adequate teaching materials to be partly responsible for the poor academic outcomes (Viveros-Márquez and Moreno-Olivos, 2014). These deficiencies are a major obstacle to reach satisfactory student achievement. In some cases, the shortage of educational resources can be attributed to the extreme poverty of most indigenous communities in the Americas, but in others, studies simply report that “the textbooks do not reach the school” or that there are distribution delays or inefficiencies, without specifying the reasons for these problems (López, 1998; Viveros-Márquez, 2016; López, 2009). Thus, in many cases, underfunding and under-resourcing make it impossible to implement real IBE programs, and when funds and resources are sufficient, inadequate management limits their impact.

- **There are not enough trained school teachers who speak local indigenous languages.** Well-trained teachers are perhaps the most important factor for ensuring quality education for all students. This question of trained teachers takes on added importance in the context of IBE, where teachers need to be not only trained in teaching but also fluent in two languages: Spanish and the indigenous language. Unfortunately, this is not always the case. In Nicaragua, a study of IBE along the Atlantic coast found that 52% of recently graduated teachers were monolingual in Spanish. In Ecuador, it was found that 28% spoke only Spanish, a situation which makes providing a bilingual education for indigenous children problematic (Catter, 2012, World Bank, s.f). Worse still, 60% of teachers in the indigenous areas of the Peruvian Amazon either only speak Spanish or speak an indigenous language other than the one they teach (Zúñiga, 2010). Even in situations where the teachers are
native speakers of the indigenous language, they often have not studied it or used it in an academic context. In the case of Bolivia, an initial training program for IBE teachers found that they had considerable difficulty teaching academic content in their mother tongue, despite being native speakers (Delany-Barmann, 2009). These examples point to a serious problem in the implementation of IBE. If teachers do not speak the language in which they are supposed to teach or if they have not used it in an academic context, therefore indigenous students are not receiving a truly bilingual education.

Teachers need to be trained in the specific skills required for intercultural bilingual education. However, the current state of IBE training institutions mirrors many of the challenges in IBE schools. A study in Bolivia found IBE teachers’ training schools seriously deficient in infrastructure and technology (Delany-Barmann, 2009). In the Brazilian IBE program, although most teachers are indigenous, they lack appropriate training, and only 65% have completed secondary school (World Bank 2015). Similarly, a study in Mexico found that two thirds of IBE teachers were teaching without credentials (Velasco Cruz, 2015). These studies suggest that a significant percentage of teachers in intercultural bilingual schools are teaching without adequate training, a situation that weakens the possibility of IBE being able to meet its goals. At the same time, at the tertiary level, there is a shortage of indigenous professors of intercultural bilingual education who know their own language and culture. This situation can be attributed to a lack of demand on the part of teachers. Among respondents to a Peruvian survey, 68.8% of teachers of Quechua IBE and 33.3% of teachers of Aymara IBE identified the lack of training workshops in bilingual methodology as a negative aspect of the program (López, 2005). Nevertheless, there has been progress on this aspect of IBE. Since 1996, PROEIB Andes (Programa de Formación Intercultural Bilingüe para los Países Andinos) has trained indigenous teachers from Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Chile, Argentina, and Bolivia in IBE, and it currently offers a master’s degree in intercultural bilingual education and sociolinguistics; it also promotes and disseminates knowledge about IBE from an indigenous perspective through rigorous research and a professional network (PROEIB Andes, 2009). Programs of this nature should be more widely promoted, and steps should be taken to give IBE teachers greater access to training opportunities targeting their specific needs. In addition, countries with indigenous peoples need to develop proposals and models for initial and continuing training that can lessen the shortage of IBE teachers at the different school levels.

Consideration should be given to indigenous people in urban areas, who represent a growing percentage of the population and have specific needs. Almost all IBE programs are located in rural indigenous communities, within which there are diverse linguistic and cultural scenarios. However, indigenous peoples are no longer exclusively rural and remote. In fact, half of the Latin American indigenous population now lives in urban areas, although it continues to be marginalized and excluded. This situation requires solutions for protecting the linguistic and cultural rights of indigenous students who are not living in the villages where they were born (World Bank, 2015; López and Küber, 1999). Chile, Venezuela, Mexico, and Peru have the most urbanized indigenous populations. Effects of this migratory process are already seen in the disuse of the native language, especially noticed in Chile and Mexico among urban indigenous populations (Viveros-Márquez and Moreno-Olivos, 2014, Lagos, 2013). Another problem that arises in urban settings is how to adapt IBE to schools with a wide variety of indigenous languages. A CARE Bolivia project in urban indigenous communities speaking many indigenous languages only offered texts and teaching materials in the two most common languages, Aymara and Quechua, effectively excluding the language and culture of many other indigenous students (CARE, s.f). IBE seems to be a tool with considerable potential for protecting and promoting the indigenous heritage of these countries, but many questions about implementing and adapting the IBE model in this new context still remain unanswered (Cariman, 2015).
There is a clear preference for programs that teach popular indigenous languages. Despite the linguistic diversity of the indigenous populations of the Americas and the political acknowledgement of the right of indigenous persons to learn in their own language, IBE programs are not available for all indigenous peoples and languages, a challenge already mentioned in regard to the urban context. Perhaps the most astonishing example of the exclusion of minority indigenous languages comes from Paraguay. In Paraguay the indigenous language Guarani shares official national language status with Spanish and is spoken by 85% of the population, indigenous and non-indigenous alike, which represents a significant achievement in the valuation and recognition of indigenous languages. However, there are 19 other indigenous peoples living in Paraguay whose languages and linguistic and cultural rights are not officially recognized. Furthermore, the illiteracy rates among Paraguayan indigenous populations are the highest in the region, indicating their extreme marginalization in the education system (López, 2009, World Bank, 2015). The situation is complicated by the fact that, in the most remote areas of the Amazon, the average population of an indigenous group is only 250 people, and each group has its own language and culture, requiring specific curricula and teachers (López, 2009). Despite significant achievements in the implementation of IBE, the exclusion of certain ethnic groups—especially the smallest and/or most isolated—in favor of majority groups remains an unmet challenge for the entire region (OREALC/UNESCO, 2017).

Much remains to be done to reconcile classroom realities with IBE regulations and policies. Many countries have established the right of indigenous children to an intercultural bilingual education in their own language, and some, such as Bolivia and Ecuador, consider themselves “plurinational”; in other words, the government acknowledges the indigenous peoples as sovereign nations within the state (OREALC/UNESCO, 2017). However, in many cases, this formal recognition of indigenous heritage and indigenous education is at odds with the actual implementation of policies to close existing gaps and the provision of quality intercultural bilingual education for indigenous children. For example, in the Urubamba valley of Peru, teachers reviewed the intercultural component of the IBE curriculum to mean translation of academic content into Quechua, with no attention to indigenous and local knowledge. A study in Mexico reports the same approach there (Valdiviezo, 2009, Viveros-Márquez and Moreno-Olivos, 2014). Moreover, a study of the IBE program in Puno, Peru, found that the supposed failure of policies to improve the academic performance of indigenous children was due largely to discrepancies between the policies established by the National Directorate of Intercultural Bilingual Education (DINEBI) and the pedagogies used in the classroom (Guerrero, 2010). In many cases, the gap between expectation and reality is the result of ineffective public policy implementation.
IBE programs require more community involvement to achieve their goals. Implementing education that is truly intercultural and bilingual requires the active collaboration of families, local indigenous communities, and local community organizations. It is also important for the students themselves to participate actively because of their own knowledge and lived experience in the school’s pedagogical procedures and administration. However, if indigenous communities do not have access to the necessary information and support, they cannot participate on an equal basis. In many cases, parents see learning Spanish as necessary for their children to have access to better economic and social opportunities. For this reason, they often oppose the IBE educational model and want their children to be taught exclusively in Spanish (Bryan, 2006; López, 1998). However, when mothers and fathers are more involved in an IBE project from the outset and can see how it benefits their children, they are more likely to support it. In Bolivia, for example, the Assembly of the Guarani People (APG) was very active in the design and implementation of the Bolivian IBE program. This had significant benefits in terms of community participation, including greater involvement of the parents in their children’s education and, eventually, a literacy program for adults in the Guarani communities (López, 1998). Another inspiring example comes from Nicaragua, where the Ministry of Education developed and contextualized the national curriculum with the active participation of IBE primary school teachers and local indigenous community leaders (Catter, 2012). These cases reaffirm that active local community involvement in the development of IBE programs is imperative to ensure that the programs are truly intercultural and respectful of indigenous peoples.
Access to Intercultural Bilingual Education Project - PAEBI (Guatemala)

Administration: The Access to Intercultural Bilingual Education Project (Proyecto Acceso a la Educación Bilingüe Intercultural, PAEBI) was administered by the General Directorate of Intercultural Bilingual Education (DGEBI) in collaboration with the Departmental Directorate of Education (DDE) and a number of community organizations in El Quiché, with the support of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

Description:
- PAEBI began in 1996 to support the educational mandates of the Guatemalan Peace Accords with four lines of action:
  1. Training administrators, principals, teachers, parents, and students in primary schools and teacher training institutions in IBE strategies.
  2. Developing culturally contextualized educational materials for use by teachers, students, and parents.
  3. Increasing parent participation in decision-making processes through leadership training for women, parent networks, and early childhood stimulation programs.
  4. Training and awareness-building at regional and national levels through conferences, radio programs, and workshops.
- The project will be operated in 750 primary schools and serve a total of 81,000 students.

Outcomes and findings:
- PAEBI improved the efficiency of participating schools by reducing the repetition rate and boosting enrollment.
- Gains were particularly strong in first grade, thanks to the Salvemos Primer Grado intervention aimed at increasing first grade promotion rates.
- PAEBI improved classroom dynamics by helping teachers achieve more student-centered classrooms with more gender equity and more usage of the mother tongue.
- Nevertheless, results in academic performance were mixed, in part because of the high enrollment and promotion rates. Many students who previously would not have enrolled or stayed in school received an education.
- Despite the project’s positive impact in terms of community participation and system efficiency, it was not able to close the wide gaps in academic performance between indigenous students and their peers in traditional schools.
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Chapter 3
SECONDARY EDUCATION

Introduction

As we have seen, the region’s educational landscape is extremely unequal. As poor children and children in vulnerable situations move through the primary grades, they acquire learning deficits that cause them to fall behind or to repeat one or more years, and to develop negative attitudes about school. These gaps yawn wider in secondary school, where their learning disadvantage is compounded by the pressures of adolescence. Many do not go on to secondary school or drop out of it because they need to work or have other responsibilities. In particular, for teenage girls, early motherhood and the responsibilities of housework and unpaid child care are factors that lead them to leave school. In addition, the low relevance of the subjects covered in class, the inadequacy of school support for individual learning needs, and precarious family circumstances combine to create a low-performance, high dropout risk environment. As a result, many young people leave the education system without a diploma or the skills necessary to exercise citizenship effectively and perform well in the job market. How then can education systems change secondary education to reduce inequalities and improve graduation rates and academic achievement among poor and young people in vulnerable situations?

In pursuit of this objective, Sustainable Development Goal 4 calls for equity at the secondary level. This is the first goal in recent history that includes secondary education in addition to primary education, indicating the growing importance of the secondary level.

Goal 4.2 sets the following target:

4.2 By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning.”
Current Situation

Secondary school attendance has grown, but many children and young people are still excluded.

Today, more young people are attending secondary school than ever before. The net secondary school enrollment rate (percentage of secondary school-aged students enrolled in school) has grown rapidly in the past 17 years—from 59% in 1990 to 65.4% in 2000, to 75.6% in 2015—placing the region above the global average (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2018). This is largely because, in the past 20 years, a number of countries in the region have made secondary education mandatory and have worked to expand secondary school supply and demand through investments in infrastructure and teaching staff and through social programs such as conditional cash transfers (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2018). However, there is wide variation among countries. For example, enrollment rates are approaching 90%—very close to the regional average for primary school—in Southern Cone countries like Argentina (88%), Chile (88%), and Ecuador (87%) and Caribbean countries like Grenada (85%), Dominica (86%), and Cuba (86%) (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2018). In contrast, the percentage of young people out of school remains high, particularly in the Central American countries like Belize (69%), El Salvador (69%), Guatemala (48%), and Honduras (49%).

Who are the young people who do not attend secondary school? Regionally, inequality in regards to the access to education across socioeconomic strata is a well-known challenge in all grades, but it is particularly pronounced at the secondary level, especially in upper secondary school. According to recent household surveys, 84% of children and young people in the wealthiest quintile attend secondary school, compared to only 65% of those in the poorest quintile (IDB, s.f.). This represents a significant reduction in the socioeconomic access gap at this level, from 31 percentage points in 2006 to 19 percentage points in 2015, and reflects a significant increase in the percentage of very poor children who have gained access to secondary schools in that short period of time (IDS, s.f). Similarly, the enrollment gap between rural children and urban children declined from 17 points to 13 percentage points over the same period, thanks to efforts to increase public school coverage in remote areas and to social programs that reward enrolling and staying in school (IDB, s.f). Afro-descendant children are also less likely to attend secondary school, although the gaps are less pronounced. According to ECLAC calculations, in 7 of the 11 countries for which data is available11, school attendance among 12 to 17-year-old Afro-descendant adolescents is lower than those of their peers. In these countries, the attendance gap is 4.39 percentage points, however, for young people between the ages of 18 to 24, the gap increases to 9.43 percentage points (ECLAC, 2017a).

---

11. Argentina, Bolivia, Brasil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panamá, Uruguay, Venezuela
School dropout is a serious problem that disproportionately affects poor and children in vulnerable situations.

The sociodemographic differences in access become more severe in the upper grades of secondary school, where dropout is an endemic phenomenon. According to UNESCO data, the attrition rate in lower secondary school is approximately 15%, while according to a World Bank report, only 45% of students who reach upper secondary school finish it (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2018; Székely and Karver, 2015). Although this problem affects much of the population, it impacts poor and vulnerable young people disproportionately. The age of young people in the highest income quintile who attend upper secondary school is almost double that of the poorest young people (64% versus 36%): a larger gap than what we see in lower secondary school, and one that has remained unchanged for the past 10 years. Rural, indigenous and young people with disabilities also have a higher dropout risk.

Why do so many young people drop out of school? The reasons why school systems are unable to retain all of their students are many and diverse. However, the essential problem would appear to be an absence of policies that provide support for young students and their families to create conditions for them to attend school and finish their education. Surveys of young people who have dropped out of school have found two main reasons: lack of interest in school (created by a combination of socioemotional problems, academic difficulties, and an institutional format that does not meet the needs of the students) and the lack of financial resources. In fact, for young people age 13 to 15, the primary reason for dropping out was lack of interest in school (33%), followed by financial problems (21%) (Graduate XXI, s.f.). Similarly, a survey conducted in Brazil found that the most frequently cited reasons for dropping out were lack of interest (40%), followed by financial problems or the need to work (27%) (Fundação Getulio Vargas). Another study of eight Latin American countries found two groups of factors to
be strongly associated with dropout (Espíndola and León, 2002). On the one hand, factors related to the family’s socioeconomic circumstances appeared to be important determinants of dropout, for example -- young people from vulnerable families and those living in circumstances of poverty, marginalization, and violence were more likely to leave school early. The other factors involved the structure and responsiveness of the schools in the education system. When teachers and principals are not trained to provide support for students with behavioral problems (and possibly their families) or for students with violence and poverty-related difficulties, the educational system then becomes a hostile environment that discourages young people from finishing school. This situation is especially important given that the new students being brought into the secondary school system come from families that have traditionally been excluded from it (Bassi, Busso, Urzúa and Vargas, 2012).

Lastly, there are also gender differences in the reasons for leaving school. For teenage girls, pregnancy and domestic chores are strong contributing factors. Among teenage girls, 13% drop out for this reason, while only 0.5% of teenage boys cite parental responsibilities as the principal reason (Nieves, Rico and Trucco, 2014). In addition, 70% of women aged 15 to 29 who are not in school or employed in the labor market are employed in unpaid domestic labor, compared to only 10.9% of men (OCDE, CAF and ECLAC, 2017). This situation seriously limits women’s educational potential since early pregnancy has a significant negative impact on educational attainment (Nieves, Rico and Trucco, 2014). Factors associated with early pregnancy include characteristics of the teenager’s home, household income, and parents’ educational attainment. However, there are other important contextual factors such as access to sex education (Nieves, Rico and Trucco, 2014). These factors must be taken into account in efforts to strengthen dropout prevention policies.

In addition to the inequalities in secondary school access and retention, the region also suffers from low and unequal levels of academic achievement.

Young people in the region are scoring higher than in the past on national and international tests, but they are still not performing adequately—especially poor and young people in vulnerable situations have particularly low levels of learning. This was confirmed by the most recent Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), conducted by the Organization for Cooperation and Development (OECD) in 2015. PISA 2015 tested 15-year-olds representing 72 countries and cities in reading, math, and science abilities. The 10 participating countries and economies in Latin America and the Caribbean were Buenos Aires, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, and Uruguay. With the exception of Uruguay and Costa Rica, all scored higher in some subject areas than from 2000 onwards. Colombia stands out among the participating countries for rapid improvement in science and reading, and the same is true for Chile in reading and Trinidad and Tobago in science. Peru is in the top six countries for rapid improvement in all three subject areas. (IDB, 2016b) However, Uruguay did not improve in any of the three subject areas, and Costa Rica went backwards in reading, losing 3.1 points every year (IDB, 2016b).

Despite these improvements, all of the countries and economies except Buenos Aires were in the lower half of the international ranking in the three subjects (IDB, 2016a). Around half of the students received low scores in science (52%), math (68%), and reading (47%), which means that they did not achieve minimum competency in these areas (IDB, 2016a). In math, for example, they cannot use basic formulas, procedures, or rules to solve whole number problems, while in reading, they cannot identify the main idea in a text or infer information that is not explicitly stated—skills which they should have mastered at this age and which are necessary in the labor market.

---

12 PISA scores are comparable in science beginning in 2006, in reading beginning in 2000, and in math beginning in 2003.
Furthermore, the assessment revealed major achievement differences between rich and poor students. Students in the region’s poorest quintile trailed their wealthier peers by almost two and a half years (around 80 points) in the three subject areas. Colombia and Peru had the widest gaps, equivalent to three grade levels (92 and 89-point differences on the science test, for example) (IDB, 2016a). In addition, the region has relatively few “resilient” students; in other words, students of low socioeconomic status who achieve above-average results compared to their peers of similar socioeconomic status. Only 10% of the region’s poorest students were classified as resilient (IDB, 2016c). This is low in comparison with the OECD developed countries (29%) and the world’s top-scoring country, Singapore (49%) (IDB, 2016c). This may be because, in the region, there is greater socioeconomic variation between schools than within them when compared to other developed countries (for example, in Peru, the variation between schools is 51%, while within them it is 49%. In the OECD, the variation between schools is 25%, and within them it is 75%). Thus, just as at the primary level, the region’s secondary schools suffer from a high degree of socioeconomic segregation. This is a problem because, according to the same analyses of PISA, schools attended by students from low-income families see the quality and quantity of school educational materials and teachers as insufficient, which makes it very hard for the most disadvantaged students to perform successfully (IDB, 2016c).
Why is reducing educational inequality in secondary school important?

Children and young people have a right to quality basic education, and governments have an obligation to provide it. Education is also a prerequisite for the full exercise of other economic, social, political, and cultural rights. The education system is the primary context in which young people learn the academic and socioemotional skills necessary to assert their rights as members of society and perform successfully in the labor market. However, the current quality and relevance of instruction is negatively affecting not only secondary school completion rates but also post-secondary job and educational opportunities for young people. In the region, 1 in 4 young people aged 15 to 29 is “not in employment, education or training” (NEET), which represents an enormous loss for the region (OCDE, CAF, ECLAC, 2017). Young people belonging to poor and vulnerable households are particularly likely to be NEET. In 2014, around 83% of young people and 76% of NEET young people came from poor or vulnerable households (Carcillo, Fernández, Königs and Minea, 2015). Furthermore, the likelihood of falling into this category correlates strongly with the level of education and the family income (Carcillo et al, 2015). This phenomenon is the result of unfavorable socioeconomic environments, the lack of support policies for young people, and in the area of education, the low quality and relevance of secondary instruction.
Furthermore, employers in the region report difficulty finding workers with the necessary skills, including basic skills (reading and math), technical skills, socioemotional skills, and knowledge of foreign languages, among other abilities. In fact, employers in Latin America and the Caribbean take longer to fill vacancies with qualified workers than in anywhere else in the world (more than six weeks on average) (Aedo and Walker, 2012). At the same time, dropout recovery rates have declined since 2000, due in part, according to some experts, to a mismatch between the skills learned in school and the skills in demand in the labor market (Bassi et al., 2012). In this situation, employers are obliged to compensate for their workers’ lack of relevant skills by offering on-the-job training. In the region, 43% of manufacturing firms offer their employees’ formal training - a higher percentage than in other areas in the world (World Bank, 2014).

Given this situation, governments in the Americas have been prioritizing strategies for increasing secondary school enrollment - particularly among poor and young people in vulnerable situations - and improving learning at the secondary level. With respect to enrollment, conditional cash transfer programs seek to motivate low-income families to keep adolescents enrolled by reducing the opportunity cost of attending school. Tutoring and academic support programs seek to improve the skills of low-achieving students through personalized, intensive instruction, and dropout recovery programs seek to reintegrate students who have dropped out by offering flexible learning options.
Strategy 8
Conditional Cash Transfers

Summary: Conditional cash transfer (CCT) programs have been the most popular form of large-scale social assistance intervention in recent decades. There is abundant evidence on the significant results in terms of secondary school enrollment and attendance of these programs, however there are still doubts about their capacity in terms of boosting learning outcomes. To ensure that students are not only attending school but also improving their academic performance as well, consideration should be given to other variables and complementary interventions.

What are Conditional Cash Transfers Programs?

Conditional Cash Transfer programs (CCT) are programs that transfer cash to families in situations of vulnerability (generally since they are living in poverty), although Afro-descendant, indigenous or rural status may be considered as well) under the condition that they must meet certain requirements, usually focused on children’s health, nutrition and/or education of children. CCTs are based on the theory that targeted investments can build the human capital of children and adolescents, thereby ensuring a better future for them and eventually breaking the cycle of intergenerational poverty (Fizbein and Shady, 2009; Ibarrarán, Medellín, Regalia and Stampini, 2017). In 2013, an estimated 137 million people in Latin America and the Caribbean received conditional cash transfers that represented between 20% and 25% of their household income (Ibarrarán et al, 2017). Today, CCT programs are operating in almost all of the countries of Latin America and some Caribbean countries and benefit nearly 20% of the region’s total population (United Nations, 2015). In some countries in the region, such as Brazil and Mexico, CCTs have become the largest social assistance programs in operation (Fizbein and Shady, 2009).

There are various CCT models differing primarily according to their goals and target populations (Fizbein and Shady, 2009; Ibarrarán et al., 2017). The characteristics of the different programs depend on the answers given to a set of questions: What are the criteria to be met for participating in the program? Is it a program focused exclusively on people in greatest need, or is it aimed at a broader group? What conditions do beneficiaries have to meet to receive payments? Do all participants receive the same amount of money, or will the transfers be adjusted according to need or dropout risk, for instance? What are the criteria for graduating from the CCT program, and how is continued eligibility determined? Clearly, the answers to these questions determine the format and operation of the CCT programs, and within the Americas there are countless combinations and designs (Ibarrarán et al., 2017).
What are the results of these programs?

To a great extent, the popularity of CCTs can be attributed to the substantial evidence of the positive outcomes for students in the region, especially their impact on school attendance, dropout rates, and grade repetition. At least in the Americas, there is evidence that, because of the high dropout rates in secondary school, CCTs can be more beneficial for secondary school students than for primary schoolers (Saavedra and García, 2013). For example, an evaluation of Colombia’s Familias en Acción program found that the intervention had a much greater impact on enrollment among students aged 14 to 17 than among those aged 8 to 13. Similarly, in Mexico, the Oportunidades program (formerly Progresa, now Prospera) had more impact on the transition rate from primary to secondary school than on enrollment rates from preprimary school through fifth grade (Fizbein and Shady, 2009). The effect on attendance rates was also higher for secondary school students. A meta-analysis of CCT programs found that they boosted primary school attendance by an average of 3%, while the average effect in secondary school was 12% (Saavedra and García, 2013). The same study found that the CCT programs had a threefold greater impact on the dropout rate in the secondary school grades than in the primary grades (Saavedra and García, 2013). Given that enrollment rates in secondary school are lower than in primary school and dropout rates are higher, CCTs can play an important role in reducing inequality in education.

However, when we look at the effect of CCTs on student academic performance, the picture becomes more complex. In the case of Jamaica, the Programme for Advancement through Health and Education (PATH) boosted the academic performance of boys in urban areas, but it had no impact on the performance of participating girls (Stampini, Martínez-Cordova, Insfrán and Harris, 2016). A study of the PROGRESA program in Mexico that analyzed the reading, math, and writing performance of beneficiaries aged 15 to 21 found no significant improvement (Behrman, Parker and Todd, 2009). Further research is needed to determine whether CCTs have the capacity to improve learning.

In addition to improving education indicators, CCTs increase the income stability of poor families, thereby protecting them from household financial crises, and encourage families to invest in education and young people to aspire for the future (Behrman and Parker, 2010). In many cases, when a family experiences an income crisis, there is a risk of dropout, particularly among older children. The study of the PROGRESA program in Mexico found that students in households receiving CCTs were less likely to drop out of school during an income crisis (Behrman and Parker, 2010). Similarly, a study of Nicaragua’s Atención a Crisis program, a CCT pilot program for households in extreme poverty, found a positive impact on parents’ future aspirations for their children and, consequently, their investment in education (Macours and Vakis, 2009). A study of Colombia’s Familias en Acción CCT program found that participating parents had a 10 to 20-point greater probability of aspiring to post-secondary education for their children and these results were most pronounced among the most vulnerable families; that is, the poorest, the most pessimistic, and least educated (Harker and Cuartas, 2016).
What are the lessons learned?

- **CCT programs reach the people with the greatest needs more effectively than other social assistance interventions.** One of the most complex problems for social assistance programs is how to make sure that the benefits reach the neediest people in situations of poverty and vulnerability without expanding the coverage of the program to the extent that would be too expensive. Given that many poor and people in vulnerable situations live in rural or remote areas or have limited access to schools, one of the fundamental challenges for implementing CCT programs is ensuring that they work for those who need them most (Ibarrarán et al., 2017). There is considerable evidence that CCTs are in fact reaching the poorest and most vulnerable households (Ibarrarán et al., 2017). For example, a study of various social assistance programs, including several CCT programs, found that in average they covered only 20% of the population in the lowest income quintile in contrast, the CCT programs in Brazil, Ecuador, and Mexico reach more than 60% of poor households (Fizbein and Shady, 2009). Another study analyzing surveys of households in 16 countries in the region finds that their CCT programs reach 42.6% of all poor and 60.6% of the extremely poor (Robles, Rubio and Stampini, 2015). This data indicates that CCTs are effective for reaching the neediest households, especially in comparison with other social assistance programs. However, coverage rates will vary considerably depending on program design. For example, a program such as the one in Costa Rica, which exclusively targets secondary school students, will always cover fewer people that programs that also include families with younger children. Regarding the “leakage” problem—the inclusion of people who do not need services—one study estimates that 39.2% of CCT beneficiaries are not poor (Ibarrarán et al., 2017). However, this means testing as well as geographic and categorical targeting, CCT programs have eliminated many leakage errors (Ibarrarán et al., 2017). Furthermore, once established, these targeting systems serve various functions, and can be useful for developing other social assistance programs (Fizbein and Shady, 2009).

- **Systems for registering new applicants should be established in order not to exclude families in need.** Potential CCT beneficiaries must be able to register easily. There are three possible systems for identifying and registering potential beneficiaries: mass registration, temporary or permanent beneficiary service desks, and targeted active search (Ibarrarán et al., 2017). In the case of beneficiary service desks, which are usually located in municipal or ministry offices, they have lower costs since they require less field work, although there exists a greater possibility of exclusion if families are unaware of their presence or are not easily accessed. However, permanent service desks allow families to register when it is convenient, rather than having to wait for an open enrollment period. A good regional example of this model is Jamaica’s PATH, which allows applicants to request registration at any time (Ibarrarán et al., 2017). These registering processes for new CCT beneficiaries involve new openings in a sometimes-unpredictable way, which can hinder the process of determining budgets (Ibarrarán et al., 2017). In addition, CCT programs are not as agile to accommodating income fluctuations in poor and vulnerable households and allowing new beneficiaries to register in such cases (Fizbein and Shady, 2009).
The benefit amount should be sufficient to achieve the desired result. A critical aspect of designing CCT programs is determining how much the benefit amounts should be and how they can be distributed and managed. Most CCT programs use a fairly simple formula to calculate the benefit amount each household will receive. The program will generally consider only the number of children in the household but can also include gender or age/grade in school (Fizbein and Shady, 2009). An example of a simple payment system is Ecuador’s Bono de Desarrollo Humano (BDH) program, which pays an annual fixed subsidy to extremely poor households, regardless of the number or age of the children or their academic performance. Because of its simplicity, the program does not require special bank accounts or complex methods of payment. Beneficiaries simply present their identity card to confirm that they are eligible to receive payment (Ibarrarán et al., 2017). More complex CCT programs, especially those that adjust the benefit amount to the gender or age of the beneficiary, normally consider the opportunity costs and direct costs of staying in school to determine the exact amount of the subsidy. For example, Jamaica’s PATH considers both grade and gender in determining the benefit amount, paying more for each successive grade, and more for boys than girls since boys have a higher dropout rate. In Mexico and Colombia, the amount per secondary school student is almost twice the amount per primary school student because the dropout rates are much higher in these grades, and school costs rise as well (Behrman and Parker, 2010). In Mexico, the subsidy amount is larger for girls than for boys because girls are at higher risk of dropping out (Behrman and Parker, 2010). Chile’s Ingreso Ético Familiar program is one of the most complex thus requiring well-developed institutions to ensure that each beneficiary receives the appropriate amount on time. This is because the program in addition to the extremely poor also includes vulnerable populations, and the quantity and frequency of the payments is determined by multiple independent variables drawn from different data sources (Ibarrarán et al., 2017).

Although less common, CCT programs that make payment conditional on positive learning behaviors and school attendance show promising results. A meta-analysis of 42 studies involving 19 CCT programs in 15 countries found better results among programs that made payment contingent on more stringent conditions, especially those that required beneficiaries to maintain a certain level of academic performance. The majority (68%) of the CCT programs conditioned payment on attending school, typically for at least 80% of the time, without setting any specific academic conditions. The other 32% that did set a qualitative condition for the benefits had greater impact. The most common additional conditions were grade promotion or school achievement (Saavedra and García, 2013). In Chile, for example, from fifth grade to the last year of secondary school, students in the top third of their grade can receive a school achievement bonus, which increases if they are the top 15% (Ibarrarán et al., 2017). However, another study in the United States found paying for positive behaviors (for example, reading books) to be more effective than paying for academic performance (Fryer, 2010). An example of this type of conditionality is a program in the Bahamas that pays secondary students whose poor grades might prevent them from receiving a graduation diploma if they attend remedial classes to improve their academic performance (Ibarrarán et al., 2017). Although currently very few in number, these programs with additional conditionalities offer a possible mechanism for promoting good academic performance of students.

This complexity is due to the IEF benefit structure. The program has 8 subsidies divided into 3 categories. Subsidies in the “dignity” category are paid to all families for a specific period of time. Subsidies in the “duties” category are conditional subsidies and are paid for meeting health and education requirements. Subsidies in the “achievements” category are paid for having found formal employment or for high academic performance. Not all beneficiaries qualify for all subsidies, and in many cases the amount of the subsidy depends on the number of children in the household, their ages, and household income (IDB, 2017).
Since other variables can significantly influence the impact of a program, complementary interventions are needed. Complementary interventions can include parent workshops, additional resources for schools, access to other social assistance programs, or skills development (Bastagli et al., 2016). As discussed above, CCT programs have had very positive impacts on school enrollment and attendance among poor students and students in vulnerable situations. However, conditional cash transfers are not the only action needed to achieve results. A meta-analysis of CCT programs found that more than 70% of the programs did not include any type of complementary intervention but that those than that did had a more sizable impact (Saavedra and Garcia, 2013). School quality, for example, affects the results of the intervention significantly. A study of Mexico’s Oportunidades program (formerly Progresa) found that the size of the intervention’s impact was determined by the quantity and quality of the school’s resources and the level of education of its teachers. Class size also affected results; reducing class size by 10% made the program 10% more effective (Behrman, Parker, Todd and Gandino, 2006). These results have major implications for the development of complementary interventions such as recruiting, hiring, and training additional teachers for marginal schools and providing adequate educational materials for low-resource schools.
Avancemos Conditional Cash Transfer Program (Costa Rica)

**Administration:** Established in 2006, Costa Rica’s Avancemos conditional cash transfer program is coordinated by the Ministry of Public Education in collaboration with the Avancemos Management Unit. The Joint Social Welfare Institute (IMAS) determines and monitors beneficiary eligibility. The program reached almost 170,000 students in 2016.

**Description:**
- The primary goal of the program is to keep secondary students (grades 7 to 12) in school through a tied monthly subsidy which increases annually by grade level. It is conditional on school attendance and passing grades.
- The program uses a point-based system to determine if a household is vulnerable and qualifies for the subsidy.
- As of 2014, it had benefited more than 185,000 students aged 12 to 25 nationwide.

**Outcomes:**
- From 2006 to 2014, Avancemos generated positive results, increasing the probability that the students would remain in school and decreasing the number of hours that they worked.
- From 2006 to 2014, the average number of years in school of program beneficiaries rose from 7.6 to 8.0.
- In addition, participants were 28.2 % more likely to attend class than nonparticipants.
- The impact was greater for boys, students from rural areas, and overage students.

**Findings:**
- Institutional capacity presents a central challenge for effective implementation of the program. In a number of cases, deposits were not made on time, or payments were suspended without clear explanation. This is a situation which could potentially increase the likelihood that students will drop out of school again.
- Financial challenges are only a part of the dropout problem. One in three dropouts cited a lack of interest in classes as the primary reason for leaving school. Measures to improve the quality and relevance of schooling should be included.
- The program’s impact on school attendance was greatest among older students. However, students aged 15 to 17 benefited most in terms of the number of years completed. These results suggest that students of different ages benefit from the program in different ways.

Strategy 9: Tutoring and Support Programs

Summary: Poor and vulnerable students entering secondary school have often accumulated serious learning deficits and repeated one or more grades in primary school, which puts them at risk of academic failure and dropout when they reach secondary school. Tutoring programs aim to strengthen the knowledge of low-achieving students so that they can stay on target in school, thereby equalizing the performance of all students. In addition, because tutoring involves individuals or small groups, it can be more relevant to each student, thereby improving student motivation. The most effective tutoring programs are integrated into the school curriculum. They detect and identify students in need of tutoring early on, pinpoint their specific weaknesses, and they use pedagogies that arouse the interest of students.

Secondary education in the Americas faces two problems: high dropout rates and very low performance. We know that students in low-income areas, rural areas, and public schools have lower levels of learning and are also more likely to miss school, repeat one or more grades, and eventually drop out of school. This is because teachers in the region often do not have the ability or institutional conditions to give the neediest students individual attention. In view of this deficiency, many countries have begun prioritizing tutoring and support programs in order to give students at risk of academic failure access to additional instruction time and assistance.

What are tutoring and support programs?

Tutoring and support programs are efforts to help low-performing students do better in class and stay in school by providing academic reinforcement or socioemotional support. While tutoring can improve the academic performance of young people who are experiencing greater difficulty, it is also important to provide psychological and affective support, precisely because of what we know about the impact of socioemotional problems on academic achievement. Tutoring is usually organized by curriculum area, and it generally focuses on the classes that give students the most trouble (language and math) and are most likely to cause them to drop out if failed or repeated. However, in other cases (in Buenos Aires, for example), tutoring is general and focuses on topics such as effective study practices and preparing for tests among other subjects. Also common in the region are tutoring and support programs aimed at strengthening students’ socioemotional skills and improving academic outcomes holistically by addressing a wide range of important subjects to adolescents (i.e., self-esteem, discipline and coexistence, health, and vocational guidance among others). Lastly, while there are tutoring and support programs at all levels of secondary school, the emphasis seems to be on the first year of secondary school, which is generally sixth grade—the transition grade—which marks a period of readjustment during which students are particularly likely to fall behind academically or develop habits that will undermine their performance. In Uruguay, for example, the Programa de Impulso a la Universalización (PIU), launched in 2008, works primarily with students in their first year because “ahí existe un cuello de botella” [there is a bottleneck there] (Aristimuño, 2010). In Buenos Aires, the new secondary school curriculum includes a “support workshop” for first-year students covering topics such as integration to school culture and getting to know one’s classmates (Ministry of Education of Buenos Aires, s.f.).
The profile of the tutor varies greatly from program to program. In some countries, tutors are faculty members who also assume tutoring functions, sometimes even tutoring their own class sections, and are paid for the additional hours involved. In other countries, tutors have a formal position who is exclusively dedicated to this task. In smaller programs, nonteachers such as recent university graduates or paraprofessionals provide academic support with surprising results. In some cases, especially when the whole school receives tutoring, tutoring sessions are treated like additional class periods (as in Mexico and Peru). In others, tutoring is scheduled after school (Uruguay). With respect to targeting, some tutoring programs are implemented across all schools, while others target vulnerable schools and, within them, low-achieving students. In many cases, tutoring is provided directly by the public school system as part of educational programming, but tutoring programs have also been successfully implemented by nongovernmental organizations and other private actors.

What are the results of these programs?

Programs that provide tutoring and support to low-performing students have demonstrated substantial positive impacts on standardized test scores and school retention rates. Most of the evidence on these programs comes from the United States, in part because of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, which makes children in schools that do not meet performance standards eligible for free academic support or tutoring and has therefore generated much interest in determining the effectiveness of these programs. A meta-analysis of 35 out-of-school-time academic support programs for low-achieving students found statistically significant effects on English and math grades (Lauer et al., 2006). One particularly successful program is Match Corps, run by the Match charter public schools in Boston, Massachusetts. Match contracts recent university graduates to tutor groups of two students in low-income schools for an hour a day. Implementation of the model in 12 Chicago schools improved math scores on standardized tests and reduced course failures in math by one half (Cook et al., 2015). It is interesting to note that, while the tutoring focused exclusively on math, the failure rate in non-math courses such as reading declined as well (Cook et al., 2015). Another recognized U.S. program is Diplomas Now, which works at the national level with some of the worst performing middle and high schools in the United States. Using an indicator-based on an early warning system to identify students with low attendance, bad behavior, or low course performance in math and English, it provides academic support and individualized socioemotional support to boost learning and keep students in school. During the 2012-2013 school year, the program achieved a 57% reduction in students failing English and a 58% reduction in students failing math (Diplomas Now, s.f.). In addition, a study of the program in 65 schools found that the model significantly increased the percentage of students with no early warning signs, i.e., with better than 85% attendance, with less than three suspensions, and passing grades in math and English (Corrin, Sepanik, Rosen and Shane, 2016).
Similar programs have generated good results outside the United States. In Israel, the national Bagrut 2001 program (2001-2005) targeted the lowest performing secondary schools, where it provided individualized instruction to groups of up to five students who had failed one or more classes. As a result of the intervention, the exam pass rate for participating students increased between 11 and 12 percentage points (Lavy and Schosser, 2004). Another example, while not specific to secondary schools, was a remedial intervention in India. In the program, young women who had finished secondary school tutored third and fourth graders who were falling behind, focusing on concepts that the children should have learned in the first and second grades. The experiment boosted test scores significantly and was relatively low cost (Banerjee, Cole, Duflo and Linden, 2007). In the Americas, a study of the tutoring program in Peru (where tutoring is part of the national curriculum) found that, in the studied school, tutoring had a significant impact on the math grades of third-year secondary school students; only 13% of participating students received unsatisfactory grades, compared to 67% of nonparticipating students. Lastly, in Mexico City, a joint program operated by the Secretariat of Education and a nongovernmental organization assigned university students to provide academic support in math to low-performing students in marginalized secondary schools. After one year, the grades of the participating students were no longer significantly lower than those of the other students (Gutiérrez and Rodrigo, 2014). In short, evidence suggests that intensive personalized instruction, even by nonteachers, can help to equalize student abilities.

What are the lessons learned?

- **Tutoring programs should be built into the school’s strategy and should be supported by all actors in the education system.** The fact that some countries in the region have included tutoring in their improvement plans for secondary education and, in some cases, their formal curricula represents major progress. In Argentina, tutoring is an integral part of the jurisdiction plans for secondary education (RJESs) and the school improvement plans (PMIs), which all secondary school jurisdictions and schools have been required to prepare since 2006, when the National Education Law made secondary education mandatory (Ministry of Education of Argentina, 2015). PMIs used as tools for improving school outcomes have prioritized state-funded tutoring and extracurricular support aimed at increasing pass and graduation rates. In addition, in its new secondary school curriculum (2014-2020), the Ministry of Education of the City of Buenos Aires requires all secondary schools to develop an institutional tutoring project (PIT) that provides a comprehensive view of tutoring within the school plan. Developed under the guidance of a tutoring coordinator, the PIT must indicate the specific functions and duties of the principal, teachers, tutors, and other staff (Ministry of Education of Buenos Aires, s.f.). In Peru and Mexico, “tutoring and guidance” is a formal hour of the secondary school week devoted to both academic and nonacademic subjects, including citizenship and health. However, Mexico’s experience demonstrates the importance of good school planning. A study of tutoring in Mexico found that, in most schools, tutors and teachers collaborate very little (47%) or not at all (29%), and tutors spend very little time on planning because no time is formally set aside for it (National Institute for Educational Evaluation, 2014). Thus, while formalizing the role of the tutor and remunerating tutoring hours represent a major achievement for these countries, it is important that the administration and management continues to be strengthened.

- **The most effective programs are those who target the students lagging behind.** A number of studies suggest that, as might be expected, students with greater disadvantages, i.e., students who have lower grades or belong to an at-risk group, benefit more than others from special academic support. An analysis of various studies of academic support in the United States found that programs targeting vulnerable subgroups (e.g., students from low-income families) generated better results than untargeted programs (Kidron and Lindsay, 2014). In Chile, where the Ministry of Education worked with the NGO Fundación para la Superación...
de la Pobreza to provide 15 sessions of tutoring focused on reading to groups of five or six fourth graders in vulnerable schools, a study found that the project improved the reading ability and attitude towards reading of certain subpopulations: students in public schools, students with a high percentage of students living in poverty, and low-performing students (Cabezas, Cuesta and Gallego, 2011). For this reason, some programs in the region use specific criteria to select schools or students within schools for tutoring programs. A report by the Ministry of Education of Argentina (where all schools have tutoring programs as part of their school improvement plans-PMIs-), indicates that one school achieved good results only after revising its PMI. Instead of providing tutoring for all students equally, it used data collected in a survey of the realities of students’ lives to divide students into groups (e.g., overage students, multi-grade repeaters, single-grade repeaters) and targeted only these students, for whom it designed an accelerated program for completing a grade in half the normal time (Ministry of Education of Argentina). In Uruguay, the PIU tutoring program for lower secondary school, now known as Liceos con Horas de Tutoría, (Schools with tutoring hours) has been operating since 2008. Until 2014, it targeted 110 schools with high dropout rates, within which students who had repeated one or more grades were selected for tutoring (González Mora, Macari and Varela, 2016). Preliminary results indicate that the participating secondary schools have succeeded in reducing dropout.

To determine which students require more support and what their needs are, programs should be based on regular assessments of all students. The literature on tutoring emphasizes the importance of developing systems for identifying students who are falling behind in their classes early on. In the developed countries, one of the most common dropout reduction strategies is to implement an early warning system based on measures of attendance, behavior, and course performance that are generally strong predictors of secondary school completion. In the United States, for example, in the 52% of secondary schools using an early warning system in 2013, the most common intervention trigger was poor academic performance (US Department of Education, 2016). A recent evaluation of early warning systems in 73 U.S. schools found a reduction in absences, suspensions, and course failures (Faria et al, 2017). Indicators are used not only to identify at-risks students early on, but also to tailor measures to individualized student needs. In Mexico, for example, the Undersecretariat of Secondary Education’s early warning system, SIAT, uses attendance and performance indicators to assign groups of students to tutors who provide academic support and initiate a dialogue to identity the underlying risk factors. (“Sistema de Alerta”, s.f). Depending on the associated risk factor, second-level strategies may be deployed (one-on-one tutoring for students with severe learning problems who do not respond to group tutoring, psychotherapy support, and even referral to scholarship programs for students lacking financial resources) (Public Education Secretariat of Mexico, 2011).

Programs for strengthening socioemotional skills also affect educational outcomes. There is ample evidence of a relationship between socioemotional skills and educational outcomes like academic performance and educational attainment. According to a meta-analysis, programs that focus on improving noncognitive skills such as self-esteem and behavior have an average impact of 11 to 17 percentage points on student test scores (Sánchez Puerta, Valerio and Gutiérrez Bernal, 2016). These types of programs are especially important in adolescence, given that the critical period for socioemotional development appears to extend into early adulthood, which means that it presents a wider window of opportunity for intervention than cognitive development (Sánchez Puerta, Valerio and Gutiérrez Bernal, 2016). In Argentina, Futuros Egresados, a program run by the NGO Fundación Cimientos, has succeeded in improving academic abilities through nonacademic support by offering students in low-income or vulnerable schools individual and group nonacademic tutoring combined with cash transfers. During the tutoring sessions, the tutors make an assessment of the students’ strengths and weakness and develop an action plan based on the assessment (for example, they explore new strategies for studying or for organizing school materials). A study of the program found that after two years,
absences and course failure rates had decreased, and students were more likely to pass their Spanish and math classes, not because of changes in general socioemotional skills, but because of stronger specific skills, such as finishing homework on time (self-discipline), participating in class (motivation), or setting academic goals (Ganimian, Barrera-Osorio, Loreto Biehl, Cortelezzi and Valencia, 2016). According to the study authors, this is consistent with other evidence that uses skills strengthened approaches in tutoring programs, and for the future should be specific to the context and the desired results (Ganimian et al., 2016).

- **Another lesson learned is that combining academic and nonacademic tutoring can be especially effective.** A study of an intervention among disadvantaged youth in Chicago that combined academic tutoring (based on the Match Education model) and social-cognitive training based on behavioral cognitive therapy (modeled on Chicago’s Becoming a Man program) found significant improvements in math (equivalent to learning three years of math in a single year) and a 14% improvement in the graduation rate. Thus rendering better results than the socioemotional intervention alone (Cook et al., 2014). In short, academic and nonacademic support programs that improve young people’s socioemotional skills—particularly their school habits—can have a strong impact.

- **The most effective tutoring programs teach the material in an appealing manner that differs from traditional teaching.** In Chapter 2 on Primary Education, we saw the positive impact of active or student-centered methodologies. This principle is particularly valuable in tutoring programs, which target students who have not been able to learn well in traditional classes and may experience feelings of frustration, low self-confidence, and disinterest in relation to the subject area. A recent report by UNICEF and Uruguay’s Council of Secondary Education (CES), entitled Estrategias de enseñanza en el espacio de tutorías [Teaching strategies for tutoring] proposes a series of guiding principles for tutoring pedagogy (Artagaveytia, 2016). One of the most important is that there should be some degree of individualized attention within the tutored group. This can be achieved using different “doors” or “access routes” that make allowance for different learning styles (for example, narration or storytelling, use of images or use of reasoning exercises). In addition, since we learn more and better by participating. For example, it proposes models for working collaboratively and in small groups, such as group solving of math problems, discussion and debate groups, group presentations, and group projects. An approach that exemplifies the value of these methodologies is Mexico’s Redes de Tutoría (Tutoring Networks), which later became the comprehensive strategy to improve student outcomes (Estrategia Integral para la Mejora del Logro Educativo, EIMLE) of the Secretariat of Public Education in 2009. The methodology has reached 9,000 of the lowest performing secondary schools in Mexico. In these schools, a methodology was used that transformed the role of the teacher to a tutor. The teacher presents the student with a list of topics in which the teacher is well versed. The student picks the one that seems most interesting and learns about it independently with the tutor’s help. Once the student has mastered the topic, he or she presents it to the class and teaches it to the other students. As a result of this program, a higher percentage of students scored “good” or “excellent” on the 2011 national ENLACE test, graduation rates rose, and classroom behavior improved (Rincón Gallardo and Elmore, 2012). This same methodology is now being used in Chile by Fundación Educación 2020 in partnership with Fundación Luksic. In the beginning of 2018, the Bogotá Secretariat of Education will also implement it on a small scale in Colombia, in partnership with Universidad de la Salle (Education 2020, 2017).
To adopt effective pedagogies, tutors need initial and ongoing training opportunities as well as peer-to-peer exchange mechanisms. Like teachers, tutors and mentors need ongoing training to prepare them to address the needs of their students. This point is exemplified by a program in Spain (Plan de Refuerzo, Orientación y Apoyo, PROA), which provides academic support, and reinforcement for secondary school students in educationally disadvantaged areas (Ministry of Education of Spain, 2011). Although student retention and performance has improved (García-Pérez e Hidalgo-Hidalgo, 2014) in a study of the program, the tutors interviewed identified initial and ongoing tutor training as the weakest area (Ministry of Education of Spain and the European Union, 2011). The subjects in which they would have liked training included methods for working with students with different skills and/or specific problems (e.g., non-Spanish-speaking immigrants), specific materials for working on areas such as study habits and coexistence, and tools to facilitate student monitoring. A program which emphasizes this training and peer-to-peer exchange is Fundación Cimientos’ Futuros Egresados in Argentina. The tutors in the program receive classroom and online training twice a year and have access to an online portal where they are able to find resources and information organized by topic, and communicate with tutors in other schools. Another program that has been successful in promoting tutor-to-tutor exchanges is the “tutor networks” program, a part of Mexico’s EIMLE strategy. Training groups (“nodes”) created at the national, state, regional, and school levels form a structured network for exchanges and advice through which tutors, principals, and even students and parents can share their experiences with the program (Public Education Secretariat of Mexico, 2012). In short, tutors need ongoing training, and specifically, tools to deal with the most challenging areas, as well as opportunities to learn from the experiences of fellow tutors.
Liceos con Horas de Tutoría and PCP (Uruguay)

Administration: Liceos con Horas de Tutoría is run by the National Administration for Public Education (ANEP) of Uruguay. The program was launched in 2008 as part of the ANEP educational equality plan under the name “Proyecto de Impulso a la Universalización del Ciclo Básico” [Project to Promote the Universalization of Lower Secondary Education], or PIU. In 2013, it was renamed and refocused to emphasize tutoring and its need to expand it. As of 2014, tutoring had been implemented in 110 schools.

Description: The goal of the program is “to improve learning and promotion rates in intermediate schools participating in the Project, which have higher vulnerable population indices” [unofficial translation] by referring students to group tutorials organized by subject area. The tutor’s role is to guide students’ learning and build their self-confidence by providing help in specific areas, such as finding and organizing information, using appropriate problem-solving strategies, and learning to self-correct and self-evaluate.

Outcomes
A preliminary study found that students who actually attended tutoring sessions did better on average than students referred for tutoring who did not attend even a single one-hour session. For example, students who were referred but not tutored failed an average of 6.2 classes, compared to 4 failed classes among tutored students. Similarly, students who were referred but not tutored had a failing grade average (4.6), while students who were tutored had a passing average (5.8). Furthermore, overage students and students who attended more tutoring sessions benefited more from the sessions since they had higher grade averages and higher school attendance rates.

A preliminary project impact study found that, during the years when national promotion rates declined steeply (2009-2011), the promotion gap between participating and nonparticipating schools widened. However, since 2012, promotion rates in participating schools have improved more rapidly, and the gap has narrowed.

Findings:

- The characteristics of the educational path of the students showed that when it comes to referrals to tutoring, the program was well targeted since the students referred had less favorable educational paths.

- However, a significant proportion of referred students did not attend tutoring. From August to November 2014, only 63% to 70% attended, and those most at risk were least likely to do so. These students indicate that their main reason for not attending was the noncompulsory nature of the sessions, which casts doubt on the decision to make attendance voluntary.

- A high proportion of principals and pedagogical coordinators indicated that the subject area teachers did not take into account what was covered during tutoring sessions. A project weakness has been the inability to generate the connections and communication required for teachers to take into account what is covered during tutoring sessions.

Sources: Uruguay, ANEP, Informe de Monitoreo y Evaluación del Proyecto “Liceos con horas de tutoría y PCP 2014” (2016), and Uruguay, ANEP, Informe de Monitoreo y Evaluación del Proyecto “Liceos con horas de tutoría y PCP 2013” (2014).
Strategy 10
Dropout Recovery Programs

Summary: School dropout is a fundamental challenge for the Americas, where millions of students leave secondary school without completing their studies. Dropout recovery programs offer young people, who are usually the poorest and most vulnerable, an opportunity to continue their education. Dropout recovery programs have different formats, but the most successful ones have been those that are most flexible, those that are able to adapt to their students’ specific situations, and those that take a holistic approach encompassing their students’ socioemotional, work, and family needs.

What are dropout recovery programs?

Despite recent positive developments in the Americas in terms of increased primary and secondary school enrollment, school dropout rates remain a matter of concern, especially at the secondary level. Secondary school dropout and incomplete secondary education are more prevalent among young people living in poverty and in vulnerable situations. This phenomenon seriously undermines their right to education, helps to perpetuate exclusion and social inequality, and limits their future opportunities (Sucre, 2016).

Dropout recovery programs seek to address this challenge through intervention strategies aimed at ensuring that young people either reenter the education system or complete their studies through alternate mechanisms. The programs span a broad spectrum, operating under various labels including “dropout recovery/reentry,” “school re-enrollment,” “school reintegration,” “alternative education,” and “youth and adult education.” Nevertheless, they can be divided into two general categories: those that put students directly back into regular schools (sometimes after a brief adjustment period), and those that offer an alternative path tailored to their particular needs (Sucre, 2016). In both cases, the central objective is for the teens to complete their secondary education and receive a diploma. The program “Volvé, el Cole te Espera” (Come Back, School is waiting for you) operated by the Province of Salta in Argentina, typifies the first model. The program allows secondary school dropouts aged 15 to 18 to return to school with the additional support of weekend workshops (Jóvenes Salteños, 2014). Programs of this type are usually restricted to students who are only minimally overage or behind, so that their return to school does not interfere with the other students’ learning. Another example of this model is Argentina’s national PROGRESAR program, which offers conditional cash transfers (CCTs) to low income dropouts aged 18 to 24 who go back to school (Sucre, 2016). With the second model, instead of reenrolling in a regular school, young people earn the necessary credits thanks to an accelerated curriculum, blended learning, or classes held outside regular school hours (Kraft, 2009). With EDUCATODOS, a Honduran program that exemplifies the second model, students can finish the three-year lower secondary curriculum in a single year with an average of two and a half hours a day in class. The rest of the program is completed through the completion of individual homework assignments on a flexible schedule (Schuh Morre, 2006). This more adaptable model generally targets students with considerable responsibilities outside school, such as teenage mothers or young people who work.
Around 80% of Latin American and Caribbean young people in the wealthiest quintile complete their secondary education, compared to only 20% of young people in the poorest quintile (Román, 2013). These inequalities are even greater when poor students are rural, indigenous, or with disabilities (Cabrol, Manzano and Conn, 2014). In view of the vulnerability and extreme poverty living conditions of the great majority of young dropouts, many dropout recovery programs also include additional measures to address other, noneducational challenges -- such as preventing violence, or repeat dropout, or preparing the young people to enter the labor market with the skills they need to get a good job (Sucre, 2016).

What are the Results of these programs?

Dropout recovery programs have generated positive outcomes for their students, in part because every student who finishes his or her studies represents a success, given the alternative of never obtaining a diploma. In terms of graduation rates, dropout recovery programs equal or surpass regular public schools’ graduation rates. For example, a study of the Honduran EDUCATODOS program found completion rates for lower secondary school of 54% among participating students, compared to only 35% among students in regular schools (Schuh Moore, 2006). Similarly, a study of various alternative education programs for students outside the regular education system found that the programs—including Community Schools in Mali and School for Life in Ghana—had higher completion rates than the public schools (DeStefano, Hartwell, Schuh Moore and Benbow, 2006). In the Dominican Republic, the graduation rate for PREPARA, an adult secondary education program, was 84.2% according to a World Bank report (World Bank, 2013). Furthermore, dropout recovery programs offer an important educational alternative for students in vulnerable situations of the region. For example, in El Salvador, 3.8% of secondary students are in the Edúcame program, and 11% are enrolled in alternative programs outside the traditional system (e.g., night or distance learning schools) (Mide UC, 2009). In Argentina, Plan FinES has enabled more than 500,000 people (90% of whom had only a few courses left to finish their studies) to earn their secondary school diploma (Sileoni Afirnó, 2014). Clearly, these programs fill a gap in the education system.

As for the learning outcomes of dropout recovery programs, students appear to equal or surpass students who have never left school. For example, two studies of the Honduran EDUCATODOS program found that seventh grade students were as strong or stronger in Spanish and math in comparison with students in regular public schools (Marshall, Mejor, Tulio and Aguilar, 2008). Similarly, a study of Uruguay’s Programa de Aulas Comunitarias (PAC), which offers alternative classes for young secondary school dropouts, found that students enrolled in the program had promotion rates two to three times higher than students in public schools (Moreno et al., 2014).

From the financial standpoint, dropout recovery programs have proved cost-effective in terms of both efficiency and benefit-cost ratio. A study of the Honduran EDUCATODOS program found a recurrent cost per secondary student of $80, compared to $292 per student in regular public schools. This figure would seem to indicate that EDUCATODOS has a much higher benefit-cost ratio that regular schooling, but a large part of the difference is due to the accelerated curriculum and to the fact that it is run by volunteers who are frequently graduates of the same program, rather than certified teachers (Schuh Morre, 2006). However, a study of the Texas Dropout Recovery Pilot in the United States found that the program was cost-effective and that it saved the State of Texas around $95 million (Vandersall, vruwink and Barclay, 2011). In general, young people who do not finish secondary school have less well paid, more unstable employment throughout their working lives, which perpetuates the cycle of intergenerational poverty and hinders economic development (De Hoyos, Rogers and Székely, 2016).
One of the most significant challenges for dropout recovery programs is student retention. It comes as no surprise that young people living in poverty and in vulnerable situations that have already dropped out at least once find it hard to stay in school. A case in point is the Honduran EDUCATODOS program which, despite very positive results in terms of the cost-benefit ratio and learning outcomes, has a rather high dropout rate. For example, only half of the 9,000 students enrolled in seventh grade in 2002 went on the eighth grade the next year (Marshall et al., 2008). In Uruguay, the PAC program also suffered from high attrition rates. In 2007, 30% of the participants dropped out, although this indicator improved considerably over the life of the program (the dropout rate was only 11% in 2013) (Moreno et al, 2014). Similarly, during the period of 2012 to 2014, 69% of participants in Chile’s dropout recovery program returned to school the next year, but three years later, the retention rate fell to only 44% of participants. A more rigorous analysis of this indicator, taking into account annual attendance and not just enrollment, shows that the vast majority of participants are at risk of dropping out again (Pizarro, de la Vega and Ormazábal, 2016). However, for many students, dropout recovery programs represent their best chance for finishing school. For example, a study of “Emprende Mamá”, a Chilean program working with teenage mothers living in poverty and in vulnerable situations, found that 57% of teenagers who had participated in the program either stayed in school or went back to school successfully. In contrast, in a nonparticipating control group, only 34.5% stayed in school or went back to school.

What are the Lessons learned?

- **Flexibility is key.** Effectively, there are three variables that can be adjusted to meet the needs of students in dropout recovery programs: scheduling, technology, and pace of study. Studies in the United States have found that flexibility and adaptability are crucial to the success of an alternative education program (Bland, Church, Neill and Terry, 2008). Given that most program participants have responsibilities outside school, class hours need to accommodate their other duties. For example, a study of the Chilean “Emprende Mamá” program found that when participants went back to school, they chose an evening program that offered a more flexible schedule. Furthermore, when program participants were unable to return to school, the most frequent reason was that they had no one available to look after their children (Emprende Mamá, s.f.a). With respect to technology, dropout recovery programs can reach more marginalized populations by adapting new online capabilities. For example, the Salvadoran program Edúcame has a virtual classroom option that enables students who would have trouble getting to instruction centers to participate and finish their secondary education (Mide UC, 2009). The third variable, pace of study, allows students to complete a year of academic content in much less time. For example, in Ecuador, students enrolled in the intensive upper secondary recovery program can complete the curriculum for eighth, ninth, and tenth grade in only 11 months (Sucre, 2016). For students in problematic situations where the traditional secondary school format is not feasible, i.e., students who are older, have job commitments, or are already parents, a flexible dropout recovery program is absolutely essential, so they have the opportunity to continue studying.

- **Programs need to address student vulnerabilities.** Although flexibility is a vital part of successful dropout recovery programs, it is also necessary to consider how students’ nonacademic challenges can be addressed. For example, the Chilean program “Emprende Mamá” offers teenage mothers not just academic support but also counseling and training services (Emprende Mamá s.f.b). Similarly, in Panamá, the “Por una Esperanza” program, which targets young gang members or young people at risk of being recruited, has a goal of reenrolling students who have not been able to finish their studies in a regular school. The program also works to promote the students’ all-round development through workshops and diverse seminars to boost their self-esteem, including vocational training in technical careers (Inscripción a Centro, 2017). Since many school dropouts
come from the poorest and most vulnerable households, Peru’s “Beca Doble Oportunidad” program, combines a scholarship for students to attend school with a job training program to prepare them for future employment (Sucre, 2016). Similarly, a support program for vulnerable youth in the Dominican Republic named “Jóvenes en Red”, which combines job training with enrollment in “second chance” education programs, found that small incentives (e.g., fee waivers) increased program enrollment by 27% (World Bank, 2013). Putting into consideration the multiple challenges that these teenagers face each day, dropout recovery programs need to adopt a holistic perspective and address all of their needs if they are to give them a chance of completing their studies.

**Socioemotional education and mental health care are an essential part of dropout recovery.** In Chile, a staggering 40.4% of students in dropout recovery programs have been diagnosed with a mental health disorder, and 66.2% have experienced some form of abuse or exploitation, i.e., psychological abuse (38.3%), domestic violence (36.8%), physical abuse (26.3%), child labor (8.5%), sexual abuse (6.1%) or a combination thereof (Mide UC, 2016). This data demonstrates the high vulnerability of these students and, thus, the importance of designing programs that can meet their pressingly specific needs. Socioemotional skills and mental health services should both be key aspects of any dropout recovery program. A number of interventions already recognize the importance of these aspects of education. In Colombia, for example, the program La Escuela Busca al Niño (EBN) integrates the academic, psychological, affective, and relational aspects of education in its learning integration centers (Unidades Integradoras de Aprendizaje, UIAs) (Calvo, Ortíz and Sepúlveda, 2009). Likewise, in Chile, Fundación Súmate combines dropout recovery schools with socio-educational programs that provide socioemotional support for the students (Fundación Súmate, s.f.). However, there is still little information on how effectively dropout recovery programs address these nonacademic needs, despite the evidence of their importance (Tyler and Lofstrom, 2009).

**Programs that use technology have the advantage of being more flexible, but they are not effective without good pedagogical support.** With the rapid, almost universal expansion of technology, many dropout recovery programs have taken advantage of the flexibility provided by information and communications technologies (ICTs) to offer blended learning or distance classes, neither of which requires a trained teacher in the classroom. However, while such programs generally cost less, some quality may be lost. For example, a study of various alternative education projects found that programs relying too heavily on independent learning are not as effective as those that offer hands-on pedagogical support, even from volunteers or uncertified teachers (American Institutes for Research, 2003). This is because many of the students in these alternative programs come from very poor and vulnerable households where they have not developed the skills needed to learn independently, such as discipline and motivation (American Institutes for Research, 2003). In the case of EDUCATODOS, even though the facilitators are not certified teachers, they do receive training in how to encourage teamwork, facilitate discussions, and create a welcoming learning environment -- all central aspects of quality education. ICTs are a powerful option for expanding and democratizing education, however they are not a magic solution to ensure learning (American Institutes for Research, 2003).
**EDUCATODOS Program in Honduras**

**Administration:** EDUCATODOS is a program of the Honduran Secretariat of Education implemented with the financial support of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

**Description:**
- EDUCATODOS began in 1995 in the context of the Primary Education Efficiency Project (Proyecto Eficiencia de la Educación Primaria) (PEEP) as an alternative education option for Honduran adults who had not finished primary school. In 2000, the program was expanded to include grades 7th to 9th. The curriculum is integrated and aligned with the national curriculum, but it also includes a more practical community project component. It is implemented through textbooks and a radio program with the help of volunteer facilitators and uses the country’s existing infrastructure.

**Outcomes:**
- In academic assessments, EDUCATODOS students in grades 7th and 8th performed as well or better in Spanish and math in comparison with students in regular schools or other alternative programs.
- EDUCATODOS students also had lower failure rates than students in traditional schools.
- Graduation results were mixed. On average, 28.5% of students enrolled graduated on time, but this figure varied considerably from department to department.
- Even so, graduating a student from Educatodos costs considerably less than graduating a student from a traditional school.

**Findings:**
- Students who finish 9th grade can use their certificates to enroll in traditional secondary schools, expanding their educational horizons.
- EDUCATODOS centers are able to keep costs far below the average for traditional schools because they use existing facilities (schools, community centers, or public offices), and all facilitators are volunteers.
- There is some evidence that the participants who have completed one or more grades have been able to improve their income, either through self-employment or by working for others.

**Sources:**
Chapter 4

LESSONS FOR IMPLEMENTING EDUCATIONAL INEQUALITY REDUCTION STRATEGIES

In this guide, we have presented 10 strategies that have been shown to be effective in reducing educational inequalities. The strategies have targeted specifically poor and vulnerable children and young people and promise to improve their development, school attendance and academic performance allowing them to enjoy their right to a quality, equitable and inclusive education. These strategies have the potential to close the opportunity gaps that today play a part to the socioeconomic inequality and social exclusion of many populations.

While each alone can improve the educational outcomes of children and young people living in poverty and in vulnerable situations, it is critical that these be framed within systemic policies to promote educational equity. In other words, these individual strategies should be part of a comprehensive approach that addresses educational equality systematically, incorporating aspects such as program targeting and school information systems, and broader educational policies such as improving teacher quality.

The recommendations below may be useful in the planning and implementation of these efforts and of equity-oriented educational policies.

- Educational inequality is an extremely serious problem that is endangering the region’s future. While enrollment rates are up at all levels, children and young people living in poverty and in vulnerable situations lag far behind their wealthier peers in enrollment, educational attainment, and academic performance. Although the enrollment in preprimary education has grown at a surprising pace since 2000-faster than in other levels (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2018)- more than 20% enrollment gap between high-income and low-income children has narrowed very little in the past 10 years (IDB, s.f.). In primary education, while the disparities in enrollment are less pronounced, the disparities in quality are substantial, and we are seeing them in children’s standardized test scores results. In secondary education, enrollment has increased from 65% to 76% since 2000, thanks to policy decisions making secondary school mandatory and investment to increase secondary education supply and demand (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2018). However, as with preschool, very poor and rural young people attend school to a lesser extent and are also at greater risk of school failure, grade repetition, and drop out. Clearly, it is not enough to implement good policies and programs for the “average” student in the region. To ensure that all children can exercise their right to a quality education, strategies specifically targeted at the most vulnerable children in education are essential. Specifically strategies that compensate for the educational disadvantages of these children can make a greater impact to improve the success of all children.
Equity-oriented strategies must clearly define the target population and identify the barriers these children face. Impact studies of the different strategies in this guide show us that it is almost always the poorest children who benefit the most from educational interventions. For example, infants and young children living in poverty start life with major disadvantages, including poor nutrition and homes with fewer learning resources. For this reason, they benefit more from early childhood care centers and preschools because they have a compensatory impact. In order to allocate public resources efficiently, it is necessary to identify the most disadvantaged children.

One way to achieve this is through well-designed targeting systems. Targeting systems are tools used to identify poor, vulnerable, or excluded individuals or population groups as well as potential beneficiaries of interventions to be provided by public assistance programs. These systems are based on a single registry of beneficiaries—a database containing systematized data on current and potential beneficiaries of the programs—and indicators for prioritizing. Good examples include Peru’s SISFOH, Colombia’s SISBEN, and Mexico’s SIFODE. However, in many cases, such targeting systems are underutilized by the various programs and/or they are not updated with regularity. Many suffer from “leakage” problems, i.e., inclusion or exclusion errors; where people who do not live in poverty are included, or those who need the services the most are left out. In fact, in the case of Conditional Cash Transfer programs, 40% of program beneficiaries do not live in poverty and only 50% of the extreme poor are covered (Robles et al, 2015). Thus, data collection processes need to be redesigned to ensure transparency, dynamism, and inclusion of the neediest. Tracking, monitoring, and assessment mechanisms are also critical, not only to reduce leakage but also to facilitate rotation, so that new households/families can be added.

Apart from addressing socioeconomic variables, efforts can also be focused on schools with negative educational indicators (e.g., low average performance, high dropout rates). Within these schools, there should be mechanisms for identifying students who need additional support, be it tutoring, psychosocial care, or in relation to a disability or specific educational need. In Mexico, for example, the EIMLE tutoring network program targets the schools with the lowest ENLACE standardized test scores (which facilitated assessment of the program’s impact on student learning). For within-school targeting, early warning systems are used by schools around the world to record student data and identify students with high risk indicators, such as excessive absences, behavioral problems, or poor performance, so that steps can be taken to help them learn and keep them in school. In both cases, targeting should be done in the context of school information systems, which provide a basis for decision-making. A good school information system standardizes the measurement of different indicators among schools, produces reliable statistics on the education system, and is readily available to everyone in the education community, including parents, teachers, principals, and national and regional decision-makers. This requires investing in the development and maintenance of digital management systems and the appropriation of these systems by all schools. Finally, no matter what instruments or criteria are used, it is important to target efforts as rigorously as possible. Through careful targeting, the education systems can ensure investment in those who need it most. However, these efforts must be part of a gradual strategy for making quality education universal.

Equity strategies also imply greater coordination among sectors. Educational inequity has countless causes that are not always school-related, including the child’s physical and mental health, home environment, or geographic location and the family’s economic resources. Addressing all of the causes of educational inequity requires inter-ministerial cooperation. This implies changing the logic of how multiple ministries traditionally operate, with its single-sector focus, and instead setting common goals and aligning their budgets. These efforts are especially critical in the early years when health and family have a special impact and where the health care can therefore play an important role. For example, prenatal checkups present an opportunity
for promoting good parenting and nutrition practices. Additionally, health facilities often refer children and pregnant mothers to home-visiting programs. And within home-visiting programs for families with young children, articulation with health facilities is important for referring cases that require a specialist. This implies good articulation between the health care system and the social protection and assistance system. The value of an intersectoral approach in this area can be seen in the success of programs such as “Chile Crece Contigo”, “Uruguay Crece Contigo”, and the “De Cero a Siempre” strategy of the Intersectoral Commission on Early Childhood of Colombia (Ibarrarán et al., 2017).

- **At other levels of education, the success of conditional cash transfer (CCT) programs attests to the power of an intersectoral approach.** CCT programs require the coordination and participation of the ministries of health and education, which must provide a sufficient supply of quality services to meet the demand generated by the transfer incentives and ensure that the transfers are actually building human capital. These ministries also must verify compliance with the requirements using their own information systems. The largest program in Latin America, Brazil’s Bolsa Familia, is implemented by the Ministry of Social Development in coordination with other entities such as the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Education, which are responsible for monitoring beneficiary compliance with the health and school attendance requirements. Lastly, within CCT programs, intersectoral coordination is critical to ensure that the sectors are able to use the programs as tools for serving populations living in poverty and in vulnerable situations. To that end, the ministries must have a specific budget for CCT program-related activities in addition to its goals for serving the beneficiary population.

- **Equity interventions must be part of a broader policy in order to be sustainable.** The best example of this involves teachers. Very few of the proposed strategies are able to be implemented unless there are well-trained teachers with the institutional support they need to teach effectively. To succeed, strategies such as expanding quality preprimary education and implementing student-centered learning require a high-quality teaching force. For this, it is necessary to have well-designed recruiting, selection, training, and evaluation systems. This implies system-level changes, including strengthening the certification systems for teacher training schools, making entry into the profession more selective, offering assistance and support for practicing teachers, implementing technically sound teacher evaluations, and designing rewards to recognize and encourage good performance of teachers. Teacher training must also be reformed to prepare teachers to respond to the diversity of educational needs in the classroom. At the same time, planning is required to ensure that the supply of teachers meets the educational demands of different groups. For example, more specialization options could be opened in areas such as early childhood, bilingual, and special education, or incentives could be offered to encourage high quality teachers to teach in the most vulnerable schools. Another way that an equity agenda can be incorporated into broader policies is through the planning of the areas such as supply and financing. Areas with low coverage should be prioritized in efforts to expand the supply of schools—especially at the preprimary and secondary levels—and the lowest performing schools should receive priority for staffing, resources, and funding.

- **Programs that promote equity should adopt a comprehensive strategy that covers the entire educational path.** The children who enter secondary school with learning deficits are the same children who did poorly in primary school, and they are almost always the same children who attended low quality preschools or did not go to preschool at all. For this reason, strategies should be design with longitudinal approach seeking to provide support for children living in poverty and children in vulnerable situations from the early years to the end of schooling. In curricular terms, this implies aligning pedagogical frameworks between levels so that they are consistent with each other while incorporating the development of strategies to facilitate the transition between levels, e.g., early reading programs in lower primary school or tutoring and guidance in the first year.
of secondary school, when young people are more likely to fall behind academically. From the management standpoint, alignment means that the different school subsystems can share information systems for storing student data such as grades and individual student records among other data. This is particularly important in inclusive education for children with disabilities, where individualized education plans are useful for monitoring a child’s progress and planning any necessary support or adaptations (see Chapter 2).

- **Priority should be given to equity-oriented funding.** The current level of educational inequality requires that more resources be allocated to programs for children living in poverty and children in vulnerable situations. This means that, in addition to funding general projects, systems should set aside specific resources to address educational inequality. This may mean further decentralization of management to regional or departmental authorities since these authorities’ local knowledge may give them an advantage for identifying critical areas, selecting beneficiary schools and students, and monitoring implementation. It also implies that governments must have a good understanding of the cost-benefit ratios of different interventions. For the cases presented in this guide, evidence suggests that the benefits of these interventions outweigh their cost to varying degrees, but in almost every case, more research is needed on this subject and on strategies that can maximize the impact of these interventions at low cost. For example, we know that in the early years, home visiting programs and community child care centers cost much less than institutional centers because they use existing facilities. We also know that, in order to improve the quality of these services, it is more cost-effective to invest in process factors, such as teacher training, than structural factors, such as infrastructure. Knowledge of this kind will be very valuable for guiding investments in educational equity.

- **Actions and programs should be an integrated part of an explicit strategy for reducing educational inequality.** This strategy should begin with the definition of goals and objectives based on the country’s specific needs. It should then specify action and monitoring plans and set budgets to guide the use of public resources. An effective strategy will align the roles of all relevant actors and guide the intersectoral coordination of activities that are essential to address inequality holistically. However, having a strategy or plan is only the starting point of national efforts to reduce inequality holistically. Implementing any strategies requires a dynamic approach. The learning processes created must make it possible not only to identify the educational needs of the most vulnerable populations but also the factors that determine the effectiveness of each intervention. In this way, the countries of the Americas will be able to move forward on strategies that can truly close the educational divide and ensure that all children enjoy their right to a quality education.
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