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Preface

This report documents the successful conduct of the Reaching the Unreached: Meeting of Southeast Asian Countries to Achieve the Education for All (EFA) Goals Together by 2015 that the SEAMEO Secretariat, ASEAN Secretariat and UNESCO Bangkok conducted jointly on 2-4 September 2008 in Bangkok, Thailand.

The conduct of the regional meeting was inspired by the agreement of the Ministers of Education of Southeast Asia to focus on implementing Education for All. In particular, the Education Ministers suggested sharing of best practices among the countries on how to reach the unreached population groups in the region.

In the global effort to provide Education for All, this regional meeting proved that sharing and working together is an effective way to reach the underserved and underprivileged learners with the little time left before the targeted year of 2015. It also signaled the first time that SEAMEO Secretariat, ASEAN Secretariat and UNESCO Bangkok worked hand-in-hand with the Southeast Asian countries in forwarding the attainment of the Education for All goals.

This report has two parts: Part One contains the proceedings of the three-day meeting, and Part Two includes the proposed collaborative projects which are the outputs of the meeting. The report contains the summaries of presentations and discussions on each day. It also includes important appendices such as the meeting programme, participants’ list and press releases.

Initially, this report is made available in a soft copy on compact discs and on the website of the SEAMEO Secretariat at www.seameo.org. The SEAMEO Secretariat will publish a print version of this report when resources become available.

Dato Dr Ahamad bin Sipon
Director, SEAMEO Secretariat
Abbreviations

ACCU Asia-Pacific Cultural Centre for UNESCO
ADRC Asian Disaster Reduction Centre
APPEAL Asia-Pacific Programme of Education for All
ARNEC Asia-Pacific Regional Network for Early Childhood
ASEAN Association of Southeast Asian Nations
ASPBAE Asian Pacific Bureau of Adult Education
BEGP Basic Education Girls Project
CLC Community Learning Centre
DAC Disability Action Council
DSWD Department of Social Welfare and Development
ECCE Early Childhood Care and Education
ECCD Early Childhood Care and Development
EFA Education for All
EFA MDA Education for All Mid-Decade Assessment
EFA TWG Education for All Thematic Working Group
INEE Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies
JICA Japan International Cooperation Agency
M&E Monitoring and Evaluation
MOH Ministry of Health
NER Net Enrolment Rate
NGO Non-Government Organization
SEAMEO – Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization
SIL Summer Institute of Linguistics
UIS-AIMS UNESCO Institute of Statistics-Assessment, Information Systems, Monitoring and Statistics
UNESCO United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNIFEM United Nations Development Fund for Women
Contents

PREFACE ...........................................................................................................................................iv
ABBREVIATIONS ..........................................................................................................................v

Part One – Proceedings
Reaching the Unreached: Meeting of Southeast-Asian Countries to Achieve the Education for All (EFA) Goals Together by 2015

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .........................................................................................................................1

II. INTRODUCTION ....................................................................................................................................3
   A. Background ........................................................................................................................................2
   B. Objectives of the Meeting ..................................................................................................................3
   C. Theme of the Meeting .......................................................................................................................4
   D. Expected Outcomes ..........................................................................................................................4
   E. Strategies ..........................................................................................................................................4
   F. Participants .........................................................................................................................................5

III. PROCEEDINGS ....................................................................................................................................6
   A. Opening Statements ............................................................................................................................6
   B. Mechanics of the Meeting ..................................................................................................................7
   C. Plenary 1: Introduction and Overall Context of the Unreached Groups in Southeast Asia ..........8
      1. Why focus on the unreached and the underserved groups as targets for attaining EFA Goals? 8
         • Who are the unreached? Who are the underserved? ..................................................................9
         • Policy strategy and recommendations from the EFA Mid-Decade Assessment .......................9
         • The 5% with multiple disadvantages and why they are not in school ......................................10
      2. Highlights of the EFA Mid-Decade Assessment ...........................................................................10
      3. Challenges in obtaining information on unreached groups in Southeast Asia ......................13
   D. Panel Discussion: Existing initiatives of EFA Partners and Insights on Good Practices of SEAMEO Member Countries in Reaching the Unreached .........................................................14
      1. On learners with disabilities/special needs ..................................................................................15
      2. On ethnolinguistic minorities .......................................................................................................15
      3. On learners from very poor families ............................................................................................15
      4. On gender .......................................................................................................................................16
      5. On stateless population, ethnic minorities, refugees, migrants .....................................................16
      6. On expanded learning opportunities for disadvantaged children and youth in Cambodia .......16
      7. On learners from remote areas and their mobile education in Indonesia ....................................17
      8. On learners with disabilities and migrant learners .......................................................................18
      9. On programmes and projects for learners from remote areas, training of teachers from disadvantaged groups, and multi-grade teaching .................................................................19
   E. Workshop 1: Setting Priorities ........................................................................................................20
      1. Part 1: Country Work to determine “what to give” and “what to take” ........................................21
      2. Part 2: Gallery Walk, sharing and learning from each other ..........................................................21
      3. Group Discussion on the Results of Workshop 1 .........................................................................21
         ● GROUP 1 DISCUSSION RESULTS ON .......................................................................................22
            Girls and women, especially from rural/ethnic nationalities
            Underperforming boys, boys at risk of dropping out, male dropouts,
            Learners with disabilities/special needs
GROUP 2 DISCUSSION RESULTS ON ...........................................................................................................22
Learners from remote and rural communities, including isolated areas
Learners from religious, linguistic and ethnic minorities/indigenous peoples
Orphans and abandoned children
Learners from very poor families

GROUP 3 DISCUSSION RESULTS ON ........................................................................................................23
Children from migrant families, refugees, stateless children/children without identity papers/nomadic children
Working children/ street children/ trafficked children/abused children
Children in difficult circumstances (affected by armed conflict, disaster, children in prison
or who are with their parents in prison)
Children affected or infected by HIV and AIDS

F. Field Visit ........................................................................................................................................... 24
1. Foundation of the Welfare of the Crippled and Srisangwan School, Nonthanburi ......................... 24
2. Ban Kru Noi, Bangkok .................................................................................................................. 25
3. Human Development Foundation and the Mercy Centre, Bangkok .............................................. 25

G. Field Visit Debriefing ..................................................................................................................... 26
1. Insights from the Field Visit: Group 1 ......................................................................................... 27
2. Insights from the Field Visit: Group 2 ......................................................................................... 27
3. Insights from the Field Visit: Group 3 ......................................................................................... 27

H. Special Session: Preparation for Action Planning ............................................................................. 28
I. Workshop 2: Action Planning ......................................................................................................... 29
J. Plenary 2: Presentation of Plans .................................................................................................... 30

K. Summary and Closing ................................................................................................................... 31
1. Wrap-up and Way Forward ........................................................................................................... 31
2. Reflections of the Participants ..................................................................................................... 31
3. Reflections of the EFA Partners .................................................................................................. 32
4. Closing Messages ......................................................................................................................... 33

Part Two – Outputs
Collaborative Project Proposals to Reach the Unreached in Education

A. Transition Support Programme for Learners with Disabilities ..................................................... 35
B. Tracking System for Students at Risk of Dropping Out ............................................................... 36
C. Conference to Promote Awareness of Education for Girls and Women ..................................... 37
D. Tracking Mechanism for Unreached Populations ....................................................................... 38
E. Pre-school Programme for All ...................................................................................................... 39
F. Multi-Grade Teaching .................................................................................................................... 40
G. Development of Community-based Learning Centres (CLCs) in Rural Areas in Southeast Asia ...................................................................................................................... 41
H. Proposed Project Number 8: Inter-Country Schooling Programme for Stateless and
Undocumented Children (Coordination between governments) ......................................................... 41
I. Proposed Project Number 9: Project on HIV and AIDS Using an Integrated Approach
(Providing education, care, treatment and counseling services to learners affected or
infected by HIV and AIDS) ........................................................................................................... 42
J. Proposed Project Number 10: Education in Emergencies and Disaster Preparedness ............. 43
K. Proposed Project Number 11: Learning and Earning (Literacy with Livelihood Component) ....44

Annexes
ANNEX 1 – Meeting Programme
ANNEX 2 – List of Participants
ANNEX 3 – Gallery Walk Summary Worksheets
ANNEX 4 – Activity Evaluation Summary
ANNEX 5 – Press Releases
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The meeting of the eleven Southeast Asian Countries called "Reaching the Unreached: Meeting of Southeast Asian Countries to Achieve the EFA Goals Together by 2015" took place on 2-4 September 2008 at Imperial Queen’s Park Hotel, Bangkok, Thailand.

It was jointly organized by the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO) Secretariat, UNESCO Bangkok and ASEAN Secretariat. This activity marked the first time that the three organizations worked together to promote the attainment of the Education for All Goals in Southeast Asia.

The meeting was a response to the directive of the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education to focus on the implementation of the Education for All and accelerate the attainment of its goals by 2015. To this end, the meeting was organized to share best practices among the SEAMEO Member Countries on reaching the unreached in education.

Representatives from Ministries/Department of Education reviewed their existing initiatives on reaching the unreached and determined their remaining challenges and priorities. Through sharing of best practices among themselves and with the EFA partners and international organizations, they identified strategies and activities to address the needs of the prioritized unreached and underserved population groups. Finally, the concrete steps were drafted into project proposals for the different target groups.

The three-day meeting produced eleven collaborative plans which will be presented to the SEAMEO High Officials Meeting and the SEAMEO Council Conference in December 2008 and March 2009, respectively for endorsement.

Seventy-five (75) participants attended the meeting. These included 41 high-level education officials from the eleven SEAMEO countries, namely, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam. Fifteen (15) representatives from international organizations, namely, UNESCO, ActionAid, ASPBAE, ATD Fourth World, Disability Action Council, E-Net Philippines, ILO, Save the Children, SIL International, and UNICEF attended the meeting as EFA partners. Meanwhile, 19 officials and staff from SEAMEO, UNESCO and ASEAN were present to provide technical and administrative support to the meeting.

UNESCO Bangkok provided the context of the meeting and shared the highlights of the major achievements and challenges of the Education for All Mid-Decade Assessment focusing on the unreached population groups.

Group discussions contributed significantly in the drafting of the collaborative proposals. These were done through a panel of EFA partners and education officials. Other discussions and workshops were conducted in big and small groups that served as opportunity for extensive brainstorming on specific
approaches to reach and work with the unreached groups. A half-day field visit in Nontanburi province and Bangkok provided insights to the real world of the underprivileged groups of the society where their real situations have moved the participants to intensify efforts to collaborate and address their needs.

On the whole, the meeting proved that there are many existing initiatives and good examples of providing education to the different underserved and unreached groups as shared by the country participants and EFA partners at the meeting. From those examples, other countries found ideas and solutions to their challenges and difficulties in bringing education to these special groups of learners.

The discussions have also led to an increased awareness of the different unreached and underserved population groups in the region. Most importantly, the meeting fostered greater appreciation on the need to work together and take advantage of the strengths and good practices of the SEAMEO Member Countries and partner organizations to advance the attainment of Education for All Goals, not only in each country, but in the whole region of Southeast Asia.

Generally referred to as the “unreached”, they constitute the last percentages of the population who have either been historically and culturally excluded, or have been pushed to difficult circumstances due to recent economic and political trends. Always used synonymously with “disadvantaged”, “underserved”, “deprived” and “excluded”, they are in the lowest range in the indicators of education participation and performance, and they lack or have no access to educational opportunities and services.
INTRODUCTION

Background

The “Reaching the Unreached: Meeting of Southeast-Asian Countries to Achieve the Education for All (EFA) Goals Together by 2015” was a response to the directive of the Ministers of Education of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).

The 43rd Conference of the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO) Council was held back-to-back with the 3rd ASEAN Education Ministers Meeting in March 2008 in Kuala Lumpur.

In these conferences, issues on access, equity and quality of education were discussed, among other education policies and initiatives in Southeast Asia.

An important highlight of the conference was a policy forum on bridging the education gap with a discussion on the progress of Education for All (EFA) in the ASEAN countries. UNESCO Bangkok presented key policies, strategies and recommendations towards meeting EFA made by Southeast Asian countries and EFA partners at the Southeast Asia EFA Mid-Term Policy Review Conference in February 2008. According to UNESCO, national assessments of EFA progress conducted by countries show significant achievements but also highlighted many issues that must be addressed urgently if Education for All is to be met by 2015.

The discussion resulted to a proposal for SEAMEO and ASEAN Secretariats to collaborate with UNESCO in developing a programme/project where ASEAN countries could work together to attain the EFA goals by 2015. The Education Ministers emphasized that the initiative should focus on themes such as “Reaching the Unreached” and “Inclusive Education”.

In a Joint Statement, the 3rd ASEAN Education Ministers Meeting raised the concern in attaining the EFA goals as follows:

“On future cooperation in education, the Ministers agreed that the focus should be on implementing Education For All (EFA) by 2015. In this regard, the Ministers tasked the SEAMEO and the ASEAN Secretariats to organise a workshop on the theme of “reaching the unreached” to share best practices among ASEAN Member States.”

In response to this, the SEAMEO Secretariat collaborated with the ASEAN Secretariat and UNESCO Bangkok and convened this meeting of ASEAN countries and Timor Leste.

Objectives of the Meeting

The objectives of the meeting were:

1) To take stock of the extent of initiatives/projects/programmes provided for the unreached in Southeast Asia
2) To identify remaining common challenges in attaining Education for All goals, particularly for the unreached groups in Southeast Asia
3) To provide suggestions to accelerate progress towards reaching the unreached
4) To develop activities/projects that Southeast Asia countries could work together on with the help of Education for All partners
The overall theme of the meeting was “Reaching the Unreached to Achieve the Education for All Goals Together”.

The meeting focused particularly on the unreached and underserved groups of society. In actually providing Education for All, these groups need special attention. In describing the ‘unreached’, countries have varied definitions. For the meeting purpose, ‘unreached’ was referred (but not limited) to the disadvantaged, underserved, deprived and excluded such as learners from remote and rural communities; learners from religious, linguistic and ethnic minorities/indigenous peoples; girls and women; children from migrant families; learners with disabilities; street children; orphans; children and young people affected by HIV and AIDS; and others.

It was expected that the meeting would provide participants with:

1) An account of the extent of initiatives, projects and programmes provided for the unreached in Southeast Asia
2) A listing of common challenges and priorities in attaining Education for All goals, particularly for the unreached groups
3) Increased awareness about the different unreached and underserved population groups in the region
4) Ideas to reach and address the needs of the underserved and unreached in education
5) Greater appreciation of the need for regional cooperation to attain the Education for All goals
6) Proposals on ways to collaborate and work together on projects to reach the unreached in education

The three-day meeting was conducted through a plenary session, panel discussion, workshops, field visits and group discussions.

On the first day, the morning sessions focused on building the overall context of the unreached groups in Southeast Asia and presenting the major achievements and challenges outlined in the EFA Mid-Decade Assessment that relate to the unreached and underserved groups. This was provided by UNESCO Bangkok team in plenary. In a panel discussion, country education officials and EFA partners shared experiences and challenges related to working with the various unreached groups. In the afternoon, participants shared best practices and identified priorities. This was done through a “gallery walk” to compare common challenges/needs and find possible solutions from the strengths and practices of other countries and EFA partners.

The second day was devoted to a field visit of some institutions in Bangkok that implement programmes for various groups of disadvantaged sectors of society.

The third day was utilized to draft collaborative proposals.

Prior to the meeting, countries were requested to fill in a matrix to map the profile of the unreached groups and the country’s initiatives for them. Relevant documents were provided. Meanwhile, the EFA partners were requested to bring materials and resources for exhibit and reference.

(The agenda of the meeting is annexed to this report as ANNEX 1 and contained within the accompanying CD-ROM.)
Participants

Seventy-five (75) participants attended the meeting:

a) 41 high-level education officials from the Ministries/Department of Education of Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam.

b) 15 representatives from international organizations, referred to in the meeting as "partners in Education for All" comprised of UNESCO, ActionAid, ASPBAE, ATD Fourth World, Disability Action Council, E-Net Philippines, the International Labour Organisation, Save the Children, SIL International and UNICEF.

c) 2 representatives from ASEAN/ASEAN Secretariat.

d) 7 representatives from UNESCO Bangkok.

e) 10 representatives from SEAMEO Secretariat.

(The list of participants is annexed to this report as ANNEX 2 and contained within the accompanying CD-ROM.)
PROCEEDINGS

Day 1:
2 September 2008

Opening Statements

The meeting started with statements from the three organizers: SEAMEO Secretariat, UNESCO Bangkok and ASEAN Secretariat. The statements provided the background and rationale of the meeting.

Remarks by Dato' Dr Ahamad bin Sipon
Director, SEAMEO Secretariat

Dato' Dr Ahamad bin Sipon, Director, SEAMEO Secretariat emphasized that the meeting brought together key officials from the Southeast Asian countries' Ministries of Education, as well as Education for All partners from various international organizations to enhance cooperation in education in order to accelerate the attainment of the Education for All goals in the region.

He explained that the meeting was a directive by the Ministers of Education of ASEAN countries.

He mentioned about the SEAMEO Secretariat’s close working relationship with UNESCO and the ASEAN Secretariat in the organization of the meeting.

He explained the objectives of the meeting and reminded the participants that they were all stakeholders and called upon them to take active part in the meeting. He stated the SEAMEO Secretariat’s hope that the outcome of the meeting would be presented to the SEAMEO Education Ministers in the SEAMEO Council Conference in March 2009. He concluded with some words of thanks to UNESCO and ASEAN Secretariat for their support.

Participants to the meeting pose for a group photo

Remarks by Dr Soeung Rathchavy
Deputy Secretary-General, ASEAN

Dr Soeung Rathchavy, Deputy Secretary-General, ASEAN expressed great pleasure as co-organizer of the meeting which she emphasized as crucial.

She reiterated that the meeting was instigated by the Ministers of Education and tasked the SEAMEO and ASEAN Secretariats to coordinate with UNESCO to focus on the implementation of the Education for All initiative.

She said that the six Education for All Goals should be prioritized and pointed out that this would become the starting point to promoting inclusive education in the region. She stressed the importance to take the matter as a priority and reach out to those who cannot be covered under the formal education system.

She presented some ongoing initiatives of ASEAN to protect children's rights and well-being. She also mentioned the challenges that remain daunting including access to education and quality of educational services.

She expressed belief on the need for a systematic approach through dialogue among nations to achieve the Education for All goals.
Remarks by Dr Sheldon Shaeffer  
Director, UNESCO Bangkok

Dr Sheldon Shaeffer, Director, UNESCO expressed his satisfaction that after 20 years of the Education for All movement, the countries are finally working together.

He explained that Southeast Asia is one of the sub-regions that achieved significant progress in achieving the EFA goals. He also highlighted many issues such as high drop out and repetition rates and limited resources that hinder the delivery of quality education for all.

He explained UNESCO’s effort to work with countries through the EFA Mid-Decade Assessment that reviewed existing policies in order to identify what needs to be done to address the remaining challenges and achieve the EFA Goals by 2015. He mentioned that the result of the assessment was presented to the SEAMEO Council in March 2009 and that the Education Ministers wanted specific activities where ASEAN/SEAMEO countries can work together to reach the remaining unreached groups in education.

He enumerated the major recommendations formulated at UNESCO’s EFA Policy Review Conference and reminded the participants to consider them in their planning processes later in the meeting along with the countries’ respective EFA Mid-Decade Assessment reports.

He emphasized that the meeting was the first ever activity jointly organized by SEAMEO, ASEAN and UNESCO and expressed hope that the partnership will be sustained.

He concluded by underscoring the spirit of unity other among the Southeast Asian countries that must come alive in formulating together proposals to address the needs of the unreached.

Mechanics of the Meeting

Dr Wahdi Salasi April Yudhi, Deputy Director for Programme and Development, SEAMEO Secretariat explained that the three-day meeting was about collaboration. He stated the objectives and the expected outputs.

He went through the meeting programme, documents and materials. He explained the grouping of the unreached groups as well as the participants. He also explained the role of the Education for All partners in the meeting.

He announced the available materials on display and thanked the exhibitors for their cooperation and generosity to share them.
Plenary I: Introduction and Overall Context of the Unreached Groups in Southeast Asia

Plenary 1 provided background and answered some basic questions about the unreached such as “Who are they?” and “What do we know about them?” The session also highlighted the major achievements and challenges of the Education for All Mid-Decade Assessment focusing on the unreached population groups.

Chair: Dr Sheldon Shaeffer, Director UNESCO Bangkok

Speakers:
1. Dr Ko-Chih Tung, Regional Advisor
2. Mr Nyi Nyi Thaung, Statistics Programme Specialist

Dr Sheldon Shaeffer, Director, UNESCO Bangkok chaired the session and started by explaining that the session was meant to set the context of the meeting. He commented that in general, there was a tendency to be satisfied with the number of children attending schools, but though the number seemed high, there were still problems to be solved. Many of those in schools were not actually learning as their achievement was not as high. The high literacy rate reported was based on self-reporting as evidence by actual

Dr Shaeffer referred to the matrices that the countries accomplished and commented that many countries did not fill in all the required cells. He said that this might be due to the unavailability of data or needs that are not seen by the Ministries of Education. He stressed that, except for Brunei and Singapore, every Southeast Asian country has issues on learners in the rural areas, linguistic and ethnic minorities, girls and women, underperforming and drop out boys, stateless population, and migrants. He said that data on these groups must be made available in order to address these issues.

Why focus on the unreached and the underserved groups as targets for attaining EFA Goals?

Dr Ko-Chih Tung, Regional Advisor, UIS-AIMS, UNESCO Bangkok started with the background on the need to focus on the unreached and underserved groups. He presented the objectives and framework of the Mid-Decade Assessment. He explained that during the EFA MDA process, answers to the following questions were sought: Which children are not in school or learning centres? What inhibits or facilitates their full participation? Who should be targeted as a priority? How can we improve quality and equality? How do we cost, budget and finance EFA?
Who are the unreached?
Who are the underserved?

Dr Ko-Chih Tung defined the unreached as those who occupy the lowest range on indicators of education participation (e.g., enrolment rate) and performance (e.g., completion rate, level of education)
They may be in school, but their learning achievement scores are significantly lower than the average for the nation, e.g. the bottom quartile
They have the greatest distance to reach the EFA Goals and Targets

Meanwhile, the underserved are those who have very limited educational opportunities and access to educational services, materials and facilities.
They lack access to the distributed educational resources, as compared to the national average, e.g., budgetary allocation, number of schools, qualified teachers, textbooks, etc. relative to the school-age population. The lack of access to these resources may also be due to other various reasons such as geographical, financial, political, linguistic, legal, socio-cultural disadvantages, and so on.

He also highlighted how countries described the unreached and underserved in their EFA national reports. They are depicted in the reports as follow:

- Learners from remote and rural communities, including isolated population
- Learners from linguistic and ethnic minorities/indigenous peoples, minority religious groups, etc.
- Girls and women, especially from rural, ethnic minorities (pregnant girls)
- Underperforming boys, boys at risk of dropping out, male dropouts
- Children from migrant families, refugees, stateless children
- Learners with disabilities/special needs
- Children in difficult circumstances (affected by armed conflict, disaster, children in prison or who are with their parent(s) in prison)
- Learners from very poor families (urban poor, poor families in remote areas)
- Child labourers/ street children/ trafficked children/abused children
- Children affected or infected by HIV and AIDS
- Orphans and abandoned children

Dr Ko-Chih Tung continued by posing the question “What inhibits the full participation of the unreached and underserved?” He explained this by giving the example of low enrolment rate among children of migrant workers which may be attributed to the requirement of birth certification and other legal documents; or that they may be too poor, afraid of being deported or they cannot speak the language of instruction.

He further posed the prevailing policies concerning the issues surrounding the inability of children of migrant workers to avail of educational opportunities. He pointed out the need to identify policies that affect the inclusion and exclusion of the unreached and the underserved groups.

Policy strategy and recommendations from the EFA Mid-Decade Assessment

In relation to the plight of the unreached and underserved, Dr Ko-Chih Tung posed the question “Where do we stand now?” He gave an accounting of the available EFA national reports of the Southeast Asian countries. He also explained the process of the EFA Mid-Decade Assessment and policy review in thematic groups that included review of remaining challenges based on the reports on Education for All and formulation of recommendations in terms of target-settings for priority target groups, strategies for attaining the unattained and reaching the un-reached, and schedule of milestones.
He then presented the outputs of the EFA Mid-decade Assessment as follow:

- Identified specific target groups, in particular unreached and disadvantaged populations
- Defined “Inclusive Education” and “Quality” of education
- Identified critical issues/ major challenges using a lifelong learning approach
- Recommended policies and strategies on how to address these issues
- Identified good practices and innovative ideas

Dr Ko-Chih Tung mentioned that the process known as the “Asian model” that took three years to complete with the participation of the Asian countries was such an achievement. Finally, he discussed on the challenge of sustaining and scaling-up good practices that requires development of supporting capacities.

The 5% with multiple disadvantages and why they are not in school

Dr Sheldon Shaeffer commented that the categorization of the underserved and unreached groups that Dr Ko-Chih Tung presented was the basis for the country matrices on the profile of the unreached. He reminded that there are other categories and groups of the disadvantaged. He also stressed that the challenge is reaching the last 5% with multiple disadvantages.

He continued to ask what may be the main reason why children drop out of school and how many put the blame on the child and the family; and how many put the blame on the system. He said that the first 10 reasons for dropping out were usually putting the blame on the victim — blaming the child and the family.

Dr Sheldon Shaeffer continued that maybe the eleventh reason is the school, the teacher and so on. He emphasized the need to think from the point of view of the Ministry of Education and consider the system attributes that make it difficult for children to gain access to school. He stressed in terms of compulsory education, they tend to be always compelling to parents. But they should be compelling to the government as well. Compulsion should work in both ways.

Ms Leotes Lugo-Helin, Assistant Programme Specialist, UIS-AIMS, UNESCO Bangkok emphasized that the focus of the Education for All Mid-Decade Assessment was the unreached, hence, the use of the national reports for the country matrices. She reminded that countries presented data and information in different manners, where some were more detailed than others.

She introduced the two sub-regional reports on Education for All called the Insular Southeast Asia and Mekong. She explained that the Insular Southeast Asia covers the Philippines, Indonesia and Malaysia; while the Mekong covers Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam. She noted the progress in terms of access to education in each group of countries. She also reported that the marginalized and disadvantaged groups continue to face challenges. Among these challenges is the lack of data about them.

Ms Leotes Lugo-Helin presented that around 80% in the Mekong countries live in rural areas and that these areas do not have complete primary schools or do not have any schools at all. She presented specific statistics relating to access to education by various unreached and underserved groups in each country and the circumstances affecting them. The details by country are in the Table 1.
### Table 1.
Information on access to education by various unreached and underserved groups in Southeast Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Learners from remote and rural communities</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Significant provincial variations in primary NER remain due to geographical factors, especially districts that have scattered, remote or island populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Rural areas have the lowest completion rate for primary education of 56% in 2005 mainly due to the high number of incomplete schools in the rural areas (more than 7,000 schools).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>The Mekong River Delta recorded lowest survival rate with 68.52%, i.e. 14.77% lower than the national average. This reflects the challenges faced by a complex geographical region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Ethnolinguistic minorities / indigenous groups</td>
<td>Mekong</td>
<td>Common to all countries in the Mekong sub-region is their multi-ethnic nature. Ethnicity is complex and related to language, livelihood, culture, religion, and geographic location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>Testing of functional literacy shows non-Lao ethnic groups literacy rates were 20-25 percentage points lower than their 32 ethnic Lao counterparts. The lowest functional literacy rates were among women in some ethnic groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>140,000 of the Orang Asli can be found living in or near the forests. Around 81% live below the poverty line and are disadvantaged in terms of schooling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Children of indigenous people have lower educational attainment, lower enrolment rates, higher repetition rates, and higher school drop-out rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Teacher language used in school is not the mother tongue of children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Girls and women, especially from rural, ethnic minorities</td>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>Training of more than 400 female teachers from disadvantaged ethnic groups through the Basic Education (Girls) Project (BEGP) in Lao greatly improved the Net Enrolment Rate, particularly for girls in remote ethnic communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>In the Northwest, 82% of lower secondary students are from ethnic minority groups, around 44% of whom are girls. Barriers: lack of day-board schools in rural, mountainous, ethnic areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Underperforming boys, boys at risk of dropping out, male dropouts</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Young boys taught fishing skills in fishing communities end up missing school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>While the gender parity index for primary in 2005 was 1.01, boys account for 65% of the out of school children of primary and secondary school-age cohort. Cumulative deficiency in learning for boys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>At the secondary level, the disparity against boys in GER and NER continues to widen. Boys tend to engage in child labour. This is due to the inability the teachers and schools to make the learning environment interesting and relevant to their specific needs, especially the adolescents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Children from migrant families, refugees, stateless children</td>
<td>Mekong</td>
<td>The three major stateless populations or illegal residents are disadvantaged ethnic groups (e.g., some hill tribes, not legally recognized groups, insurgents), refugees (e.g., Karen refugees in Thailand, Cambodian refugees in Vietnam), and economic migrants (e.g. children of migrants from Myanmar in Thailand).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>In 2004, registered 1.3M adult migrants from Myanmar, Lao PDR, and Cambodia, and their 93,000 children under 15. But only 13,500 children under 15 from the three countries were attending Thai schools (IOM, 2005:43).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Learners with disabilities/special needs</td>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>No data, no policy guidelines and budget for these groups, project implementation but not programme level, no job opportunities after schooling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Difficulty in making provisions for children with special needs due to lack of information on their number, the kinds of disabling conditions that affect them, their location and the barriers they experience to full participation in ECCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>About 1 million children with disabilities, accounting for 1.18% of total population with about 700,000 primary school-age children (2005 survey)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7) Children from very poor families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Lack of appreciation of the importance of education is linked to the socio-economic situation of families, e.g. parents from the lowest income quintile are often not educated and sometimes do not see the value of education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>Access of children from poor families to ECCD is very limited; estimated GER for children of the richest quintile (43%) is more than ten times as high as for children from the lower quintiles (MICS III 2006).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) Child Labourers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>More that 50% of Cambodian school-aged children are involved in some form of economic activity, work an average of 22 hours a week, and account for almost 28% of household income. (World Bank, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>About 1.50M children aged 10–14 were in the labour force and not in school. Another 1.62M were not attending school and helping at home or doing other things. About 4.18M children of junior secondary school (13-15 years old), representing 19% of the age group, were not attending school. The incidence of child labour and nonattendance in school is higher in rural areas (National Socio-economic Survey, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Around 2.12 million children, or 9.1% of the 5-17 population are working (LFS, Oct. 2004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) Street children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Around 50,761 street children nationwide in 2003 according to the Department of Welfare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>DSWD estimates around 222,417 street children across the country (1998), usually in urban areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10) Children affected/infected by HIV and AIDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>An estimated 12,000 children under 15 years of age are living with HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar, Cambodia and Thailand</td>
<td>These countries have the highest infection rates in East Asia &amp; the Pacific, with prevalence rates of more than 1% for youth (According to UNDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines, Indonesia and Malaysia</td>
<td>Philippines has 0.03% prevalence rate for the population aged 15-49 years, Indonesia, 0.10%, Malaysia, 0.5% in 2005 (WHO 2006). Available data on HIV/AIDS in these countries do not reveal the proportion of children among these cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>16,000 infected children in 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11) Children in difficult circumstances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Conflicts exist in Aceh and Papua (Irian Jaya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Cyclone Nargis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Armed conflict in some areas have resulted to loss of lives, displacement, delays in the delivery of basic education services, and incidences of children recruited as child soldiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Children affected by natural disasters: 2004 tsunami</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some underserved and underprivileged children in Southeast Asia
Mr Nyi Nyi Thaung, Statistics Programme Specialist, UIS-AIMS, UNESCO Bangkok emphasized that reaching the unreached was the major theme of the Education for All Mid-Decade Assessment. He reported that findings from the Education for All Mid-Decade Assessment show that most countries presented the condition of the unreached groups in relation to their access to education and the quality of education that they receive.

He presented some practices of countries in data collection and reporting:

- Not all countries disaggregate the data into rural/remote and city.
- The focus in the disaggregation of data is on gender.
- Lao PDR demonstrated a good practice by dividing regions into categories, namely, poorest, poor and non-poor.
- Time series provide the means of observing narrowing or widening of gaps which were applied in countries like Cambodia, Vietnam, and the Philippines.
- There are efforts in collecting data on learners with disabilities.
- There is very few data on children in difficult circumstances, child labourers/street children/trafficked children/abused children, children affected or infected by HIV and AIDS, orphans and abandoned children.
- Myanmar and the Philippines provided some information on the unreached groups.

Mr Nyi Nyi Thaung also presented some examples of data indicated by countries in the EFA MDA reports. He presented some challenges concerning the lack of data on the unreached as follow:

- Data is limited. In some countries, data is never collected. Some collect data but not as part of the routine channels.
- Quality of data is beyond the acceptable and publishable level.
- Organization of available data is difficult. For available data, organization is a challenge because they come in various forms and media. Some are based on varying concepts and definitions because they come from various sources.
- Weak capacity – Many countries do not have data collection mechanism. Since some do not have institutional mandate, they lack skills and have no resources.

He proposed to conduct a mapping study on the availability of data on the unreached and posed the following questions for discussions:

- What data do we need to collect on the unreached?
- How do we arrange and disaggregate the data?
- How do we collect the data?
- Who should collect the data?
- Who should consolidate, maintain and distribute the data?
- How do we coordinate to get the data needed?
- How do we build the capacity to do the above?

“There are many other categories and groups of the disadvantaged. The challenge lies in reaching the last 5% with multiple disadvantages.” — DR SHELDON SHAEFFER, Director, UNESCO Bangkok
Panel Discussion:

Existing initiatives of EFA Partners and Insights on Good Practices of SEAMEO Member Countries in Reaching the Unreached

The session was an interactive discussion involving some Education for All partners and education officials from the SEAMEO Member Countries as panelists. The session presented important information and some specific approaches of working with unreached groups. It allowed participation of the audience through a brief Question & Answer forum.

Moderator:
Dr Sheldon Shaeffer, Director, UNESCO Bangkok

Panelists from International Organizations (EFA Partners):
1. Mr Ou Sokhim, Programme Coordinator for Inclusive Education Disability Action Council, Cambodia
2. Dr Carl Grove, MLE and Language Policy Consultant SIL International-Asia, Nepal
3. Mr Alain Souchard, Project Director, ATD Fourth World Thailand
4. Ms Maki Hayashikawa, Programme Specialist in Gender UNESCO Bangkok
5. Dr Ko-Chih Tung, Regional Advisor, AIMS, UNESCO Bangkok.

Panelists from Ministries of Education
6. Mr Ou Eng, Deputy Director General of Education Ministry of Education Youth and Sports, Cambodia
7. Dr Ir Harris Iskandar, Head of Center for Development of Non-formal and Informal Education Directorate General of Non-formal and Informal Education Ministry of National Education, Indonesia
8. Dr Prapatpong Senarith, Advisor, Ministry of Education, Thailand
9. Mrs Yangxia Lee, Director General, Centre for Promotion of Education Ministry of Education, Lao PDR.
Panelist 1: On learners with disabilities/special needs

Mr Ou Sokhim, Programme Coordinator for Inclusive Education, Disability Action Council, Cambodia explained that Cambodia has a population of around 10 million. He said that according to the 2004 survey of the National Statistic Office, the overall prevalence of disabilities is higher among rural residents. Children from birth to four years old have disabilities more than any other age group. Children with disabilities remain one of the most vulnerable groups in Cambodia and this is relative to wealth and gender. At present, Cambodia does not have accurate data on education of children with disabilities. However, for the school year 2007-2008, the Education Management Information System has started processing some data. He presented some related statistics for the school year 2006-2007 on children’s disabilities in Cambodia.

Comment: Dr Sheldon Shaeffer commented that getting the magnitude of those data is important, because only then can the country truly address the issue.

Panelist 2: On ethnolinguistic minorities

Dr Carl Grove, Multi-lingual Education and Language Policy Consultant, SIL International-Asia clarified that Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) focuses primarily on the mother tongue. He said that this is fundamental in bringing quality education to ethnolinguistic minorities.

He reiterated three challenges in reaching the minorities in the region. In general, the Asia region has a small number of multi-lingual education programs. There are not enough good role models, we need more of them. Across the region, ethnolinguistic minorities often speak a language which is not officially recognized. This makes it difficult to allocate resources to authorities on behalf of this group. Ethnolinguistic minorities, similar to other unreached groups, are often over represented in remote and impoverished populations. Large class sizes are in areas that do not have financial resources to bring in teachers, fewer materials and hidden costs exist.

Dr Carl Grove emphasized that SIL tends to focus on the language aspect of quality education. He further explained that it is important to recognize that the language aspect is not the only aspect that must be addressed in education. There are other areas to consider such as class size and so on.

Comment: Dr Sheldon Shaeffer commented that from a scientific and pedagogical perspective, it is more effective for students to learn with their mother tongue.

Panelist 3: On learners from very poor families

Mr Alain Souchard, Project Director, ATD Fourth World Thailand explained that ATD Fourth World is working with two target groups in Bangkok, the street children and their families. He said that it is necessary to know both the children and their families very well in order to better help them. The key is to build good relationships with them.

He narrated some of their experiences working with some communities in Bangkok and emphasized the need for consultation. He also clarified some specific reasons why children drop out from school. He cited that some families send their children to school but they are also required to earn some living. In such situations, children have difficulty coping with school especially when teachers are not supportive.
Comments: Dr Sheldon Shaeffer commented that schools should be child-seeking, that is, they should welcome learners and provide some flexibility to accommodate the excluded. He further commented that equivalency and second chance programmes in Thailand are important.

Ms Maki Hayashikawa, Programme Specialist in Gender and Quality Basic Education, UNESCO Bangkok explained that gender is not always about girls and women. She said that there are still sub-national disparities. There are boys who are at a disadvantage. She said that gender is very much seen as a girls’ and women issue. There are boys who are underserved but not enough research was done in this area.

She commented that in disaggregation of data in terms of geographical location such as rural versus urban, the sex-disaggregated data disappears. This makes it difficult to indicate whether data is of boys or girls. She further explained that when there are issues on underperforming boys, they seem to be highlighted. But this should not be the case. Girls and boys require equal attention from the teachers.

Comments: Dr Sheldon Shaeffer gave a reminder on the second goal of Education for All which is on gender equality. He also shared some experiences about government officials that tend to deny the presence of gender problem in their countries.

Dr Ko-Chih Tung, Regional Advisor, AIMS, UNESCO Bangkok explained that collection statistics on stateless populations, ethnic minorities, refugees and migrants is difficult due to their nature. Without status, these population groups are in suspension.

He said that the region has a big problem. In the Mekong region, Thailand is the main destination of migrants and victims of trafficking from neighboring countries. He said that the population group faces many barriers of education such as language, cost of education and so on. Parents send their children to migrant schools funded by NGOs, without legal status. These migrant schools cover costs, but these schools do not have legal status, and thus cannot provide legal accreditation. Thus, these students are unable to further their studies.

Dr Ko-Chih Tung reported that there are about 1 million in Thailand who live in hill tribe areas, 40% or 400,000 of this group are not registered; thus, they have no right to work, learn and travel. He said that there is a UNESCO Thailand survey that studied 192 villages in the border area and looked at access of these villages to social services, education, healthcare and agricultural. In conclusion, he said that the integration of educational bridging programs might address the exclusion of migrants and hill tribes in Thailand.

Comment: Dr Sheldon Shaeffer stressed the importance of reaching all children.

Mr Ou Eng, Deputy Director General of Education, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport, Cambodia explained on the context of education in Cambodia and how the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport (MoEYS), Cambodia implements Education for All. He shared the MoEYS’ experiences on specific programmes for unreached learners. Among the programmes he shared included pre-school, school readiness, multi-grade teaching, bilingual education,
disadvantaged children and youth in Cambodia

Mr. Ou Eng informed the meeting that the ministry has plans for new projects to accelerate the attainment of the Education for All goals, namely, building more schools, establishment of model community pre-schools, integration of home-based child care, provision of scholarship programmes, and school mapping for children with disabilities. He also mentioned that the MoEYS works closely with the Disability Action Council, Cambodia. The ministry also gets support from UNESCO and UNICEF.

Panelist 7:
On learners from remote areas and their mobile education in Indonesia

Dr. Ir. Harris Iskandar, Head, Sub-Directorate of Secondary Education Directorate of Equivalence Education, Directorate General of Non-Formal and Informal Education, Ministry of National Education, Indonesia, said that the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) Indonesia has difficulty providing information on learners who live mostly in rural and remote areas because there is no data. He said that they hardly collected data for the 11 categories of the unreached. There is also difficulty in coordinating this with the non-government organizations in the country.

He said that Indonesia’s gross enrolment rate reaches up to 92 point something percent. Many of those learners live in very remote areas – beyond transportation access. And when they drop from school, the MoNE has the non-formal education to retrieve them back into the educational system. He said that for the nine-year basic education, most of the Ministry’s approach is the secular schools that are being expanded to the community level. The non-traditional Islamic school curriculum has now been integrated into the national curriculum. Over-aged students and those who could not attend regular schools and have only specific time for learning are given other options.

Dr. Ir. Harris Iskandar explained that the Ministry has three strategies and programmes to reach the learners in remote areas, namely, the Open Junior Secondary Education, the One Roof School and the Equivalency Programs called “Paket A, B, and C”. He said that in the next few years, the Ministry will work harder to promote these programmes.

They will strengthen, particularly, the equivalency programme (Paket A, B and C).
which has been successful in targeting people with no access or have lost opportunity to formal schooling. The curriculum features more competencies on life skills; delivery system is flexible; teachers are recruited locally, thus empowering local community; and the availability of a national equivalency examination. He concluded by sharing a big challenge to the Ministry, that is, some areas in the country are so remote that the only way to reach these areas is on foot. He also mentioned about the challenge on reaching island communities and the budget requirements associated with it.

Comments: Dr Sheldon Shaeffer commended the Paket A, B and C of MoNE Indonesia. He mentioned that Thailand might learn from the equivalency programmes of Indonesia.

Dr Prapatpong Senarith, Advisor, Ministry of Education, Thailand said that the Ministry of Education, Thailand has worked hard on the collection of data on learners with disabilities and migrant learners. He said that they have problems with data collection and analysis and they found it difficult to fill in the matrices needed at the workshop. He explained that Thailand has done much for the education of people with disabilities. The country has centers that detect disabilities among young people, the Ministry work with hospitals and has opened schools for the blind, deaf and so on.

He reported that the Ministry of Education has integrated inclusive education last year. Thailand has the National Education Act and is committed to the Education for All and the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child. He informed the meeting that this year, a new law on the promotion of education for people with disabilities might be implemented in the country. This will provide guidelines for schools to pay more attention to this group of learners. This will be coupled with corresponding funding from the government to reach this group further. Teachers to be assigned to disabled children will receive training and extra pay of 2000 baht per month.

Dr Prapatpong Senarith explained further that the Welfare School is a special school that accommodates children from difficult circumstances such as children with HIV/AIDS. It is the national policy in Thailand to provide equal access to those learners. Extra funds are provided to support these welfare schools. Schools cannot deny a child's access to the school, regardless of their condition. However, he said that the country must work on the flexibility of schools in order to support migrant children. These learners pose a challenge because they are mobile. They tend to move from one place to another. He encouraged non-government organizations to help address this issue. There are at least 12 government agencies who work for the street kids in Thailand and there are some problems on coordination and collaboration among them. He said that Thailand is having more and more stateless children, however the total number could not be accounted for accurately. He said that there is a national policy approved by the Cabinet in 2005 to provide equal opportunity to children without identity papers and that they could still enroll in schools. There is also a need to work with community leaders to identify the migrant learners.

Comments: Dr Sheldon Shaeffer said that there has been quite a big change in terms of addressing the need of these groups of learners in Thailand. He said that there are national level policies. However, when one goes to the local level and district offices, the attitude seems not to catch up with the more liberal national policies.
Panelist 9: On programmes and projects for learners from remote areas, training of teachers from disadvantaged groups, and multi-grade teaching

Mrs Yangxia Lee, Director General, Centre for Promotion of Education for Women-Ethnic Disabled People, Ministry of Education, Lao PDR said that in Lao PDR, there is very little access to remote areas and data on learners from these communities have not been updated yet. In far villages, enrolment rates are low especially for girls. The issue of shortage of teachers is also prevalent. She reported that in order to fully implement Education for All, the country set aside some budget to conduct basic initiatives in 52 districts and 11 provinces.

She explained that female teachers were recruited to be trained and deployed to the remote areas. They were preferred over males to serve as role models because very few females from ethnic groups in remote areas attend school. The teachers were provided motorbikes but some who could not drive were forced to take their husbands with them. Some teachers were also provided in-service training for multi-grade schools. Part of these training programmes was the gender awareness workshops and researches. She mentioned that a total of 512 schools were constructed in the rural and remote areas to ensure that ethnic children are still close to their families and communities.

To support the teaching and learning, many supplementary materials have been developed in the Laotian language.

Mrs Yangxia Lee further explained that the government provided more support to these groups of learners by setting-up boarding schools for the ethnic learners. Per policy, every district should have an ethnic boarding school. In addition, the government has provided them with scholarships. She concluded by saying that after all the initiatives enrolment rate of these groups has increased. However, follow-up and monitoring is important especially to record the best practices and ensure sustainability. She mentioned, too, that recently, the center for promotion of education for women-ethnic-disabled people was established in Lao PDR. Subsequently, policy guidelines and strategies will be developed for this.

Comments: Dr Sheldon Shaeffer said that recent study shows that about 30% of children in developing nations are being educated in some formal or non-formal multigrade contexts. However, one could hardly find any teacher training, especially pre-service training for this area. Nor are there curriculums adapted to the multigrade context. He also mentioned on the issue of teacher deployment, that is, how to get the trained teachers back to the villages where they are supposed to teach. He also commented that children might be seen, but not counted, or they might be counted, but not served at all or served badly in school. He emphasized inclusive education and getting all children into school; and all children learning in an atmosphere of high quality learning and teaching.
Workshop 1: Setting Priorities

This session was the heart of the meeting where matching of strengths and challenges took place. First, participants decided their respective country priorities. Each country’s matrix was used as in doing this. Next, participants walked through other countries and EFA partners’ “gallery” to compare common challenges/needs and find possible solutions from the strengths and practices of other countries and EFA partners. Finally, group discussions on potential areas of cooperation followed.

Facilitator:
Dr Tinsiri Siribodhi, Deputy Director for Administration and Communication
SEAMEO Secretariat

In this workshop, the participants used as reference the country matrices they prepared prior to the meeting. The matrices presented the profile of the unreached groups in each of the Southeast Asian country. It contained information on:
1. the target groups
2. barrier to education in terms of access and participation
3. existing programmes, projects and activities for the target unreached groups
4. challenges to implementation of existing programmes for the target unreached groups
5. planned strategies to improve existing programmes or proposals for new measures to reach target unreached groups and accelerate progress in meeting the EFA goals
6. areas, programmes, projects, activities where the country would like to work with other Southeast Asian countries with the support of EFA partners to reach the unreached
Part 1
Country Work to determine “what to give” and “what to take”

For the first half of the session, participants worked by country to determine country’s priority unreached groups, strengths and needs. “Strengths” referred to what the country is good at. These were best practices that could be shared to other countries and participants. “Needs” referred to what the country wanted to take and learn from others. These were what the country needed and the plans to reach the unreached. There were 11 countries. The EFA partners worked as one group. Big worksheets were used in this activity. The outputs were displayed by country in a gallery.

Part 2
Gallery Walk, sharing and learning from each other

The second part of the workshop was a gallery walk where participants shared and learned from 12 worksheets in the gallery. The EFA partners published one common worksheet. Countries compared common challenges and needs and looked for possible solutions from the strengths and good practices of other countries and EFA partners. While going around the gallery, participants surveyed which country might have the answers to their respective countries’ needs. In same manner, they also investigated countries needs that they could be of help. The participants expressed this by signing-up in the respective worksheets in the gallery.

(The summary worksheets of the gallery walk are annexed to this report as ANNEX 3 and contained within the accompanying CD-ROM.)

Group Discussion on the Results of Workshop 1

The participants were grouped into three. Group chairpersons and rapporteurs were elected. Meanwhile, the 11 groupings of the unreached were clustered into three and assigned to each group of participants. The clustering of the unreached group is in Table 2.

Table 2.
Clustering of Unreached Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Learners with disabilities/special needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Girls and women, especially from rural/ethnic minorities (pregnant girls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Underperforming boys, boys at risk of dropping out, male dropouts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Orphans and abandoned children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Learners from very poor families (urban poor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Learners from remote and rural communities, including isolated areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(remote islands, mountainous areas, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Learners from religious, linguistic and ethnic minorities/indigenous peoples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Children from migrant families, refugees, stateless children/children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without identify papers / nomadic children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Working children/ street children/ trafficked children/abused children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Children in difficult circumstances (affected by armed conflict, disaster, children in prison or who are with their parent(s) in prison)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Children affected or infected by HIV and AIDS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the summary of the “give-and-take session” in the gallery walk, the groups discussed on the following:

- What were the areas of collaboration that emerged from the “give and take” session?
- Which unreached groups needed priority attention?
- How would these groups be reached?
- Who would be involved? Which countries? Which EFA partners?

The results of the discussions are summarized in Tables 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3.
### Group 1: Discussion Results

**Girls and women, especially from rural/ethnic nationalities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unreached Groups</th>
<th>Areas of collaboration</th>
<th>Who will give</th>
<th>Who will take</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls and women, especially from rural/ethnic nationalities</td>
<td>• Scholarship programme</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Special centre for gender, gender responsive project</td>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>Indonesia, Timor Leste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gender budget</td>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pregnant girls (home based modules)</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Underperforming boys, boys at risk of dropping out, male dropouts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unreached Groups</th>
<th>Areas of collaboration</th>
<th>Who will give</th>
<th>Who will take</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underperforming boys, boys at risk of dropping out, male dropouts</td>
<td>• Underperforming boys (research why boys do not perform well?)</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support programme to parents</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Malaysia, Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student tracking system</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learners with disabilities/special needs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unreached Groups</th>
<th>Areas of collaboration</th>
<th>Who will give</th>
<th>Who will take</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learners with disabilities/special needs</td>
<td>• Framework for transition support</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Lao PDR, Cambodia, DAC, Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High support needs curriculum</td>
<td>Brunei</td>
<td>Cambodia, DAC, Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Data collection</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Timor Leste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project for gifted students</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Timor Leste</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group 2: Discussion Results

**Learners from remote and rural communities, including isolated areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unreached Groups</th>
<th>Areas of collaboration</th>
<th>Who will give</th>
<th>Who will take</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learners from remote and rural communities, including isolated areas</td>
<td>• Education equivalency</td>
<td>Indonesia, The Philippines, UNESCO</td>
<td>Malaysia, Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Multigrade teaching</td>
<td>Lao PDR, Malaysia</td>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incentive for teachers</td>
<td>The Philippines, Cambodia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Data collection for children not in school/not registered/underserved/unreached</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Timor Leste, The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support programme for textbook loan; trust fund; food programmes; tuition aid scheme</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Timor Leste, The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Family support boarding schools</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Indonesia, The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Distance learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learners from religious, linguistic and ethnic minorities/indigenous peoples**

**Orphans and abandoned children**

**Learners from very poor families**

---

**Table 3.1**

**Group 1 – Discussion Results**

**Chairperson:** Dr Faridah Abu Hassan, MOE, Malaysia  
**Rapporteur:** Mr. Ou Sokhim (DAC, Cambodia)

---

**Table 3.2**

**Group 2 – Discussion Results**

**Chairperson:** Dr Nguyen Ngoc Hung, MOET, Vietnam  
**Rapporteur:** Ms Psyche Vetta G. Olayvar
Group 3: Discussion Results

Children from migrant families, refugees, stateless children/children without identity papers / nomadic children

Working children/ street children/ trafficked children/abused children

Children in difficult circumstances (affected by armed conflict, disaster, children in prison or who are with their parents in prison)

Children affected or infected by HIV and AIDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.3</th>
<th>Group 3 – Discussion Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson:</td>
<td>Chairperson: Dr Ir Harris Iskandar, MoNE, Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapporteur:</td>
<td>Ms Zaleha Abdul Hamid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unreached Groups</th>
<th>Areas of collaboration</th>
<th>Who will give</th>
<th>Who will take</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children from migrant families, refugees, stateless children/children without identity papers / nomadic children</td>
<td>Policy for Thai border state education – young children</td>
<td>ASEAN Thailand</td>
<td>ASEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working children/ street children/ trafficked children/abused children</td>
<td>Flexibility time of learning (working children)</td>
<td>UNESCO, ILO</td>
<td>Cambodia, Myanmar, Malaysia, Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in difficult circumstances (affected by armed conflict, disaster, children in prison or who are with their parents in prison)</td>
<td>Emergency Disaster Preparedness</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children affected or infected by HIV and AIDS</td>
<td>Children affected by HIV &amp; AIDS</td>
<td>Lao PDR, Thailand</td>
<td>Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam, Indonesia, Timor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“This meeting reminded us that there is only seven years left before 2015; and that there’s still so much to do for the unreached population groups in Southeast Asia.”

- DR NGUYEN NGOC HUNG, Deputy General Director
  International Cooperation Department, MoET, Vietnam
Day 2: 3 September 2008

Field Visit

The second day of the meeting was intended for field visit to some institutions in Bangkok and nearby province of Nonthanburi that implement programmes for and provide services to various groups of underserved and disadvantaged sectors of society.

The purpose of the site visit was to provide participants immersion in the actual situations where the unreached and underserved groups were given educational and other related services. The visit allowed the participants to get authentic experiences and insights among the unreached and underserved groups in Bangkok and Nonthanburi, Thailand.

Participants were pre-grouped and assigned to the three institutions. They were accompanied by group coordinators. The institutions visited were: 1) the Foundation of the Welfare of the Crippled and Srisangwan School in Nonthanburi; 2) Ban Kru Noi in Bangkok, and 3) the Human Development Foundation and the Mercy Centre in Bangkok.

The participants recorded their experiences, observations and insights in an observation worksheet. The notes were also used as reference in the debriefing. Likewise, the insights gained from the field visit provided context in the development of collaborative proposals on the third day of the meeting.

Each institution received a donation of Baht10,000 and some gifts from the SEAMEO Secretariat as token of appreciation.

The Foundation of the Welfare of the Crippled and Srisangwan School, Nonthanburi provides basic education, medical services, social and psychological services, occupational training such as agriculture, home economic, arts, handicraft, and others.

Many of the children who come to the Foundation and attend Srisangwan School need both physical assistive devices such as wheelchairs, crutches, and walkers.
and learning tools to enhance their writing, reading, and speaking skills. Since 1998, Srisangwan School has taken part in the IT for the Disabled Programme under the Princess's IT Project. Special assistance has also been provided for the individual children at Srisangwan School, particularly those with cerebral palsy, who have difficulty in speaking, reading, and writing.

The foundation and the school are being supported by HRH Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn. The school also receives support from physical therapists, speech therapists, special educationists, and computer instructors to create individual curricula to suit each child's special needs and physical abilities. The school has 299 boarding and day students.

**Ban Kru Noi, Bangkok**

Since 1980, Kru Noi (“Kru” is a Thai word for teacher) helps children who have no chance to study at primary level because of poverty and the lack of necessary documents such as birth certificates and house registration forms. She also helps children with imprisoned parents and those homeless and astray children.

Kru Noi uses her house (which is “ban” in Thai language) to accommodate street children, feed and teach them to become literate. Her extreme generosity is well known in Bangkok even though she is massively indebted for food and other expenses.

Ten years ago, Kru Noi’s story received attention from the mass media. Organizations, foundations and the general public started giving help to "Ban Kru Noi" donating money, food, clothes and toys. They also encouraged the government to allow children to study at primary level without official documents.

At present, Ban Kru Noi houses a total of 85 children, aged between 6 and 18 years; and eight families of multiple disabilities. Some of these children go home at night while others live at Ban Kru Noi and in houses rented by Kru Noi. Kru Noi cooperates with many other foundations and organizations in Bangkok and in other provinces.

**Human Development Foundation and the Mercy Centre, Bangkok**

The Human Development Foundation and its Mercy Centre is a shelter for street kids. It has four orphanages, a hospice, a home for mothers and children with HIV/AIDS, a 500-pupil kindergarten, a community meeting place, and a serene haven in the slums with small gardens and playgrounds.

Major services of the foundation include the mercy schools, combating AIDS, orphanages and shelters. The foundation oversees community services such as housing, community organization, drug rehabilitation, documentation and obtaining proper birth and identity certificates required for government schools, sports, financing small business loans, and others.

“These children and young people are wanting in many things. They are homeless and they lack love from their parents. They are bound to face many difficulties in life without proper education. They are truly underserved but they are lovely.”

MR NGUYEN TRUNG KIEN, Senior Expert
ECCE Department, MoET, Vietnam
Field Visit Debriefing

Facilitator:
Mr Hameed Hakeem, Coordinator, APPEAL, UNESCO Bangkok

After the morning’s field visit, this session allowed for sharing of insights among the participants. This activity also strengthened camaraderie and the potential areas of cooperation identified on Day 1.

Mr Hakeem started the session by reflecting that in helping the excluded and the unreached groups, there is a need to use both cognitive and affective domains in order to fully commit and gather a strong voice in providing services to the underprivileged population groups.

He commended the SEAMEO Secretariat for the arrangement and organization of the visits. He reiterated that the field visit was indeed necessary to provide hands-on experiences and meet people who work at the grassroots level.

He pointed out that not all of the institutions visited captured all examples of excluded children and persons, but they provided the groups with insights of the people and children who are excluded. He reminded the participants of the institutions visited and briefly went over the Field Visit Observation Worksheet and posed several questions to help focus the groups in completing the worksheet. The groups were given 30 minutes to collate their responses.

Table 4.1
Group 1 – Field Visit Report
Foundation of the Welfare of the Crippled and Srisangwan School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Physically disabled children can further their education and go to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is limited support when the children finish schooling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Equality no longer means Education for All, but the best education for everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is much goodwill from all stakeholders in supporting the Foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Passion and commitment of staff are very apparent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Only three centers exist. How to find other learners who are similarly situated? How to extend services to them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need for continuing training among teachers and the staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personalized instruction is highly visible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vocational training at early age is being applied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Welfare facilities, medical services, instructional materials are available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is good indication of physiotherapy, skills development and formal education, all in one.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Best Practices to Bring Home

| • Malaysia – set-up government school for the crippled |
| • Myanmar – to have sufficient members and teachers who can effectively teach and take care of students |
| • Indonesia – to adopt varied tools for learning |
| • Vietnam – to integrate education and treatment of crippled children; teacher and staff exchange program |
| • Philippines – development of local and indigenous materials for the disabled |

Implications to MOEs and EFA Partners

| • Continued pursuit of inclusive education, including the establishment of a Regional Center on Inclusive Education in Malaysia |
| • Capacity building for special education |
| • Data collection and information sharing among countries |
| • Research on preventing, if not eradicating, cerebral palsy |
### Table 4.2  
**Group 2 – Ban Kru Noi**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Poor individual helping the poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Children are fortunate to have an individual (without support from the government) who help them go to school. Some even completed college education. However, they are underserved in terms of government support. Could the government provide support to this institution, example, granting of scholarship especially in college?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Children are happy and contented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● It is an academic support center for the poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Children have lots of instructional materials for them to become competitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Good management of the “centre”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Immediate community awareness and support are wanting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Best Practices to Bring Home**

| ● Home-based day care |
| ● Friendliness of teachers; positive attitude and kindness of teachers – should be an attribute of a teacher in formal schools |
| ● Small NGOs could replicate the services provided by Ban Kru Noi – to focus more on providing academic support rather than directly delivering formal education services. |

**Implications to MOEs and EFA Partners**

| ● Linkage with Ministry of Social Welfare and Development to “systematize” the services like an organized Child Center |
| ● Linkage with the Ministry of Local and Interior Government to facilitate the processing of birth certificates for future use (i.e. college education and work) |

### Table 4.3  
**Group 3 – The Human Development Foundation and The Mercy Centre**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Visionary leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Strategic approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● dignity and respect as human being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● dedication and commitment for the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Outreaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Sustainability of funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Cooperation with private and government schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● One-stop centre for education, legal aids, hospice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Learning the skills of living (life skills)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Peer decision – democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Provides second chances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Follow-up programme, role model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Hospice should be separated from the kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Staff members do outreach by visiting homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Kindergarten teachers get certificates through night courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Best Practices to Bring Home**

| ● Rapid survey technique |
| ● Modules for teachers – how to approach learners with HIV AIDS |
| ● Integrating child rights programme to the villages |
| ● Orphanage (for 0-18 years old) – provides education and religious studies |
| ● Have set-up community centres, temple, mosque and organized programme for the children |
| ● School for orphans/street children (run by the government) |
Implications to MOEs and EFA Partners

- Push for decentralized policy, customize to the need of the community
- Integrate ECCE in the slum areas
- Budget arrangement in most countries is under different ministries
- Inter-ministry cooperation (social work, welfare, education and healthy)
- Work with NGOs
- Apply counseling
- Encourage other NGOs to follow practices of the foundation
- How about sustainability?

Mr Hakeem concluded that all the three organizations visited seemed to have offered very personalized and customized services to their respective target clients.

He said that it is not easy to address the diversity in mainstream. He observed that the photos presented in the reports showed not only disability, but also ability, referring to a photo of a child drawing using his feet.

He emphasized that providing help to the underprivileged children become more meaningful when their abilities are given importance. He concluded that sharing information about the underprivileged groups visited was only the first step. More importantly, next series of discussions should be focused on what needs to be done which will soon be expressed in concrete joint actions.

Special Session: Preparation for Action Planning

Facilitator:
Dr Tinsiri Siribodhi, Deputy Director for Administration and Communication
SEAMEO Secretariat

For the remaining time in the afternoon of Day 2, a special brief session was conducted to provide guidelines in the preparation of action plans.

Dr Tinsiri briefed the groups on their next task which was drafting of action plans. She explained the five steps:

1. Use the Summary Sheet of the “Give and Take” session as the main reference. She said that a lot of potential areas of collaboration came out in the summary such as the concern of girls and women in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Timor Leste, Indonesia. These countries might want to work together. Concerning learners in remote areas, she mentioned that the summary sheet indicated Thailand, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Vietnam and Philippines as countries that considered this unreached group a priority. Meanwhile, Vietnam, Timor Leste, Thailand, Lao PDR and Malaysia expressed interest to develop projects for migrant children.
2. Clarify the result of the Group Discussion as basis in identifying specific roles of countries in the pre-identified areas of collaboration.
3. Decide on four priority programme/activities.
4. Work in sub-groups.
5. Use the Action Planning Worksheet.

Each big group went through their worksheets and clarified certain points. The groups sub-divided into smaller groups. The sub-groups decided on areas of priority and started planning on the details.
This session put together the results of the first two days’ meeting. Participants drafted collaborative proposals and indicated concrete steps to reach particular unreached population groups.

Chair: Dato’ Dr Ahamad bin Sipon, Director, SEAMEO Secretariat

Dato’ Dr Ahamad bin Sipon reminded all participants of the importance of the action planning session. He emphasized that the plan should be collaborative in nature because it was the Ministers’ aspiration that all SEAMEO Member Countries work together to achieve EFA Goals by 2015.

He explained that the plans would be presented to the SEAMEO High Officials Meeting in December 2008 where they would give inputs and feedback before presenting the proposals to the SEAMEO Council for endorsement. Upon approval by the SEAMEO Council, details of the plans could be worked out. He also encouraged the groups to be creative and innovative in their action planning.

He enumerated the following guide questions for the planning session:

- What specific activities are identified?
- Who are involved? Which countries? Which EFA partners?
- Who are the stakeholders?
- What strategies, activities, tasks will be taken?
- What are the roles and responsibilities of each country/ stakeholder?
- What is the indicative timeframe?
- What are the major resources needed?
- What assumptions, issues and risks should be noted down?
Comments: Ms Mega Irena, Senior Officer, Human Development Unit, Bureau of Resources Development, ASEAN Secretariat stressed that the plans should be collaborative in nature. She reminded the country participants to focus on the guide questions. She mentioned that all parties would be benefited if the proposals were eventually accepted and implemented. She assured the participants not to worry in making concrete suggestions. Ms Irena queried about the scope of the projects to be proposed as her group focused on projects that would involve all ASEAN countries and not just a limited number of countries.

Dato’ Dr Ahamad responded that regional projects must be priority. Dr Tinsiri Siribodhi added that there could be two ways: 1) with regional scope involving all the SEAMEO/ASEAN countries, and 2) a cluster of countries. She said that after the group discussions, she observed that most countries are involved in each of the projects.

This session provided participants opportunity to present their collaborative plans and sought for further inputs from the organizers and EFA partners and experts.

Facilitator: Ms Mega Irena, Senior Officer Human Development Unit, Bureau of Resources Development ASEAN Secretariat

Ms Mega Irena explained how the session would run and the time allocated was two hours. She informed that there would be 11 sub-groups and each would be given 5-7 minutes for the presentation. A Question-and-Answer session would follow after all the sub-groups in each group had presented.

The details of the 11 proposals are included in Part Two of this report.
Summary and Closing

This concluded the three-day meeting with a wrap-up and presentation of next steps. Also, the session provided opportunity for some participants and organizers to share overall thoughts about the activity through reflections.

Wrap-up and Way Forward

Dr Wahdi SA Yudhi
Deputy Director for Programme and Development, SEAMEO Secretariat

Dr Wahdi SA Yudhi said that the meeting was all about sharing and working not as a country alone but as a region of Southeast Asia. He said that the meeting had accomplished the objectives. He said that the processes that the participants went through led to the attainment of the meeting target, that was, the formulation of plans to reach the unreached in education.

He said that the plenary and panel discussion led by UNESCO provided a very important background and reference in the three-day meeting. He said that the worksheets and tools used in the meeting were very useful. He added that the field provided great insights about the unreached in education.

He expressed gratitude and satisfaction for the active participation of the participants that resulted to the formulation of 11 action plans on reaching the unreached.

He informed the participants that the plans will be presented to the SEAMEO High Officials and the SEAMEO Council and the participants will be informed of the next set of activities, accordingly. He said that the results and outputs of the meeting will be sent to all participants in electronic form. They will also be uploaded to the meeting webpage at the SEAMEO website.

Reflections of the Participants

Dr Nguyen Ngoc Hung
Deputy Director General, International Cooperation Department, Ministry of Education and Training Vietnam

Dr Nguyen Ngoc Hung said that he had been to many meetings but he enjoyed this meeting so much. He said that in this Bangkok’s meeting, he found more ways to do education and with passion.

He reflected on his realization that the mainstream education may meet some or the majority of the needs, but not all of them. This is the reason why initiatives to provide education for the very poor and desperate in non-formal ways should be encouraged. Personalized and specialized curriculums should be recognized, making it easier for learners to shift from formal to non-formal and vice versa.

He thanked the organizers: SEAMEO, UNESCO and ASEAN for the reminder that the time left to attain the EFA Goals is only 7 years, and that there are still many things to do for the 5-10% of learners who are unaccounted for and not availing the educational services due them. He thanked all his fellow participants for opening up their hearts and minds; and for sharing experiences.

He concluded with his hope that the proposed projects will serve as concrete steps to achieve the goals of Education for All by 2015.
Ms Raquel Castillo
Asia Policy Advocacy and Campaigns Coordinator
Asian South Pacific Bureau of Adult Education (ASPBAE), the Philippines

Ms Raquel Castillo expressed her delight that the group of Non-Government Organizations represented in the meeting was referred to as “partners” and not “observers”.

She said that she is thankful that the forum provided opportunity to dialogue with the high-level education officials because at the country-level, it has always been difficult to get appointments with them. She added that it was the first time that the national education coalitions came in engagement with the education officials.

She suggested that adults should be included in the list of the 11 disadvantaged and unreached groups because Education for All is not only about children. She also mentioned the importance of literacy mapping as part of the action plans to ensure effective assessment.

Ms Castillo said that discussions focused on education as a right and that it is a right of everyone. Coming from a regional organization that focuses specifically on adult education, she called on everyone to give adults attention too because many adults are illiterate too. She also informed the participants that the year 2008 is the 60th year of the declaration of human rights. For the civil society like ASPBAE, Ms Castillo explained that in “EFA”, “E” means early childcare, “F” is for formal education, and “A” refers to adults.
She also shared some words of her fellow EFA partner, Mr Carl Grove of SIL International who said that the group has indeed adventurous and ambitious plans and that one year from now, it would be exciting to see which ones of the plans have gotten off the ground. Finally, Ms Castillo recommended that the next meeting could be on financing because the proposed projects can’t take off without financing.

A photo slideshow that highlighted the events of the three-day meeting was shown.

**Closing Messages**

**Dr Sheldon Shaeffer**
Director, UNESCO Bangkok

Dr Sheldon Shaeffer said that it is important to note that the meeting’s end is not the end, but the start of a process. There is a need to look at what the follow up will be. Going back to the matrix that the participants were asked to fill in, he said that “the empty cells” should be filled-in to enrich the other cells.

While waiting official ministerial approval in six months’ time, he said that maybe sharing of best practices could be a good way to start especially on areas such as registering the unregistered, finding and tracking them down, providing disaster risk reduction education, doing something about HIV/AIDS issue, girls and women’s education and special needs of learners. He said that there are networks and groups that are already at work and to learn more from.

Dr Sheldon said that the resources for the proposed projects will be an issue. The meeting result will be reported to the EFA TWG meeting of international NGOs and all other meetings that will have stake on education. He said finally that the meeting outputs are materials that would be of good use to everyone.

**Ms Mega Irena**
Senior Officer
Human Development Unit, Bureau of Resources Development
ASEAN Secretariat

Ms Mega Irena said that the three-day meeting had been a learning process for the ASEAN Secretariat. She said that in terms of the Millenium Development Goals attainment, the international community has always praised Southeast Asia in terms of primary education enrolment. Statistics show impressive numbers. But when the Education for All goals attainment is referred to, there are still many challenges to address, not just within the seven years remaining, but in the years after that.

She said that the Education Ministers in the region have focused their attention to support the attainment of Education for All at the regional level. At the ASEAN meeting in March 2008, it was the first time that the Education Ministers mentioned that Member Countries should focus on the attainment of Education for All. There has been a significant shift of attention at the regional level.

Ms Irena also informed that ASEAN is in the process of finalizing the ASEAN blueprint that concerns various educational sectors including universal access to education. She said that there is a need to carry forward the goal together because the ministries could not do it by themselves alone, thus the need for civil societies, NGOs, SEAMEO, ASEAN and UNESCO to work together.
Lastly, she said that Education for All should be discussed with other sectoral bodies for them to help attain the goals. This is an important point to carry on at the regional level. She emphasized that the cooperation among ASEAN, SEAMEO and UNESCO will truly support the Members Countries in attaining the EFA Goals by 2015.

Dato’ Dr Ahamad bin Sipon
Director of SEAMEO Secretariat

Dato’ Dr Ahamad bin Sipon, emphasized the important directive of the Education Ministers about the need to reach the unreached and accelerate the attainment of Education for All Goals in Southeast Asia.

He thanked the participants who he said were the trusted ones by the Education Ministers not only to help draft the plans but also in the subsequent implementation. He also thanked the Education for All partners for sharing their rich experiences with the country participants. Likewise, he thanked UNESCO and ASEAN Secretrariat for co-organizing the activity.

He said that UNESCO has given great value to the EFA Goals and that the Mid-Decade Assessment results provided valuable inputs towards organizing the meeting.
**Part Two - Outputs**

**Collaborative Project Proposals to Reach the Unreached in Education**

| Proposed Project Number 1: | Group 1, Sub-Group 1  
Presented by Mr Sokhim Ou (DAC, Cambodia) |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| **Transition Support Programme for Learners with Disabilities** | **Brief Description:**
The proposed programme will assist learners with special educational needs to adapt to change at school and in the world of work. |
| **Target Group:** Learners with disabilities or with special educational needs | **Countries Involved:** Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Philippines, Timor Leste, Vietnam |
| **Proponents:** Mr Othman bin Hj Simbran (Brunei Darussalam)  
Mr Dr Hoang Minh Luat (Vietnam)  
Mr Truong Thanh Hai (Vietnam)  
Mr Sokhim Ou (DAC, Cambodia) | **Lead Country:** Not identified |
| **EFA Partners:** Disability Action Council, Cambodia  
UNESCO UIS-AIMS | **Components and Activities:** Policy formulation, data collection, exchange programme/training, establishment of a regional centre |
| **Timeframe:** 2-3 years | **Issues:** Formulation of policy at regional level could be difficult, large scope for data collection, funding support |
| **Note:** Draw from experiences of Singapore in the conduct of training programmes and workshops | **Comments:**

**Ms Mega Irena** commented that the proposal for children with disabilities was challenging. She explained that in this context, there is a need to coordinate and see what the Ministry of Social Welfare has been doing in this area to avoid any duplication of effort.  

**Dr Shaeffer Shaeffer** said that the ECCE has a special role in the idea of promoting smooth transition from home to school, and school to home. He said that it is easier to start at the preschool level as this level tends to be more flexible and open. Thus, the transition to primary school may be easier.
Proposed Project Number 2: Tracking System for Students at Risk of Dropping Out

Presented by Ms Milagros Talinio (Philippines)

Group 1, Sub-Group 2

Brief Description:
A school-based computerized system that can monitor, evaluate and initiate interventions on students who have tendency of dropping from the public schools

Target Group: Underperforming students and students at risk of dropping out

Countries Involved: Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand

Proponents:
Ms Milagros Talino (Philippines)
Dr Azwan Abd Aziz (Malaysia)
Mr Chatree Chananart (Thailand)
Mr Kyaw Thu (Myanmar)

Lead Country: All four countries involved

EFA Partners: UNICEF, Disability Action Council, Cambodia, UNESCO UIS-AIMS

Components and Activities:
Inventory of existing researches, identification of student tracking and profiling system, workshop to develop the framework, system development, toolkit development, capacity building

Timeframe: 3 years

Issues: None

Notes: The proposed projects will tap UNICEF’s existing initiative and MOE Malaysia’s student profiling system. The four countries are willing to share the costs for the pilot stage but would rely on UNESCO and EFA partners’ expertise and consultancies. The group identifies UNESCO UIS AIMS to provide technical assistance.

Comments:

Ms Mega Irena clarified that the reasons why students drop out might be due to the system or individuals themselves. She said that she is supportive of the initiative for countries to share information using innovative approach. She said that clarification on how to monitor and how to prevent children from dropping out must be provided because social and economic implications might be involved.

Dr Sheldon Shaeffer recalled the Philippines’ experience where a research on why children drop out of school was conducted. Unfortunately, the initiative was not sustained. He said that there are many reasons why children incur increasing absences and eventually drop from school. One is bad reading scores of a child. Children drop out more in grades 1-2 and less in grades 5-6.

He said that Thailand and Malaysia have examples of good child management systems that detect the causes of dropping out. Toolkit should be developed to train teachers in understanding and knowing signs of dropping out.
**Proposed Project Number 3:**

**Conference to Promote Awareness of Education for Girls and Women**

*Presented by Dr Sisamone Sithirajvongsa (Lao PDR)*

**Brief Description:**
The conference aims at raising awareness on education for girls and women and various support programmes to enable SEAMEO Member Countries to develop action plans and future collaboration.

**Target Group:** Girls and women in rural areas and ethnic minorities

**Countries Involved:** Cambodia, Lao PDR, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Timor Leste

To be invited: Brunei Darussalam, Myanmar, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam

**Proponents:**
Dr Faridah Abu Hassan (Malaysia)
Dr Sisamone Sithirajvongsa (Lao PDR)
Dr Elih Sudiapermana (Indonesia)
Mr Vasco Viana (Timor Leste)
Mr Ou Eng (Cambodia)

**Lead Country:** Malaysia

**EFA Partners:** UNIFEM, UNICEF, ASPBAE, SIL, WFP

**Components and Activities:** Sharing of best practices in budget-based gender, school supplementary food programmes, gender responsive projects, basic education for girls

**Timeframe:** July 2009

**Issues:** Human resources, coordination within the country, educational budget, decided by individual country, budget for the conference, data collection of each country on the issue, convincing high officials, sustainability

**Comments:**

Ms Mega Irena said that the proposed project on Girls and Women is very important. She also reminded that the promotion of a more gender-balanced approach not only include attendance of girls, but also in the development of a good curriculum and budget planning.

Dr Sheldon Shaeffer said that in the idea on gender budgeting is very important. He said that the idea of looking carefully at what can be done to keep girls in school is also vital and that there are interesting studies by UNESCO that looked at the pros and cons of girls in boarding schools, how mother tongue is used in education and how it might be more important for girls than boys.
Proposed Project Number 4: Tracking Mechanism for Unreached Populations

Group 2, Sub-Group 1
Presented by Ms Sahara Ahmad (Malaysia)

Brief Description: Sharing of technical expertise and experiences to mobilize different stakeholders and coordinate plans and resources

Target Group: Learners from remote and rural communities; children who are not registered in schools

Countries Involved: All 11 SE Asian countries

Proponents:
Dr Nguyen Ngoc Hung (Vietnam)
Mr Put Samith (Cambodia)
Ms Sahara Ahmad (Malaysia)
Dr S Mariam Aljunied (Singapore)

Lead Country: Not identified

EFA Partners: ASPBAE, UNESCO UIS-AIMS

Components and Activities: Research, exchange visits, capacity building

Timeframe: 2 years

Comments:

Ms Mega Irena commented that the proposal to develop tracking mechanism is something new. It could be challenging as it involves both qualitative and quantitative data collection.

Dr Sheldon Shaeffer said that “unregistered” means two different things, 1) those who are not citizens of a nation, or 2) children registered in the system, but not in a school. Due to very remote distances, some parents have not bothered to get their children registered officially, they are children of migrants.

He also said that the proposed project can identify innovative ways such as tracing and tracking children who are moving a lot, in and out of systems. However, a lot of systems do not have common school record and it is difficult to transfer them into other schools, especially in the middle of the year.

A representative from MOE Thailand shared that in their experience, they would identify catchment areas for the unregistered groups of children in Thailand. But it is more difficult for those who do not have birth certificates and those children of migrants.
Proposed Project Number 5: Pre-school Programme for All

**Group 2, Sub-Group 2**

**Mr Tin Nyo (Myanmar)**

**Brief Description:**
The proposed is a six-year project to be implemented in phases. The project aims to assist the SEAMEO Member Countries in establishing a mechanism to provide all 5-year old children with pre-school education as foundation of lifelong learning, prepare them for formal schooling and reduce early drop-outs to attain EFA Goal of Universal Primary Education

**Target Group:** Children from poor families

**Countries Involved:** All 11 SE Asian countries

**Proponents:**
Mr Tin Nyo (Myanmar)
Ms Psyche Vetta Olayvir (Philippines)
Mr Nguyen Trung Kien (Vietnam)
Mr Somboun Masouvanh (Lao PDR)

**Lead Country:** Not identified

**EFA Partners:** UNICEF
Save the Children

**Components and Activities:** Study visits, capacity building, development of regional school readiness competencies, provision of technical assistance to member countries in enriching national standards and curriculum, establishment of pre-schools in remote areas, provision of support services such as feeding, M&E

**Timeframe:** 2 years

**Issues:** Lack of awareness and negative attitude of parents towards pre-school education, insufficient budget from national and EFA partners and other resources, sustainability and commitment of the national and local governments as well as communities to pursue pre-school education for all

**Comments:**

Ms Mega Irena said that it is important to provide the enabling environment to support the increasing number of student enrolment in preschool. If we have good preschool system, the drop out rate may decrease.

She also said that ASEAN has developed a directory of ECCE providers which is available on the ASEAN website.

Dr Sheldon Shaeffer said that the proposal on early childhood is essential and that there is a network (called ARNEC) that develops policies and good practices on early childhood. Although the focus is on 5 year olds, he reminded ECCE or ECCD involves 0-8 years old. He said that focusing on a rich preschool year before the formal school is very important as it acclimatizes the family to get their children ready for formal school, including girls into the school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project Number 6: Multi-Grade Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2, Sub-Group 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presented by Mr Awangku Abdullah Pg Hj Tengah (Brunei Darussalam)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief Description:</strong> Teaching and learning on multigrade subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Group:</strong> Learners from remote, dispersed and isolated areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Countries Involved:</strong> Cambodia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Timor Leste</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Proponents:** Mr Awangku Abdullah Pg Hj Tengah (Brunei Darussalam)  
Mr Didik Suhardi (Indonesia)  
Mr Antonio de Jesus (Timor Leste) |
| **Lead Country:** Not identified |
| **EFA Partners:** ASPBAE |
| **Components and Activities:** Development of guidelines for training of multi-grade teachers, capacity building, M&E |
| **Timeframe:** 3 years |

**Comments:**

**Ms Mega Irena** said that multi-grade teaching is very crucial in terms promoting education in remote/isolated areas.

**Dr Sheldon Shaeffer** said that it is always better for teachers to get more training, both in pre and in-service. But there is a need to look at the curriculum. Some countries consider multi-grade teaching as a second class. Vietnam has an excellent multi-grade program which might be worth looking at.

**Mr Tin Nyo of MOE Myanmar** commented that each country has respective national standards on multi-grade teaching. Therefore, it is important to look at what sort of settings are available so we can make the plans flexible. He also suggested that ACCU’s implementation of community learning centers in Asia and the Pacific is a good networking resource.

**A representative of MOE Thailand** commented that in the training of teachers, Thailand teachers are trained to teach one grade at a time and the teachers have to learn on the job. Peer-teaching is also being practiced.
**Group 2, Sub-Group 4**  
**Presented by Ms Mega Irena, ASEAN Secretariat**

**Brief Description:** The CLC will serve as the venue to provide vocational education for the poor families in rural/remote/isolated areas that have no access to formal education. The project will support lifelong learning of local communities to promote communal solidarity, capacity building and income generation. The project is expected to be sustained by the local community.

**Target Group:** Children, youth and adults from poor families in rural/remote/isolated areas

**Countries Involved:** All 11 SE Asian countries (Note: Not certain of Singapore’s participation)

**Proponents:**  
Mega Irena (ASEAN Sec)  
Adinan Pakbara (Thailand)  
Gosol Pracom (Thailand)  
Alain Souchard (ATD Fourth World)

**Lead Country:** Not identified

**EFA Partners:** ATD Fourth World, Save the Children, UNESCO UIS-AIMS

**Components and Activities:** Inter-Ministerial coordination, assessment, work planning, development of centres, M&E

**Timeframe:** 5 years (2009 – 2015)

**Comment:**

A representative of MOE Thailand commented that if there is no strong government policy to support this initiative, it is hard to get support from other agencies as well.

---

**Proposed Project Number 8:**  
**Group 3, Sub-Group 1**  
**Presented by Dr Roziah binti Abdullah (Malaysia)**

**Brief Description:** Inter-country schooling program

**Target Group:** Stateless/non-documentated children in the states’ borders

**Countries Involved:** Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, Vietnam

**Proponents:**  
Dr Roziah binti Abdullah (Malaysia)  
Ms. Zaleha Abdul Hamid (Malaysia)  
Mrs Doreen Tan (Singapore)  
Mr Prapatpong Senarith (Thailand)  
Ms Pontip Glarob (Thailand)

**Lead Country:** Not identified
EFA Partners: UNICEF, UNCHR, INEE, Save the Children

Component and Activity: Set-up special border schools

Timeframe: Not indicated

Issue: Policy reforms for inter country-border school system

Comment:

Dr Sheldon Shaeffer commented that the proposal is a very complicated one and will deal with all political issues such as legal migration and language of instruction.

Proposed Project Number 9:

Project on HIV and AIDS Using an Integrated Approach (Providing education, care, treatment and counseling services to learners affected or infected by HIV and AIDS)

Group 3, Sub-Group 2
Presented by Mr Ko Lay Win, (Myanmar)

Brief Description: The proposed project focuses on strengthening existing government policies on addressing the HIV/AIDS

Target Group: Children, youth and adults infected and affected by HIV and/or AIDS

Countries Involved: All 11 SE Asian countries

Proponents:
Mrs Yangxia Lee (Lao PDR)
Mr Ko Lay Win, (Myanmar)
Mrs Zarinah Salleh (Brunei Darussalam)

Lead Country: Not identified

EFA Partners: UNAIDS, WAF (Myanmar), AIDS Council (Malaysia), Youth Union (Lao PDR)

Components and Activities: Data collection, care and treatment, curriculum strengthening, capacity building, M&E

Timeframe: 5 years (2009 – 2015)

Issues: Prevailing culture and tradition towards HIV/AIDS maybe a barrier in identifying who are infected, financial support and equipment available, difficulty in monitoring cases of HIV/AIDS, review and strengthening of higher education curriculum needs much resources, inter-Ministry coordination is a challenge, need for a high-level endorsement for ministries to work together e.g. MOE, MOH, MOS, etc.

Comments:

Ms Mega Irena suggested that there might be a need to look at what the ministries have done in the past in the issue of HIV/AIDS. She mentioned about ADFOA which is on their third phase now and has been doing many activities including those presented in the proposed project. She also suggested include HIV/AIDS awareness into the curriculum, keeping in mind the cultural and religious beliefs of particular countries.
Mr Alain Souchard of ATD Fourth World, Thailand commented that establishing a special hospital for the HIV/AIDS infected people is discrimination. He suggested learning more from past experiences.

Dr Sheldon Shaeffer agreed with the comment of Mr Souchard that special hospitals lead to more stigma and discrimination. He said that special care is needed but need not need to segregate them.

Proposed Project Number 10: Education in Emergencies and Disaster Preparedness

Group 3, Sub-Group 3
Presented by Dr Harris Iskandar, Indonesia

Brief Description: The proposed project is a collaborative effort by and between the government and civil society in providing and/or seeking out post-crisis support (educational and psychosocial) to children or youth affected by natural and man-made catastrophes and teaching emergency preparedness in the learning environment.

Target Group: Children in difficult circumstances

Countries Involved: Indonesia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam

Proponents:
Dr Harris Iskandar (Indonesia)
Haydee Ann Montoya (E-Net Philippines)
Ms Racquel Castillo (ASPBae Philippines)
Ms Erlinda Sevilla (Philippines)

Lead Country: Not identified

EFA Partners: E-Net Philippines, Save the Children, ASPBAE

Components and Activities: Provision of kits and guidelines, teachers and community involvement, refurbishment of structures, advocacy

Timeframe: 2 years

Issues: Insufficient funds for construction and repair may hamper this activities; some international donors may decide to pull-out assistance from affected countries.

Notes: The proposed project will tap the promotion of disaster education in schools at the primary and secondary levels initiated by ADRC that is based in Japan. The curriculum has been implemented in the Philippines, while Thailand has the same initiative in collaboration with JICA.

Comments:

A representative from MOE, Malaysia shared the Malaysia’s experience in the provision of education in emergencies and disaster preparedness. With funding from UNICEF, primary and secondary level students were given education on disaster preparedness. Teachers and counselors have been trained too using handbooks for school level preparedness.

Dr Sheldon Shaeffer commented that disaster-risk reduction education is very important at the moment with many projects being done, especially after the...
tsunami in Indonesia and Thailand.

### Proposed Project Number 11:

**Learning and Earning (Literacy with Livelihood Component)**

**Group 3, Sub-Group 4**  
**Presented by Ms Zaleha Abdul Hamid, Malaysia**

**Brief Description:** Inter-Partnership with Corporate Foundations

**Target Group:** Working children

**Countries Involved:** Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, Vietnam

**Proponents:**
- Ms Zaleha Abdul Hamid (Malaysia)
- Ms Cizela Orleans da Cruz (Timor Leste)
- Mr Chantarat Pakmash (Thailand)
- Ms Phimwarat Muangnil (Thailand)

**Lead Country:** Not identified

**EFA Partners:** UNICEF, UNCHR, ASPBAE, ILO

**Components and Activities:** Provision of support such as feeding, entrepreneurship, capacity building

**Timeframe:** Beginning July 2009, project duration not indicated

**Issues:** Absence of data or difficulty in data collection, difficulty in determining beneficiaries

**Comments:**

A representative from MOE, Brunei Darussalam shared that Queensland in Australia has a good national policy and mechanism that could be used as reference.

Dr Sheldon Shaeffer said that the issue will include those learners who are not in school and those who are beyond schooling age; and how to get them back into the system. Various learners may need a more flexible school timetable.

**Other Comments:**

A participants representing Group 1 commented that open and distance learning could be used as a means to implement some of the drafted proposals. SEAMEO Centres can help out how to develop the needed curricula. The idea of training teachers could also be done online and consider using ICT to the fullest.