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Executive Summary

In conjunction with the 10th anniversary of the Education for All flagship for girls' education, the United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI) organized a global conference, entitled ‘Engendering Empowerment: Education and Equality’ (E4), during April–May 2010. The E4 conference consisted of an electronic discussion held online in April and May 2010 and as a face-to-face meeting in Dakar from 17 to 20 April 2010. This report provides a summary account of the deliberations of the e-discussion and Dakar conference and is collectively referred to as the “E4 Workshop Report”.

The overarching goal of the E4 conference was to harness the power of partnerships to improve girls’ access to quality education globally. More specifically, E4 brought together a vibrant mix of scholars, practitioners, government representatives and development partners who aimed to:

1. recommit to the acceleration of gender equity-related actions agreed to at the 2000 World Education Forum in Dakar; and
2. deepen public-policy advocacy and debate on girls’ education in order to accelerate action towards the attainment of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) 2 and 3 and inform a broader understanding of gender equity, girls’ education and the strategic actions necessary to support this.

The e-discussion was designed to galvanize public debate among as wide a population as possible: academics, practitioners and policymakers from diverse geographic regions; and also to generate input into the Dakar conference and output into one specific framework, the Dakar Declaration. During the e-conference, 16 teams and individuals presented their work and more than 80 participants contributed at least once each in the discussion forums. The forum questions allowed for a structured, yet interactive, discussion during the course of five weeks on the multilayered influences on girls’ education.

Contributions from a wide range of practitioners, including networks such as ActionAid, the Africa Network Campaign on Education for All, Community Action for Popular Participation in Nigeria, Plan International, Save the Children, the Save Our Youth Campaign in Nigeria, and the Forum for African Women Educationalists (FAWE), among others, provided a rich backdrop for the forum, and responses brought together the latest analyses and thinking on the following issues: a) the linkages between poverty and other intersecting inequalities (race, class, gender and location, among others), and how that circumscribes the educational opportunities of girls; b) the gendered nature of education and the role quality education can play in enabling gender equality; and c) latent and manifest violence in general – and against women and girls in particular – and its impact on girls’ education. In addition, cross-cutting topics related to emergent issues such as HIV and AIDs and climate change were also explored to provide insights on the way forward.

The follow-up Dakar conference was organized around three related thematic strands: poverty, quality and violence. Under the poverty strand, participants moved beyond orthodox definitions of poverty and explored its gendered effects on schooling. They spoke to the fact that poverty can be both visible and invisible and stressed that, along with resource levels, human rights are also important. Moreover, it was recognized that the process of making definitions itself is a form of power. The stream explored how power inequalities intersect to further marginalize the poorest through educational disadvantage, and questioned whether existing strategies address poverty holistically, or leave gender and power inequalities untouched. Participants also identified the need for improved data and gender budgeting, support for staff training and sustainable measures, in order to create “specific solutions for specific problems”, give more to the poorest girls and open up participatory spaces for discussion of poverty, inequality and violence.
The quality strand explored the notion of quality education beyond parity. The stream examined issues of power and participation; investigated the ways in which multiple types of inequalities intersect and compound one another; and explored how actors could work together to raise the quality of girls’ education. The stream also identified a number of emerging themes for action and concluded that gender equality must be at the heart of any definition of quality education – it can be transformative and empowering for girls, and also for boys.

The violence strand noted that a high incidence of violence against girls and women is a central factor in gender inequality in schooling; yet a ‘culture of silence’ perpetuates the on-going violation of rights. The stream also examined the definition of violence itself, along with other accepted notions, such the idea of schools as ‘safe havens’. Discussions identified key contributing factors to violence and explored a range of solutions and partnerships. The stream strongly concluded that it was not possible to address gender equality in school without addressing experiences of violence, and that redressing unequal power structures is central to this.

The E4 conference as a whole offered a unique opportunity in which key global actors were brought together, enabling them to explore pertinent issues and consider how they might work together more effectively to achieve the goal of gender equality in education. The discussions reflected the rich variety of experiences of the participants, and voiced a strongly perceived need to address the persistent barriers to gender equality in education. In that regard, the two components of the conference were also important and unprecedented opportunities to learn how greater global participation might work in practice. At the Dakar conference, a partnership forum enabled donors and participants to discuss the challenges and potentials of partnership. In addition, country working groups also provided a space and format for devising workable and realistic strategies to be taken forward at the national level. UNGEI was in direct contact with partners in governments, as well as a number of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and academics, strengthening its plans for the next 10 years.

Recommendations arising from the conference indicate that follow-up research and action should focus on:

- increasing partnerships, particularly with civil society and the women’s movement, and making stronger efforts to harmonize with global campaigns such as the MDGs;
- increasing accountability and commitment of actors from all groups;
- improving the sharing of knowledge, information and good practices, particularly related to violence, quality and poverty/inequality;
- the hardest-to-reach and poorest girls, and especially the issue of power in sustaining or eliminating levels of marginalization; and
- the need to build capacity, especially in research and reporting mechanisms.

The E4 conference made it abundantly clear that the achievement of gender equality in education rests on effective partnerships among all stakeholders involved. The challenge now is to harness the momentum at the global, national and local levels and channel it towards the achievement of quality of education for all children.
Dakar Declaration on Accelerating Girls’ Education and Gender Equality

We the participants of the United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative global conference ‘Engendering Empowerment: Education and Equality’, assembled in Dakar in May 2010, call for urgent action in support of girls’ rights to education, gender equality and empowerment opportunities.

The rights of girls and women are guaranteed by the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women, the Convention against Discrimination in Education and the Beijing Platform for Action.

In Jomtien in 1990, we established the Education for All Framework; in Dakar in 2000, we strongly endorsed the need for targets for education, especially for girls.

Since then, there has been considerable progress: about 22 million more girls enrolled in primary schools from 1999 to 2007, and gender gaps in primary school enrolments have narrowed in many countries.

Despite the progress that has been made, poor quality of education, extreme poverty, structural inequality and violence against girls continue to jeopardize the achievement of the education- and gender-related Education for All and Millennium Development Goals by 2015.

Powerless and poor girls make up the most disadvantaged group in education. Achieving equity in education will entail putting in place a rights-based empowerment framework that will target the most vulnerable and transform power hierarchies in learning spaces, communities and policy structures in order to give poor and vulnerable girls a voice and ensure that their right to quality education is sustained.

Gender equity is at the centre of transformative, quality education. Attention to the physical, social and academic aspects of multiple learning environments is necessary to enhance opportunities, especially for adolescent girls, and to move beyond basic education. Recognition of teachers as professionals, supported by gender-responsive curricula, is likewise key to ensuring gender equality.

Because poverty is both structural and multidimensional and has differential impacts on girls and women, interventions for girls’ education must cover multiple sectors. Education policies, strategies, plans and budgets must all be gender-responsive.

Gender-based violence remains an obstacle to the full achievement of girls’ rights to education. We call for effective strategies and for enforcement of legislation and policies to ensure safe and secure learning environments for girls. Protective and innovative learning opportunities must also be created for children and young women affected by HIV and AIDS and for those in armed conflict and emergency situations.

We envision a world in which a special initiative for girls’ education is no longer needed – a world in which all girls and boys are empowered through quality education to realize their full potential and contribute to transforming their societies, so that gender equality becomes a reality.

Dakar, Senegal, 20 May 2010
E4 conference: Introduction and background

The Education for All (EFA) flagship for girls' education, the United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI) is a partnership that includes the United Nations system, governments, donor countries, NGOs, civil society and the private sector, as well as communities and families, and works at global, regional and country levels. UNGEI’s goal is to narrow the gender gap in primary and secondary education and to ensure that all children complete primary schooling, with girls and boys having equal access to all levels of education. In conjunction with the 10th anniversary of the partnership, launched by former United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan at the World Education Forum in Dakar in 2000, UNGEI held a global conference on ‘Engendering Empowerment: Education and Equality’ (E4) during 12 April–20 May 2010. The conference consisted of an electronic discussion held online between April and May 2010 and a face-to-face meeting in Dakar from 17 to 20 May 2010. This report provides a summary account of the deliberations of the e-discussion as well as the Dakar conference, and is collectively referred to as the “E4 conferences report”.

The overarching goal of the E4 conference was to harness the power of partnerships to improve girls’ access to quality education globally and address the gender inequalities that prevent initiatives from reaching their full potential to transform societies. To this end, the Dakar conference brought together diverse stakeholders – activists and practitioners on the ground, national and international policymakers, and researchers in order to:

1. recommit to the acceleration of gender equity related actions agreed to at the 2000 World Education Forum in Dakar; and
2. deepen public-policy advocacy and debate on girls’ education in order to accelerate action towards the attainment of MDGs 2 and 3 and inform a broader understanding of gender equity, girls’ education and the strategic actions necessary to support this.

The E4 conference came at a critical time, when much was at stake. As noted in the EFA Global Monitoring Report 2010: Reaching the marginalized, which was published by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), “On current trends, some 56 million children [over half of whom would be girls] could still be out of school in 2015. Changing this scenario will require a far stronger commitment by governments to reach girls and marginalized groups.” Had prior EFA targets related to gender and education been met by the original deadlines of 2000 and 2005, global development efforts would have received a tremendous boost – and progress on the attainment of the MDGs related to survival and poverty reduction would be much more easily within reach. Current discussions concerning aid for education and the reform of the EFA Fast Track Initiative, together with the calls for a global education fund and more ambitious global initiatives for education, highlight the urgency for making a stronger case for education and for increasing efforts to maintain it high on the international development agenda.

The E4 conference was organized by UNGEI at the behest of the UNGEI Global Advisory Committee (GAC). GAC members believed that the 10th anniversary of the partnership should be utilized to draw attention to the challenges relating to girls’ education and encourage partnerships that will promote girls’ access to quality education. The UNGEI secretariat then entered into collaboration with the Beyond Access project, coordinated by the Institute of Education at the University of London, to organize the conference. Beyond Access is a project that brings together a wide network of practitioners, policymakers and academics working in many different contexts to explore critical issues that affect the achievement of gender equality in education.¹ This collaboration facilitated

¹ Beyond Access was set up in 2003 by Oxfam Great Britain, the Institute of Education at the University of London and the UK Department for International Development. The project aims to contribute to achieving
UNGEI to leverage the latest academic and scholarly perspectives on gender equality in education, a range of links with practitioners and local organizations and the institutional knowledge, networks and technical expertise of UNGEI to the benefit of the electronic and Dakar conferences.

Specifically, a situation analysis, entitled ‘Partnership, Participation and Power for Gender Equality in Education’ and commissioned by UNGEI in February 2010, reviewed the achievements since the World Education Forum in 2000 and the challenges that remain for gender equality in education. The document provided the analytical backdrop for the E4 conference and reiterated that while many countries have achieved significant achievements in gender parity in enrolment and attendance and in expanding access to schooling, challenges still remain. Improvements in enrolments need to be viewed in the context of intersecting inequalities associated with wealth, rural life or membership in a particular social group, which have been shown, among others, to affect girls in particular.

Further, the analysis reiterated that greater attention should be given to the impact of violence against girls on their education and stressed the challenge of understanding the complexity of gendered power in local settings as well as the educational conditions that can support change and provide quality schooling. The analysis also paid special attention to the role of partnerships in promoting girls’ education and indicated ways in which “inadequate attention to inequalities in power, and obstacles to participation, have meant the important partnerships established cannot yet fully reach their potential without additional mobilization of analysis and action.”

Against this larger background, E4 brought together a vibrant mix of scholars, practitioners, government representatives and development partners to deepen the understanding of policies and practices in education that can support gender equality and the empowerment of women. Participants examined ways to transform the global partnership to accelerate the achievement of the gender- and education-related MDGs by their target date of 2015. They also addressed the major barriers to gender equality related to education, as well as the keys to girls’ empowerment. In particular, the E4 workshop participants engaged with the three main sub-themes:

- conceptualizing schooling beyond formal access or enrolment;
- addressing gender-based violence in and near schools; and
- examining the roles of poverty and intersecting inequalities and their impact on schooling.

In addition, a number of current cross-cutting issues were identified for discussion with reference to their impact on girls’ education, including:

- the intersections of health and education;
- the effects of HIV and AIDS;
- the significance of nutrition for learning; and
- the effects of climate change.

**E4 conference: Expected outcomes and outputs**

The E4 initiative was launched to bring together activists, practitioners, policymakers and scholars to build a common knowledge base from which to tackle the above issues, with the explicit goal of strengthening and expanding partnerships for girls’ education.

---

MDG 2 – universal primary education – and MDG 3 – gender equality and the empowerment of women – by generating and critically examining knowledge and practice regarding gender equality and education.

2 The full text of the document may be accessed from the conference website, <www.e4conference.org>.
Expected outcomes
1. Participants will share a common understanding of the principal barriers to girls’ equal access to quality education and to accelerating robust strategies to overcome them.
2. Country-specific action plans on gender equity and education will inform a global research and action agenda for eradicating poverty and violence, and for promoting quality education.
3. Participants will identify means to research, document, disseminate and advocate good practices relevant to girls’ education and equal access to quality education.
4. Participants will identify partnerships at the country level and means to strengthen them, including communication strategies, action plans and capacity building.

Expected outputs
1. Feedback on papers written for the conference that will serve as the basis for their revision and eventual publication through various channels in order to disseminate the content of the conference to a wider audience;
2. Outlines of country-specific action plans to convene relevant actors in order to formalize a girls’ education partnership or – where a formal partnership exists – to present a brief on the conference and action plan outline;
3. Commitment by each country delegation to finalize a country-level action plan leading up to 2015 and to report back to UNGEI through the UNICEF country office at the end of 2010;
4. South-South and North-South research and practice networks and partnerships identified for follow-up;
5. UNGEI Dakar Declaration that calls on political leaders, policymakers, education practitioners and communities to make a concerted effort in the next five years to reach every girl, and provide a school experience that is not simply nominal enrolment but offers the possibility of empowerment. The declaration will identify areas of strategic engagement to help make this happen.

E4 conference: Structure

The E4conference featured a participatory and collaborative methodology oriented towards transformative action, which sought to break from traditional formats and encourage interaction, dialogue and new forms of engagement between the diverse set of participants. As indicated above, the conference consisted of two distinct, yet related, activities:

1. Electronic discussion held online between April and May 2010; and
2. Follow-up workshop in Dakar from 17 to 20 May 2010.

The e-conference was designed to galvanize public debate among as wide a population as possible: academics, practitioners and policymakers from diverse geographic regions; and also to generate input into the conference in Dakar as well as output into one specific framework, the Dakar Declaration. The e-conference was held on a specially constructed website established for the E4 conferences between 12 April and 14 May 2010. It was structured into four themed weeks:

- Week 1: ‘Poverty, Intersecting Inequalities and Girls’ Rights to Education’
- Week 2: ‘Quality Education and Gender Equality’
• Week 3: ‘Breaking the Silence: Contesting violence and promoting girls’ education’
• Week 4: ‘Connecting Social Policy: Climate change, health, AIDS and girls’ education’

In Week 5, the final week of the e-conference, thematic discussions were drawn together to reinforce linkages across issues framing girls’ education. Participants contributed ideas towards the Dakar Declaration on girls’ education and gender equality. The conference moderators were able to take these ideas directly to the discussions in Dakar. Internet-based interactive software was used to broadcast the keynote presentations and to enable participants who were listening to the live transmission to ask questions.

The Government of Senegal hosted the in-person conference in Dakar, which took place on 17–20 May 2010. In keeping with the e-discussion, the Dakar conference was divided into three inter-related streams – poverty, violence and quality education – which examined key opportunities to strengthen partnerships working to achieve gender equality through education. The format of the conference combined author presentations with structured discussions in participatory working-group sessions organized around each of the three streams. Each stream comprised a plenary and five working-group sessions, designed to encourage participants to consider existing situations and problems, as well as discuss potential solutions, particularly in terms of how deeper forms of participation could be generated (see Box 1).

To bring into sharper focus the overarching theme of partnerships, a special partnership forum was held. The forum brought together bilateral and multilateral donors, foundations, private sector partners and multiple agencies to dialogue on effective and viable partnerships for girls’ education. In addition, two sessions were allocated for delegates to meet in their national groupings to discuss the formation of country action plans. The documentary film, To Educate a Girl, commissioned by UNGEI, was also premiered at the conference.

To optimize the possibilities for discussion in the conference, the number of conference participants at Dakar was limited to 200 people. The UNGEI Global Advisory Committee (GAC) attended the conference, and GAC members performed key roles such as chairing plenaries and contributing to the facilitation of the working-group sessions. For a full list of delegations and conference participants, see Appendices 5 and 6.

In terms of papers, 23 papers were prepared for the Dakar conference, which were either commissioned directly or chosen from among the approximately 70 papers submitted as a result of an open call. In line with the overall end of fostering partnerships, organizers requested that proposed papers be developed through collaborations, such as campaigning alliances, partnerships between policymakers and practitioners/activists, academics working collaboratively in the global south, or south-north, and collaborations between academics and policymakers/practitioners/activists. Commissioned papers and papers from the open call were requested to be in either French or English (with a balance actively sought) and all selected paper abstracts were made available in both languages.
Report structure

The introductory section of this report has outlined the aims and structure of the two components of the E4 conference. In the remaining sections, the report attempts to provide a synthesis of key points from the thematic discussions as they played out in the e-discussion as well as the Dakar conference. The next section focuses on the summary of the main points and discussions by week relating to the e-discussion are articulated. The concluding section then summarizes the discussion that took place during the Dakar conference concerning each of the thematic streams, and reflects on some of the core themes. This is followed by a conclusion, which summarizes the agenda that emerged from E4 for UNGEI and its partners.

Detailed documentation relating to the E4 conference is available on the website, <www.e4conference.org>.
**Electronic discussion: A summary**

An exciting feature of the E4 conference was the use of the Internet to expand access to discussion. An online conference took place from 12 April to 14 May 2010 as part of the build-up to the Dakar conference. Five weeks of in-depth discussions on the E4 website opened up participation in E4 well beyond the 200 delegates who could be accommodated at Dakar. The e-forum allowed for additional high-quality contributions, with valuable insights, experiences and ideas given a public platform. The format allowed for exchanges free from the constraints of limited speaking opportunity and time.

During the e-conference, 16 teams and individuals presented their work and more than 80 participants contributed at least once in the discussion forums, generating a total of more than 25,000 words of text – an indicator of the depth of the discussion. The discussion was fully public, using current web technology to remove as many barriers as possible. While active e-conference participants represented about 5 percent of all visitors to the e-conference web pages, every day between 100 and 300 people engaged in the contributions.

Overall, more than 2,800 people from 140 countries visited the E4 web pages, most of them multiple times to follow the progress of the discussion, exemplifying the level of worldwide interest. The Western Africa, Southern Asia and Eastern Africa regions were particularly prominent among visitors to the web pages. The top 10 contributing countries outside the United Kingdom and the United States were Burkina Faso, Canada, France, India, Kenya, Israel, Peru, Senegal, South Africa and United Republic of Tanzania.

**Week 1: ‘Poverty, Intersecting Inequalities and Girls’ Rights to Education’**

**What are the links between poverty, social division and discrimination against girls with regard to schooling in contexts you know well?**

- Two of the people who commented drew on examples from Nigeria and the Sudan; both highlighted interlinked sites in which poverty and social division generate discrimination against girls.

- In the Nigerian context, where education is still “far from being free,” families view girls education as a “double loss,” both because of the opportunity cost and the cost of schooling, while income-generating activities also affect participation in school. Also mentioned were findings from an ActionAid project in Nigeria, which showed that girls' education is viewed as a “waste of resources.” This is linked to negative stereotypes that view women as subaltern and education as a negative influence towards achieving the prescribed role of a submissive wife, in a society where marriages are often contracted as early as 10 years old.

- The positive impact of mothers' education in determining whether children are sent to school was highlighted, and it was suggested that African governments should put more resources into women’s literacy programmes, particularly in rural areas. Another person who commented suggested that microcredit schemes could be given on the condition that children from the family of the recipient are sent to school.

- Elaine Unterhalter, from the Institute of Education at the University of London, also highlighted that government policies (e.g., a lack of free education, or high costs for basic...
food) exacerbate the tensions on poor families, forcing them to choose between boys' and girls' futures. The comments point to the importance of working on particular policies – free education, possible subsidies for basic foods, and improving teaching and learning in the poorest communities – so that poverty and social division do not limit girls' opportunities and force poor families to make tragic choices.

**What avenues exist to hear the voices of poor girls with regard to schooling and what actions result?**

- Many of the comments discussed the importance of empowering children themselves, either through the participation of children’s organizations, such as committees, youth parliaments and clubs, or as representatives in school management committees. Many positive results of this empowerment were discussed, particularly in relation to ways of challenging gender-based violence in schools, opening discussion about HIV and AIDS, or creating additional school feeding programmes. In one of the examples given, a girls' club was able to campaign for and receive an additional budgetary allocation for girls' education.

**How are partnerships across social sectors working with regard to girls’ rights to schooling?**

- Elaine Unterhalter highlighted that the replies confirmed themes she had seen in research literature. Partnerships appear to work on particular projects, like a girls' dormitories initiative in Morocco or a girls’ education summit in Nigeria, but long-term initiatives across social sectors, particularly those that deal with the multidimensionality of poverty and girls’ rights to schooling, are difficult to put in place and sustain.
- The difficulties of partnerships dealing with highly politicized issues, such as violence, were stressed, although some interesting examples of how to overcome them were also given. Partnerships in health might also provide examples of good practice.

**What intergenerational strategies to address gender inequalities in education exist in contexts you know well and what do evaluations show?**

- As stated above, literacy programmes for mothers were highlighted as having very positive results, empowering women to be involved in school management committees and further support girls’ education.

**What advocacy for girls' rights in education is taking place and with what outcomes?**

- The impact of international conventions for human rights was cited as a useful framework for identifying where obstacles and violations occur, as well as rights holders and duty bearers, which can give solid ground for action to demand remedies and accountability. The success of using rights to fight for education for Roma children or against the discrimination of girls of Haitian descent in the Dominican Republic were highlighted as good examples.
- The limitations of laws were also highlighted through an example from India, where compulsory elementary education must be supported with incentives for poorer households.

**What more could be done to enhance policy and practice?**

- One of the key points emanating from the comments was that a more holistic understanding of the barriers to girls' education must be reached, so that more work at the community level can take place and more deliberative approaches can be used. A good example was given of the multiple intersecting causes affecting education attainment and conversion in the slums in Kampala.
Week 2: ‘Quality Education and Gender Equality’

In what different ways do policymakers, teachers and learners link quality education with gender equality?

– The discussion highlighted that to achieve real change and quality education for girls, with gender equality as a priority, the work of policymakers must be contextualized within the community, taking into account the expectations and aspirations of parents themselves for their own daughters. It was suggested that the key to success is ownership, and understanding at the local level, of education programmes and schools, particularly through a meaningful engagement of girls themselves. This can be a slow process, but is not instructive to think in terms of quick fixes for entrenched views; there is no ‘silver bullet’ for equality.

– Another discussant, while agreeing that work should be holistic and integrated, suggested that it was also necessary to work with power brokers to tackle the underlying gender discrimination that keeps girls’ education undervalued. There is a need to work with management structures to combat negative gender stereotyping, as well as with local and national governments to ensure that appropriate curricula, services, resources and commitments for girls’ rights and gender equality at the national level are implemented and upheld.

What methods are helpful in overcoming different perceptions about the problems for girls?

– The discussion highlighted that there is still a lack of differentiation in some nationwide education policies, and that it is still necessary to target the needs of adolescent girls in particular. The fact that in Ghana, pregnancy accounted for 70 percent of junior secondary-school dropouts between 1997 and 2002 highlights the importance of policies that focus specifically on the needs of girls.

What new methods and approaches are proving useful for understanding gendered issues and problems in the classroom?

– The discussion stressed that continued support was needed for teacher training on gender equality, as well as for ensuring gender parity of teachers, even though this is not a ‘new method’. Female role models and sensitivity to gender issues are known to have a positive impact on girls’ enrolment, retention and achievement within school, as well as positive overall outcomes for attendance.

– As in other discussions, the need to increase the consciousness of whole communities and families about issues such as sexual harassment was highlighted as being a very important aspect of the resolution of gendered problems.

How do teachers see their role in terms of promoting gender equality?

– The discussion (in French) focused on the role of teachers as not just imparting lessons, but as being part of social formation and transformation, aiming to contribute to an equal society.

What kind of training do teachers receive – or should receive – to help combat the fact that gender inequalities experienced in schools are symptomatic of wider social inequalities?
One of the discussants highlighted the focus of the keynote address on the fact that schools and classrooms do not exist in vacuums, but are embedded in wider environments of social and gender relations and historical contexts. Teacher training offers a space to discuss the attitudes and values of future teachers, and could focus on inclusive pedagogical approaches and safe learning environments, as well as challenging gender stereotypes and bias in curricula.

One of the discussants also suggested that gender codes of conducts could be developed and introduced to teachers during training, to ensure that teachers are aware of their own gendered power and responsibilities.

Another discussant was less convinced about the effectiveness of teacher training, but did highlight the impact that a teacher’s own expectations will have on results. Sheila Aikman also stressed that teacher training curricula should place emphasis on developing the individuals’ capabilities rather than being authoritarian or hierarchical.

What are some examples of transformative teachers and training?

An example was given of a child-friendly schools concept in pre-service training, as is being done in Malawi. This helps teachers to find creative ways of addressing girls’ attendance, such as mobilizing the community to fund separate toilets and changing rooms for girls.

The breaking down of stereotypes is also a central aspect of transformative training. One example provided in the discussion was of a camp where girls and boys were treated equally, encouraged to attempt the same tasks that they would not have done at home. A positive moment was seen to be when the boys won the cooking competition!

While many of these examples were inspiring, there are implementation issues in that often training funds are being cut, and inexperienced teachers hired.

Week 3: ‘Breaking the Silence: Contesting violence and promoting girls’ education’

Summary of general comments:

In this strand of the discussion, as with many other aspects of gender and education, the importance of involving the wider community was stressed. This is particularly relevant in politically sensitive issues such as female genital mutilation, where opening a dialogue with mothers and grandmothers is the key to building consensus to address the issue. The importance of a holistic approach and of bringing together a variety of stakeholders was also emphasized in this context, so that civil society can work together with governments to keep laws up to date and talk openly with those most affected by violence. There is a clear need to involve not just duty bearers, or those in power, but the rights holders themselves, so that marginalized voices are heard. Models that allow girls to integrate their experiences, and become part of civil and political society, promote an inclusive and more democratic culture.

The fact that there is an insufficient focus on the empowering qualities of adult education for women who suffer domestic abuse was criticized. Such a focus is necessary both so that women can improve their self-esteem, but also so that their participation in social and national building activities is enhanced.

Can you provide an example of a strong policy framework or legislation that addresses gender-based violence in education? What makes it a good policy? What is lacking? Is it enforceable?
– Some of the discussion here focused on the fact that, in many countries, pregnant girls are forced to drop out of school. One discussant suggested that legal frameworks need to be just, as well as take the best interest of girls into consideration.
– The need for broad measures to support laws by enabling communities to change the view that sexual relationships between teachers and students are normal or justified was also highlighted.

How do you engage teachers and teachers’ unions in combating violence against girls in education? What happens if a teacher has exploited, abused or sexually violated a female student? What policies does the teachers’ union have to address this violation? How can you work together with the union on this important issue?
– The work of the UK government on violence and gender equality was introduced as an example of possible good practice, because it integrates lessons in the personal, social, health and economic curricula of schools.
– It was agreed by some discussants that teachers’ unions were key agents for stopping gender-based violence in schools. Sometimes, however, they can be part of the problem, especially when teachers can protect other teachers who have committed abuse, and/or aim to influence parents of victims to ensure that cases are not being brought to justice.
– Codes of conducts, with specific clear penalties, or locally adapted guidelines for members of unions, can go some way to help with this problem. Targeted training that assists unions in addressing gender dynamics within their own unions can also help.
– In some countries, there are no laws specifying age of sexual consent, which has clear implications for protecting young female students.
– One discussant suggested that in some countries, the teachers’ unions are mostly there to protect the interest of teachers, and that in many communities the parents or community teacher associations can be more influential.

Can you share examples of child participation, particularly of girls at national and international levels? Do you have examples of participation by other actors – parents, teachers, etc.? What was the goal of the activity, and what was the outcome? How do you address issues of protection?
What are the challenges?
– In the United Republic of Tanzania, the NGO Plan International supported a child-led media project that transmitted 26 video magazines on TvT, the national television broadcaster in the country. The project aimed to mitigate harassment of schoolchildren by teachers, parents and other adults. It proved to be an eye-opener for school and local authorities, but especially for the 30,000 individuals reached directly by community screenings. The project aimed to give a voice to children to advocate for their rights in 25 schools, particularly those aspects related to violence. Children are now involved in the decision-making process of some schools and communities. For example, some districts have added more primary teachers to their schools after receiving special requests from children.
– Discussions on this project reflected on the capacity of children to be active participants in advocacy strategies, as well as the difficulties that children must face in voicing their experiences, particularly publicly. In an example given by another discussant, the risks of youth-led advocacy, and therefore the need for adequate support and negotiation, were stressed.

Week 4: ‘Connecting Social Policy: Climate change, health, AIDS and girls’ education’

What are the effects of the HIV and AIDS epidemic on girls’ education?
– Those commenting on this question highlighted (in French) that there are many different levels on which the stigma and effects of AIDS operate, and that one of the biggest concerns
is the ever-rising numbers of people suffering from HIV and AIDS. There are immediate effects on the health of the family, both in terms of possibly carrying the infection, but also in terms of nutrition, since one or both parents is no longer able to work. Girls tend to carry the greater burden of care; some are even driven to prostitution to generate money for food.

In what ways has climate change impacted girls’ lives and their participation and success in education?

– One discussant noted that “climate change is no different than other structural factors that affect social equity and development issues”. The view that the survival of the family often falls on the shoulders of girls was supported by other discussants in both French and English.

– With unpredictable rainy seasons, girls are often pulled from school to help with erratic harvests, or to help with other labour if crops fail. Fetching water is also often a gendered activity, which negatively impacts girls’ attendance if they are forced to travel farther. As in other discussions, comments in both French and English discussed the preferences of many families for educating sons, which becomes particularly relevant in times of hardship, when already-existent inequities are accentuated.

– The experience of NGOs such as Plan International has been that decentralized support, such as through village development committees, is a critical flexible response mechanism in situations of political or climate-related instability. Ensuring girls’ participation in the decisions that impact climate change was also been stressed.

What kinds of interventions are needed to successfully intervene against the negative impacts of HIV and AIDS, as well as of climate change, on gender equality in education, and particularly on girls’ education?

– The discussion highlighted that there are still too many barriers to girls getting the health care and protection that they need.

– One suggestion was to strengthen and promote centres for sexual and reproductive health, which could provide adolescent-friendly information, and other services such as counselling or confidential testing. The need to have properly enforced comprehensive and ubiquitous child-protection policies so that teachers are unable to sexually exploit vulnerable female students is also pressing.

Dakar conference report

This section presents a summary of the discussions at the Dakar conference, comprising the plenary sessions, the working-group sessions in each of the three themes (poverty, quality and violence), the keynote speeches in the opening and closing ceremonies, and the partnership forum.

Opening events and ceremony

The opening ceremony was moderated by international journalist and broadcaster, Femi Oke. Senegal’s Minister of Preschool, Primary and Lower Secondary Education and National Languages, Kalidou Diallo, delivered the opening remarks. He stated that Senegal was honoured to host the conference, and noted that the country has taken strides in girls’ education since 2000, such as the achievement of gender parity in primary enrolments with the assistance of UNGEI. Despite progress, however, he said that many inequalities remained, in response to which Senegal launched a programme in 2007 to monitor gender equality in all levels of education.
The next speaker was Graça Machel, activist and former Minister of Education of Mozambique, who gave a presentation by video. She celebrated the huge advances made since the World Conference on Education for All in 1990, held in Jomtien (Thailand), which called for the universalization of basic education in all countries, but reminded participants that many girls around the world still remain out of school. Reflecting that “the last mile can be the hardest,” she advised participants that to reach the remaining girls, it may be necessary to tailor specific solutions for each constraining situation that holds girls back from attaining quality education.

Ann Therese Ndong-Jatta, Director of the UNESCO Regional Bureau for Education in Africa, hailed the successes achieved by both UNGEI and the Forum for African Women Educationalists, particularly related to access to education. She identified one outstanding lesson of the last 10 years: that with the right level of commitment from governments, civil society and other organizations, gender equality is achievable. While noting that many countries had achieved major progress in access to education, she stressed that there has been stagnation and, in some cases, even reversals in terms of quality. As a result, it is now more important than ever to pay attention to outcomes, not just in terms of gains to the community but in terms of the services and resources available to women themselves, such as how many women get top jobs and how many go on to higher education. She concluded by calling for a “new humanism,” where men and women join together to eliminate injustices.

The acclaimed Senegalese singer, Coumba Gawlo, described how girls’ education was central to her work as an ambassador against poverty and, through her own organization, Light for a Child, helps girls enrol in school. Ms. Gawlo called for a strong commitment from governments to help African girls to become empowered.

Anthony Lake, Executive Director of UNICEF, thanked the Government of Senegal for making education a policy priority, and noted advances in girls’ education in Senegal since 2000 as proof that progress can be achieved. He noted, however, that at the current pace, many of the world’s poorest children will still not be in school by 2015, and stressed that the global economic crisis is likely to worsen this trend. Mr. Lake said that it is morally reprehensible to ignore the right to education of these hardest-to-reach children. Moreover, he observed that girls’ education is a key opportunity to produce a more equitable society through a ripple effect: educated women are more able to protect themselves, e.g., against HIV and AIDS, sexual harassment and the dangers of childbirth. Strategies such as free education, re-entry into the education system for young mothers and interventions to reduce violence in schools have increased the number of girls in schools. Despite this, a broader agenda is required because gender equality in education alone does not necessarily lead to women’s empowerment and gender equality in wider society. He urged the conference participants to explore these issues further.

Following this address, a video message from Her Majesty Queen Rania Al-Abdullah of Jordan, Honorary Global Chairperson of UNGEI, was shown. The message is part of the trailer for the documentary film, To Educate a Girl. Queen Rania underlined that girls are more likely to be affected by poverty and disease than boys, but noted that due to the efforts of UNGEI, many more girls are likely to receive a quality education.

The Prime Minister of Senegal, Souleymane Ndéné Ndiaye, delivered the closing remarks. He observed that governments and international organizations have unstintingly worked towards the goals identified 10 years ago. But despite the significant budgetary commitment made by the Government of Senegal, gender disparities continue to persist. The Prime Minister noted that the three themes of the conference – quality, violence and poverty – are particularly relevant, and also observed that the basic truth is that societies must ensure that girls and women are actively engaged
in economic and social life for the country, but this cannot be done without the provision of equitable education. He outlined that Senegal had responded to this challenge by setting up a national framework for gender equity and adopting pertinent legislation. In addition, 11 November has been dedicated as a national day for girls and is celebrated throughout the country. He concluded with a vibrant appeal to the international community to increase mobilization to support girls’ education.

**Overview of thematic discussions**

1) Poverty stream

**Plenary**

The plenary for the poverty stream was chaired by David Wiking, co-chair of the UNGEI GAC and SIDA Team Director for Knowledge, Education and ICT. Cheryl Gregory Faye, Head of the UNGEI secretariat, outlined the process leading up to the conference and described its aims, objectives, outcomes and outputs, explaining that half of the countries with UNGEI partnership were present – those either with persistent gender gaps, or those which have made large strides in recent years.

Elizabeth King, Sector Director, Education, Human Development Network, World Bank, described the challenges facing girls’ education, the predominant patterns of gender gaps and how national averages can mask disparities at sub-national levels. Another particular challenge is the transition from primary to secondary school, the stage at which many girls drop out of schools. Ms. King outlined the “virtuous circle” of instrumental and intrinsic benefits to girls’ education, with more equitable education resulting in more economic power, better health and more political power, which in turn improve children’s well-being, affecting poverty reduction in the country and overall prospects for economic growth.

As a means to achieve this, Ms. King highlighted measures taken by countries to overcome barriers to education: increasing the number of schools, improving safety in schools, changing pricing policies and improving the quality of service delivery in education. One example is the private, community-managed schools in Pakistan, built by rural education committees and staffed with a teacher trained and paid for by the Government. In conclusion, Ms. King outlined four areas that are still unaddressed: early childhood development, family support policies to relieve girls of household tasks, labour policies to increase girls’ chances of securing jobs after schooling, and political participation.

Elaine Unterhalter linked the issue of poverty with the themes of the other plenaries – violence and quality. She noted the lack of a universally accepted and representative definition for poverty, and asked the delegates to question how poverty intersects with gender to keep girls out of school or give them negative perception of schooling, and of similar problems regarding violence. Ms. Unterhalter emphasized how talking about poverty can also be a challenge, as there is a lack of language that covers all its dimensions: It is believed that school is essential for the “virtuous circle,” but the content and form of that schooling must constantly be investigated. Finally, she spoke of a “coercive challenge”: girls are most likely to be out of school in conflict areas and gender-based violence may compromise girls’ experiences with school. It is imperative to consider the coercive effects of girls living in poverty.
The floor was then opened up for questions. Several questions and comments centred on the need for more classrooms and scholarships. In response, Ms. King noted that the economic crisis will affect many countries, as well as flows of international aid, which will bring challenges to investment in infrastructure. She recommended that the situation be monitored closely through up-to-date statistics. Other participants questioned whether mitigation interventions were sufficient to bring about change, and whether privatization reinforced gender imbalances, since parents could be more willing to spend fees on boys than on girls. In response, Ms. King stressed that getting women teachers into rural areas was the key to transformation, and that while privatization can exclude girls, abolishing fees can help. Ms. Unterhalter emphasized that it is important to work against schools being the site of educational poverty. Another delegate offered evidence that the EFA Fast Track Initiative is making a significant difference in gender equality, aiming to improve monitoring and pushing forward on a multimillion-dollar programme to support civil society organizations in developing countries.

**Working group: Session 1**

This session reviewed the implications of recent work on poverty, gender and schooling. The first paper in this session was authored by Veerle Dieltiens, Jenni Karlsson, Setungoane Letsatsi, Herbert Makinda, Amy North, Jane Onsongo, Elaine Unterhalter and Chris Yates and was entitled ‘Girls, Gender and Intersecting Inequalities in Education: A reflection from case studies in South Africa and Kenya’. Focusing on the implications of these case studies for gender equality at a global level, the paper outlined that research has revealed that those in the poorest sectors, as well as ethnic minorities and racial groups, are most vulnerable to not attending school. It raised issues about the multidimensionality of poverty and suggests that the concept of intersectionality may be useful in considering the ways in which inequalities form and are formed by each other.

**Angela Melchoire** authored and presented the next paper, ‘The Missing Link: Using the dynamics of human rights advocacy to enhance gender equality in education for girls and women in situations of extreme poverty’. Employing the lens of a human rights advocate, she argued that emphasis on human rights must remain central to work on gender equality in education: the law can be used not just to define violation, but also to influence society and bring about social transformation, as was the case in Nigeria’s recognition of education as a human right.

**Working group: Session 2**

**Alice Akunga** presented the first paper, co-authored with Ian Attfield and entitled ‘Northern Nigeria: Approaches to enrolling girls in school and providing a meaningful education to empower change’. This paper analysed different aspects of the UK Department for International Development education programme in Nigeria. These included the setting up of school-based management committees for community participation, school grants, the involvement of religious leaders, and scholarships to girls from rural areas, where they later return to teach. The paper also asked how we can influence Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers and concluded that power relations and sociocultural reasons account for many of the barriers encountered.

The next paper, by Patricia Ames and Rita Carroll, was ‘Gender, Schooling and Poverty in Peru’. While gender parity in enrolment rates has been achieved in Peru, poverty and emergent issues relating to climate change have created barriers for indigenous girls. Enrolment rates are much lower for indigenous girls than for other girls and they are much less likely to transition to secondary school. As resources become scarcer due to the effects of climate change, and floods occur more frequently, the household burdens on girls increase, threatening their educational participation. During the discussion, a participant from Chad offered an example of an initiative that has
attempted to tackle the issue of climate change. Another pointed out that while the North generates climate change, the South suffers from it, and moreover that multilateral donors may come in with limited-duration programmes that are not sustainable. In addition, an awareness of climate change can put girls into a leadership position so they can promote change. A delegate from Kenya suggested that the challenge of climate change will make us more innovative: rather than blaming, we must look to find solutions.

The next paper was ‘Engendering Rural Eye Care for Access to Education’, and was written by Rajat Chhaba and Ajita Vidyarthi. The paper revealed the hierarchies of power affecting eye care. The findings indicate that in India, women suffer disproportionately from visual problems but are less able to access and afford eye-care services compared to men, affecting their access to education. The paper offers the example of an innovative scheme that trains rural women as vision-care specialists, resulting in improved access to eye care, particularly for women and children, as well as greater empowerment of women and a positive impact on girls’ educational access and school achievement.

The session ended with a role play activity on partnerships, which explored time constraints, budgetary allocations, the difficulties of working with different departments that have different cultures, the lack of capacity and human and material resources, proper communication and commitment. In particular, participants were asked to consider: Who is accountable for how the money is spent?

**Working group: Session 3**

The third session focused on interventions and partnerships in practice, with the intention that during discussions participants would be able to share their experiences.

The first paper was by Aniceta Kiriga, Amy Maglio and Adji Senghor and was entitled ‘Gender Equality in Rural Education: Best practices and lessons learned from Senegal and Kenya’. The paper described a programme in Senegal and Kenya, the Women’s Global Education Project, which has succeeded in getting girls from disadvantaged backgrounds into school through scholarships, as a result of partnerships with local organizations. Problems with retention, however, remained. A closer look at other barriers resulted in a more comprehensive approach, including clubs, examination, medical treatment and mentors in the communities aiming for 360-degree programmes looking at poverty, health, counselling, housing, and joining up every aspect of service provision. This also involved the creation of an alternative rite of passage: keeping girls in school. Following the presentation of the paper, other participants shared their experiences with partnerships, stressing the need to avoid duplication across projects and the importance of good communication with the department or ministry of education. One participant from Yemen offered an example of building up a system of committees as a good model for partnership. Many participants reiterated that community involvement and participation was important for sustainability.

The second paper, by Grace Chisamya, Joan DeJaeghere, Nancy Kendall and Marufa Aziz Khan, was entitled ‘Challenging Gender, Poverty and Inequalities in Schooling through Collaborative, Cross-National Partnerships: Evidence from CARE Bangladesh and CARE Malawi’. Both countries have been successful in achieving or moving towards gender parity in primary enrolments, but this has not necessarily translated into gender equality within the school or in wider society. In response, CARE has designed interventions and an indicator framework that will aim to build awareness between the community and teachers to enhance a gender focus in classrooms and build an enabling environment for girls’ education.
The third paper was on ‘Poverty, Gender and Education: Participation and knowledge-building in the schools of Porto Alegre, Brazil’, by Luis Armando Gandin and Moira Wilkinson, which explored the role of school governance structures in the reproduction of social inequalities. The study questioned the education being provided for girls and argued that schools themselves need to change in order to promote a more nuanced understanding of what it means to be a girl, thus challenging whose knowledge is in the curriculum and whose knowledge has been silenced. An innovative project in Porto Alegre uses community knowledge as a pedagogical tool and ensures that the school is structured within the community itself. The authors caution, however, that changing structures is only a first step: Although spaces for participation might have been created, it does not mean they will be occupied; e.g., poor women may not participate in school counsels because they do not believe they have the technical language or knowledge to ask questions. Discussion focused around how to broaden female roles in educational structures, rather than, for example, always taking specific roles such as treasurers.

In closing, linkages were made with the discussions in Session 2 about the different ways in which hierarchies of power can manifest themselves. For example, poverty can operate financially, but also by distancing girls, both in terms of geographical remoteness and through social distance. It also operates by making things invisible, which in turn makes it hard to bring the concerns of the poor higher up the administrative structure.

**Working group: Session 4**

The aim of the fourth session was to discuss the connections that can be leveraged to promote change. The group members noted that defining poverty involves confronting inequalities of power, and described the different ways in which poverty can prevent girls from attending school, as well as how it can negatively affect their ability to participate if they do attend school. Power inequalities can be both visible and invisible – for example, they are invisible when someone silently feels they do not have the right skills or knowledge to put forward their opinion. They may be visible in household relations, but invisible in the ideas, feelings and emotions that women carry their entire lives. There is a need to examine whether current interventions are doing enough to reach the poorest girls, or whether they work on girls’ schooling, but leave other areas of gender and other power inequalities untouched. To what extent have partnerships (e.g., those with trade unions and civil society) thus far taken up the issue of poverty?

There are many challenges to addressing such intersecting inequalities, including time, resources, communication, trust, conflicting priorities and a lack of appropriate data. There has been innovative, cross-sectoral work on violence, but little research and critique has been conducted on poverty, especially in the gathering statistics disaggregated by gender and poverty. Points outlined by participants in the ensuing discussion included that the World Education Forum held in Dakar in 2000 did not address power relations, but that now the focus is on women’s voices and how unequal power relations can be rebalanced, and that schooling is just one arena where this can be realized. A more comprehensive approach is now needed. At the moment, poverty is being sustained because we are not transforming power relations. In addition to gender mainstreaming, there is also a need for sustainable policies, as well as a need to address the ‘culture of silence’ against factors that disempower girls.

Participants also read through the draft declaration and, working in groups on different sections, drew on discussions over the previous sessions to make suggestions for the declaration working group.

**Working group: Session 5**
Alice Akungu presented a summary of the working-group discussions. This covered the importance of defining poverty, the need to confront power inequalities, and strategies to bring about effective change. It also focused on the need for improved data, gender budgeting, staff training and sustainable measures. It is vital to recognize that the poor have a voice, rather than them needing to be given a voice, and to this end, there is a need to identify participatory spaces and opportunities for them to express that voice, and to work with them rather than for them. We need to create participatory spaces to look at and act upon poverty, quality and violence together.

2) Quality stream

Plenary

Gianfranco Rotigliano, UNICEF Regional Director for West and Central Africa, chaired the plenary. He noted that although it has been possible to increase the number of children enrolled in school and reduce the gap between boys and girls attending schools, challenges persist in the provision of quality education.

Albert Motivans, Head of Educational Indicators and Data Analysis at the UNESCO Institute of Statistics, presented a paper on ‘Measuring Education Quality through a Gender Lens: Challenges and opportunities’. He noted that quality education is a complex concept that can be challenging to define at the country level. He outlined the Deprivation and Marginalization in Education (DME) index as a useful tool that measures educational poverty in terms of children who have attended school for less than four years, and said that the tool has revealed that in many countries, it is the girls from the poorest households who are living in education poverty. The data show interesting patterns: disproportionate numbers of girls are out of school; in sub-Saharan Africa, it is more frequent that children of school age do not enter school, while in south and west Asia, children enter schools in higher numbers, but subsequently drop out. To provide high quality, all factors must be considered together in a comprehensive manner (such as the learning environment, teacher training, curricula, out of school support, etc.) and targeted interventions should be employed to reach the most vulnerable girls. Other issues for discussion included are whether there is an illusion of equality in public systems where despite parity of enrolment, there is weak governance or no large-scale policy effort; and that there is need to explore why some poor countries are more successful on gender equality than others.

Codou Diaw, UNGEI GAC member and Executive Director of the Forum for African Women Educationalists (FAWE), offered a number of points in response. First, she noted that while the data showed some encouraging signs, they also reveal that there is little progress in sub-Saharan Africa, and south and west Asia, and that we now need to focus on allowing girls access to higher levels of education. In particular, we need to examine different levels: the micro-level to see what types of girls are in school; the community level to see the impact on ethnic and linguistic minorities; and the country level, including rural and remote areas. Some significant issues to consider are why girls do better in reading rather than maths, why they underperform later on in school despite early potential, the boundaries of education beyond the conventional classroom, and making teachers, communities and administrators more gender sensitive and competent.

When discussion was opened to the floor, a number of participants highlighted the importance of the presence of women teachers, the need for gender training of teachers, the need to invest more specifically in the marginalised; the importance of financial data; and measuring quality in non-formal schooling.
Working group session 1

Sheila Aikman explained that the goal of this working group was to go beyond the concept of parity as defined by ‘gender gaps’, and address the issue of equality in a holistic manner. The group looked at in-school as well as out of school factors to understand quality in its fullest sense, which means not only learning outcomes and achievements, but the value girls place on education and learning opportunities offered to them, and the nature of the educational experience for them.

The first paper, ‘Quality Education for Gender Equality’, by Nitya Rao and Sheila Aikman was presented by Nitya Rao. While noting a great emphasis on gender equality in the Millennium Development Goals and the Education for All campaign, the quality of education has so far been ignored, including factors such as respect for diversity, and the right to actively participate in education. It is therefore important to look at what kinds of materials are delivered to students. Ultimately this is an issue of the processes of participation and decision-making – community involvement has been recognised as crucial in mobilisation, but teachers are often not consulted on textbook design, and parents also need to be engaged in the development of educational materials, even when they are illiterate. In the discussion, participants spoke of factors for raising the quality of education for girls, such as synchronising the resources which governments and parents offer, the need for teachers to be involved in the development of gender sensitive materials, raising parents’ awareness, despite poverty and illiteracy, and the importance of water and separate toilets in schools.

The second paper, ‘Literacy and Gender-Focused School Management in Northern Tanzania and Northern Nigeria’, was authored by Dunstan Kishekya, Rebecca Ingram and Andrew Mamedu. The paper centred on the Transforming Education for Girls in Nigeria and Tanzania project, which is working to retain girls in 132 schools in the two countries. The presentation outlined two analytical tools, developed by researchers working with the project, which were devised to examine the quality of girls’ schooling in the project: (i) school gender profiles, a series of variables that included gender parity in enrolment, retention and progression, and exam success; and (ii) a school gender management profile, including training and information for teachers, pupils and parents on issues such as gender, HIV and AIDS and reproductive health; involvement with political campaigning organizations; outreach activities to help the most disadvantaged families; and the mobilization of students and staff to promote community development. Analysis so far has revealed that in schools with high gender profiles, girls’ voices were better heard in relation to the barriers stopping them from getting a quality education. This reiterated the need to address girls’ education in a holistic manner.

Discussion focused on barriers to improving quality, such as the lack of political commitment to the issue, the resources and incentives given to head teachers and teachers, and the need for policies for early childhood. After the discussion, participants talked in groups about what defined quality to them.

Working group: Session 2

The aim of the second session was to examine hierarchies of power and how these have an impact on the quality of education. The first paper presented was by Ron Watt, on ‘Evidence-Based Practice in Girls’ Education in Cambodia’. The paper was based on the education component of the Highland Communities programme implemented by CARE Cambodia, which aimed to address the educational needs of disadvantaged indigenous children, especially girls, through the establishment of six community bilingual schools. The hypothesis was that ethnic minority children, who receive a
bilingual education in their mother tongue and the national language in early grades, master the national language and mathematics better than ethnic minorities, whose education is in the national language only. The Government of Cambodia is now replicating the model in a number of schools. In the ensuing discussion, participants suggested that this might be a problematic scheme in countries where there are many different languages, and that the strategy may hamper integration. On the other hand, it is positive and empowering to teach children in their mother tongue. Questions were also raised about integrating this approach into national curricula.

The second paper, by Patricia Ames and Rita Carillo, was on ‘Gender, Schooling and Poverty in Peru’. The first part of the paper outlined how poverty affected girls’ enrolments and retention rates in Peru and how climate change exacerbates many of these existing issues. Increasing levels of poverty (e.g., as a result of floods damaging infrastructure and disrupting agricultural production) can put an additional and disproportionate strain on girls, because they may have to work harder to provide for their siblings and families, making schooling a secondary priority. Moreover, if there are health effects, this will also disproportionately affect girls, who may have to take care of family members. Participants discussed how schools are often called on to house displaced people when crises such as flooding occur and that new technologies might be considered as a way to take education closer to affected populations.

The third paper in the session was by Harsh Mandar and Anita Rampal, and was presented by Raka Rashid, UNGEI focal point, UNGEI regional secretariat, South Asia. Entitled ‘Lessons on Food and Hunger: In search of transformative education’. The paper examined food and hunger in relation to children’s access to quality education, using the case of India’s Mid-Day Meal Programme. In India, activists lobbied and took legal action for the government to provide a cooked meal at midday to every child in primary school. The Mid-Day Meal Programme can help mitigate the effect of short-term hunger on immediate learning among children and on quality education in the long run. The model has the potential to be replicated in other countries and provides a good practice example of partnership. Participants reported back on their own experiences, including the need to pay particular attention to the urban poor, and provided examples of using public-private partnerships to run school canteens.

Many participants talked about a need for cross-sectoral partnerships, as also evidenced by all of the papers, which draw in a range of different actors: government, NGOs, parents, communities and the private sector.

**Working group: Session 3**

The aim of this session was to explore types of interventions and partnerships that could be employed to improve the quality of girls’ education. Recapping the previous day’s discussions, Sheila Aikman suggested that quality should be framed in terms of three gears that are interconnected and that must move in tandem:

- **Enabling environment** – both the physical and social environment and how they presented opportunities for girls;
- **Education that is meaningful and relevant**, including looking at teacher education and learning outcomes; and
- **Democratic processes** – What are the forms of school management and community participation, and are girls’ voices heard?

Quality must be maintained through changing contexts, and the dimensions of empowerment that are important to quality girls’ education must be examined fully. In addition, initiatives aimed at
changing boys’ behaviour and actions are very important for girls’ quality education, as gender equality is achieved through strategies that are targeted at both boys and girls.

The first paper presented during this session was by Yanick Douyon, Kether Hayden and Bridget McElroy, and was on ‘Teacher Training: The superhighway to gender equity in Senegal’. The paper examined the role that in-service teacher training for secondary schoolteacher’s plays in creating a gender-responsive educational system in Senegal. The study observed that the gender-equity dialogue is currently limited in teacher training. Since 1992, teacher training has not been mandatory and many teachers are hired straight out of university. The study found that the remaining teacher training programmes were jeopardized by limited budgets, poor road systems and a lack of transportation. Teachers themselves, however, asserted that they needed more gender training and that there were high levels of inappropriate teacher-student relationships. Recommendations included that adequate funding should be secured for the purpose; there should be collaboration with local actors to implement gender-sensitive trainings; and there should be incentives for new teachers and engagement with men as change agents.

In the ensuing discussion, representatives from the Senegalese Ministry of Education challenged some of the findings, and emphasized that there was a gender bureau in the Ministry of Education. In addition, the representatives said that gender training manuals existed for teachers and that work was being done by the Government of Senegal to raise awareness among teachers.

The second paper, by Dora Amoah Bentil, Wendwosen Kebede, Polly Kirby and Purna Kumar Shrestha, was on ‘Working in Partnership to Address Gender Inequality in Education: Lessons from VSO Ghana and VSO Ethiopia’. The paper, presented by Dora Amoah Bentil, offered an example of good practice in partnership and reported on how consulting with children, parents, teachers, head teachers, teacher training institutions and local education authorities in the planning, implementation and evaluation of education programmes is crucial in achieving gender equality in education. Specific outputs of VSO’s efforts from Ethiopia included 10,000 teachers who benefited from 50 hours of service training on gender issues, 37 schools that received separate toilets and small changing rooms for girls, and girls who received extra tuition to help their academic performance. The partnership provided evidence that quality teaching encourages parents to send their children to school, female teachers can act as role models, improved learning environments help to retain girls in schools, and leadership trainings are effective.

In the ensuing group work, participants discussed successes and challenges they had experienced in partnerships for quality.

**Working group: Session 4**

The aim of this session was to explore possible processes and strategies for change, drawing on the work of the previous session, and also to review the draft declaration. Four points were identified as the main themes of the stream’s work:

- Gender equality is at the heart of all dimensions of quality education.
- Quality education that is gender equitable is empowering and transforming.
- Gender equality in quality education is about process as much as outcomes.
- Partnerships must involve effective participation and decision-making by women and girls as well as men and boys.

The discussions in the previous session had identified four key areas central to the provision of quality education:

- teachers and teacher training (in-service and pre-service, locally recruited teachers);
• curricula (textbooks, life skills, language and culture);
• local school environment (child-friendly schools, school clusters, and parent and teacher associations); and
• education institution environment (organizational structure, gender units and gender budgets).

In the ensuing group work, each group focused on one key area, and discussed a strategy that would deliver quality education. Participants also discussed how such a strategy could empower girls and change the status quo, and what partnerships are required to implement such a strategy.

In the second part of the session, discussion turned to the draft declaration, and covered a range of points that participants felt should be taken into account in the formulation of the declaration.

**Working group: Session 5**

The final working group session was devoted to developing the report for the closing plenary session. Two sections were outlined: an overview and a description of the strategies identified as integral to quality education.

The principal strategies covered were: gender equality must be at the heart of all dimensions of quality education, and should not be viewed as an add-on, and education should be empowering and transformative and needs to focus on processes as well as outcomes. Teachers should have a gender-responsive career development programme, with an emphasis on the recruitment of local teachers and with equal numbers of male and female teachers. They should acquire the skills to use a gender-responsive pedagogy, with skills development possibly using information and communication technologies. The local and national curriculum should be reviewed to ensure that it is relevant, gender responsive and inclusive of all the learning needs of disadvantaged girls and boys. The local school environment requires a multi-pronged strategy, which engages national policy with school practice. In addition, educational institution environments can be strengthened by advocating to decision-makers to strengthen existing structures and procedures in favour of a quality education for girls.

The report was presented to the closing plenary by Codou Diaw.

3) **Violence stream**

**Plenary**

The Plenary on Violence was chaired by Sally Gear, DFID, who described violence as the issue which is perhaps the most challenging to address within girls’ and women’s education. Cynthia Lloyd, consultant and Senior Associate at the Population Council, made a presentation which drew on recent reports on schooling in Darfur. She stated that girls have the same educational requirements everywhere: (i) complete educational access (ii) a girl-friendly learning environment (iii) compensatory support to overcome past discrimination. However conflict can often exacerbate already adverse conditions that girls face in claiming an education. Darfur provides a stark illustration: non-availability of non-formal education options for primary school-aged children; among the IDP communities sampled in West Darfur, only 36% and 65% of the primary schools were single sex in West and North Darfur, respectively; and no secondary schools located inside the sample communities even when the communities were very populous. She emphatically concluded that the main difference between Darfur and other geographical contexts was not their educational
requirements, but rather the extra challenge of meeting those requirements in conflict-affected settings.

**Safa El-Kogali**, from the Population Council (West Asia and North Africa Region), used qualitative data from Darfur to report on a research project that investigated the protective role of schools. Schools can offer physical protection for girls, both from physical attacks and sexual assaults, as well as protection from early marriage. It can also teach children about safety, both from HIV and AIDS, and about issues such as landmines. Moreover, schools provide psychosocial support. In these ways, education in conflict settings can constitute both relief as well as development.

This was followed by a presentation from **Susan Shepler**, from the American University, Washington, D.C. Ms. Shepler reported on research from a teacher training project for refugee women in West Africa provided by the International Red Cross. The project explored whether refugee female teachers continue to use their skills after repatriation, which would also contribute to the reconstruction of post-conflict countries. Approximately half of the teachers were still teaching, and they said they enjoyed their work and were empowered by their training. Those who had not continued to teach spoke of sexual harassment as a reason for not continuing. There were also lower employment rates for female teachers despite the fact that many had higher levels of training.

The final presentation was by **Martha Laverde**, Senior Education Specialist at the World Bank. Ms. Laverde spoke of the impact on girls of violence – including armed conflict and other forms – in her native Colombia. The direct support that has been offered to girls and women can be seen to focus on empowerment in three ways: personal empowerment (recognition of the body and how it is constructed), social empowerment (emotional and communicational competence through dance and sport) and economic empowerment (flexible education increasing employability). These efforts have also been supported by a communication strategy to encourage community support, such as road signs that say, ‘Stop! Machismo kills!’ She also spoke of the importance of a supportive legal and political framework, reliable data and monitoring and evaluation to address the gendered nature of violence in societies.

During the discussion, participants called for more political support to address violence against girls and women, as well as the central role of psychosocial support and teacher training in mitigating the impact of violence. Informal schooling was highlighted as a particularly effective stepping point for post-conflict situations, and participants stressed that more attention is required regarding the role of education on peace-building.

In conclusion, **Akansksa Marphatia** identified cross-cutting issues across the three conference themes. She called for explicit attention to the four elements that drive inequalities between the genders: power, justice, rights and silence. She called for recognition that regardless of definitions, violence against women is a universal occurrence, but that rights against violence are also universal. Genuine participation and voice from women can only come about through changing the existing structures – particularly economic structures – in order to bring about equitable gender relations both within schools and in the wider community.

**Working group: Session 1**

**Fatuma Chege** and **Jenny Parkes** presented ‘Girls’ Education and Violence: Reflections on the first decade of the twenty-first century’. Three key areas emerged from the paper: (i) work that has highlighted the prevalence of sexual violence against girls in school; (ii) studies that challenge the notion of schools as safe havens, both in terms of sexual violence and also in terms of corporal punishment, bullying, armed conflict and social upheaval; and (iii) research into the frequency of incidents and breaking silences and taboos.
The paper also stressed, however, that there are also gaps in knowledge. ‘Everyday’ inequalities and violence may be missed, as the focus is only on extreme actions. Similarly, little is known about homosexuality and boys’ experiences of sexual violence. The connections between policy and school-level processes are weak with regard to violence. When we think about how to combat violence, it may be helpful to consider: (i) the underlying gender power relations; (ii) the possibility of dismantling barriers through participation; and (iii) building partnerships to combat violence.

During the discussion, participants talked about the elusiveness of a working definition for violence, which takes into account the different perspectives across cultures. Participants felt that research evaluations of successful interventions have so far been weak and it is currently easier to identify programmes that have not succeeded. The importance of links between researchers and academics, and between practitioners and government agencies, was emphasized – with the E4 conference being one example.

The second paper presented was authored by Laetitia Antonowicz, Vanya Berrouet, Stefanie Conrad, Catherine Flagothier, Victorine Kemonou Djitrinou, Soumahoro Gbato, Joachim Theis and Yumiko Yokozeki and was entitled ‘Too Often in Silence: A report on gender-based violence in schools in West and Central Africa’. The study found that violence in schools tends to occur when the weakness of the school intersects with the broader sociocultural context, because school is first and foremost a social space in which dominant power relations and discriminatory practices are reproduced.

In the ensuing discussion, participants spoke of how violence also occurs outside of school walls, which is particularly pertinent for out-of-school children and those who travel long distances to schools. The community has an important role to play in addressing violence out of school, but schools can also educate children about how to deal with violence. Initiatives that so far have proved to be effective are those which focus on developing children’s capacities to deal with violence, such as children’s clubs that work with communities. There was also discussion of which factors enable violence to exist and continue, such as lack of social understanding, a cycle of silence and traditional cultural practices. The task of changing masculinities is also critical, and involving boys, men and teachers in reducing violence and ‘victim-friendly’ reporting mechanisms can be effective.

The session concluded with a group exercise in which participants discussed specific policies and practices where different interpretations of ‘violence’ have made the delivery of gender, equality and education problematic.

Working group: Session 2

The objective of the second working-group session was to hear research findings on challenges associated with hierarchies of power, and reflect on the effects of climate change and aspects of health and hunger. Seema Vyas began the session by presenting a paper entitled ‘Contested Development? Women’s economic empowerment and intimate partner violence in urban and rural Tanzania’, which she authored with Jessie Mbwambo and Charlotte Watts. The paper explored the relationship between levels of domestic violence and status within households in two Tanzanian settings, focusing on educational attainment, employment status and access to income. High levels of violence against women were reported overall, with some evidence of correlation with lower levels of poverty. The relationship with education levels was not straightforward, although women with higher levels of education than their husbands were more likely to experience violence. Access to income did not appear to be related to the risk of partner violence: Women who do not work perhaps risk experiencing violence if having to ask for resources, and women who do work risk perhaps being mistrusted by their partners.
The next presentation was by Madeleine Arnot, jointly authored with Georgina Oduro and titled ‘Gender Security, Gendered Violence and Social Justice: The rights of protection through education of urban youth in sub-Saharan African cities’. The paper placed the promotion of girls’ schooling and, indeed, the struggle to achieve gender equality within these environmental concerns about urbanization and slum life, but also the effects of the associated rise in crime and violence, particularly among youth living in such settings. The study focused on gendered experiences of urbanization and presented qualitative data from the girls and women living in Accra, Cape Town and Nairobi. Tackling violence against girls, as the study’s research shows, means addressing the relationship between gender identities and power relations, as well as the lack of power young people experience within marginalized, degraded environments. By listening to the voices of both young men and women, we can begin to understand the connections between poverty, gender and violence, and begin to perceive the types and levels of work that schooling needs to achieve in shaping a secure environment.

The final presentation in this session was of a paper by Thandi Lewin, Claudia Mitchell and Relebohile Moletsane, ‘A Critical Analysis of Gender Violence and Inequality in and around Schools in South Africa in the Age of AIDS: Progress or retreat?’. The paper reflected on policymaking in South Africa in the 16 years since the end of apartheid. High levels of poverty and inequalities by gender, class and race remain, including high levels of HIV and AIDS and violence, particularly among girls and women. There is no silence about the incidence of violence against women, but there is silence about the requirements that will promote change. More specially targeted programmes are needed, as well as political will.

Discussion afterwards focused on how cycles of violence can be effectively addressed, especially as teachers themselves may have gone through such cycles, and – along with the broader community – may need time to critically reflect on their actions. Reasons for weak policy communication were also discussed, including discomfort with policy or the issues involved, as well as the fact that the scope for interpretation of existing policies may be too broad. Another important issue discussed was the quality of indicators, with participants stressing the need for surveys to have very clear definitions of violence to get quality data for analysis.

This was followed by group discussion about the limitations of empowerment in protecting against violence, the implications of gender equality programmes for different contexts, and the forms of power that have been identified.

**Working group: Session 3**

The session began by re-grouping the priorities identified in the previous day’s group discussions into two distinct categories: (i) the ‘enabling factors’ for violence against girls; and (ii) strategies to counter violence and its impact. The task for this session was to discuss how specific interventions in the field can – and must – match these enabling factors and strategies.

A paper by Asmara Figue, Victorine Djitrinou, Akanksha Marphatia and Jenny Parkes, ‘Girls at the Heart: A review of girls’ participation in initiatives to combat violence in school’, was presented by Asmara Figue. Participation in schooling is an enabling right, because it supports the realization of other rights for girls. The paper discussed the ways in which a wide range of collaborative interventions contributed to creating and opening up spaces for girls to voice their opinions and concerns. In this way, girls’ participation demonstrates that by engaging in local-level activities, girls have gained the confidence and skills to both assert ownership of previously ‘invited spaces’ and also claim or gain access to other spaces that would normally be ‘closed’ to them.
The paper also highlighted that girls are situated in a wider, complex sphere of power and inequities, which often keeps them disempowered, and that violence is a part of this larger reality. But if we see power as multidimensional, then moments of empowerment can be transferred between different contexts. Working with children can involve unequal power relationships, but it is crucial for them to participate at national and global levels in discussions and decisions. The question was raised that despite broad-based participation at the conference, where were the girls in this conference?

The next presentation was of a paper by Kaia Ambrose, Anderson Kumpolota and Victoria Machakaire, entitled ‘Turning the PAGE: Working collaboratively to reduce gender-based violence in Malawi schools’. The paper was presented by Anderson Kumpolota and revealed the prevalence of gender-based violence within schools, on the way to school, and sometimes at home. The study revealed high levels of under-reporting by girls, hence rendering the issue invisible. Power inequities were a central reason for not reporting incidents, which raises the issue of how much fear of violence prevents some children from coming to school entirely. Some interventions, based on the results of the study, were aimed at building girls’ assertiveness to increase levels of reporting, and also raising boys’ self-esteem.

The final presentation was of a paper by Lucy Lake, Angeline Murimirwa and Laurie Zivetz, ‘Prioritizing Gender Equality in Education in the Midst of Crisis’. The presentation was by Sinikiwe Makove, an activist from Zimbabwe, and Lucy Lake from Camfed. The paper explored how partnerships can work and be sustained, even during a political crisis. Where partnerships with the community were well established, fewer schools closed, despite crises. The study revealed that cases of abuse lessened in schools where there were such partnerships, as there was greater responsiveness to tackling abuse. Mothers frequently stood up to protect vulnerable children, and in turn gained status, thus redefining traditional power structures. Girls were also present on decision-making bodies, ensuring that actions were informed by the perspectives of young women and girls.

During the time for questions, one participant asked whether such initiatives increased the likelihood of backlashes against girls. The presenters responded that they try to include men and boys as well. Lucy Lake stated that Camfed’s strategies have focused on bringing a critical mass of girls to schools and on fostering support networks, broadening out the intervention to tackle the issue in the community.

In response to another question about the outcomes of adolescent participation, the presenters said that they had developed indicators that revealed increasing levels of confidence in girls in particular.

**Working group: Session 4**

Following the discussion, the stream was divided into groups by table, to consider two main questions:

- What kind of strategic partnerships need to be established to ensure that girls’ participation is meaningful and effective, and how can we assess if they lead to the empowerment of girls at all levels (local, national and global)?
- What key issues should be on the action-research agenda going forward, and why? What kind of partnerships need to be developed to deliver on this agenda?

Feeding back on the discussions, groups identified a number of potential strategic partners: parents, local and religious leaders, women’s organizations, teachers’ unions, government agencies, school principals and committees, and boys and girls themselves. To work effectively against violence, all
collaborators must share an understanding of their priorities. Advocacy is a key strategy to bring synergy within partnerships, along with social mobilization and alliance building. Schools should have codes of conduct and child protection policies, and in-service training for teachers. It is also important to collaborate with paralegal institutions as well as police, in order for them to gain an understanding of the issue. Capacity, especially in terms of reporting mechanisms, must be built and strengthened so that violence is properly documented and so that the success of such strategic partnerships can be measured. There should also be a dedicated budget line and integration across sectors.

In response to the second question, participants identified issues for the research-action agenda that included: how to address the ‘culture of silence’, and the issue of trust. One group also decided it was crucial to have a documentary review to harmonize good practices and bring these together. To move forward with such a research-action agenda, partnerships must be sought between as many groups as possible as well as developed with countries with similar experiences in order to capitalize on good practices. Another group highlighted the research potential of working with new technologies. Many pupils use the Internet and mobile phones and many new partners could be involved in such research, such as telecommunication agencies and journalist networks, to ensure that issues such as rape are considered seriously and adequately dealt with in the media.

Participants then reviewed a one-page draft of the declaration that had been produced by the declaration committee, and provided feedback on the issues of importance, what needed to be changed and what was missing, particularly regarding the perspective of violence. The discussions were lively and many suggestions were made.

**Working group: Session 5**

The purpose of the final session was to review and synthesize the discussions of the previous four sessions, and to work on to the presentation for the final plenary session. Marie Siby presented an overview of the work in this stream in French. The discussions that followed were passionate, with different perspectives offered by participants from developing and income-rich countries, from academics and practitioners, and from large aid agencies and less powerful contexts. All points were synthesized into the final summary that was presented during the closing ceremony.

**Partnership forum**

**Expanding Opportunities: Harnessing the power of partnerships**

Nitya Rao, UNGEI GAC member representing the Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education (ASPBAE) and the University of East Anglia, chaired the forum and introduced UNGEI as a partnership organization, as well as highlighted the complexities of fostering effective and viable partnerships. She noted that so far, UNGEI partnerships have been most successful at the global level. It was necessary to examine how to move forward with partnerships at the country level? The first question posed to the panel was: What is one major barrier for partnership, and how can we overcome it?

Alfie Hamid, UNGEI GAC member and Cisco Networking Academy Manager for sub-Saharan Africa, summarized what he saw as the crucial elements for developing effective partnerships. For partnerships to work, four actors must come together: government, NGOs, the education sector and business. To accomplish tasks, all actors must be aware of one another’s (i) aims, objectives and expectations; (ii) abilities and resources; (iii) individual and partnership goals; and (iv) means of measurement. Moreover, for proper governance, it is important to have full transparency and
communication; a clear articulation of goals; a clear outline of responsibilities; and project implementation plans for the partnership.

**Hege Hertzberg**, Development Policy Director, Norway Ministry of Foreign Affairs, observed that today’s generation is less concerned about the struggle for gender equality, but that some strategies clearly do work. For example, results have shown that when education is free for all, culture does not hinder school participation. She suggested that perhaps the main barrier to partnership is the thought of partnership itself for those involved: negotiations regarding funding can be problematic and there are often too many people around the table. There is therefore a need for a restructuring of the aid architecture, taking into account previous experiences.

**Awa N’Deye Ouedraogo**, former member of the Committee on the Rights of the Child and member of the board of directors of Plan International, stated that barriers to partnership could be either on the side of donors, or local international partners. Some prominent barriers are exclusivity in interventions, the idea of competition among stakeholders and a lack of communication even when the objective is shared. Partnerships need to be strengthened through a systematic sharing of knowledge. Each side should know what the other is doing. Furthermore, the state should improve harmonization in line with the needs that emerge at the country level, and also monitor and follow up. Partners must honour their financial and technical commitments, particularly in the light of the recent financial crisis.

**Susan Durston**, UNGEI GAC member and UNICEF Associate Director and Global Chief of Education, offered a controversial comment that there was no real barrier to partnership at all, but that the problem laid in individuals and organizations preoccupied with their own concerns. Instead, a more collective approach was necessary, and the results themselves should be the incentive, rather than any credit.

The second question posed to the panel was: If your organization had a dream that it would like to see come true, what would that be? How can we move together to achieve this dream?

**Alfie Hamid** stated that too many partnerships fail due to a lack of partnership management skills. The most important skill is open communication between all partners. **Hege Hertzberg** identified that current funding is insufficient, and climate change will take away much of the support that is available. The most important thing we can do is work together to empower governments to take responsibility, which will mean there is more aid at the country level.

The dream outlined by **Awa N’Deye Ouedraogo** was that all girls would go to school in a sustainable manner at all levels, which could be achieved by pulling together technical and financial resources with well-coordinated actions. She outlined how Plan International’s work was aiming towards this end. **Susan Durston** spoke of a vision of progress in girls’ education, which would also incorporate empowerment and broader human rights. Research has shown that countries with high gender parity indices in education do not always also have high gender empowerment measurements. UNGEI should employ such tracking methods for progress in empowerment and should start collecting viable data on these various areas. No single agency can do this alone, she stressed.

The floor was then opened to questions. One speaker from Africa said that many partnerships at the moment did not seem sincere because Africa was considered poor and left behind. Another asked why the African Union had not been mentioned, despite the fact that it has an action plan (2006–2015) on gender and education and a specialized agency for girls’ and women’s education, and asked for partnership with UNGEI to be recognized. Another comment was that partners need results that show the quality of education in order to keep investing in education interventions.
**Alfie Hamid** suggested using technology to take schooling to girls who live in remote areas, as well as to facilitate partnerships and cut budget spending on face-to-face meetings. **Hege Hertzberg** drew attention to the need for pressure for good governance within each country. **Awa N'Deye Ouedraogo** stated that we must improve what we already have and manage existing partnerships better. **Susan Durston** acknowledged that partnerships can be very difficult, but stressed that we must all keep in mind the ultimate end, which is to improve the lives of children.

**Closing ceremony**

**May Rihani**, Co-chair of the UNGEI GAC, AED Senior Vice-President and Director of the Global Learning Group, chaired the closing ceremony. First, there were presentations from each of the three streams: **Alice Akunga** presented from the poverty stream, **Marie Siby** from the violence stream and **Codou Diaw** from the quality stream.

**Elaine Unterhalter** then discussed some of the key linkages among the three working groups. The work of all three streams had gone beyond notions of gender parity and equality of enrolments into a different landscape, marked by power inequalities that can work in both visible and invisible ways, silencing girls and portraying them as victims. She emphasized that more research and resources were needed to be attentive to these girls who are silenced, in order to work more closely with teachers and to develop women’s literacy, as mothers and teachers are crucial partners.

During remarks from the floor, there was discussion about the declaration and the importance of making better links to civil society organizations and NGOs. Senegal’s Minister of Preschool, Primary and Lower Secondary Education and National Languages, **Kalidou Diallo**, arrived at this point and the formal closing ceremony began. May Rihani thanked Mr. Diallo for showing his commitment to the conference, and presented a synthesis of the proceedings:

- Despite progress in primary education in the past 10 years, advances were weak at secondary and tertiary levels.
- Poverty and quality dimensions play a crucial role in girls’ education, and are pertinent when examining education in families and communities.
- Poverty is visible and invisible.
- Poverty creates a fertile space for violence against girls, which is a great limitation to girls’ education.
- There is a great need for a multi-sectoral approach to girls’ education.
- Capacity building for all actors in the education field is crucial.
- Education that integrates a gender-equality dimension becomes transformative education, which will enable the transformation of society.
- The Dakar Declaration has been produced and is a real call for action.

The Dakar Declaration was then read in English and French by two of the conference delegates.

Following that, **Cheryl Gregory Faye** expressed thanks to the Government of Senegal, UNICEF and UNGEI teams, all other participating organizations and NGOs, and the Beyond Access team. She then appointed Senegal’s Minister of Preschool, Primary and Lower Secondary Education and National Languages, Kalidou Diallo, as the third UNGEI global champion who will work to advocate on behalf of girls’ education at national and global platforms.
Thematic analysis

This section reflects on the E4 proceedings at both the electronic and Dakar conferences, and analyses some of the key issues and challenges ahead.

1) Partnerships to improve girls’ access to quality education globally

If gender equality in education is to be achieved globally, partnerships must be strengthened and new collaborations fostered. E4 explicitly sought to explore the central question of what kinds of partnership will help countries which still face substantial obstacles in girls’ education. The conference deliberations revealed the current gaps in partnerships and provided the opportunity to strengthen existing partnerships and foster new ones.

In the running of the conference itself, various partnerships were mobilized. First, partnership was a requirement for all of the papers selected for the conference in Dakar and most papers were authored collaboratively by international organizations, local NGOs, practitioners and academics. The E4 organizing team itself consisted of collaboration between the UNGEI secretariat in New York and a London University-led team, Beyond Access, with members in each region of the world (Africa, Asia and Latin America). This enabled theoretical and scholarly perspectives on the topic to be combined with field experience, and feed directly into the planning of both the Dakar and the electronic conferences.

For logistical reasons, however, numbers attending the Dakar conference were limited, which restricted the range of groups that could be involved. There was proportionately less collaboration with civil society organizations, in relation to UNICEF and government representatives, and relatively low representation from bilateral donors and the women’s movement. As this was a regional conference, there was a strong representation from Western and Southern Africa, so some of the countries with the largest populations (and significant numbers of girls out of school) were not represented at all. The electronic conference provided an opportunity for wider collaboration with actors not present in Dakar, and such links could further be strengthened at future face-to-face meetings.

Different forms of strategic partnerships to promote progress were directly considered in the third and fourth working-group sessions at the Dakar conference, and innovative partnerships were suggested. For example, partnerships are required between the education sector and local communities to address the root causes of violence in and around schools. To secure high-quality education, partnerships among schools, parents and the local community are crucial. Such collaborations can inform for the design of relevant educational materials and textbooks, and also be crucial for bringing about effective parental engagement and mobilization. Effective partnerships are also important, if not crucial, for monitoring, as illustrated by Albert Motivans’ keynote presentation. Discussion in the violence working group also highlighted the importance of accurate indicators and whether they picked up the occurrence of violence. Building cross links between countries with similar experiences was also suggested in order to leverage good practices.

Discussions at the Dakar conference explored how partnerships could work in practice. Partnerships need to exist within governments between different sectors and are also needed between different groups across society (e.g., in relation to violence against women, between schools, the police, legal services, social services and the community). There can be many challenges in working cross-departmentally and across organizations, such as different resources and priorities. Difficulties with
communication and trust can be exacerbated by unconnected committee structures, tiers of government and monitoring frameworks. As outlined in the situation analysis, the current lack of discussion and engagement within existing partnerships can be an additional barrier to addressing the problems of girls’ education.

Difficulties can also arise when there are significant power differences between partners. These may be further exacerbated by external shocks such as the global financial crisis. Partnerships can only work if they allow for equitable dialogue. In the partnership forum at Dakar, speakers identified competitive elements and power struggles in the current donor system as a barrier to improving partnerships, and considered the possibility of harmonization and collective action to counter this dynamic. Local partners also expressed frustration at not being treated equally by, or gaining recognition from, global actors. Power differences may also affect partnerships at other levels, such as when working with children. In many instances, when a participatory space has been provided, actors may still not perceive that they are able to use such a space if they feel they lack the relevant knowledge or legitimate experience to participate.

Overall, however, by bringing together many diverse actors, the E4 conferences provided a platform for different groups to strengthen existing partnerships and explore potential avenues of cooperation.

2) Recommitting accountable partners

The E4 discussions emphasized that accountability is essential for guaranteeing commitment from global partners and, in this way, can be a lever for activists. While the conferences did not create any new accountability structures for UNGEI, the participatory structure allowed for the issue of accountability to be openly discussed between the actors who require commitment from one another.

The need for new levels of accountability is long-standing. The attendees of the World Education Forum in 2000 pledged to “develop responsive, participatory and accountable systems of educational governance and management.” The Fast Track Initiative was specifically designed to foster greater commitment and predictable levels of aid. It was evident during the E4 discussions that the greater levels of commitment and accountability agreed to were now required to move the agenda forward. In working-group discussions, participants produced examples of perceived shortcomings of the 2000 framework and called for greater commitment from the international community.

No new accountability structures were generated by the conference, and this remains a concern for UNGEI, as UNGEI functions currently without powers or mechanisms to require actions from its partners. This may constitute an argument for greater partnership with United Nations women’s bodies, such as the Commission on the Status of Women and the recently formed United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (known as UN Women), as well as for leveraging the legal frameworks of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) and the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action to a greater degree, as they do contain accountability mechanisms and legal requirements.  

E4, however, provided stakeholders an opportunity to think about and discuss the commitments they could make in the future, while the declaration was also a strong and valuable statement of commitment. Moreover, the conference

---

3 States that have become party to CEDAW are obliged to submit regular reports to CEDAW on how the rights of the convention are implemented. The committee is also mandated to receive communications from individuals or groups submitting claims of violations of rights, and to initiate inquiries into situations of grave or systematic violations of women’s rights.
was highly effective in terms of raising awareness through discussion and paper presentations, and stronger commitment may stem from these efforts in the future.

3) Acceleration from 2000

While substantial progress has been made in girls’ primary enrolments since 2000, greater acceleration in other areas of girls’ and women’s education, particularly in terms of the poorest and most marginalized, is required. As Ann Therese Ndong-Jatta suggested in the opening ceremony at Dakar, there have also been reversals on the quality of girls’ education, and many presentations indicated little has changed for the poorest and the hardest-to-reach girls. The desire of participants for accelerated change was evident in the move for a more strongly worded declaration in the final draft.

The conference laid the foundations for an increased pace of progress by generating a new knowledge base. The electronic and in-person discussions fostered greater awareness and understanding, and there were calls for more targeted statistics collection and research studies. E4 also produced a new body of studies and resources on the current challenges that are impeding the achievement of the goal of education for all girls. Examining examples of good practice in discussions (e.g., as seen in all streams in Sessions 3 and 4) gave participants a good foundation for working towards improved results in the future.

The global financial crisis is a potential barrier to acceleration, particularly if aid budgets are reduced. Anthony Lake referred to such constraints in his speech in the opening ceremony, and he also emphasized that it would be morally reprehensible to ignore the hardest-to-reach children at this time.

4) Linking with the MDGs

The MDGs have legitimized the cause of gender equality in education, but have not gone far enough in either articulating the goal or providing the structures by which to achieve it. In the discussions at Dakar, the MDGs were frequently cited to underline the legitimacy and importance of the goal of gender equality in education. Taking the MDGs as the predominant global framework for development, participants sometimes questioned their effectiveness in addressing the problems of girls’ education. They stressed, for example, that the MDGs contain little emphasis on the quality of education. However, there was less explicit discussion of the MDGs in relation to strategies, such as how they might be used in the coordination of monitoring, funding and organization. This was possibly a missed opportunity, although in the light of the large amount of material generated for the MDG summit, many openings for connection have become evident. In addition, it may be advantageous to consider linking with groups working for the implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action.

5) Broader understanding of gender equality, girls’ education and strategic action

For progress to be achieved, all actors need to have a broader understanding of gender equality in education. The situation analysis identified an existing limitation in many governments’ approaches to gender equality: Full educational enrolment may lead officials to think that they have addressed gender, but in fact many crucial issues remain unresolved.

During both the electronic and Dakar conferences, participants frequently stated that progress towards gender equality in education will be hampered if actors do not improve their understanding of the issues and familiarize themselves with the most recent research. Several participants
highlighted that the achievement of gender equality in society is central to the realization of goals in girls’ education. On the other hand, Anthony Lake and others warned that despite this, gender equality in schools alone may not lead to gender equality in wider society. For instance, in the third working group of the poverty stream, the example of Malawi was cited in discussions to demonstrate that gender equality in school may not lead to gender equality in wider society. During discussions in all three streams, power was identified as a crucial factor in ongoing work towards this broader definition of gender equality. Power imbalances can silence and marginalize girls and women, and must be addressed to bring an end to the ‘culture of silence’ surrounding violence.

The E4 conference provided an opportunity for a range of actors to explore more substantive definitions of gender equality in education. The working groups addressed the issue of ‘defining’ directly, as multiple definitions are a barrier to a shared understanding and thus hamper strategic action. The first session in each of the three streams encouraged participants to look at different definitions and interpretations in the particular theme of the stream. In challenging narrow and varied definitions, discussions in many cases led to the identification of areas in which further research and understanding is required.

E4 also actively fostered such an understanding in a number of ways. To some degree, this occurred through the diverse geographical and organizational positions of actors participating in the Dakar and e-conferences. E4 was also productive and generated new perspectives, which benefited both participants at the conference in Dakar as well as a wider audience. Such new perspectives were disseminated through a space for semi-structured discussion, both online at the e-conference and during the conference in Dakar; the creation of a declaration that pushes for a more substantive understanding of gender equality in education; and the production of a number of papers from partnerships.

Discussions on the final text of the Dakar Declaration demonstrated that participants had moved together towards an understanding of the power dynamics of gender equality. In the fourth sessions of the quality and poverty streams, for example, participants demanded that rights-based language be used in the declaration, along with more specific references to gender equality. The issue of power is very much present in the text of the declaration, which states that “powerless and poor girls make up the most disadvantaged group in education,” as well as highlights the need to “transform power hierarchies in learning spaces, communities and policy structures.”

6) Public policy advocacy

Public policy is one of the key areas in which change is required. While the right to education is recognized in principle by most governments, other supplementary policies are needed to guarantee this right in practice. Taking the example of violence against girls in school, legislation may be needed to report and prosecute abusers, to increase access to support services for survivors – such as counselling and free legal services – and to include anti-violence themes in school curricula. Using another example, additional policies may be required to make education accessible for marginalized groups.

Instances of good practice for advocacy were offered during both the electronic and Dakar conferences. The working groups reflected examples, both anecdotally in discussions and through the presented papers. For example, the paper by Mandar and Rampal in the second session of the quality stream directly tackled the issue of influencing public policy and using legal action through the example in India of the midday meal scheme and public pressure for government action.
In addition to advocacy at the national level, it is also important to think about public policy advocacy strategies for global policy. While international agencies may formally recognize the right to education, at times extra pressure to give substantial and committed support to gender equality in education is needed. Civil society has a role to play in this process. For example, the Global Campaign for Education has been an active member of the EFA campaign.

Public pressure is a crucial part of accountability. The Dakar Declaration will be significant for public policy advocacy at both national and global levels. Some changes to the declaration were made during the conference, with the specific aim that it could be used more effectively for leverage with governments.

7) Good practices relevant to girls’ education and equal access to quality education

Sharing and disseminating good practices will speed up the movement towards gender equality. The E4 conferences provided an opportunity to share examples of good practice: The papers and discussions offered many pointers, and at the Dakar conference the third session in each stream was allocated for participants to discuss practical solutions and interventions. Some countries had successful overall national policy strategies, and during the sessions, evidence of such practices was collected and shared from around the world.

Many of the papers were helpful in contemplating contextualized interventions – the “specific solutions for specific problems” that Graça Machel had advocated in the opening ceremony at Dakar– to reach the most marginalized children. For example, in the paper by Ingram, Kishekya and Mamedu, evidence was presented that school management procedures were beneficial to girls’ education and that girls were more able to articulate and analyse barriers to their education if they were from schools with higher levels of gender equality in student participation and progress. Similarly, the paper by Mandar and Rampal outlined good practices on partnership by exploring the Right to Education Act in India, including considerations of food and hunger as central to the issue of education.

In the ensuing discussion, other good practices for school feeding were shared, including the use of public-private partnerships to run a school canteen in Burkina Faso. Other examples highlighted community education, such as road signs, as outlined by Martha Laverde in the violence plenary (“Stop! Machismo kills!”) Overall, however, participants noted that there have been few evaluations of anti-violence strategies and programmes, making it difficult to point to examples of good practice with regard to violence.
Conclusion: A global research and action agenda for education, to eradicate poverty and violence, and to promote quality education

The two related conferences, the Dakar conference and the electronic conference, were an opportunity to bring stakeholders together around the issue of gender equality in education, enabling them to explore pertinent issues and consider how they might work together more effectively. The conferences were particularly timely, taking place shortly after the Beijing +15 activities at the 54th session of the Commission on the Status of Women and in the build-up to the MDG Summit at the United Nations headquarters in September 2010. The discussions reflected the rich variety of participants’ experiences, as well as a strongly perceived need to address barriers to gender equality in education that had remained since 2000.

Wider engagement beyond the conference in Dakar was made possible both through the electronic conference and through the E4 and UNGEI websites, which featured constantly updated information about events at the conference and made use of new media, including blogging, Twitter and video posts. The country working groups and the formation of country action plans provided a format for making workable and realistic strategies to be taken forward at national levels.

The E4 conference represented an opportunity to learn how greater global participation might work in practice: how different groups on girls’ education might collaborate, as well as how different agendas, working practices and expectations might be brought together to advance the goals in girls’ education. The conferences presented a microcosm of the wider challenges and possibilities of creating global partnerships among groups with different perspectives.

Through reviewing the achievements and shortcomings of the past 10 years, and through discussions of the range of new materials prepared for the conferences based on research and field experiences, evidence suggests that subsequent research and action should focus on:

- Increased and improved partnerships, particularly with civil society and the women’s movement. This entails awareness of the benefits of dialogue and partnership fostered through the collaboration generated through the conference, and stronger efforts to harmonize with global campaigns such as the MDGs.
- Increased accountability and commitment of actors from all groups: international agencies, national governments and civil society.
- Improved sharing of knowledge, information and good practices, particularly on violence, quality and poverty/inequality. As part of this, it is necessary to identify specific and contextualized interventions that take into account vulnerable children in general and girls in particular.
- The hardest-to-reach and poorest girls, and in particular the issue of power in sustaining or eliminating levels of marginalization.
- The specific research and action agenda points that emerged from each theme.
- The need to build capacity, especially in research and reporting mechanisms. New technologies may be employed (such as the Internet and mobile phones) in research, and new partners may also be drawn in (such as telecommunications companies and journalists).

E4 made abundantly clear that the achievement of gender equality in education rests on effective partnerships between all stakeholders involved. The challenge now is to harness the momentum at the global, national and local levels and channel it towards the achievement of quality of education for all children.
## Appendix 1: Conference agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisional agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNGEI Global Conference</strong>&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engendering Empowerment: Education and Equality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dakar, Senegal, 17–20 May 2010</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provisional agenda</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Monday, 17 May 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9am – 4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Participants’ registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 p.m. – 7 p.m.</td>
<td>Opening ceremony&lt;br&gt;Ms. Femi Oke, Mistress of Ceremonies&lt;br&gt;Ms. Graça Machel, video message&lt;br&gt;Ms. Ann Therese Ndong-Jatta, UNESCO BREDADirector&lt;br&gt;Ms. Coumba Gawlo Seck, Celebrity Spokesperson&lt;br&gt;Mr. Anthony Lake, UNICEF Executive Director&lt;br&gt;Screening trailer of documentary film, <em>To Educate a Girl</em> (featuring introduction by UNGEI Honorary Global Chairperson, Queen Rania of Jordan)&lt;br&gt;Mr. Souleymane Ndéné Ndiaye, Prime Minister of Senegal, TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 p.m. – 9 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>Reception</strong>&lt;br&gt;Hosted by the Government of Senegal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tuesday, 18 May 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 a.m. – 10 a.m.</td>
<td>Opening plenary on poverty&lt;br&gt;The opening plenary session is chaired by Mr. David Wiking, UNGEI Global Advisory Committee (GAC) Co-Chair and SIDA Team Director for Knowledge, Education and ICT. Ms. Elizabeth King, Director of Education, World Bank Human Development Network, delivers the keynote address on poverty. The session also includes an introduction to the methodology of the conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Working groups in streams&lt;br&gt;This is the first session for the working groups for each stream: Poverty, violence and quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-14:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 p.m. – 3 p.m.</td>
<td>Plenary on violence&lt;br&gt;Ms. Sally Gear, UNGEI GAC member and DFID Gender and Education Advisor, chairs this session, and Ms. Cynthia Lloyd serves as discussant. The plenary features the Violence Panel. The papers presented are ‘Effects of Teacher Training for Refugee Women in West Africa’, Ms. Susan Shepler, American University; ‘Schooling and Conflict in Darfur: A snapshot of basic education services for displaced children’, Ms. Safaa El-Kogali, Population Council Middle East Regional Director; and ‘Empowering Young Women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>4</sup> Simultaneous interpretation in French and English will be available during the opening ceremony and all plenary and working-group sessions.

3 p.m. – 3:30 p.m. Coffee break
3:30 p.m. – 5:30 p.m. Working groups in streams

This is the second session for each stream and includes the presentation of final papers for each stream.

7 p.m. – 8 p.m. Screening of To Educate a Girl

This UNICEF documentary film, in English with French subtitles, celebrates the 10th anniversary of the UNGEI partnership and explores its efforts to educate girls around the world, with a special focus on Nepal and Uganda.

Wednesday, 19 May 2010

8:30 a.m. – 10 a.m. Plenary on quality education

Session chaired by Mr. Gianfranco Rotigliano, UNICEF Regional Director for West and Central Africa. ‘Measuring Education Quality through a Gender Lens: Challenges and opportunities’, keynote presentation by Mr. Albert Motivans, UNGEI GAC member and Head, Education Indicators and Data Analysis, UNESCO Institute of Statistics. Discussant: Ms. Codou Diaw, Executive Director, Forum for African Women Educationalists.

10 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. Coffee break
10:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. Working groups in streams

The third session for each stream identifies strategies and solutions.

12:30 p.m. – 2 p.m. Lunch break
2 p.m. – 3:30 p.m. Partnership forum

Moderated by Ms. Ann Therese Ndong-Jatta, UNGEI GAC member and UNESCO BREDa Director, this panel features presentations by Mr. Alfie Hamid, UNGEI GAC member and Cisco Networking Academy Manager for sub-Saharan Africa; Ms. Awa N’Deye Ouedraogo, former member of the Committee on the Rights of the Child and member of the Board of Directors of UNGEI Global Partner Plan International; Ms. Hege Hertzberg, Development Policy Director, Norway Ministry of Foreign Affairs; and Ms. Susan Durston, UNGEI GAC member and UNICEF Associate Director and Global Chief of Education.

3:30 p.m. – 4 p.m. Coffee break
4 p.m. – 5:30 p.m. Working groups in country groupings

This initial session for country delegations develops country plans.

5:30 p.m. – 6:30 p.m. Screening of girls’ education documentary films

L’éducation des filles : la longue marche in French, produced by the Senegal Ministry of Education in 2008, with support from UNICEF

Girls’ in the Class - A story of women teachers in Nigeria in English, produced by UK Department for International Development

Thursday, 20 May 2010

8:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. Working groups in streams

This fourth session for each stream finalizes strategies and solutions.

10:30 a.m. – 11 a.m. Coffee break
11 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. Working groups in country groupings

This second session for country delegations develops country plans.

12:30 p.m. – 2 p.m. Lunch break
2 p.m. – 3 p.m.       Working groups in streams
                      Fifth session for each stream to finalize plenary presentations
3 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.   Coffee break
3:30 p.m. – 5:30 p.m. Closing plenary
                      Ms. May Rihani, UNGEI GAC Co-Chair and AED Senior Vice-President and
                      Director of Global Learning Group, will chair the closing plenary.
                      The three streams, poverty, violence and quality, make presentations (15
                      minutes each).
                      Discussions
                      UNGEI Dakar Declaration on Girls’ Education with ministers from
                      participating countries
Appendix 2: Procedural note

Engendering Empowerment: Education and Equality
Dakar, Senegal, 17–20 May 2010
Procedural Note for participants

Dear Colleague:

We have prepared this Procedural Note to provide clear guidance on what we hope to accomplish together at the conference and how we will do that. We hope that by sharing this guidance, you will have all the information you need to envision the work we will do in Dakar, to prepare yourself for that work and to make our time together as productive as possible.

Some of the information here is conceptual and some is strictly procedural. A few things require action on your part. Please read this document thoroughly to familiarize yourself with the goal and objectives of the conference, as well as to note what actions you need to take leading up to our meeting in Dakar. Please look at the boxes in the left hand column for specific action on your part – and cross them off the checklist below!

In preparation for the conference, did you:
Communicate your stream selection on the website?
Indicate if you are interested in helping with interpretation during working-group sessions?
(Authors) Send your full paper to papers@e4conference.org by 30 April?
Download and read the abstracts for your stream before coming to the conference?
Send digital copies of relevant documents to Desmond Doogan (ddoogan@unicef.org) by 30 April?

Please enter your responses to the questions above directly on the conference website - http://www.e4conference.org/logistics/registration.
The link above requires the password ‘Dakar’.

GOAL, OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED OUTCOMES & EXPECTED OUTPUTS
Overarching goal: To harness the power of partnerships to improve girls’ access to quality education globally.

Objectives:
1. To recommit accountable partners to the gender-related actions agreed at the 2000 World Education Forum in Dakar.
2. To consolidate the public and policy debate needed around girls’ education in order to inform a broader understanding of the relationship between gender equity and disparity in education in developing countries.

Expected outcomes:
1. A common understanding of the barriers to girls’ equal access to quality education and strategies to overcome them.
2. A research and action agenda on gender and education to address poverty, violence and quality education.
3. Country-specific strategies developed for moving forward the research and action agenda and strengthening the partnership.
Expected outputs:
1. Outlines of country-specific action plans to convene relevant actors in order to formalize a girls’ education partnership or (where a formal partnership already exists) to brief them on the conference and present the action plan outline.
2. Commitment by each country delegation to finalize a country-level action plan leading up to 2015 and to report back to UNGEI through the UNICEF country office at the end of the year.

SIGN UP FOR YOUR STREAM
If you are participating as part of a country delegation, decide with your colleagues who will participate in each stream and enter your selection on the website by 30 April.
If you are an author, because your paper was selected for presentation within a certain stream, you will participate in that same stream for the three days of that conference and you do not need to notify us of your selection. If you are a participant that does not fit in either of these categories, decide which stream you would like to participate in and enter your choice on the e4conference.org website.
There will be up to 50 places available in each of the streams and all participants are expected to select one of the three streams by 30 April. We reserve the right to reallocate participants if there is uneven distribution across the streams.

CONTENT AND METHODOLOGY
The situation analysis posted on the conference website provides the overarching theoretical framework for the conference. If you have not already done so, please read that document. As shown in the situation analysis, this conference is organized under the broad theme of harnessing the power of partnerships to improve girls’ access to quality education globally. The conference is divided into three streams that examine key areas relevant to achieving that goal: poverty (intersecting inequalities), violence and quality (Beyond Access). Further, there are three issues that cut across these and will be addressed in all streams as they relate to girls’ education: health, climate change and participation.

To build a specific knowledge base around these issues, several papers were commissioned from academics and practitioners for each of the three streams. UNGEI and the Institute of Education at the University of London also circulated an open call for papers that rendered over 70 submissions from organizations around the world. Including both commissioned papers and those accepted from the open call, there are 30 papers divided across the three streams. The content of each of the selected papers will be presented in the working-group sessions. The abstracts for all papers received by the submission deadline will be available in French and English on the conference website (http://www.e4conference.org/agenda) at the beginning of May. All participants should read the abstracts for their stream before arriving in Senegal.

Because dismantling these multiple barriers to a quality education for all requires not just technical knowledge but also time to reflect together and discuss paths and solutions, the format of this conference combines plenary and working-group sessions organized around each of the three streams. Each participant will dedicate her/himself to one of those streams throughout the conference and attend all working-group sessions in that stream to build a common knowledge base on that topic with fellow participants and to collectively produce concrete plans for applying that knowledge for transformation across the conference streams at country level.

To accomplish this goal, the conference participants are intentionally composed of a vibrant mix of scholars, activists, practitioners, government representatives and development partners who, as a group, represent each of the professional spheres critical to removing the obstacles to attaining
quality education for all. Country delegations should divide their team across each of the three streams, for full coverage and maximum benefit from the discussions.

**ABSTRACTS AND CONFERENCE PAPERS: NOTE FOR AUTHORS**
When preparing the final version of your paper, please observe a 6,000-word limit. The full-length papers are due by **30 April**. These papers are expected to be fully edited copies that are suitable for distribution to all conference participants. They will be made available to all participants prior to the conference via the e4conference.org website. Please send your paper to papers@e4conference.org by **30 April**.

**NOTE FOR ALL PARTICIPANTS**
Go to e4conference.org, agenda tab to download all the abstracts for the stream you choose before the conference. Read those papers before the conference in order to familiarize yourself with the content and gain the most from the group work.

**AGENDA**
The three-day conference agenda is consists of **plenary sessions, working-group sessions, country planning sessions and a partnership forum**. Each of these sessions fulfils a unique function towards our goal.

**Plenary sessions** - There will be a total of four plenary sessions. Three of the sessions will be held on the first and second days of the conference and will be dedicated to each of the three stream topics: poverty, violence and quality. These sessions are intended to bridge the work across streams so that all participants may consider and incorporate each of the three critical topics when they work on their stream-specific products. The sessions will be led by a keynote speaker who will open by providing critical insights into the topic. The discussion will then be opened to the plenary to offer more experiences, pose questions and deepen the understanding of the issue. From these sessions we will move into stream-specific working-group sessions. We will end the conference with the fourth closing plenary, in which all streams will present their work to the larger group.

**Stream working-group sessions** – Throughout the course of the three-day conference, participants will each meet in their selected streams five times. These sessions are intended to afford everyone the necessary time and space to think collectively about: obstacles in the way of progress; identify strategies and approaches that have worked to overcome those obstacles in some contexts; explore how those strategies might work in other circumstances; and to develop integrated agendas for action post-conference.

During the first and second working-group sessions, participants, authors and facilitators will make self-introductions and share ideas about their goals for the week. Following those exercises, those participants whose papers were selected will share the key ideas from their papers briefly, about three to five minutes each, with the whole group to provide concrete reference points for the work to follow.

The third and fourth working-group sessions will be dedicated to identifying strategies and solutions which have worked to improve girls’ access to quality education including policy, practice, research, and campaigning – and to begin examining how those initiatives may be useful in other contexts and whether and how to integrate those into the plan for action post-conference. The fifth working-group session will be dedicated entirely to planning the stream’s presentation to during the closing plenary.

Following this format in each of the groups will enable a clear presentation of problems and solutions not only for each of the streams but across the three streams after presentation in the
closing plenary. Ideally, this will lead to the identification of unique, multidisciplinary activities and practical options that all constituencies represented at the conference may consider implementing upon return to their countries.

*Country planning sessions* – The goals of this conference are simultaneously global and national in scope. Nevertheless, the best way to make gains globally is by creating strong partnerships for girls’ education at country level. That is the reason why country delegations should be mixed, to include civil society, researchers, ministry officials and practitioners, and that is why all outputs of the meeting are designed to strengthen such partnerships. Since country delegates will be distributed across all three streams, there will be two formal opportunities during the conference to reconvene in homogeneous country groups to design a plan forward. Countries will be given further guidance on the concrete outputs that will be used as examples during the closing plenary.

*Partnership forum* – This session is reserved for selected institutional participants to profile their approach to girls’ education and their experience working in their particular type of institution. Panellists will showcase their work in gender and education by addressing the three streams of the conference – poverty, violence and quality education – in relation to the overarching goal of partnership among institutions of different types that share a commitment to development and girls’ education.

We have deliberately invited a cross-section of people and professionals to this meeting with the understanding that each of these constituencies is vital to the movement that will take the agenda forward, in partnership. Everyone’s contributions are invaluable and we want to make sure that each and every person has the space to speak. In every society, different groups perceive themselves to be differently entitled to occupying public space and we are organizing the conference with the intention of involving all people equally to ensure inclusion. In that way, we encourage all participants to be conscious of this reality in both plenary discussions and working-group sessions alike. We welcome champions from among the participants to assist in the effort to maintain equitable participation throughout the conference!

**Help with interpretation?**
If you would like to contribute to the conference by offering to serve as an informal interpreter in your smaller group during working-group sessions, please indicate this when you communicate your Stream selection.

**LANGUAGE**
During the conference plenary sessions, simultaneous interpretation will be available in English and French. During the working-group sessions, there will also be one or two interpreters available for each stream. When these working groups sub-divide to enable greater participation, however, there will not be a sufficient number of professional interpreters to accompany all subgroups. We would, therefore, welcome assistance with this from the participants! If you are bilingual and willing to assist informally to interpret for colleagues during these smaller group sessions, please indicate this when you make your stream selection at:  [www.e4conference.org/logistics/registration](http://www.e4conference.org/logistics/registration).

**MATERIALS**
*Print copies* – For space and environmental reasons, we request that participants bring a minimum of print materials or publications for distribution. There will be limited space to display print materials in the conference plenary room and the working-group rooms. Each organization or country delegation may bring up to five materials for display and distribution (five documents, multiple copies of each). Participants are requested to manage their own materials and replace them as needed. There will not be any projection equipment available for exhibiting videos or wall space...
for hanging posters or banners. Unfortunately, we cannot accept materials sent in advance of the conference.

**Send Digital Copies**
Send digital copies of any files you would like to be available on the E4 flash (USB) drive to Desmond Doogan by **30 April** at (ddoogan@unicef.org).

*Digital copies* – In lieu of print materials, we request that organizations and country delegations send in advance digital copies of any documents they have published and that they consider relevant to the themes of the conference. UNGEI will be providing flash drives for all participants at the end of the conference. The flash drives will contain electronic copies of documents contributed by conference participants or organizations, anything presented at the conference, any reference materials used by presenters during the working group or Plenary sessions (e.g. PowerPoint presentations, background documents, statistical data, etc.), and all materials provided by organizations and country delegations.

Finally, we are expecting an exciting E4 conference in Dakar and look forward to your active participation!

*E4 Conference Team, April 2010*
Appendix 3: List of conference papers, by working-group stream

UNGEI
E4 conference, Engendering Empowerment: Education and Equality
Dakar, May 17–20th
Working-group sessions

Facilitators and rapporteurs:

Poverty:
Facilitators: Elaine Unterhalter (coordinator), Patricia Ames, Aster Haregot, Lebo Moletsane, Amy North, May Rihani Ydo Yao, Malak Zaalouk
Rapporteurs: Lucy Hatfield - Tara Knies-Fraiture

Quality:
Facilitators: Sheila Aikman (coordinator) Maki Hayashikawa, Anita Ramphal, Raka Rashid Rosie Vaughan, David Wiking
Rapporteurs: Sandra Zerbo, Saip Sy

Violence:
Facilitators: Akanksha Marphatia (coordinator), Aisatta Dia, Victorine Djitrinou, Joseph Foumbi, Lucy Lake, Fatoumata Marega
Rapporteurs: Lucy Hatfield, Wilma Emanuel Randle

Papers by stream

Poverty
Working Group: Session 1
a) ‘Girls, Gender and Intersecting Inequalities in Education: A reflection from case studies in South Africa and Kenya’
Elaine Unterhalter (Institute of Education, University of London), Jenni Karlsson (University of KwaZulu Natal), Amy North (Institute of Education, University of London), Chris Yates (Institute of Education, University of London), Veerle Dieltiens (University of the Witwatersrand), Setungoane Letsatsi (University of the Witwatersrand), Herbert Makinda (Catholic University of Eastern Africa), Jane Onsongo (Catholic University of Eastern Africa)
b) ‘The Missing Link: Using the dynamics of human rights advocacy to enhance gender equality in education for girls and women in situations of extreme poverty’
Angela Melchiorre (for Right to Education Project- Global Campaign for Education, ActionAid International, and Amnesty International)

Working Group: Session 2
a) ‘Northern Nigeria: Approaches to enrolling girls in school and providing a meaningful education to empower change’
Alice Akunga (UNICEF) and Ian Attfield (DFID)
b) ‘Gender, Schooling and Poverty in Peru’
Patricia Ames (Instituto de Estudios Peruanos) and Rita Carrillo (Foro Educativo)
c) ‘Engendering Rural Eye Care for Access to Education’
Ajita Vidyarthi (Democracy Connect, India), and Rajat Chabba (Sankara Eye Care Institutions)

Working Group: Session 3
a) ‘Gender Equality in Rural Education: Best practices and lessons learned from Senegal and Kenya’
Amy Maglio (Women’s Global Education Project), Adjji Senghor (Union Démocratique Des Enseignantes de Sénégal) and Aniceta Kiriga (Tharaka Women’s Welfare Program)
b) ‘Challenging Gender, Poverty and Inequalities in Schooling through Collaborative, Cross-National Partnerships: Evidence from CARE Bangladesh and CARE Malawi’
Grace Chisamya (CARE Malawi), Joan deJaeghere (University of Minnesota), Nancy Kendall (University of Wisconsin-Madison), Marufa Aziz Khan (CARE Bangladesh)
c) ‘Poverty, Gender and Education: Participation and knowledge-building in the schools of Porto Alegre, Brazil’
Moria Wilkinson (UNICEF), Luis Gandin (Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul)

**Quality**

**Working Group: Session 1**
a) ‘Quality Education for Gender Equality’
Sheila Aikman (University of East Anglia) and Nitya Rao (UEA/ASPBAE)
b) ‘Literacy and Gender-Focused School Management in Northern Tanzania and Northern Nigeria’
Rebecca Ingram (ActionAid International) Dunstan Kishekya (Maarifa ni Ufunguo) and Andrew Mamedu (ActionAid Nigeria)

**Working Group: Session 2**
a) ‘Evidence-Based Practice in Girls’ Education in Cambodia: Lessons from work in progress’
Ron Watts (CARE) and Jan Noorlander (CARE Cambodia)
b) ‘Gender, Schooling and Poverty in Peru’
Patricia Ames (Instituto de Estudios Peruanos) and Rita Carrillo (Foro Educativo)
c) ‘Lessons on Food and Hunger: In search of transformative education’
Anita Rampal (Delhi University) and Harsh Mander

**Working Group: Session 3**
a) ‘Providing Scholarships and Lodging to Increase Girls’ Junior Secondary School Enrolment in Morocco’
Joshua A. Muskin (Academy for Educational Development), Aziza Chbani, (Agence pour la promotion du progress) Abdelhak Kamime (Ministry of National Education Morocco) and Abdellah Adlaoui (Entraide Nationale Morocco)
b) ‘Teacher Training: The superhighway to gender equity in Senegal’
Bridget McElroy, Kether R. Hayden and Yanick Douyon (International Foundation for Education and Self-Help)
c) ‘Working in Partnership to Address Gender Inequality in Education: Lessons from VSO Ghana and VSO Ethiopia’
Dora Amoah-Bentil (VSO Ghana), Wendwossen Kebede (VSO Ethiopia), Polly Kirby (VSO International) and Purna Kumar Shrestha (VSO International)

**Violence**

**Working Group: Session 1**
a) ‘Girls’ Education and Violence: Reflections on the first decade of the twenty-first century’
Jenny Parkes (Institute of Education, University of London) and Fatuma Chege (Kenyatta University)
Laetitia Antonowicz (Education for Change), Catherine Flagotthier (UNICEF), Vanya Berrouet (UNICEF), Joachim Theis (UNICEF), Yumiko Yokozeki (UNICEF), Stefanie Conrad (Plan West Africa), Victorine Djitrinou (ActionAid International) and Soumahoro Gbato (Save the Children Sweden)

**Working Group: Session 2**
a) ‘Contested Development? Women’s economic empowerment and intimate partner violence in urban and rural Tanzania’
Seema Vyas (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine), Jessie Mbwambo (Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences) and Charlotte Watts (London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine)
Madeleine Arnot (University of Cambridge), Georgina Oduro (University of Cambridge), Sharlene Swartz (HSRC SA), Fatuma Chege (Kenyatta University), Paul Wainaina (Kenyatta University) and Leslie Casely Hayford (Associates for Change, Ghana)
c) ‘A Critical Analysis of Gender Violence and Inequality in and around Schools in South Africa in the Age of AIDS: Progress or retreat?’
Relebohile Moletsane (HSRC), Claudia Mitchell (McGill) and Thandi Lewin (South African Department of Education)

**Working Group: Session 3**
a) ‘Turning the PAGE: Working collaboratively to reduce GBV in Malawi schools’
Anderson Kumpolota (CARE Malawi), Victoria Machakaire (CARE Canada) and Kaia Ambrose (CARE Canada)
b) ‘The Impact of Political and Economic Crisis on Gender Equality in Education: Zimbabwe’
Lucy Lake (Camfed International), Laurie Zivetz (Camfed International) and Angeline Murimirwa (Camfed Zimbabwe)
c) ‘Girls at the Heart: A review of girls' participation in initiatives to combat violence in school’
Asmara Figue (ActionAid International), Akanksha Marphatia (ActionAid International), Victorine Djitrinou (ActionAid International) and Jenny Parkes (Institute of Education, University of London)
Appendix 4: Working groups and related outputs/outcomes

Tuesday, 18 May, 10:30 a.m.–12:30 p.m.
Working Group: Session 1
‘Reviewing Literature and Refining Definitions’

Aims: To introduce participants to each other and our methodology and to review scholarly writing on the theme and some of the disputes about definition (see Conference Objectives 1 and 2)

Intended outcomes:
Participants will have:
   i) Become acquainted with the range of people in the working group, their interests and expertise
   ii) Been introduced to the methodology we are using to ensure a participatory discussion
   iii) Had a chance to discuss to the range of different ways in which we are gathering information about E4 themes (research, project reports, reflections from electronic conference, discussion amongst participants)
   iv) Been introduced to and had a chance to discuss themes from the research papers which review literature, definitional discussions and consider how these affect policy and practice.

(Conference outcomes 1, 2 and 3)

Papers for discussion

Poverty stream:
1) Presentation by Elaine Unterhalter and Amy North
‘Girls, Gender and Intersecting Inequalities in Education: A reflection from case studies in South Africa and Kenya’
Elaine Unterhalter (Institute of Education, University of London), Jenni Karlsson (University of KwaZulu Natal), Amy North (Institute of Education, University of London), Chris Yates (Institute of Education, University of London), Veerle Dieltiens (University of the Witwatersrand), Setungoane Letsatsi (University of the Witwatersrand), Herbert Makinda (Catholic University of Eastern Africa) and Jane Onsongo (Catholic University of Eastern Africa)
2) Presentation by Angela Melchiorre
‘The Missing Link: Using the dynamics of human rights advocacy to enhance gender equality in education for girls and women in situations of extreme poverty’
Angela Melchiorre (for Right to Education Project, Global Campaign for Education, ActionAid International and Amnesty International)

Quality stream:
1) Presentation by Sheila Aikman and Nitya Rao
‘Quality Education for Gender Equality’
Sheila Aikman (University of East Anglia) and Nitya Rao (UEA/ASPBAE)
2) Presentation by Rebecca Ingram and Dunstan Kishkeya
‘Literacy and Gender-Focused School Management in Northern Tanzania and Northern Nigeria’
Rebecca Ingram (ActionAid International) Dunstan Kishkeya (Maarifa ni Ufunguo) and Andrew Mamedu (ActionAid Nigeria)

Violence stream:
1) Presentation by Jenny Parkes and Fatuma Chege
‘Girls' Education and Violence: Reflections on the first decade of the twenty-first century’
Jenny Parkes (Institute of Education, University of London) and Fatuma Chege (Kenyatta University)
2) Presentation by Catherine Flagothier
'Too Often in Silence: A report on gender-based violence in schools in West and Central Africa'
Laetitia Antonowicz (Education for Change), Catherine Flagothier (UNICEF), Vanya Berrouet (UNICEF), Joachim Theis (UNICEF), Yumiko Yokozeki (UNICEF), Stefanie Conrad (Plan West Africa), Victorine Djitrinou (ActionAid) and Soumahoro Gbato (Save the Children Sweden)

Tuesday, 18 May, 3:30 p.m.–5:30 p.m.
Working Group: Session 2
Addressing hierarchies of power

Aims:
To hear about the findings from the research papers on challenges associated with hierarchies of power and engage with this in reflecting on effects of climate change, aspects of health and hunger. The session will crystallize some challenges contained in undertaking interventions and negotiating policy and practice between different across different social sectors.

Intended outcomes:
Participants will have:
   i) Been introduced to and had a chance to discuss themes of gendered power and forms of empowerment documented in the research papers
   ii) Reflected on the possibilities and limitations of working cross-sectorally
   iii) Considered how they might define empowerment
   iv) Reviewed issues on these themes emerging from the electronic conference
   (Conference outcomes 1, 2, 3 and 4)

Papers for discussion
Poverty stream:
1) Presentation by Alice Akunga
'Northern Nigeria: Approaches to enrolling girls in school and providing a meaningful education to empower change'
Alice Akunga (UNICEF) and Ian Attfield (DFID)
2) Presentation by Patricia Ames
'Gender, Schooling and Poverty in Peru'
Patricia Ames (Instituto de Estudios Peruanos) and Rita Carrillo (Foro Educativo)
3) Presentation by Lebo Moletsane
'Engendering Rural Eye Care for Access to Education'
Ajita Vidyarthi (Democracy Connect, India) and Rajat Chabba (Sankara Eye Care Institutions) (Akunga in poverty stream; Watts in quality stream; Vyas on households in violence stream)

Quality stream:
1) Presentation by Ron Watts
‘Evidence-Based Practice in Girls’ Education in Cambodia: Lessons from work in progress’
Ron Watts (CARE) and Jan Noorlander (CARE Cambodia)
2) Presentation by Raka Rahid
‘Gender, Schooling and Poverty in Peru’
Patricia Ames (Instituto de Estudios Peruanos) and Rita Carrillo (Foro Educativo)
3) Presentation by Anita Rampal
‘Lessons on Food and Hunger: In search of transformative education’
Anita Rampal (Delhi University) and Harsh Mander

Violence stream:
1) **Presentation by Seema Vyas**

‘Contested Development?: Women’s economic empowerment and intimate partner violence in urban and rural Tanzania’

Seema Vyas (London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine), Jessie Mbwambo (Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences) and Charlotte Watts (London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine)

2) **Presentation by Madeleine Arnot**

‘Gender Security, Gendered Violence and Social Justice: The rights of protection through education of urban youth in sub-Saharan African cities’

Madeleine Arnot (University of Cambridge), Georgina Oduro (University of Cambridge), Sharlene Swartz (HSRC SA), Fatuma Chege (Kenyatta University), Paul Wainaina (Kenyatta University) and Leslie Casely Hayford (Associates for Change, Ghana)

3) **Presentation by Thandi Lewin and Claudia Mitchell**

‘A Critical Analysis of Gender Violence and Inequality in and around Schools in South Africa in the Age of AIDS: Progress or retreat?’

Relebohile Moletsane (HSRC), Claudia Mitchell (McGill) and Thandi Lewin (South African Department of Education)

**Wednesday, 19 May, 10:30 a.m.–12:30 p.m.**

**Working Group: Session 3**

‘What We Can Do?: Interventions and partnerships’

**Aims:** To hear about the findings from the research papers and reflect on themes emerging from the electronic conference discussion relating to Interventions, inequalities and power. What are our experiences of empowerment, participation and partnership? How can we build this into plans of what needs to be done?

**Intended outcomes:**

Participants will have:

i) Been introduced to and had a chance to discuss themes from the research papers that reflect on interventions, empowerment and participation

ii) Reviewed issues about participation emerging from the electronic conference

iii) Begun to develop some guiding orientation for strategies that look at the connections between interventions, institutions and interactions

(Conference outcomes 1, 2, 3 and 4)

**Papers for discussion**

**Poverty stream:**

1) **Presentation by Amy Maglio**

‘Gender Equality in Rural Education: Best practices and lessons learned from Senegal and Kenya’

Amy Maglio (Women’s Global Education Project), Adji Senghor (Union Démocratique Des Enseignantes de Sénégal) and Aniceta Kiriga (Tharaka Women’s Welfare Program)

2) **Presentation by Grace Chisamya**

‘Challenging Gender, Poverty and Inequalities in Schooling through Collaborative, Cross-National Partnerships: Evidence from CARE Bangladesh and CARE Malawi’

Grace Chisamya (CARE Malawi), Joan deJaeghere (University of Minnesota), Nancy Kendall (University of Wisconsin-Madison) and Maruja Aziz Khan (CARE Bangladesh)

3) **Presentation by Moira Wilkinson & Luis Gandin**

‘Poverty, Gender and Education: Participation and knowledge-building in the schools of Porto Alegre, Brazil’
Quality stream:
1) Presentation by Abdelhak Kamime
‘Providing Scholarships and Lodging to Increase Girls’ Junior Secondary School Enrolment in Morocco’
2) Joshua A. Muskin (Academy for Educational Development), Aziza Chbani, (Agence pour la promotion du progress), Abdelhak Kamime (Ministry of National Education Morocco) and Abdellah Adlaoui (Entraide Nationale Morocco)
3) Presentation by Bridget McElroy
‘Teacher Training: The superhighway to Gender Equity in Senegal’
Bridget McElroy, Kether R. Hayden and Yanick Douyon (International Foundation for Education and Self-Help)
4) Presentation by Dora Amoah-Bentil
‘Working in Partnership to Address Gender Inequality in Education: Lessons from VSO Ghana and VSO Ethiopia’
Dora Amoah-Bentil (VSO Ghana) and Wendwossen Kebede, (VSO Ethiopia)
Polly Kirby (VSO International) and Purna Kumar Shrestha (VSO International)

Violence stream:
1) Presentation by Anderson Kumpolota
‘Turning the PAGE: Working collaboratively to reduce GBV in Malawi schools’
Anderson Kumpolota (CARE Malawi), Victoria Machakaire (CARE Canada) and Kaia Ambrose (CARE Canada)
2) Presentation by Lucy Lake
‘The Impact of Political and Economic Crisis on Gender Equality in Education: Zimbabwe’
Lucy Lake (Camfed International), Laurie Zivetz (Camfed International) and Angeline Murimirwa (Camfed Zimbabwe)
3) Presentation by Asmara Figue, Akanksha Marphatia and Victorine Djitrinou
‘Girls at the Heart: A review of girls' participation in initiatives to combat violence in school’
Asmara Figue (ActionAid International), Akanksha Marphatia (ActionAid International), Victorine Djitrinou (ActionAid International) and Jenny Parkes (Institute of Education, University of London)

Thursday, 20 May 20, 8:30 a.m.—10:30 a.m.
Working Group: Session 4
‘Making Connections: Processes for change’

Aims: To strategize on how to maximize global, national, regional and local partnerships and what forms of collaboration and participation will be useful in sustaining processes of change

Intended outcomes:
Participants will have
• discussed different forms of partnership
• reviewed the draft Dakar Declaration

Thursday, 20 May, 2 p.m.—3 p.m.
Working Group: Session 5
‘Reporting and Reviewing’
**Aims:** To synthesize what has been discussed in four working groups and agree upon a collective report to be shared in the plenary;

**Intended outcomes:**
Participants will have
- agree upon a collective report to be shared in the final plenary; reviewed the process of reflection in the working groups
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Amy North: Beyond Access/Institute of Education
Victorine Djitrinou: Beyond Access/ActionAid International
Aissata Dia: Beyond Access/ActionAid Senegal
Akanksha Marphatia: Beyond Access/ActionAid International
Relebohile Moletsane: Beyond Access/Human Sciences Research Council, South Africa
Anita Rampal: Beyond Access/Delhi University
Patricia Ames: Beyond Access/Instituto de Estudios Peruanos
Charlotte Nussey: Beyond Access/Institute of Education
Lucy Hatfield: Beyond Access/Institute of Education
Yishay Mor: Institute of Education
Tim Neumann: Institute of Education
Holly McGlynn: Institute of Education
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United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative
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3 United Nations Plaza
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