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1. Introduction

Globally, some 39 million girls of lower secondary age are currently not enrolled in either primary or secondary education, while two-thirds of the world’s 796 million illiterate adults are women. Only about one-third of countries have achieved gender parity at secondary level. The evidence shows that something needs to change.

The IIEP 2011 Evidence-Based Policy Forum on Gender Equality in Education: Looking Beyond Parity, aimed to review how schools and the education system as a whole can function proactively in the equal interests of girls and of boys, men and women. Much of the currently available research on gender equality in education has focused on gender parity in terms of access to primary and secondary schools (including how this is related to engagement of women within the teaching profession and the education system more broadly). More recently, evidence has emerged that looks beyond access, examining gender equality in more depth in terms of learning achievement.

In addition, there is a dearth of evidence that focuses on leadership patterns in educational planning and management. Although there is increasing evidence in the private sector that increased diversity at senior levels of management makes economic sense, this has so far not been translated systematically to the public sector. This is despite the increased feminization of the teaching profession at the lower levels of education. It is still the case that in most countries, the most senior management and leadership positions in education are occupied by men. The evidence presented during the Policy Forum examined some of the multiple reasons why this is the case.

Therefore, the Policy Forum presented evidence relating to two aspects of gender equality in education (the presentations and papers are available in full online1):

(a) at the school and classroom level – analysis of gender differences in student achievement in relation to classroom teaching, school environment, and local context; and

(b) at the ministry of education level (both central and decentralized levels) – improvement of gender equality in relation to educational leadership in planning and management.

Gender equality in learning and teaching (at the school level)

IIEP has conducted several studies in the area of gender equality through cooperation with the 15 ministries of education in Southern and Eastern Africa that form the Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ). SACMEQ research has been undertaken to explore possible cross-national explanations for the presence, and absence, of differences between girls and boys in learning achievement. The potential explanations include factors related to: (i) classroom teaching (e.g., sex of teacher, curriculum gap, pedagogy, use of ICT, textbooks), (ii) school environment (e.g., repetition, streaming, HIV and AIDS programme,

1 http://genderpolicyforum.wordpress.com
security, latrines); and (iii) home and community (e.g., gender of household head, mother’s education, household tasks, family interests, extra tuition).

The Policy Forum highlighted some of the latest SACMEQ III results undertaken in 2007 which indicated that the size and the direction of gender differences in learning achievement at the Grade 6 level has been very stable across the period 2000 - 2007, regardless of whether it was the boys or girls who performed better. The results have led researchers to question whether past gender-related educational interventions have neglected the question of learning achievement (Saito, 2010), especially in rural schools and low socio-economic groups.

The above evidence on gender equality in learning achievement was a consequence of IIEP’s capacity building programmes on educational policy research in close collaboration with SACMEQ. The valuable trend information generated from over 120,000 pupils has provided inputs to evidence-based planning decisions within the ministries of education in the sub-region. The results have also been used by publications such as the UNESCO EFA Global Monitoring Report, the UIS Education Digest focusing on Gender, and United Nations publications on the Advancement of Women.

**Gender equality and leadership in education (at the Ministry level)**

To date, limited research has been conducted in the field of gender equality and leadership in education. Although there is nothing unique in countries with low participation of women in public policy as compared with other areas of senior management in the public sector; there is, however, one feature that singles out ministries of education from other sectors: their role in education is crosscutting and wide-ranging. They span the formal sector of education but also have the mandate of educating the public and the nation in general. They are ministries of education and not ministries of schools. They can therefore be expected to lead in educating the nation on all subjects of fundamental interest to the state and of intrinsic interest to the individual citizens of the state, through a variety of modes of delivery. One of the time-honoured methods of educating is by example and by modelling. Further, pedagogical theories indicate that curriculum content transmission is nullified when teachers fail to practice by example what they are advocating (Obura, 2011).

During the Policy Forum, IIEP presented preliminary findings of action-oriented research with ministries of education to review mechanisms that support effective leadership practices and promote greater access for women in positions of authority. This research was funded through the generous contribution of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and conducted in Argentina, Kenya, and Viet Nam. It illustrated the obstacles and enabling factors that affect women’s access to, and experiences in, senior levels of ministries of education. This research and the outcomes from the forum will help to identify specific strategies that support ministries of education to model positive change at all levels so as to promote greater gender equality in education systems.
2. The Policy Forum

The Policy Forum was opened by Irina Bokova, Director-General of UNESCO, who emphasized the importance of the theme of the forum and the need to look beyond parity. ‘Equality’ said Ms Bokova, ‘is not a numbers game.’ By drawing attention to the 2011 EFA Global Monitoring Report, Ms Bokova painted a picture of widening disparities and challenges to equality. ‘Girls are getting lost along the way, falling out of education,’ said Ms Bokova. She called on the forum to examine their strategies and practices and to respond to these challenges in a clear and constructive manner, as these disparities start early and run deep. The need for education of quality and equality has made it necessary to examine both the academic and institutional levels, in terms of, respectively, the achievement of students and the planning and conception of programmes. The United Nations Economic and Social Council has already taken an important first step in affirming the key role of education as a fundamental right for the realization of the Millennium Goals of Development. Ms Bokova also spoke of the launch of the Global Partnership for Girls and Women’s Education, with the participation of United Nation’s Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and Secretary of State Hilary Clinton, as well as large private enterprises such as the James Foundation, Nokia, Procter and Gamble, Microsoft, and the Packard Foundation, which will be developing further partnerships with UN Women. These initiatives provide a sense of hope that around the world successful strategies, such as in Kenya, exist. Ms Bokova concluded that as the prerequisites to these common goals, it is important to provide reliable analyses as well as appropriate planning policies.

This sentiment was reiterated by Cheryl Faye, the Executive Director of the UN Girl’s Education Initiative (UNGEI) who emphasized that even though great strides had taken place, only one in three countries around the world had achieved parity in both primary and secondary education. Ms Faye argued that good practice and an informed evidence base is necessary to ensure that gender sensitive interventions and clear policy strategies are developed and implemented.

The forum brought together over 100 people, from 35 nations, committed to the topic of gender equality in education (as outlined in Figure 1). Ministers of education from seven countries and other senior policy-makers, experts on gender equality, educational planners, and education specialists from donor agencies and international organizations, from around the

______________________________

2 Visit http://genderpolicyforum.wordpress.com for the full list of participants
world participated to discuss ways to promote gender equality in education. The event was hosted with support from a number of key partners.³

The forum also provided a space for networking and further discussions. The annual practice of the IIEP Policy Forum engages participants from academia, education institutions, with high level decision-makers to deliberate the role of education in finding solutions to the challenging issues of our time.

The diversity of the participants is further demonstrated by Figure 2, which highlights the high number of policy-makers who attended from around the world.

³ A-A Dialogue, Aga Kahn Foundation, CONFEMEN, FAWE, French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, JICA, Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, OECD, SACMEQ, UNGEI, and UNICEF.
3. Forum content

The forum was structured in order to review the evidence on the above mentioned themes, and to explore experiences from different contexts in terms of the approaches to enhancing gender equality in education over time. This included examining the international evidence on gender equality at different levels, reviewing programmatic interventions and strategies; and examining the methodologies for researching gender-related studies. The ultimate aim of the event was to draw conclusions and strategies for action from the presentations and discussions to look at a more concrete agenda for action and partnership on the topic. Some of the recommendations emerging from the Policy Forum are outlined in Section 9.

Within the two themes of the Policy Forum, participants were asked to deliberate on a number of key questions related to the research and evidence presented to them:

1. Learning and Teaching (at the school and classroom level):
   a) What trends exist in regards to gender differences in learning (opportunities, processes and/or outcomes)?
   b) How does gender inequality relate to classroom practices, school environment, and context?
   c) What are the strategies for achieving gender equality in learning achievement?
   d) What further research is needed in order to improve gender equality in learning achievement?

2. Educational Planning and Management (at the Ministry level):
   a) What is the present situation of women’s participation in decision-making, both globally and more specifically in a number of selected case study countries?
   b) What are the constraints and barriers to women’s upwards mobility into leadership positions in education?
   c) What are the strategies to institute positive change in planning and management of education systems and increase the participation of women?

Each of the debates was initiated by a keynote speaker. The final debate aimed to round off the Policy Forum by identifying some key issues that need to be addressed through a common vision and agenda for action. This was conducted through a panel discussion and also included comments from some of the ministers of education who were present.

---

4 See Annex 1 for full agenda
5 http://genderpolicyforum.wordpress.com
4. International Evidence on Gender Equality

Keynote Speaker Nelly Stromquist

In her keynote address, Ms Stromquist reiterated that gender equality in teaching and learning and gender equality in leadership and management are complementary: If girls never successfully pass through the academic system they will never become leaders within it. The main thrust of her address focused on assessment. She emphasized that assessment of students’ learning happens at four main levels: classroom, school, national, and international. The closer assessments are to students, the greater the chance that they will influence their learning. And yet, little time is devoted to student assessment in teacher-training programmes.

She suggested that despite the benefits of international assessments, some results cannot be used to improve learning in a specific classroom and tend to have a low impact on equality issues. By focusing on abstract numerical data, we lose sight of the important contextual factors. For example, when presented with a mean test score, we should also complement with the factors that underlie it. What was the length of the school day? Did students have access to regular meals? What social expectations did the students face? Even within a same international assessment initiative, a score of 250 from one country should not necessarily be treated the same way as the same score from a different country.

Gender differences in achievement vary by region and country and tend to diminish as countries achieve higher levels of industrial development and democratic practice, indicating that gender differences are not due to innate cognitive capacity. Social expectations also affect performance in certain subjects. However, large international studies tend to focus on mathematics, reading and science, with a limited view of quality. Furthermore, levels of social and personal development are often ignored in favour of cognitive performance. Psychologists have already developed a number of scales to measure emotional development, but qualitative data can also be used to capture a richer picture. Teachers can assist in this assessment but more needs to be done regarding training with a gender perspective. The issue of sexual harassment in education has not been fully recognized and must be further researched, with a qualitative approach.

Greater gender equality in leadership may be assisted by focusing on local recruitment of school leaders so that women are not disadvantaged by not being as mobile as men. ‘If you want a new equilibrium you have to allow for those who were let down by the previous system to participate, providing forms of support which allow those to become more proficient.’ We must be cautious when appraising situations with large numbers of female teachers, as men often avoid the profession due to poor salaries and conditions. There is a need to look beyond just student performance, or enrolment, as schools are often not positive nor neutral but sometimes contribute to the marginalization and repression of certain groups.

In regards to women as school leaders and principals, limited comparable statistics across countries exist, but there is a clear pattern showing that the proportion of female leaders
decreases the higher up the education system one goes. The main reasons for the low representation of women as educational leaders are:

- difficulties balancing work and domestic responsibilities;
- internalized messages of limited political competence;
- unsupportive institutional climates;
- in developing countries, fewer girls graduate high school, a prerequisite for becoming secondary school teachers.

Having female leaders is important as they demonstrate different leadership styles, provide role models for girls and illustrate the gender inclusiveness of educational institutions. Increasing access to empowering experiences and gender-related knowledge could accelerate the process of change towards greater gender equality in educational management.

Steps now required include: recognizing the importance of non-cognitive development; providing teachers and educational leaders with more knowledge regarding the role of gender in society; and redefining quality to encompass more social, emotional, and critical skills. Issues of gender equality in educational management need to be addressed at micro, meso, and macro levels and with socio-cultural as well as cognitive interventions.

**Evidence on gender equality in learning achievement**

As reported in Saito (2011) and Byamugisha (2011), the evidence suggests that the improvement in access in enrolment has not been mirrored in an improvement in gender equality in performance. Concerns about gender differences in education have focused primarily on the disadvantage and underachievement of girls, but recently the underachievement of boys in reading has become the focus of some policy attention. ‘In the PISA 2009 reading assessment, girls outperform boys in every participating country by an average of 39 PISA score points – roughly the equivalent of an average school year’s progress’ (Borgonovi and Jakubowski, 2011: 2).

These gaps vary considerably from country to country and are closely related to gender differences in student attitudes and behaviour. Gender gaps in achievement in mathematics are quite small, but at the higher level boys tend to outperform girls. These results echo those found in Saito (2011), where again girls significantly outperformed boys in reading but were under-represented at the highest competency levels in mathematics. Worryingly, the direction and the magnitude of these gender differences in learning achievement in reading and mathematics in Southern and Eastern Africa have not changed over time. ‘This has led to a hypothesis that gender-related interventions in these countries might have focused too much on school access and participation, rather than on educational quality’ (Saito, 2011: 2). The gender gap in favour of boys in mathematics is more pronounced in evidence from 11 Francophone African countries, with Grade 5 boys performing significantly better in 7 of the countries studied (Sy, 2011).
Analysing gender differences at the national level often obscure differences that exist within different population subgroups, for example students from low socio-economic backgrounds or students in rural areas (Saito, 2011). Sy (2011) found that the rural setting affected both boys and girls negatively at the beginning of primary school but only girls by the later grades; ‘the reason may be that in rural areas as girls grow up, more demands are made on them to perform household tasks. Rural girls are less encouraged to pursue their education and in some cases have to prepare for marriage (early marriage is still practised in some country areas’ (Sy, 2011: 7).

Differences in student achievement however do not account completely for gender differences career choices. Across the OECD countries, girls tend to be more ambitious, but boys are still much more likely to opt for careers in computing and engineering, and ‘girls who opt for a career in health and medicine outnumber boys, without exception’ (Borgonovi and Jakubowski, 2011: 18). This suggests ‘that achievement-focused policies will not change the relative disadvantage of women in labour markets’ (Borgonovi and Jakubowski, 2011: 23), and that what is needed are school-level campaigns attracting girls to these areas, combined with supportive employment and family policies.

Participants in the concluding discussions of this session suggested that boys need to be encouraged to read. Although results were generally consistent across socio-economic groups, gaps were wider between boys and girls, as disadvantaged boys, for instance, did not excel in reading, whereas girls in OECD countries read much more for pleasure. Student career ambitions were also a good guide to potential careers, however choices were not linked to performance. For example, high-performing girls in mathematics still avoided engineering. These discussions pointed out that policies promoting different career paths produced smaller gender difference, for example, in former Soviet states. In many SACMEQ countries, there has been a drop in student achievement, which may be due to a reduction in community participation after the introduction of free primary education; the best-performing students were found in schools with high community participation. This needs to be addressed in policies, and trends should be plotted separately for rural and urban areas.

**Evidence of gender equality in educational planning and management**

Evidence presented from the EFA GMR 2011 (UNESCO, 2011) demonstrated how, although moving in the right direction, progress towards gender parity in primary schools has varied greatly. In addition, significant gender imbalances remain and tend to increase as the level of schooling increases, culminating in large gender imbalances in labour markets. These imbalances can be partly explained by the fewer years in education that women tend to have, but ‘labour markets themselves often reinforce gender disparities’ through social barriers, cultural practices, and discrimination (UNESCO, 2011: 8). Governments which tolerate high levels of gender inequality in education are not only ignoring the basic human rights of half the population, but also sacrificing gains in economic growth and productivity as ‘there is clear evidence that economic returns to female education are very high – and, at the secondary level, higher than for boys.’ (UNESCO, 2011: 8).
Unfortunately ‘evidence from several developing regions suggests that progress towards gender equity has been far slower in labour markets than in school systems’ (UNESCO, 2011: 8), and three broad causes of disparity can be identified:

- gender differences in skills and experience,
- social norms governing women’s roles in economic life,
- segmentation and discrimination in the labour market.

There appears to be no difference in the levels of gender equality in educational planning and management and other senior management positions. However what is different is that ministries of education have a mandate which incorporates not only the formal school system but also the education of the public and the nation as a whole and therefore have a responsibility to act as an example in this regard (Obura, 2011). Unfortunately ‘global experience suggests that the rate of increase in the proportion of women in leadership is slow, sporadic, subject to reversal and requires stimulus to attain the goal of equity.’ (Obura, 2011 p.5). The two major problems affecting women’s advancement in ministries of education are: The pipeline, the supply of sufficiently qualified women at each level of authority in order to ensure gender equality at the most senior levels; and the Labyrinth, the myriad of obstacles to women’s career advancement. The glass ceiling metaphor appears to have been replaced by the labyrinth, which incorporates both institutional and societal barriers.

Gender imbalances in educational planning and management are not limited to developing countries; ‘globally women are not accessing senior positions in the public or private sectors in the numbers expected given their increased education and work experience’ (Wallace, 2011: 1). Although there have been large and significant shifts in terms of policies and legislation, ‘governments often lack the financial resources and political will to implement them and progress is slow’ (Wallace, 2011: 2). This is compounded by the often externally imposed uniform language and nature of policies which are often developed without the engagement of the women they affect. Interestingly, similar policies have led to very different outcomes across and even within countries, often with rural and low economic groups the most disadvantaged. Great variability exists among the barriers affecting women’s advancement, as it does in terms of the enabling factors found to support women, such as ‘access to mentors and supervision, tailored training, flexible working hours, the possibility of having a good work/life balance, having support networks, good policy and legislative contexts’ (Wallace, 2011: 14).

During concluding discussions with participants, it was noted that although there are multiple pathways to leadership for both men and women, there appears to be fewer obstacles for men in relationship to their personal and social responsibilities when finding a career. Women are actors and are not passive and need to seek out organizational alternatives that complement their multiple role. This can be supported by finding mentors, networking, seeking training, finding their voice in different fora. It was also noted during the discussion that although quota systems have worked in some countries (e.g. Norway, where now 50 per cent of all parliamentarians are women and the quota system can now be abandoned), it is not the only answer to ensuring an organizational culture that supports women as leaders.
5. Learning from experience: gender equality intervention and strategies

Keynote speaker Oley Dibba Wada

Ms Dibba Wada opened her presentation by arguing that despite the progress being made in terms of parity and overall enrolment, quality remains a major concern. The drive and focus on enrolment associated with Education For All risks reversing achievements in gender equality in education. It is estimated that over 200 million children enrolled in primary school learn so little that they struggle to read even basic words. Quality education is crucial for development.

Curriculum content must be gender responsive and so should the training of those who deliver it. Often the school learning environment and the attitudes of teachers serve to reinforce, rather than challenge, prevalent stereotypes and injustices. An example of good practice is FAWE’s Gender Responsive School model, where the academic, social and physical environments of the school and local community recognize the specific needs of both boys and girls. All stakeholders, from pupils to community leaders, understand and practice gender equality. Academic delivery, materials, classroom interactions, and management processes are all gender responsive. Another important element of FAWE’s Gender Responsive School model is the development of gender-responsive pedagogy, which focuses on lesson planning, language use, classroom interactions, and the role of management in supporting gender-responsive approaches in schools. It targets practical skills as well as the training of school management teams.

Ms Dibba Wadda identified that the key lessons learned from FAWE’s gender equality interventions and strategies were:

- holistic Approach: Policy level, school environment and community, and classroom interactions must all be tackled simultaneously;
- gender equality means equality in terms of completion rates, performance and life opportunities;
- partnerships and networks between ministries, teachers, parents, and local communities are vital in order to transform education systems;
- evidence-based advocacy is a critical factor in influencing governments to integrate gender into national frameworks and policies;
- female role models, particularly in leadership positions in schools, are important in encouraging the enrolment and retention of female students.
Ms Dibba Wadda highlighted very movingly how she, as a female educationalist, is forced to ‘fight her demons’ regularly when she leaves her children to meet the heavy travel demands of her job. She noted that cultural and structural changes, with regards to women’s attitudes and roles, are needed to address this issue, and women need to be part of a solution rather than projecting themselves as victims. We need to focus on guidance and counselling, as gender equality in educational leadership is often an issue of capacity development. Furthermore, if men dominate leadership, we should seek them as allies and gain their support for greater gender equality. However, although gender equality in educational management is important, more women in positions of power do not necessarily guarantee greater opportunities for girls.

**Experiences of gender equality in learning achievement**

Girls from low socio-economic backgrounds in more remote areas continue to be the most deprived in terms of basic education. Parental motivation and societal pressures are critical factors for achieving EFA goals, ‘in this context, community, as well as family needs (including social and economic constraints) should be accounted for in school management’ (Mizuno and Kobayashi, 2011: 2).

In Yemen JICA developed a framework and mechanism for participatory school planning and implementation based on an analysis of the physical, social, and cultural obstacles to girls’ education. By involving mothers, community leaders, and religious leaders in advocacy campaigns and in the running of schools they hoped to ‘lessen the psychological distance between community and school so that community ownership and commitment to school education can be enhanced’ (Mizuno and Kobayashi, 2011: 3). This was found to increase girls’ enrolment and was successful ‘in reducing obstacles to girls’ education, including the shortage of teachers, classrooms, and female toilets, with solutions implemented under the SIP’ (Mizuno and Kobayashi, 2011: 13). Although social norms and traditional mind-sets are difficult to change over short time periods, the ‘collaborative efforts involving stakeholders beyond education should be encouraged and sustained for continued progress towards gender equality in the society’ (Mizuno and Kobayashi, 2011: 13).

Southern and Eastern Africa is the region hardest hit by HIV and AIDS, with young women eight times more likely to contradict the disease than young men, meaning that related education interventions and programmes are extremely important. The findings from the SACMEQ countries suggested that there was gender equality in terms of knowledge about HIV and AIDS, but that the level of knowledge was worryingly low. This indicates an urgent need to improve the general level of HIV-AIDS knowledge among boys and girls and to review the education programmes and especially the school curricula on HIV and AIDS (Dolata, 2011: 6). There was no gender difference in regards to the knowledge level of the teachers, which was quite high. The problem lies in the transfer of that knowledge to pupils. There was no significant gender difference in students’ preferences of sources of information, but electronic media was by far the most popular mechanism for both boys and girls.
Despite many policies and interventions targeting the promotion of female school head teachers, there remains ‘considerable bias in the allocation of school managerial positions in favour of males for 12 SACMEQ school systems’ (Hungi, 2011: 1), as seen in Figure 3.

This bias is most marked in rural areas. This widespread inequality has two main implications: first, female teachers may become demoralized by the lack of opportunity for professional development, and secondly pupils are given the impression that female teachers are incapable of being leaders. The way forward in this area is to open up informed dialogue among the key stakeholders in the process of managing the career progression of teachers (staffing divisions, the inspectorate, teacher unions, etc.) (Hungi, 2011: 3), which is focused on setting and agreeing on feasible targets.

The summary discussions with participants of the forum revealed that JICA is currently developing unified guidelines so that all donors or agencies working in education can implement the lessons learned. It was also suggested that SAQMEQ should initiate complementary qualitative studies to analyse teaching processes and why both girls and boys perform better with female teachers. While more qualitative studies are needed, they are often instigated and motivated by the results of large quantitative studies, such as SACMEQ, which rarely get back to the people who run systems and can affect required change. Therefore, there is also a need to ensure that findings from quantitative studies are translated into a ‘language’ that can influence decision-making.
Experiences of gender equality in educational planning and management

In Argentina quota legislation has been in place for 20 years and has led to some progress, e.g. a female president since 2007 and 37.7% women in national congress. However, problems such as a lack of general consensus promoting gender equality still remain. Middle and senior education managers interviewed made reference to motherhood and their extra domestic pressures, but interestingly ‘none of the persons interviewed spontaneously mentioned public policies as necessary to provide strategies to overcome the obstacles and difficulties posed by family responsibilities’ (Gheradi, 2011: 9). Instead these matters were viewed simply as private negotiations between partners.

In Viet Nam ‘the government recognizes the role of women in the home through awards and certificates, but does not recognize or encourage men’s contributions’ (Kelly, 2011: 4) with parental leave associated with the care of a new-born baby or sick child only available to mothers. Interventions have not targeted the constraints placed on mothers by traditional norms, and understandably there has been little progress in the share of household work since 2004 (Kelly, 2011).

In Kenya a new constitution has been established where no more than two-thirds of any leadership/management positions can be of one gender, and presently ‘42 per cent of the senior officers in the Ministry of Education are women; and 22 per cent in the Ministry of Higher Education.’ (Obura et. al, 2011: 3). Despite high levels of female teachers there are very low levels of female head teachers. In the ministries ‘women comprise 27 per cent of those reportedly involved in the totality of the policy decision-making, shaping and originating process’ with the highest concentrations occurring at the middle rather than lowest levels(Obura et. al, 2011: 4). ‘Increased female visibility in senior positions reportedly raises the morale of female staff in the Ministry but, so far, has not led to strategic action by women or anyone else to maintain positive change. Women say that currently there is no gender affirmation’ (Obura et. al, 2011: 6). Significant structural challenges within the Ministry remain with male domination of officer positions and of the public service commission which controls recruitment and promotions. Additional support strategies are required including those which empower women to overcome the effects of societal and structural barriers and assist them in being more pro-active in their own career progression (Obura et. al, 2011).

Interventions and strategies need to address the various levels of enablers and barriers to women becoming valued educational leaders: (1) body politics, (2) socio-cultural values and attitudes, and (3) institutional conditions. Body politics refers to assumptions and beliefs on what women and men can and should do. Socio-cultural values and attitudes refers to how men and women are valued are performing certain roles and/or tasks and the effects of stepping outside of societal norms (Kelly, 2011). ‘Institutional conditions includes those laws, policies, organizational guidelines or institutional structures that enable or hinder women’s (and men’s)
ability to translate body politics and socio-cultural values and attitudes into the social, political or economic capital they need to advance their careers.' (Kelly, 2011: 4)

Participants noted in concluding discussions that despite the high numbers of highly educated women in many countries which could ‘feed’ into education systems, women are still underrepresented at the very apex of leadership. It is important to have laws and policies in place, but also to be aware who is in charge and how they behave. Women in MoEs may have both a positive and negative effect on gender equality, and future studies may examine how women in higher positions view gender equality within education. In general, women in middle management welcome having other women in higher positions, although some participants recognized that there are some situations in which senior women do not encourage their female colleagues.
6. Methodologies in gender-related studies

Keynote speaker Elaine Unterhalter

Ms Unterhalter emphasized the need to recognize the great policy and practice achievements made since 2000: increasing enrolment and progression, decreases in the number of out-of-school children, the enormous demand for education, the high profile of gender and education in international agreements and national education plans, and the Dakar declaration on accelerating girls’ education and gender equality. However, how we view gender also determines our tackling of gender inequality, be it simply counting boys and girls, examining the relationships of power, or decoding different types of behaviour.

Looking beyond parity is vital due to the many problems associated with such a narrow indicator:

- aggregation problem: by focusing on national or regional levels, schools and the intersections of inequality are often ignored;
- multi-dimensionality problem: inequalities are not examined in relation to those in the wider societies e.g. in the home, in areas of work, etc.
- aspiration problem: there is no measure where gender is a dimension of aspiration;
- implementation problem: measuring what is easy rather than what is important;
- gaming problem: by aiming to cross thresholds those who are in most need of assistance are ignored in favour of those closest to the line.

However, it is important to note that composite indicators are available. These include the UNESCO GMR Deprivation and Marginalization Index, TEGINT Gender Profile, and the TEGINT Gender Management Profile. The TEGINT Gender Profile uses school data to create weighted profiles based on gender parity in enrolment, attendance, progression, and attainment. The TEGINT Gender Management Profile measures how proactive school management committees are in promoting gender equality. Results from a study of schools with poor facilities in areas of poverty Tanzania and Nigeria were presented. Girls, in both countries, were found to be more likely to voice concerns over school facilities and pregnancy in cases of high Gender Profiles. In Tanzania, but not Nigeria, higher Management Gender Profiles were associated with higher Gender Profiles.

Educationalists need to look beyond their domain in order to combine educational data and approaches with larger, gender-focused data sets, like the European Gender Equality Index or the Equity Adjusted MDG Indicators. In order to create a richer picture, which moves beyond abstract figures, qualitative and quantitative research methods must to be combined. The complexity of important factors such as teacher approaches, social distance, and reactions to violence inside and outside of schools can only be unravelled through qualitative studies.
Developing strategic indicators on rights and equalities, by selecting aspects of quality associated with gender equality, is another important element in conducting gender-related research in education. Those who engage in methodologies must engage in self-criticism, participation, and complementary approaches. Improved methodologies are stepping stones towards greater gender equality in education. Although they will not lead to policy changes, they will create the necessary conditions for improving policies.

When conducting gender-related education studies, research methods should be inclusive and should address the intersections of various factors. Invariably, problems will exist with both quantitative and qualitative data, and hence, in order to ensure quality, studies must allow for peer review and external examination. Although in-depth qualitative studies require time and expertise, they are a vital in shifting thinking in the education sector beyond gender parity.

Methodologies to assess gender equality in learning achievement

In order to move beyond parity we must focus more on gender equality in learning outcomes and in the effects of school resources, ‘understanding the reasons for differences in student performance might be considered the first step for designing effective educational policies to address quality and equity concerns’ (Nguyen and Griffin, 2011: 1). It has been argued that recent shifts in teaching approaches may have increased gender differences in achievement and that ‘because of the differences in how girls and boys learn, it can be difficult to create educational environments that are suitable for both groups’ (Zuze and Reddy, 2011: 17). It is therefore crucial that we have a clear understanding of the factors influencing student achievement. In terms of improving this understanding the development and use of proficiency levels alongside mean scores are important (Zuze and Reddy, 2011). They provide greater insight into the nature of the gender differences and ‘may facilitate differentiated teaching to meet the needs of male and female students’ (Nguyen and Griffin, 2011: 2).

Student level variables (Zuze and Reddy, 2011; Nguyen and Griffin, 2011) are also of great concern as gender differences are often more marked in certain population subgroups such as in rural communities or children from low socio-economic backgrounds and must be analysed in conjunction with school level variables (Zuze and Reddy, 2011; Nguyen and Griffin, 2011) and the findings used to direct future interventions and policies. Current findings suggest that male students need extra support to cope with the transition between primary and secondary school (Nguyen and Griffin, 2011) and that in South Africa boys and girls benefit equally from the provision of school libraries. Future research on gender difference should go beyond comparing outcomes and should focus more on the learning process with the aim of linking the results to teacher professional development and teaching interventions (Nguyen and Griffin, 2011).
The feminist mission of promoting the rights and the empowerment of women and girls and challenging their oppression is often portrayed as being un-African and a threat to the construction of African masculinities. Gender research however has the ‘potential to increase the shift of emphasis in feminist scholarship away from women per se to gender relations (men and women)’ (Chege and Sakurai, 2011: 9), thus allowing it to contribute more freely to the discussion on the social construction of masculinities and femininities in a relational manner. Feminist gender research now has the ‘theoretical and conceptual tools for enhancing gender equality and eradicating women’s subordination that is founded on research-based knowledge’ (Chege and Sakurai, 2011: 9).

Effective feminist gender research uses a bottom-up, participatory approach which empowers both men and women and involves ‘doing research with the people’. By centring the research around boys’ educational experiences the researchers are ‘employing feminist thought in a critical light that raises awareness of the possibilities of sidelining boys (men in the making) in a social process that may result in their future subordination in society.’ (Chege and Sakurai, 2011: 10). The approach employs two main sources of data: documents and subjects/participants. Documents include literature reviews, programmes objectives, programme evaluations, reports on best practices, etc. Subject/participants supply data through survey questionnaires, open-ended interviews, focus group discussions, photography and drawing, etc., allowing for rich and individualized data to emerge.

During the concluding discussions, participants suggested that there were some resources which benefited girls and boys, though girls still benefited the most. It was noted that gender gaps develop early: for example, boys think that reading and language are not important as schooling does not correspond with the expected role of manhood. Boys often want a basic education to enter manual jobs earlier and earn money quickly. Participants proposed that there should be greater focus on the first years of school by tracking achievement and attitude, implementing a half-hour-a-day reading period and policies promoting libraries. It is important that plans are contextualized and incorporate local needs and wishes. In Guatemala, for instance, a study found that female teachers did not think that housewives needed an education. In this case, training teachers should incorporate a gender perspective. Pilot schools led by women often reflected increased performance, enrolment, and willingness of girls to discuss, although similar results were not shown with male students. In light of preferential treatment shown to girls, there have been cases of anger, frustration, and threats of violence from boys.

**Methodologies of gender equality in educational planning and management**

Parity of representation is still seen as the primary goal of many organizations and nations and is the main framework for much gender research, however the approach is now seen as being ‘discredited in that it essentialises women and ignores great differences in the experience of women as mediated by personal, social and geographic characteristics.’ (Lumby, 2011: 1). Representation in education planning and management reduces the issue of gender equality to a mathematical relationship which has numerous methodological and substantive issues such as
the choice of a comparator population and determining what constitutes progress (Lumby, 2011).

‘Intersectionality appears to offer a response to the crisis’ of the limits of focusing on representation (Lumby, 2011: 2). In addition, ‘the causes of the underrepresentation of women in educational leadership are not uniform across cultures and education systems. Rather, they are the product of complex interactions between cultural understandings of gender roles, national policy and organizational structures, and pressure from the international community that are highly context specific’ (Sperandio, 2011: 11). It is the nature of these interactions and interrelationships and how they change in different contexts that should form the focus of research and should provide an increased understanding of current situations and the effects of proposed changes to them (Sperandio, 2011). Race, class, and gender must all be considered in order to understand inequality, and as individuals’ characteristics ‘do not function discretely to create advantage or disadvantage’ they cannot be simply investigated separately and then added together and analysed; a leap in methodologies is required. ‘The challenge is to investigate adequately and understand the effects of gender as moderated not only by individuals’ other characteristics, but also as mediated by the context within which they function’ (Lumby, 2011: 3).

One cannot rely therefore on ever-expanding matrices of quantitative data but rather expand the sources of data to include those which illuminate the intersections and which focus on the complex and individual nature of the experiences that influence career choice. ‘Qualitative techniques such as interviews and the recordings of focused personal narratives are powerful in their ability to give insights into aspects of personal psychology, life patterns and work experiences that influence women’s choices and aspirations towards educational leadership’ (Sperandio, 2011: 2) while also providing an opportunity for the voices of women to be heard directly in the data. Similarly ‘narrative and ethnographic approaches may offer data that are rich enough to pursue analysis of how particular characteristics and contexts moderate self-perception and the response of others; interpretation becomes not the mathematics of social justice, but listening to the dissonant music of inequality’ (Lumby, 2011: 3).

Despite the fact that there is now a critical mass of women who qualify to be leaders in both primary and secondary schools, very few are inspired to apply for leadership positions. At the university level, top academic and administrative positions are dominated by men. In the 1990s, the government of Uganda introduced affirmative action policies intended to boost women’s participation in educational leadership. These included: the Government White Paper on Education, the Ugandan constitution of 1995, the 1.5 points awarded to girls to facilitate their entry into university, policies of expanding tertiary institutions, introducing evening programmes.

---

6 There are a specific number of points required for university entrance. The affirmative action policy allows more girls the opportunity to obtain the required number of points.
at public universities, initiating distance programmes, and many others. These policies were also intended to bring about gender parity in education, which has almost been achieved. However this has not translated into gender parity in educational leadership. Leading causes for this imbalance are male domination in recruiting agencies, women’s self-limitation, fear of responsibilities, and lack of self-esteem (Kagoda, 2011).

During the concluding discussions of this session, participants suggested that quality is often judged by systems which are based on male leadership styles and environments that benefit men. Not only do education systems need to be more gender sensitive, but men also need to be liberated so they can contribute to gender equality. Main policy changes should include pre- and post-appointment mentoring, international and national monitoring, anti-discrimination training for those controlling promotions, and training women in applying for higher positions. Other factors that prevent women from entering senior positions relate to self-limiting issues, where women often deliberately choose not to enter into competition for the most senior positions. The reasons for this are often cited as the gendered nature of the work world, where connections, patronage, and networks appear to be more important than qualifications or experience. In addition, the nature of many organizational cultures do not sufficiently cater for and often ignore the need for men or women to care for others.
7. Lunchtime talks

A Global Compact on Learning: Taking Action on Education in Developing Countries

Center for Universal Education at Brookings Institution

Evidence indicates that although progress has been made in many areas of enrolment and gender parity there remain significant gaps in terms of learning achievement. The scope and scale of the crisis in learning is only gradually emerging from the more recent focus on learning attainment globally. This study highlights the ‘double jeopardy’ more often facing girls in terms of learning (although recognizing that in some areas there is also an issue facing boys who are forced into early employment), where if girls fall behind due to their domestic situation, they are more likely to drop out and therefore not likely to progress into further education and therefore achieve their full life potential.

The Global compact suggests three priorities:

1. Support quality early childhood development and learning opportunities for girls and boys.
2. Build foundational skills in literacy and numeracy in the lower grades.

The education community needs to move forward by: enhancing the coordination of advocacy efforts, developing a shared research agenda, forming multi-stakeholder collaborations, and new goals, targets and benchmarks which will shift the focus from access to improved learning opportunities and outcomes. Figure 4 below summarizes the approach suggested by the Global Compact on Learning.

Figure 4: Elements of the Global Compact on Learning (Source: Brookings Institution, 2011)
Gender violence in schools as a factor in school dropout rates in sub-Saharan Francophone Africa

French Ministry of Foreign Affairs

In May 2010, a working group was set up by the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Genre en Action, Forum for African Women Educationalists (FAWE), Plan France, UNESCO, UNICEF, and l’Organisation internationale de la Francophonie (OIF) with two main objectives: to identify and highlight gender-based violence in schools and its impact on the schooling of girls, and to advocate the eradication of this violence and promote universal education.

The activities of the group can be broken down into four areas:

1. active monitoring of the issue of gender violence in schools;
2. synthesis reporting of studies as well as updating and deepening of previous work;
3. research work and pilot testing of enhanced data collection methods;
4. tackling gender violence as a factor in girls’ premature leaving of education, and forming a three-year working group with all members making explicit indicator-based commitments.

The document which forms the basis of their approach was developed through a participatory process in Dakar and has three themes: best data collection practices, the legal treatment of gender based violence in schools, and preventative actions and management structures. Different forms of gender-based violence have been found, including sexual, physical, and psychological violence. Gender violence is often a means by which boys assert their masculinity and determine their social identities. Furthermore, gender-based violence often involves power relations and can therefore be influenced by the dominant players who control power structures. Violence occurs within and on the way to schools, and often involves pupils, teachers, bus drivers, and community members. It is difficult to quantify the impacts of gender-based violence, but it can amplify already existing discrimination against girls, discourage girls from attending school, and increase the likelihood of early pregnancies or STIs and HIV/AIDS.

No single regional definition of gender-based violence currently exists, and although there are national and regional laws protecting the rights of women and children, they are often not upheld at the local and community levels. Thus, three critical elements must be addressed in order to ensure a significant change regarding gender-based violence, including: breaking the silence surrounding gender violence, addressing the issue of the impunity of perpetrators, and implementing preventative measures and treatments in schools.
8. Policy, Research, Agenda for Action, and Partnership

The panel discussion for this session comprised all of the Keynote Speakers and was chaired by Joshua Muskin from the Agha Khan Foundation. In addition, this session invited the ministers of education present at the Policy Forum to provide some final contributions to the proceedings.

Gender equality is not just about numbers

Throughout the Policy Forum, many speakers emphasized the focus of the forum – looking beyond parity. While there has undoubtedly been progress towards gender parity in many countries, this has not necessarily translated to equality in learning outcomes as well as life opportunities. For example, girls continue to significantly outperform boys in reading in OECD countries and the gender gap is widening. Similar findings were reported in Viet Nam and SACMEQ countries where boys tended to outperform girls in mathematics. In addition, the direction and magnitude of gender differences in achievement have remained the same in SACMEQ countries even when there have been improvements in gender parity. The focus of gender-based interventions needs to move away from gender parity towards the wider issue of education quality.

The context of what lies behind the numbers and the inequities underlying these statistics is not always considered. For example a girl achieving an above-average score in mathematics living in a poor rural village has many more challenges to overcome than a girl living in a rich household in an urban area who obtained the same score.

We need to broaden our perspective and not just talk to ourselves

As educators we often just talk to our own sector and fail to reach out to other organizations working on similar issues. It was recognized that some very interesting work on gender equality lies outside of education, including in areas such as the corporate sector, where arguments are being made regarding the power of diversity in management. Instead of creating more data sets, we should advocate for the inclusion of education in some of the data collection and analyses of other agencies such as the European Gender Index, OECD Gender Index, Global Gender Gap Report, ILO decent work indices, etc. This was a concrete action point that the organizers were urged to take forward when discussing with agencies and advocating for education to be included as part of broader analyses. It was suggested that a working group or consortium could be mandated with creating more effective collaboration between the different actors working on gender equality issues at different levels.
There need for interventions at different levels (macro, meso, and micro): (i) international/national government level (ii) organizational level (iii) personal level

Various interventions at different levels (macro, meso, and micro) were suggested. Such interventions include: organizational development of ministries to ensure the gender responsiveness of ministries’ organizational cultures; comprehensive gender responsive training for educators at all levels; the development of theoretical frameworks that consider the intersectionality of gender with race, ethnicity, religion, and economic and social statuses.

Participants at the Policy Forum also recognized that interventions need to also occur at a personal level. We must change our daily conduct, within our schools, work environments, and/or households to challenge gender roles ascribed by society. We must view education as a mechanism for opening mindsets, supporting emotional and social development (via curricula), and a tool for self-empowerment. Personal and organizational work practices that counter the possible progression of caretakers, whether they are men or women, is also important. It was noted by some speakers that there is an emotional price to being successful, which is particularly prominent among professional women, many of whom are also caretakers of children.

Multi-sectoral interventions (education, health, labour, and women’s affairs)

Very few of the major issues surrounding gender equality can be tackled within education alone. Hence, other sectors such as health or labour should be included in our actions moving forward. The World Bank reported that they are currently re-evaluating their efforts in gender equality and are also moving towards a more holistic approach that works across sectors. We need to promote gender responsive organizations, and engage in comprehensive gender training beyond just teachers. Gender equality is not a collateral outcome; it must be directly addressed and focused upon. The discussion on gender equality cuts across all sectors, ministries of education, and other line ministries. Men and women globally need to lead by example, to work together across boundaries and become the role models for the young leaders of the future. We should be inspired by the readiness of younger generations to break traditional barriers when conceptualizing innovative interventions.

Inclusion

We must recognize issues of inclusion, and acknowledge that several key areas of the world were not represented in the Policy Forum, including Arab states and South Asia. We also need to support and educate boys in order to achieve better educational opportunities for all students. The next generation will be crucial actors in the movement towards gender equality, and hence, both girls and boys must be included in all interventions. We must also consider how others – such as teachers and administrators who work daily in the education sector – can be supported in implementing necessary changes.

Use the existing legal frameworks to ensure policy becomes practice

Progress towards gender equality has been made regarding enrolment and textbooks, and must now be focused towards reducing gender gaps in educational quality. It was proposed that we
must link our findings and policies to national gender plans. There already exist many frameworks designed to promote greater gender equality. For example, national action plans and shadow reports of CEDAW could be used more effectively for advocacy purposes. National frameworks, constitutions, and policies can also provide a backdrop by which greater accountability for ensuring gender equality could be promoted.

**Men and women in leadership positions have an important role to play**

It was acknowledged by many that men have a critical role in promoting women’s leadership; men, like women, can be strong agents of change. As his Excellency Nath Bunroeun, the Cambodian Secretary of State for Education noted, ‘men need to open their hearts’. Both men and women need to recognize their responsibilities when they are political leaders to ensure that political will to promote gender equality at all levels is sustained. Furthermore, men and women at all levels need to lead by example and be effective role models personally and professionally in ways that promote gender responsiveness.

**We all have a role to play**

Some members of the Policy Forum personally committed to taking action to promote gender equality in education. The actions varied from commitments to reach out more forcefully to the Arab states that were underrepresented in the forum, to ministries of education committing to making gender equality an issue at the highest political levels.
9. Recommendations

Conduct qualitative research
In order to go beyond the ‘numbers game’ of gender parity we need research which goes beyond the measurement of numbers and parity in learning outcomes; research which provides a way to measure and understand gender from a multidimensional perspective. Hence more qualitative research that listens to the life histories and voices of those we claim to represent.

Take a holistic approach
Participants argued that research and practice in relation to gender equality need to take a more holistic approach, to look at education from early childhood through to adult education. In this regard, and in relation to research spanning other age groups, the Policy Forum for 2012 would most likely address the issue of planning for youth engagement, which will also have a strong gender dimension. In addition, approaches to gender equality need to account for the fact that education and gender do not exist in isolation from other sectors and that we should learn from the research, policy, and practice that has been undertaken in both the private sector and other development sectors.

Ensure ongoing collaboration
Many of the participants expressed appreciation of the forum as an opportunity to bring together a number of actors from senior policy-makers to academics working on gender-related issues. The complementarity and collaboration that emerged as a result of the exchanges was felt to be valuable, and it was suggested that these could be more formalized, even to the extent of utilizing each other’s data items for greater synergies – for example between PISA and SACMEQ. Similarly, collaboration on different research agendas could enrich both qualitative and quantitative research programmes. In this light it was suggested that the Policy Forum should not be the ‘end’ of the exchange, and participant’s expressed a wish to continue the exchange in some form, so that others who were not able to attend the event could also participate in the rich discussions. As a result, IIEP is conducting an online forum in March 2012, which will continue the debate virtually.

Ensure that internal processes and external support are gender transformativ
Participants noted that IIEP (as with all organizations) needed also to look at its policies and practices to ensure that they are not only gender responsive but also gender transformativ, whether in the training of ministry officials at IIEP and in-country, as part of its ongoing research, or when implementing technical assistance programmes. There is a need to ensure that IIEP’s work with ministries of education actively promotes gender equality in all respects. While IIEP has made some key efforts in this regard, there is still much to be done, and a comprehensive mapping of the gender-related activities that IIEP is undertaking or planning to undertake will be conducted in 2012. As part of the ongoing research into the two strands featured during the Policy Forum, there will be further qualitative research conducted into gender equality in learning achievement in a number of countries, which will be connected to identified strategies to improve gender equality in planning and management.
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11. Annex I. Agenda

Monday, 3 October 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Participants’ registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Inauguration of the Policy Forum in the presence of Irina Bokova (Director General, UNESCO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Opening remarks by Cheryl Gregory Faye (Head, UNGEI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>Opening remarks by Khalil Mahshi (Director, IIEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>Plenary Session #1: International Evidence on Gender Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>Keynote Speech: Professor Nelly Stromquist, International Education, University of Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Working Groups in Session #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Stream 1: Gender equality in learning and teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Chair (s): Elaine Unterhalter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Stream 2: Gender equality in educational planning and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Chair (s): Nelly Stromquist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>• What can we learn from PISA on gender equality in educational achievement? (Francesca Borgonovi and Maciej Jakubowski)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>• Gender and learning achievement in Francophone Africa: Study on the performance of pupils in primary cycle (Vanessa Sy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>• Trends of gender differences in learning achievement in Southern and Eastern Africa (2 papers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>(i) Albert Byamugisha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>(ii) Mioko Saito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>• International issues affecting gender equality in educational planning and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>• UNESCO-Global Monitoring Report Gender overview of progress towards gender parity and equality (Pauline Rose)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>• A global review of gender equality in educational planning and management (Anna Obura)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>• Conceptualising gender equality in educational planning and management: a comparative analysis (Tina Wallace)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>Lunch – Brown Bag Lunch – Centre for Universal Education, Brookings Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>Plenary Session #2: Learning from experience of gender equality interventions and strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>Keynote Speech: Oley Dibba-Wadda, Executive Director, FAWE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>Chair (s): Jacques Ki, Director General, CONFEMEN and Hon. Minister Ongeri of Kenya Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-16:00</td>
<td><strong>Coffee/tea break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-17:30</td>
<td><strong>Working Groups in Session #2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|              | **Stream 1:** Gender equality in learning and teaching  
|              | Chair (s): May Rihani, FHI360                 |
|              | **Stream 2:** Gender equality in educational planning and management  
|              | Chair (s): Oley Dibba-Wadda, FAWE            |
|              | • Promoting gender equality: Lessons from a JICA technical cooperation project in basic education in Yemen (Keiko Mizuno and Miyako Kobayashi)  
|              | • Gender dimension of HIV and AIDS programme (Stephanie Dolata)  
|              | • Gender balance of teachers and school heads in SACMEQ countries (Njora Hungi)  
|              | Can women circumvent the ‘glass ceiling’ in educational planning and management? Evidence-based case studies from four countries:  
|              | • Argentina (Natalia Gherardi)  
|              | • Kenya (Anna Obura)  
|              | • Viet Nam (Kristy Kelly)                     |
| 17:30-20:00  | **Group Photo**                               |
|              | **Reception hosted by IIEP**                  |
### Tuesday, 4 October 2011

**8:30 – 9:45**  
Participants’ registration  

**9:45 – 10:45**  
**Plenary Session #3: Methodologies for Gender-related Studies**  
Keynote Speech: **Professor Elaine Unterhalter, Education and International Development, Institute of Education**  
Chair (s): Professor Nelly Stromquist, University of Maryland  

**10:45-11:15**  
Coffee/tea break  

**11:15-12:30**  
**Working Groups in Session #3**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stream 1: Gender equality in learning and teaching</th>
<th>Stream 2: Gender equality in educational planning and management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair (s): Jane Freedman, UNESCO</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chair (s): Jane Hodges, ILO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Literacy and the Gender Gap in South African Schools: Application of multilevel analysis methods (Linda Zuze)</td>
<td>Approaches to promoting gender equality in leadership positions in education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gender differences in student learning outcomes in Viet Nam: Application of structural equation modelling (Cuc Nguyen)</td>
<td>• Creating and supporting women’s leadership in education: Charting the effects of international, national and organizational cultures (Jill Sperandio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Feminist research and boys’ schooling: Gender equality and construction of African masculinities: An example study of Africa-Asia university dialogue network (Fatuma Chege and Riho Sakurai)</td>
<td>• Methodological Issues and Intersectionality in Gender Studies (Jacky Lumby)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessing the effectiveness of affirmative action on women’s leadership and participation in Uganda (Alice Kagoda)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**12:30-14:00**  
Lunch – Brown Bag Lunch – Ministère des Affaires étrangères et européennes  

**14:00-15:30**  
**Plenary Session #4: Policy, Research, Agenda for Action, and Partnership**  
Panel discussion: Recommendations for policy and practice  
Chair (s): Joshua Muskin, Aga Khan Foundation  
Panellists: Oley-Dibba Wadda, Nelly Stromquist, Elaine Unterhalter, Cheryl Gregory Faye  

**15:30-15:45**  
Coffee/tea break  

**15:45-17:00**  
Closing Ceremony  
Closing Remarks by Khalil Mahshi (Director, IIEP)  
Closing Remarks by Jane Freedman (Gender Equality Division, UNESCO)