

Implementing Sustainable Development Goal on Education (SDG4) amid Donor Fatigue: Challenges for the Global South

Paul Kakupa

Faculty of Education, Northeast Normal University, Changchun, Jilin, China
School of Education, The University of Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia

Happy Joseph Shayo

Faculty of Education, Northeast Normal University, Changchun, Jilin, China

ABSTRACT

This paper critically reflects on the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goal on education (SDG4) in the Global South amid apparent donor fatigue. It also highlights international observers' concerns about a huge funding gap in implementing SDG4 in the Global South. With the COVID-19 pandemic currently ravaging the world, this funding gap is expected to widen further. In the face of these challenges, low-income countries with a high dependency on aid remain at risk of not meeting most SDG4 targets. While reflecting on what the decline in education aid might mean for low-income countries, the paper argues that a truly transformative approach can help these countries achieve SDG4 and its sustainability agenda despite their funding challenges.

Keywords: COVID-19; Donor fatigue; Education aid; Foreign aid; Least developed countries; Sustainable Development Goals; SDG4.

INTRODUCTION

In September 2015, the United Nations (UN) member countries ratified and adopted an ambitious development plan, dubbed: *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. The 2030 agenda is an international initiative meant to address the economic, social, and environmental aspects of development through a set of 17 universal Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and 169 targets (United Nations, 2015). Like the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), SDGs aim to advance sustainable development by eradicating poverty, hunger, social inequalities, conservation of environmental resources, and building of just, fair, and peaceful societies, among others, by 2030 (Wils, 2015). However, unlike MDGs, which were designed by a small team of experts from the developed world (Hulme, 2009), SDGs were formulated and adopted through a comprehensive consultative process (United Nations, 2015). A wide range of development stakeholders from all walks of life directly participated in the design process. These included government representatives, civil society organizations, academia, think tanks, and non-governmental organizations. Ordinary individuals worldwide also participated by voting (online) for the issues they wished to see addressed (Brissett & Mitter, 2017).

To the extent that the process of developing SDGs involved the participation of people from both the Global North and Global South, it can be argued that these goals are universal and

constitute ideals that apply equally to all countries. Nevertheless, the stark resource disparities between these two sets of countries make SDGs more attainable in the Global North, where countries are generally wealthy and better equipped (Ferguson et al., 2018). The implementation of interventions critical for the achievement of SDGs requires enormous financial investments (Masaiti et al., 2018). For this reason, the resource-constrained countries in the Global South may sadly not meet the targets (Ferguson et al., 2018). International observers have since raised concerns about the challenges that least developed countries (LDCs), in particular, face in meeting SDGs in general and SDG on education (SDG 4). LDCs currently have a huge funding gap of US\$148 billion for them to implement SDG4 successfully (UNESCO, 2020). With the current global pandemic (COVID-19) in full swing, UNESCO (2020) has warned that this funding gap will widen further to reach US\$200 billion if no action is taken. While calls have been made for more education aid to be pumped into LDCs, there is no guarantee that they will be heeded to, as most donor countries are turning their attention to more pressing demands at home, such as tax reforms, energy, infrastructure, and emerging issues such as global warming and climate change (Benavot et al., 2010; UNESCO, 2014). The current global health and economic crises occasioned by the COVID-19 pandemic further complicate aid mobilization efforts since the world's major aid donors are among the worst hit and may have to entirely refocus their resources on rebuilding their economies (World Bank, 2020a), at least in the foreseeable future. In this paper, we reflect on what the decline in education aid might mean for LDCs that have almost always depended on it. We make a case for the recontextualization of SDG4 targets to align with LDCs' unique circumstances and local contexts. We also challenge the neoliberal pro-growth development model that appears to undergird some of SDG4 targets and caution that a utilitarian approach to implementing SDG4 cannot work in resource-constrained contexts.

SDG4 Agenda

SDG4 is one of the seventeen global goals adopted by the UN membership to advance sustainable social and economic growth by eradicating poverty and inequality, creating equal opportunities for all, and ensuring environmental sustainability (Regmi, 2015; United Nations, 2015). Through ten ambitious targets focusing on children, youth, and adults' needs, the goal aims to "ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all" (Regmi, 2015, p. 317). SDG4 was formulated to respond to the global challenge of over 58 million out-of-school children and over 100 million more who were not completing primary school (United Nations, 2020). Since 2015, the number of out-of-school children has risen to 250 million (UNESCO, 2019a; United Nations, 2020). Additionally, over 670 million children and adolescents in primary and secondary schools worldwide are not acquiring minimum proficiency in mathematics and reading. More than half of these problems occur in LDCs, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa (UNESCO, 2017a; Mulenga-Hagane et al., 2020).

SDG4 aims to achieve inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning through the following ten targets:

4.1: By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable, and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes (United Nations, 2015, p.17).

4.2: By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys have access to quality early childhood development, care, and pre-primary education so that they are ready for primary education (United Nations, 2015, p.17).

4.3: By 2030, ensure equal access for all women and men to affordable quality technical vocational and tertiary education, including university education (United Nations, 2015, p.17).

4.4: By 2030, substantially increase the number of youth and adults who have relevant skills, including technical and vocational skills, for employment, decent jobs, and entrepreneurship (United Nations, 2015, p.17).

4.5: By 2030, eliminate gender disparities in education and ensure equal access to all levels of education and vocational training for the vulnerable, including persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples, and children in vulnerable situations (United Nations, 2015, p.17).

4.6: By 2030, ensure that all youth and a substantial proportion of adults, both men, and women, achieve literacy and numeracy (United Nations, 2015, p.17).

4.7: By 2030, ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development (United Nations, 2015, p.17).

4.a: Build and upgrade education facilities that are child, disability, and gender-sensitive and provide safe, non-violent, inclusive, and effective learning environments for all (United Nations, 2015, p.17).

4.b: By 2020, substantially expand globally the number of scholarships available to developing countries, in particular least developed countries, small island developing States, and African countries, for enrolment in higher education, including vocational training and information and communications technology, technical, engineering and scientific programs, in developed countries and other developing countries (United Nations, 2015, pp.17-18).

4.c: By 2030, substantially increase the supply of qualified teachers, including through international cooperation for teacher training in developing countries, especially least developed countries, and small island developing States (United Nations, 2015, p.18).

Like the other sixteen SDGs, SDG4 targets are essential to both developing and developed countries. As a matter of fact, SDG4 has been recognized as a vehicle through which all the other SDGs can be delivered (Brissett & Mitter, 2017). However, as noted earlier, the implementation of these targets heavily depends on resource availability. Countries in the Global North that are comparatively well-off are more likely to achieve them than their needy counterparts in the South. It has been suggested that for SDG4 targets to be fully attained in the Global South, these countries will need to increase their educational expenditures by 50 percent of their Gross Domestic Products (GDPs) (UNESCO, 2015a). While this suggestion sounds good, it is unattainable in LDCs, whose share of the world's total wealth is less than one percent (Regmi,

2015). Given these countries' many challenges, it remains to be seen how they will achieve SDG4 targets. Sadly, these countries have already missed the 2020 target of 46 percent on secondary school completion rate (UNESCO, 2020).

DECLINING FOREIGN AID AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SDG4 IN LDCS

The world is currently undergoing a challenging period occasioned by the COVID-19 pandemic. National health, economic, and educational systems around the globe have not been spared from the pandemic's devastating impact. Ironically, among the most severely hit countries are the world's major aid donors, whose economies are projected to shrink to levels unseen since the 2008 economic recession (World Bank, 2020b). The COVID-19 crisis is taking place at a time when international aid to education was already experiencing a steady decline. Since 2010, the share of development and humanitarian aid going to the education sector has been dwindling (UNESCO, 2017a). Despite LDCs' heavy dependence on external assistance, aid to education significantly declined during the latter phase of the MDG implementation. In 2012, for example, when the financing gap to education stood at US\$26 billion, and contrary to their aid pledges made in 2000, large donors massively cut their spending to education (UNESCO, 2014). The Netherlands, for instance, cut its assistance to education by about US\$200 million (UNESCO, 2014). With COVID-19 in the interplay, the situation will only get worse.

In 2017 UNESCO released a communique with the caption: "Aid to education falls for the sixth consecutive year." In the said bulletin, it was noted that education aid had continued to decline since 2010. With the total value in 2016 standing at \$12 billion, education aid had reduced by four percent from its 2010 value (UNESCO, 2017b). Surprisingly, while development aid, in general, registered an increase of 24 percent since 2010, the proportion going to basic education was six percent lower than in 2010 (UNESCO, 2017c). Additionally, the allocations of the world's top donors (the United States and the United Kingdom) fell by around 10 percent between 2014 and 2015 (UNESCO, 2017b). By 2012, the share of aid going to basic education in LDC was 57 percent —fourteen percent lower than in 2002 (UNESCO, 2014). In terms of the share of humanitarian aid allocated to education, the picture remains gloomy. Despite marginal increases since 2013, the level of humanitarian aid to education still falls below the target of four percent set by the Global Education First Initiative (GEFI) in 2011 (UNESCO, 2014; UNESCO, 2017c). The closest humanitarian aid has come to achieving this target was 2.7 percent recorded in 2016 (UNESCO, 2017c). As if that were not enough, UNESCO (2014) observes that, Education is suffering a double disadvantage because it is not only receiving the smallest proportion of humanitarian appeals, but it is also receiving one of the smallest proportions of the requests that it makes for funding: in 2013, the sector received 40% of what it had requested from humanitarian aid. This compares with 86% for the food sector and 57% for the health sector (p.5).

Unfortunately, the scenario described above has persisted. In 2016, the education sector was allocated only 48 percent of the total amount requested, when all other sectors received an average of 57 percent (UNESCO, 2017c). Therefore, notwithstanding the recent formation of the International Finance Facility for Education (IFFEd) —a new international body uniquely designed to galvanize support for continued access to low-cost education financing for LDCs (Alba & Mathiasen, 2020), the task of mobilizing additional donor funds for education will remain daunting (UNESCO, 2019a, 2019b).

Alongside the general decline in education assistance, another trend that has been observed is that aid is no longer flowing to the poorest countries that need it the most. A 2017 United Nations report revealed that sub-Saharan Africa, a region that hosts “over half of the world’s out-of-school children, now receives less than half the aid to basic education it obtained in 2002” (UNESCO, 2017b, p.1). To put this into perspective, the aid to basic education allocated to sub-Saharan Africa was barely four percent higher than that allocated to Northern Africa and Western Asia, where only 9 percent of the children are not in school (UNESCO, 2017b). What is more distressing to note is that while educational conditions in LDCs are calling for more aid, “...donors to education are shifting their attention away from the poorest countries” (UNESCO, 2017b, p.1).

An SOS has since been raised to draw attention to the plight of the world’s poorest countries. In her 2017 appeal, the UNESCO Director-General, Irina Bokova noted that “aid remains far short of what is needed to achieve Sustainable Development Goal 4, putting our commitments at risk,” adding that “aid would need to be multiplied by at least six to achieve our common education goals...” (UNESCO, 2017b, p.1). Clearly, the low aid priority to education is a sharp departure from the agreements made at the Dakar Framework for Action in 2000, where governments and donor agencies swore that “no countries seriously committed to education for all will be thwarted in their achievement of this goal by a lack of resources” (UNESCO, 2000, p.9). At least in the foreseeable future, there is no indication that education aid will receive a higher donor priority.

Therefore, one question begging an answer is what the decline in education aid means for LDCs that have almost always depended on it. The backtracking of donors on education aid promises reflects more than the desire to focus resources on their local problems and is striking given that the same donors have continued to increase funding to other sectors such as food and health (Benavot et al., 2010; UNESCO, 2017c). One reason that has been advanced for this decline is that “donors may be questioning its [education aid] importance” (UNESCO, 2014, p.3). Considering the mass wastage and persistent learning crisis in these countries (UNESCO, 2015a; Wils, 2015), they may be skeptical about the value of education in LDCs. According to recent reports, about 79 percent of pupils in Nigeria were unable to read even after completing primary school (Keffenbeger & Pritchett, 2017). In Zambia and Malawi, as many as 89 percent of all second-graders proceeded to the third grade, unable to read and write (RTI International, 2015). Earlier in 2013, Muralidharan & Zieleniak (2013) reported that over 58 percent of sixth-grade pupils in West and Central Africa were not competent in reading and arithmetic enough to proceed with schooling. Overall, schooling in LDCs continues to have minimal impact on learning outcomes for millions of children (Pritchett, 2013). Given these grim statistics, it may not be an overstatement to suggest that the donors are probably fatigued with the lack of educational progress in the countries where they spend millions of dollars each year in aid.

WAY FORWARD FOR LDCS

While donors are gradually reneging on their education support commitments, many LDCs continue to depend on aid (UNESCO, 2017c). For example, about two-fifths of public spending on education in Afghanistan, Malawi, and Liberia come from external assistance (UNESCO, 2014). What, then, do cuts in foreign aid mean for these and other developing countries? While calls have been made for LDCs to broaden their tax bases, explore non-traditional sources of funding, and increase budgetary allocations to education, we argue that in addition to these

initiatives, these countries should critically reflect on what sustainable development should look like in their local contexts, and decide how they can achieve it given their resources. Sustainable development ought to be contextually defined by each individual country. To achieve the anticipated inclusive education, LDCs should adapt SDG4 to their local situations and devise means for achieving it using local resources while taking “lessons from countries in the Global North” (Ferguson, 2018, p.4). This will allow them to not only track their own progress but also make them more accountable and committed to the goal. Currently, it is even difficult to tell how these countries can be held responsible for non-compliance (King, 2015).

Another critical issue to address concerns the double messages being conveyed in some of the SDG4 targets. While the goal broadly appears to be transformative and humanistic, by emphasizing skills, science, and technology (e.g., targets 4.4 and 4.b) to the exclusion of other forms of knowledge, it is essentially endorsing the very old neoliberal capitalist development model (Brissett & Mitter, 2017), which has failed to work in the Global South. It is probably for this reason that some scholars have labeled SDGs in their entirety “ideals set by countries in the North” (Ferguson, 2018, p.3). If SDG4 continues to be implemented with a utilitarian focus, then it will not be attained in LDCs. Only a truly transformative approach is needed to actualize the vision of sustainable development in these resource-needy contexts. There has to be a shift in approach from the current emphasis on skills for employment (Kakupa, 2017) consistent with Western notions of knowledge, to one that acknowledges and integrates indigenous forms of knowledge (Brissett & Mitter, 2017). That way, the implementation of SDG4 will involve the participation of local communities who will play a critical role in selecting and integrating indigenous knowledge forms necessary to address the social, economic, and environmental injustices that the utilitarian approach cannot (Owuor, 2008). In the current setup, SDG4 does not fully support local models of sustainability. The result is that LDCs will always require external assistance to achieve any agenda based on external (Western) conceptions of development.

Some SDG critics have gone further to argue that the very format of the SDG framework point to a typical Western way of doing things (Brissett & Mitter, 2017; Easterly, 2015). The use of goals, targets, and indicators “reflects [a] Western obsession with action plans” (Brissett & Mitter, 2017, p.191). Earlier in 2009, Hulme (2009) criticized this approach of reducing development to mere statistics, goals, and targets. By privileging a Western scientific way of planning, it is evident that other non-Western ways of conceptualizing sustainable development may have been sidelined. Indeed, as Brissett & Mitter (2017) correctly observe, when these [Western] approaches define the policy initiative and are arrived at in the context of inequality among stakeholders, certain interests and values are likely to be marginalized (p.191).

While economic outcomes of education are important, alternative knowledge forms must be accommodated in formal education circles. Likewise, alternative notions of progress must begin to be acknowledged and appropriated. Sustainability issues that the SDG movement speaks to can be better addressed through locally generated approaches.

CONCLUSION

SDG 4 targets will be a significant financial burden for LDCs even in the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic. While SDG4 envisions a transformative and shared aspiration for all, its targets

appear to be toeing the line between two contrasting dominant approaches to education and development —one that links education to economic outcomes and another that views education as a tool for achieving social, economic, and ecological justice. However, the former (utilitarian) approach to implementing SDG4 does not speak to LDCs' unique contexts and circumstances (HLP, 2013) and can, therefore, not work in LDCs. We have argued that by privileging the Western notion of sustainability and development over others, the SDG agenda technically absolves LDCs of their responsibility to define sustainability for themselves and work towards achieving it within the constraints of their resources. These countries will always require foreign aid to implement policies rooted in discourses that marginalize indigenous or alternative knowledge forms. This then means that donors' cuts to education aid spell doom for achieving SDG4 targets in LDCs. However, SDG4 can still be attained in LDCs if a genuinely transformative approach is adopted; one that will advance curricula that incorporate alternative forms of knowledge and effectively allow for contextual translations of SDG4.

References

- Alba, P. & Mathiasen, K. (2020). *The International Finance Facility for Education: A vital instrument to mitigate the impact of the pandemic*. Future Development. <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/future-development/2020/07/09/the-international-finance-facility-for-education-a-vital-instrument-to-mitigate-the-impact-of-the-pandemic/>.
- Ball, S. J. (2016). Subjectivity as a site of struggle: refusing neoliberalism? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 37(8), 1129-1146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2015.1044072>.
- Benavot, A., Archer, D., Moseley, S., Mundy, K., Phiri, F., Steer, L. & Wiking, D. (2010). International Aid to Education. *Comparative Education Review*, 54(1), 105-124. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/649052>.
- Brissett, N., & Mitter, R. (2017). For Function or Transformation? A Critical Discourse Analysis of Education under the Sustainable Development Goals. *The Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 15, 181-204. <http://www.jceps.com/archives/3326>.
- Easterly, W. (2015). The SDGs Should Stand for Senseless, Dreamy, Garbled. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2015/09/28/the-sdgs-are-utopian-and-worthless-mdgs-development-rise-of-the-rest/>.
- Ferguson, T., Illisko, D., Roofe, C., & Hill, S. (2018). *SDG4 - Quality Education: Inclusivity, Equity and Lifelong Learning For All*. Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/publication/doi/10.1108/9781787694231>.
- HLP (2013). *A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies through Sustainable Development (HLP Report)*. <http://www.un.org/sg/management/beyond2015.shtml>.
- Hulme, D. (2009). The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs): A Short History of the World's Biggest Promise. *Global Development Institute Working Paper Series 10009*, GDI, The University of Manchester. <https://ideas.repec.org/p/bwp/bwppap/10009.html>.
- Kaffenberger, M., & Pritchett, L. (2017). *More School or More Learning? Evidence from Learning Profiles from the Financial Inclusion Insights Data*. Background Paper, World Bank. https://riseprogramme.org/sites/default/files/publications/RISE_WP-012_Pritchett%20Kaffenberger.pdf
- Kakupa, P. (2017). The vocationalization policy in Zambia's secondary education sector: A critical analysis. *International Journal of Vocational and Technical Education*, 9(4), 31-39. <https://doi.org/10.5897/IJYTE2017.0229>.
- King, K. (2015). *The History and Future of International Cooperation*. NORRAG. https://www.norrag.org/fileadmin/Working_Papers/Working_Paper__9_King.pdf

Maclure, R., Sabbah, R. & Lavan, D. (2009). Education and Development: The Perennial Contradictions of Policy Discourse. In P. Haslam, J. Schafer, & P. Beaudet, (Eds.), *Introduction to International Development: Approaches, Actors, and Issues* (1st ed., pp.367-383). Oxford University Press.

Masaiti, G., Njobvu, T., & Kakupa, P. (2018). Education and Learning in the Post Third Republic: Opportunities and Challenges. In Masaiti, G., *Education in Zambia at Fifty Years of Independence and Beyond: History, Current Status and Contemporary Issues* (pp. 66 – 90). UNZA Press: Lusaka.

Mulenga-Hagane, M., Daka, H., & Kanchebele-Sinyangwe, M. (2020). Learning from Change: Benefits and Implications of Distinct Primary and Secondary Schools for Education in Zambia. *Malcolm Moffat Multidisciplinary Journal of Research and Education*, 1 (1), 121 – 136.

Muralidharan, K., & Zieleniak, Y. (2013). *Measuring Learning Trajectories in Developing Countries with Longitudinal Data and Item Response Theory*. Paper presented at the Young Lives Conference, Oxford University, Oxford, U.K., July 8–9.

Owuor, J. (2008). Integrating African Indigenous Knowledge in Kenya's Formal Education System: The Potential for Sustainable Development. *JCIE*, 2(2), 21-37. <https://doi.org/10.20355/C5Z594>.

Pritchett, L. (2013). *The Rebirth of Education: Schooling Ain't Learning*. Center for Global Development. Brookings Institution Press.

Regmi, K. D. (2015). Lifelong learning and post-2015 educational goals: challenges for the least developed countries. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, (45)2, 317-322, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2014.993223>.

RTI International (2015). *Survey of Children's Reading Materials in African Languages in Eleven Countries – Final Report*. U.S. Agency for International Development.

Sayed, Y., & Moriarty, K. (2020). Chapter 9 SDG 4 and the 'Education Quality Turn. In *Grading Goal Four* (pp. 194-213). Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004430365_009.

The Global Goals for Sustainable Development. (2015). *Quality Education*. <http://www.globalgoals.org/global-goals/quality-education/>.

UNESCO (2000). *Dakar Framework for Action*. UNESCO. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001211/121147e.pdf>.

UNESCO (2014). *Education for All Global Monitoring Report: Policy Paper 13*. UNESCO. http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/ED/GMR/images/2014/transforms/UNESCO_Policy_Paper_13-EN_v5.pdf.

UNESCO (2015a). *Education for All Global Monitoring Report: Policy Paper 18*. UNESCO. <https://en.unesco.org/gem-report/node/819>.

UNESCO (2015b). *Incheon Declaration: Education 2030*. UNESCO. <https://iite.unesco.org/publications/education-2030-incheon-declaration-framework-action-towards-inclusive-equitable-quality-education-lifelong-learning/>.

UNESCO (2017a). *More Than One-Half of Children and Adolescents Are Not Learning Worldwide*. UNESCO. <http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/fs46-more-than-half-children-not-learning-en-2017.pdf>.

UNESCO (2017b). *Aid to education falls for the sixth consecutive year*. UNESCO. <https://en.unesco.org/news/aid-education-falls-sixth-consecutive-year>.

UNESCO (2017c). *Global Education Monitoring Report: Aid to education is stagnating and not going to countries most in need*. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000249568>.

UNESCO (2019a). *Out-of-school children, adolescents, and youth: Global status and trends*. UNESCO. <http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/new-methodology-shows-258-million-children-adolescents-and-youth-are-out-school.pdf>

UNESCO (2019b). *Global Education Monitoring Report: Migration, displacement and education*. UNESCO. <https://en.unesco.org/gem-report/report/2019/migration>.

UNESCO (2020). *Policy Paper: Act now: Reduce the impact of COVID-19 on the cost of achieving SDG4*. UNESCO.
<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000374163>.

United Nations (2015). *Transforming our world: 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. United Nations.
<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/21252030%20Agenda%20for%20Sustainable%20Development%20web.pdf>.

United Nations (2020). *Policy Brief: Education during COVID-19 and beyond*. UNESCO.
https://www.un.org/development/desa/dspd/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2020/08/sg_policy_brief_covid_19_and_education_august_2020.pdf

Wils, A. (2015). *Reaching education targets in low and lower-middle-income countries – costs and finance gaps to 2030 for pre-primary, primary, lower- and upper secondary schooling*. UNESCO.
<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000232560>.

World Bank (2020a). *The COVID-19 pandemic: Shocks to Education and Policy Responses*. World Bank.
<https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/education/publication/the-covid19-pandemic-shocks-to-education-and-policy-responses>.

World Bank (2020b). *The Impact of the Covid-19 Pandemic on Education Financing*. World Bank.
<http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/734541589314089887/Covid-and-Ed-Finance-final.pdf>.