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Executive Summary

The document analysis follows a systematic perspective to address Inclusive Education in Guatemala. Some vulnerable groups were initially identified in the research design, which are considered key for the achievement of education for all goals without exclusions: indigenous, gender, and population with special education needs linked or not to disabilities.

The starting point for the document analysis, derived from an assessment of the national context, took into account poverty as a factor that creates barriers that prevent the achievement of inclusive educational systems and results in conditions of vulnerability that affect most of the population. Therefore, it is considered that there are elements of context and pertaining to the individuals which, separately or together, may impact the access to, acceptance of, and participation in education. In addition, the systematic perspective implies that there are at least three levels which, when interacting with each other and relating with other stakeholders outside the system, have an impact on the educational processes and their achievements.

The document covers five topics. The first is an explanation about the National Education System. The second presents the sociodemographic profile of the country and presents information about the national education context. The third offers background information about the research and experiences of inclusive education in Guatemala. The fourth presents information about the vulnerable groups of concern. The fifth presents conclusions based on the document analysis.

With respect to the National Education System, pursuant to the Political Constitution of the Republic of Guatemala, education is a human right and the State is responsible for providing it to all the inhabitants of Guatemala without discrimination. To this effect, the Ministry of Education is empowered as guiding body of the education policy. The Ministry of Education currently bases its actions on eight education policies, namely: Coverage, Quality, Management Model, Human Resources, Bilingual, Multicultural and Intercultural Education, Greater investments in education, Equity, Institutional Strengthening and Decentralization.

The country’s legal framework includes several laws that govern the rendering of education services and recognize the need to protect school-age population. The National Education Law, Decree 12-91 governs the National Education System; however, it does not have a set of rules that can ensure the enforcement of its legal provisions. This prevents the development of an inclusive educational system and the opportunity to expand the offer of education services to vulnerable groups. A review of the legal base, provided information that confirms that currently there is no extra-school education subsystem as it is contemplated in this law.

However, the legal context does foresee the tasks that will need to be carried out to ensure opportunities to vulnerable groups who not always benefit from the education offered by the school education subsystem.

The National Education System was divided for this research in three levels: 1) macro level, which is responsible for the execution of education policies through the Minister’s Office, the Vice Ministries, the General Directorates of Education and their interaction with other stakeholders outside of the System but directly involved in supporting education (i.e., Universities, Research Centers, International Cooperation, etc.). 2) meso level, understood as the level that links the macro and
Micro levels. It represents the stakeholders involved in the delivery of education services at a regional level. Its main figures are the Departmental Directorate of Education which, by interacting with other actors in this context, contribute to education. Among other actors at the meso level, we can highlight the role of government organizations which offer other services (for example, health services) and non-governmental organizations with regional presence (i.e., Development Organizations). The micro level is formed by the educational community and the surrounding local context. This level is the most important one because this is where the practice of educational inclusion happens every day. As in the other two levels of the system, there are other stakeholders of the local context whose actions have an impact on education.

Another relevant issue is that the National Education System operates with its own funds, which are allocated in the General Budget of Income and Expenditure of the State every fiscal year. However, there are other entities within the public system that invest in the education services provided by the State to the population, namely: the Urban and Rural Development Councils and the Municipal Councils. This shows that the National Education System is supported by other government systems that contribute in different ways to a task that primarily concerns to the Ministry of Education. This can be seen as an opportunity to expand investment in education and/or as a barrier if there is no coordination and articulation between these institutions.

The second chapter supports the assertion that Guatemala is a country of deep social inequalities which has an impact both in the education results obtained by the population that does have access to a school and the integral development of the individual. It shows the link between poverty and learning, and explains why poverty must be taken as the common background of students for whom inclusive educational systems are being sought in developing countries. The second part of this same chapter presents a detailed description of the national education context through its main education indicators: gross and net schooling rates by year, level, and gender when data was available. Special attention was given to the stages of transition. Furthermore, retention, promotion, and repetition rates by year, level, cycle, and gender. An important subject within the national context and this research is the over-age school population; therefore, data on this matter is included. The chapter concludes with a number of key questions that can encourage future research on this topic.

The third chapter offers a review of the background of research and experiences that relate to inclusive education in Guatemala. A review of different sources revealed that up to now the vision of inclusive education has been mainly linked to attention to persons with special education needs linked or not to disabilities. It also made it clear that since there is no integrated data system, different sources were consulted. The evidence collected shows that previous research encompasses different vulnerable groups but lacks a clearly construed concept of inclusion to explain the challenges that the different vulnerable groups face in the national context. With respect to experiences, it highlights that these are directed to the attention of vulnerable groups, although it is not necessarily explained from the perspective of inclusive education of the present research.

Chapter four presents information about the three vulnerable groups identified as groups of interest in this research: education of indigenous populations and bilingual education, education for girls, and education of population with special education needs linked or not to disabilities. Each group has had achievements derived from government and non-government actions. In the case of Bilingual
Education and Special Education, two General Directorates were created within the Ministry of Education, which are exclusively dedicated to the attention of these matters. Furthermore, there are specific laws and policies. In the case of equity, an education policy exists but there is no institution dedicated to the attention of education for girls. However, there is evidence pointing to important advances in the road to equity of access to education by girls.

Finally, the fifth chapter summarizes conclusions based on the document analysis. These are:

In the first place, poverty is considered a structural barrier that limits access to, acceptance of, and participation in school. The evidence found confirms the effect that social inequality has on learning processes, allowing to conclude that in order to achieve inclusive educational systems, it will be necessary to consider a work articulated with child and youth protection systems.

The current policies of the Ministry of Education and the legal framework favor the vision of an inclusive educational system, but the lack of a set of rules to enforce the specific education law is a barrier to consider future actions.

The organizational structure of the Ministry of Education opens the opportunity to expand the existing education offer within the National Education System, whether focused on the vulnerable groups that although are within the system might abandon their studies before graduating and/or might need support alternatives to achieve the established goals. It could also be applied to those who were excluded from the existing programs and cannot access them.

Public investment on education has been increasing with the participation of other public systems which directly or indirectly support Guatemala’s public education.

However, it would seem that there are coordination tools missing between the different systems and/or entities involved in optimizing said investment.

The information about the education context confirms that there are advances in the access of the population to elementary level education; however, there is a critical gap, namely access to preschool levels and basic secondary school and difficulties to remain in school during the transitions from one cycle to the other.

Indigenous populations living in rural areas present the more complex challenges for the achievement of an inclusive educational system when comparing them to other vulnerable groups. The conditions of poverty and extreme poverty, and consequently the limited opportunities found in their immediate surroundings explain the complexity of the challenges faced.

According to the Ministry of Education Statistics Yearbook, in 2012, the school-age population comprised 28.51% of the total population, from which 55.10% were between 7 and 12 years old. In Guatemala there are 15,835 preschools and 19,414 primary schools; independently of the level, the majority of schools are located in the rural area and are monolingual (the language of instruction is Spanish). In Guatemala, there are three types of school for the primary level, namely: regular (one or more teachers serve one grade); multigrade (one teacher serves two or more grades in one classroom); and one-teacher schools (one teacher serves all grades of primary level). From the total number of primary schools, 55.68% are conformed by multigrade and one-teacher schools (DIPLAN, 2013). The Education System has 195,270 in-service teachers, from which 80% work in the rural area,
82% serve primary level, and 68% are women. Only 17% of preschool teachers and 15% of primary level teachers work in bilingual schools (Sistema e-SIRH, Junio 2014).

The notion of inclusive education in Guatemala has been built from the delivery of services to segments of the population with special education needs linked or not to disabilities. It is necessary to work on a concept of inclusive educational systems that can be transferred or made general to other vulnerable groups that might not be represented in the notion of special education needs and/or vulnerability.

There are advances in the process to achieve inclusive education for the population with special education needs linked or not to disabilities. Among them, the strengthening of the public institutions (through DIGEESP), legal support and the creation of a specific public policy.

There are key precedents with respect to attention to the two vulnerable groups of this research: education for girls and education for indigenous people. However, the processes reported show affirmative action policies instead of a transformation of the National Education System.
Introduction
This paper presents the document review for the Research for Inclusive Education in International Cooperation and it is based on the premises of its design as well as some notions over which the subjects addressed are built.

The research on inclusive education for developing countries of the Refie project for Guatemala and Malawi proposes two main ideas. The first is a systematic perspective to address the matter. The second identifies some vulnerable groups within developing societies which are considered priority to achieve the goal of an education for all, with no exclusions.

The notions that guide the document review are the following. The order of their presentation does not correspond to an order of relevance.

First, when a developing country has been recognized for its inequality and inequity, the possibility to access education services is determined long time before the girl or boy is formally enrolled in an education establishment. By the time the boy or girl reaches the age to attend school, the road to inclusive education and the education community to which this child is destined or to which he or she has access, may be pre-determined and there are obstacles and challenges long before his or her direct experience in school. This background surpasses the scope of the education system per se and its ability to ensure inclusion with equality of conditions for everyone in school.

Second, an unequal country with profound inequities fosters living conditions of vulnerability for a great majority of its citizens. Poverty explains the inequality, inequity and vulnerability shared by all the groups.

Third, the factors that pre-determine inclusive education in developing countries can be identified from two dimensions: a) the dimension of the context that encompasses historic, cultural, social, economic, political and institutional aspects; b) the dimension that is the individual; that is, his/her characteristics or conditions attributable to the particular nature of each person and his/her interaction with his/her immediate development context as socio-cultural being. This research aims to understand the individual immersed in this context; that is, the interaction of the two dimensions.

Fourth, the importance of education as a human right and a factor for individual and social development is recognized and shared although with differences with respect to the assessment and the expectations of the members of the education community and the society.

Fifth, a systematic vision of inclusive education encompasses the macro, meso or intermediate and micro levels. In a context like Guatemala’s, the actors involved in each of these levels go beyond the individual actors or the institutions responsible for education, given the characteristics of vulnerability and the living conditions of the students.

Sixth, in order to achieve inclusive education, the articulation of the system at different levels and within the different social actors involved is necessary.

Based on the above, the document review encompasses five lengthy chapters.

An explanation of the National Education System in two of its main aspects: its operations through the main education indicators and its organization as entity responsible for guiding the education
policy at the three levels of the system: macro, meso and micro, taking into consideration its governing legal framework and the interaction with other systems within the public apparatus, which also impact education.

The socio-demographic profile of the country: A brief explanation of the characteristics of the country appears with information concerning Guatemala’s education system. Some arguments are included with respect to how poverty impacts education and social inclusion. The matter of poverty is considered a cross-cutting matter that impacts the living conditions of the population, in particular those considered vulnerable to education exclusion.

Another matter addressed relates to the background of the research or reports carried out in Guatemala on inclusion, although they are probably guided by different concepts, but that can be compared as explained herein after. A review of studies on this matter took precedence in the analysis, but also the concept of inclusion (implicit or explicit) used in said studies or reports.

We also provide information about the vulnerable groups initially defined by the Refie Project, based on gender, ethnic diversity and disability. The first refers to the situation of girls and their right to education, as well as their vulnerability to being kept out of the education system. The second refers to ethnic and cultural diversity, in particular addressing bilingual education, the advances, challenges and obstacles for inclusive education. Finally, a review of the situation of the disabled population and the education opportunities available to them.

The document presents a final summary to underline some conclusions and/or recommendations derived from the document review.

The starting premise is that the education system operates within the framework of a deeply unequal country, which defines its scope of action, priorities and the availability of resources when considered part of the broader government apparatus (structural and operational dimension of government).

We hope that this systematic vision of inclusion will allow to analyze the assumption that a system framed in a context of inequity might contribute to perpetuate this situation.
1 Education System Guatemala

According to the dictionary of the Royal Spanish Academy (2014) the word system comes from the Latin system and one of its many meanings refers to the group of rules or principles on a certain matter rationally linked amongst each other. It is also indicated that it refers to the group of things that relate to one another in an orderly fashion contributing to a specific objective.

The vision of system taken as reference framework for this research is explained in the following pages in two parts. The first describes in general terms the National Education System of Guatemala, taking into consideration its organizational structure, governing legal framework, as well as the guiding education policies for its functions and execution at its different levels. The second part explains the way in which, for the purposes of this research, a concept of Education System is brought forward, with an inward vision, as well as its linkages with other government systems that invest on education, in particular the task of promoting access, acceptance and participation. This dimension is defined for the analysis of inclusive education systems.

1.1 National Education System

The following sections present the Education Public Policies and the Legal Education Framework of Guatemala.

Public Polices

According to the (National Education Law, 1991) five articles define, characterize and explain the function and organization of the National Education System.

Article 3 defines it as “the organized and interrelated group of elements, processes and subjects through which education action is developed, pursuant to the characteristics, needs and interests of the historic, economic and cultural reality of Guatemala”. Article 4 characterizes it as a participative, regionalized, decentralized and de-concentrated system. Article 5 explains that the structure of the National Education System is formed by: 1) the Ministry of Education; 2) the Education Community, and 3) Education Centers. Article 6 indicates that it is formed by two subsystems: the School Education subsystem and the Extra-School or Parallel Subsystem. Finally, Article 7 indicates that the main function of the system is to “investigate, plan, organize, guide, execute and assess the education process at the national level, in its different forms”.

The establishment of education policies in the country and its operational guarantees as well as the system at all its levels is the responsibility of the Minister’s Office and the National Education Council (Article 10 of the National Education Law). The organizational structure of the Ministry is the following:
According to the National Education Council (2010), Guatemala’s current education policy is based on the 1998 Education Reform Design and it includes eight policies.

### Infobox: Education Policies of Guatemala

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Strategic Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Coverage:** Guarantees the access to, permanence in and effective conclusion of schooling to children and youth, indiscriminately, at all school levels and in all school and extra-school subsystems. | • Increase coverage at all education levels.  
• Guarantee conditions that allow the permanence in and conclusion of different education levels by students.  
• Expand extra-school programs for those who have not had access to the school system and who may complete the elementary and middle school levels. |
| **Quality:** Improvement in the quality of the education process to ensure that every person is subject to a pertinent and relevant education. | • Have designs and curricular instruments to respond to the characteristics and needs of the population and the advances of science and technology.  
• Promote development and curriculum execution instruments.  
• Strengthen the evaluation system to guarantee the quality of education. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model of Administration:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systematic strengthening of effectiveness and transparency mechanisms within the national education system.</td>
<td>• Systematize the process of education information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strengthen the model of administration to achieve effectiveness in the education process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Guarantee transparency in the management process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strengthen quality criteria in the administration of education institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish refurbishment, maintenance and construction systems for school facilities centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger training, evaluation and management of the human resource within the National Education System</td>
<td>• Guarantee training and relevant continued education for the human resource to achieve an effective performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluate the performance of the human resource to improve its quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement a system of incentives and benefits for the human resource, linked to performance, training and conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual, Multi-cultural and Inter-cultural Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening of Bilingual, Multi-cultural and Inter-cultural education.</td>
<td>• Strengthen bilingual, multi-cultural and inter-cultural programs for the harmonious coexistence between peoples and cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement curriculum designs pursuant to the socio-cultural characteristics of each segment of the population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Guarantee the general coverage of Bilingual, Multi-cultural and Inter-cultural Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish a system of technical accompaniment in the classroom, specific to Bilingual, Multi-cultural and Inter-cultural Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Education Investment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the budgetary allocation to education up to what is established in Article 102 of the National Education Law (7% of the Gross Domestic Product)</td>
<td>• Guarantee a sustained budget for education that corresponds to the increase in the school population and the permanent improvement of the education system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promote criteria for an equitable allocation of resources to reduce gaps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allocate resources to regularly supply material and equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarantee the quality of education that is demanded by the four cultural groups, in particular the most vulnerable groups, in recognition of their context and today’s needs.</td>
<td>• Ensure that the National Education System allows access to integral education with equity and equality of opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure the essential conditions to guarantee equity and equality of opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce school failure in the most vulnerable groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement education programs that favor the quality of education for vulnerable groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional strengthening and decentralization:
Strengthen the institutionalism of the national education system and the participation at the local level to guarantee quality, coverage and social, cultural and language relevance at all levels, with equity, transparency and long term vision.

- Strengthen local instances to develop the decentralization process and their participation in administrative and technical decisions.
- Promote and strengthen the participation of different social sectors at the community, municipal and regional levels in education.
- Strengthen research and evaluation programs within the National Education System.

Source: Developed by the team based on the Education Policies obtained on July 2, 2014 in: http://www.mineduc.gob.gt/portal/contenido/menu_lateral/quienes_somos/politicas_educativas/pdf/Politicas_Educativas_CNE.PDF

In addition to the education policies indicated, Guatemala has an Inclusive Education Policy for Populations with Special Education Needs, linked or not to disabilities, to favor the inclusion of children facing special education needs. The purpose of this policy is to ensure access and education attention with quality to this group, working towards the equality of opportunities and conditions to facilitate the development of their physical and intellectual capacities, and acquisition of abilities and skills to ensure their full participation in society (MINEDUC, 2008). It is considered that the existence of an Inclusive Education Policy is an important precedent for future actions concerning inclusive education in Guatemala.

The next page graphically illustrates the history of education policies along the last 28 years. This review underlines the progressive and sustained attention to some groups considered vulnerable along this period of time. Furthermore, it shows how some matters have been and continue to be relevant nowadays.
Graph 2: *Education Policies in Guatemala*. A Retrospective Tour to Identify the Provisions related to Inclusive education in Guatemala

**Governments from 1986-1995**
- Coverage expansion
- Recognition of linguistic and cultural multiplicity.
- Respect to human dignity
- Consolidation of democratic system.
- Strengthening of National Identity.
- Strengthening in autonomy to take decisions.
- Participative management
- Special attention to marginal groups.
- De-concentrate and decentralize

**Governments from 1996-1999**
- Coverage expansion
- Education reform
- Community participation
- Improvement of quality
- Modernization of institutions.
- Strengthening of Extra-School Education Programs and Programs to teach to read.
- Better use of cooperation and coordination.
- Contribution to consolidation of peace.

**Governments from 2000-2003**
- Coverage expansion
- Education reform
- Community participation
- Improvement of quality
- Modernization of institutions.

**Governments from 2004-2007**
- Expansion in the coverage at all levels.
- Strengthening of Inter-cultural bilingual education of quality.
- Transparent management model.

**Governments from 2008-2011**
- Expansion of education coverage incorporating in particular boys and girls living in extreme poverty and coming from vulnerable groups.
- Advance towards an education of quality.
- Social justice through education equity and permanence in school.
- Strengthening of inter-cultural bilingual education. Transparent administration.

**Governments from 2012-2015**
- Coverage of multicultural and inter-cultural bilingual education.
- Quality.
- Management Model.
- Human resources.
- Increased investment on education.
- Equity.
- Strengthening of institutions and decentralization.

**CROSS-CUTTING THEMES**
- Increase in education investment.
- Decentralization of education.
- Strengthening of the institutions in the school system.

**CROSS-CUTTING POLICIES**
- Increased investment on education.
- Decentralization of education.
- Strengthening of...
Legal Education Framework in Guatemala

The legal framework that governs the National Education System in Guatemala and guarantees the right to an education to all its inhabitants is, in the first place the (Political Constitution of the Republic of Guatemala, 1985). In line with its legal precepts and principles, a number of Treaties, Agreements and Conventions have been signed before international organizations such as the United Nations, the Organization of American States and the International Labor Organization.

Furthermore, the Congress of the Republic of Guatemala –abiding by the constitutional framework and the demands of a democratic, multi-ethnic, multi-cultural and diverse society as a result of a number of social factors – has approved laws that aim to guarantee the protection of the rights of children, teenagers and the population as a whole. Amongst the most important, from the point of view of this research, are the laws that relate to education matters, resulting from Legislative Decrees, Government Agreements, Ministerial Agreements and Regulations to guarantee the provisions of Constitutional Articles 71 to 79. In addition to the above, we also have the Accords for a Long and Lasting Peace, 1996, signed by the Government of the Republic of Guatemala, and the Framework Law for the Peace Accords, Decree No. 52-2005.

The Political Constitution of the Republic of Guatemala establishes in said articles the obligations of the State to provide and facilitate free education to its inhabitants, with no discrimination, to achieve the integral development of the individual. Furthermore, it guarantees freedom of teaching and the right of parents to choose the way in which their minor children will receive their education. It stipulates that the inhabitants have the right and the obligation to receive initial, pre-school, elementary and middle schooling, within the age limits established by law.

According to the Constitution, the State is responsible for providing and promoting scholarships and education credits, in addition to promoting special, diversified and extra-school education.

In 1985, when the Political Constitution of the country was approved, there was an incredibly high illiteracy rate. That is the reason for Article 75, which declares of national urgency to teach to read and write.

In response to the needs and social demands of the nation, and in view of its characteristics of cultural, ethnic and language pluralism, in the articles under Section Fourth of the Constitution, the State assumes the commitment of decentralizing and regionalizing the education system and stipulates that in the schools established in areas of population predominantly indigenous, teaching must be bilingual.

To implement the principles and constitutional precepts in education matters, there are several laws described below:

National Education Law, Decree Number 12-91

This law sets the guiding principles and general guidelines for the National Education System in Guatemala, pursuant to the Political Constitution of the Republic. The first two articles set the principles and purposes of education in the country; considering that education is an inherent right of human beings and an obligation of the State. It stipulates that the student is the center and object of the education process and that in view of the number of communities that form the country, education must be defined and delivered in a multilingual, multi-ethnic and pluri-cultural
environment.

Pursuant to this law, education in Guatemala aims, among other things, to provide integral training to the student, to prepare him/her to work and live in a society, and have access to different living conditions. It establishes the need to promote co-ed schooling at all levels of education and encourage the systematic education of adults.

The National Education Law, in Article 4, characterizes the National Education System as participative, regionalized, decentralized, and de-concentrated. Article 6 stipulates that the National Education system is formed by two subsystems.

Graph 3. Composition of the National Education System

The previous image represents what the law stipulates with respect to the composition of the National Education System.

Of particular interest is the content of Articles 30, 31, and 32 of this Law, which define and characterize the extra-school or parallel education subsystem as the way to implement the education process provided by the State and the institutions to segments of the population that remain excluded or that do not have access to school education and to those who after having had school education wish to expand their possibilities, through a modality that is not subject to a rigid order of grades, ages or an inflexible system of knowledge, in which students are trained by developing their abilities and skills, towards new personal, work, social, cultural and academic interests.

It also stipulates that the Ministry of Education will promote the organization and operation of services offering models of alternance, free education and distance learning. Its operations will be governed by the regulations of this law.

Article 32 stipulates that the Regulations for the National Education Law, Decree Number 12-91 will guide all forms of non-school education; however, it is important to underline that this law does not
have regulations that enable its full enforcement.

As a result, the Regulations for the National Education Law that governed before this law was approved are the ones currently being used to ensure enforcement of this precept; that is, Government Agreement Number M. of E. 13-77, dated November 7, 1977.

The lack of consistency between the current Law and the regulations that allow its enforcement constitutes a barrier, but may also represent an opportunity. The actual Education System has a General Directorate designed to attend and serve extra-school education. Pursuant to Article 3 of Government Decree Number 225-2008, Internal Organic Regulations of the Ministry of Education, this body should be part of the internal structure of the Ministry of Education (School Education Subsystem).

Article 12 of this Government Agreement stipulates that DIGEEX is responsible for providing education to children and youngsters over the normal age range, with modalities that differ from the formal school subsystem, with its corresponding attributions.

The scope of this document review only allows us to point out that DIGEEX is the institutional response to provide attention to the population outside the formal education subsystem, although it wouldn’t seem to have the full scope foreseen by the Law.

**Law for the Integral Protection of Children and Teenagers, -LPINA- Decree Number 27-2003**

This law aims to achieving the integral and sustainable development of Guatemalan children and teenagers, within the democratic framework and with full respect for their human rights. Article 2 of this law defines a boy or a girl as any person from the time of his/her conception to the age of thirteen, and a teenager as any person from the age of thirteen to the age of eighteen.

In Section II, Articles 36 to 40 establish the legal provisions that relate to boys, girls, and teenagers and their education. Article 36 of the (Law for the Integral Protection of Children and Teenagers, LPINA) stipulates that they must receive an integral education pursuant to the ethnic, religious, and cultural options of their families. This legal provision materializes the precepts of Article 73 of the Political Constitution of the Republic of Guatemala with respect to the right of parents to choose the education to be given to their minor children.

The same article mentions the importance of ensuring that all boys, girls and teenagers have equal conditions to access and remain in school, reciprocal respect, and treatment with dignity by teachers and students.

Article 37 states that public education must be free, secular and obligatory until the last grade of diversified or senior high school.

Pursuant to Article 38 of LPINA, the State is responsible, through its competent authorities, for guaranteeing the right to a multi-cultural and multi-lingual education to boys, girls and teenagers in regions with a majority of Mayan, Garifuna and Xinka population. The same law stipulates that the State must develop the necessary mechanisms for boys, girls and teenagers living in rural areas to have access to education, through programs that are adequate to their geographic, ethnic and cultural reality. All boys and girls under the age of six have the right to enjoy the services of day care centers, which must be furnished by employers, whether in the public or private sector, as stipulated
by the Political Constitution of the Republic. Article 40 establishes that parents, tutors or legal representatives are responsible for the education of boys, girls and teenagers. They must enroll them in the education center of their choice, ensure that they attend their classes regularly and actively participate in their education process.

With respect to the disabled children’s and teenagers’ right to protection, Article 46 of LPINA stipulates that boys, girls and teenagers with a physical, sensorial or mental disability have the right to enjoy a full life with dignity. The next article indicates that the State is responsible for ensuring the fulfillment of the right of disabled boys, girls and teenagers to receiving free special care. Pursuant to the law, this right includes access to early stimulation programs, education, health services, rehabilitation, leisure, as well as skills training, which it will create should these not be available. If necessary and within its possibilities, the State will refer these children to private institutions, according to the administration procedures established.

Article 48 stipulates that the State recognizes the right of disabled boys, girls and teenagers to access information and communication and have special access facilities to allow them to fully integrate and participate. Article 49 of the same law stipulates that the State must promote, provide and disseminate programs for the prevention, detection and treatment of disabilities, through different institutions, to ensure a timely diagnosis and treatment, both at the institutional and community levels.

The State of Guatemala has ratified Conventions, Treaties and International Agreements before the United Nations, which contain legal provisions that relate to the human rights inherent to the individual, which include the right to an education. The State of Guatemala is forced to abide by them because of this ratification, facilitating services and opportunities to access education to all its inhabitants, with no discrimination (see annex 1).

In summary, Guatemala has a legal framework that favors inclusive education, although there are some barriers to take into account; namely, the lack of regulations for the enforcement of the National Education Law.

### 1.2 Vision of Guatemala´s Education System in the context of this research

The design of this research takes into account that inclusive education is successful in the measure that it can guarantee a joint and participative learning process to all the groups of the population within the education system, taking special considerations for groups vulnerable to exclusion or little support from the existing system. Therefore, the problem is not in the individual, but in the education systems available, which do not adapt to the individuals.

Previous studies indicate that there are multiple perspectives in the discourse about inclusive education, some emphasizing the individual more, and others emphasizing an equitable distribution of resources, in particular with respect to the offer of specialized services and/or common education services to any person, regardless of his/her particular challenges. (Artiles, Harris, Rostenberg, 2006).

In this sense, it is necessary to recognize that the State of Guatemala through the MINEDUC has implemented a number of actions related to the national strategy through the education coverage public policy, among others. However, education indicators show a gap in the educational opportunities to which some groups have access, quality in the educational services, and the
relevance of the educational service that is offered.

According to Ainscow, M. (2004) inclusion means the joint work of two leverages for change to achieve inclusive education systems. The first relates to schools and their internal practices, and the second to the development of schools related to other factors that could facilitate or make more difficult the expected progress.

Ainscow, M. (2004) talks about “developing schools” and proposes that this refers to what Wenger (1989) calls communities of practice; that is, schools capable of learning from their local context, with two main processes: participation (shared experiences and negotiations resulting from internal social interactions within a community with a common purpose) and materialization (concrete representations of the school’s own practices).

With respect to the second process, Ainscow M. (2004) recognizes that there are a number of contextual influences that “affect the way in which schools carry out their work”. Among them, the political priorities within an education system; the opinions and actions of third parties within the local context, including members of the local community and staff of the departments responsible for school administration; the criteria taken to assess the performance of the schools. (p. 5) Ainscow adds that in time there is greater possibility of achieving sustainable progress in school if they “are part of a systemic change process”. (p. 11).

Based on the premises presented and for the purposes of this research, the National Education System is considered as being formed by three inter-dependent and inter-related levels based on the education process. These are: Macro level, Meso level and Micro level.

The Macro Level is formed by the core level responsible for the management of the Education System and its policies, in its interactions with other government and non-government organizations that support the implementation of education policies. At the ministerial level we have the Minister’s Office, the Vice-Ministries and more directly the Directions General. As it occurs with the rest of its duties, the results of the system are a consequence of the work of the organization as a whole.

However, this research into consideration the Directions General that in the opinion of the Ministry itself are more directly involved in promoting inclusive education. (A proposal was presented by Luisa Müller, Director of DIGEDUCA within MINEDUC on March 7, 2014 to include these in the consultation to key informants workshop).

The Education Directions General are under the mandate of the Minister’s Office and the different Vice-Ministries. These are the technical-administrative bodies with national jurisdiction in charge of the coordination and implementation of the polices and guidelines of the Superior Direction to guide and put in place system plans, programs and activities (Article 13 of the National Education Law). Thirteen Directions General were identified. Below is a list of some of them:

The Direction of National and International Cooperation, DICONIME, which is the body within the Ministry of Education that coordinates, facilitates and supports the process for the management, negotiation and follow-up of technical and financial cooperation before national and international donors.

The Education Planning Direction –DIPLAN– whose general objective is to coordinate plans, programs and education policies, and to establish the criteria for support, monitoring and follow-up of the
indicators of demand for infrastructure and production of statistics, to guarantee the achievement of objectives. Results must coincide with the State’s national and international commitments.

The Direction General for Coordination of Education Departmental Directions DIGECOR is the body within the Ministry that is responsible for the coordination with the Minister’s Office and Central Units of the Ministry with respect to the activities that need to be carried out by the Education Departmental Directions.
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DIGECADE: its main function is to ensure the implementation of the Basic National Curriculum at each level, following the modalities, programs and projects of the school subsystems according to the attributions granted by the Internal Organic Rules of the Ministry of Education.

DIGEEF: responsible for training processes to promote a physical, sports and leisure culture for integral development and peaceful cohabitation.

DIGEEEX: responsible for the provision of the education process to children and youth over the age limit, following modalities that differ from the formal school subsystem.

DIGECUR: entity that is responsible for the design, development, updating and evaluation of the curriculum at all levels and in the modalities of the education system.

DIGEESP: governing body for special education services rendered in the country. Its objectives are a) to promote the development of inclusive schools of quality which respond to the education needs of the students regardless of their personal, social or cultural characteristics, promoting actions to guarantee their access to, permanence in and completion of the regular education system, and b) encourage the creation and development of special education services to assist boys, girls and teenagers with special education needs linked or not to disabilities, from their childhood until their integration to work training.

The meso level corresponds to those initiatives that serve as link between the Macro and Micro levels.

This research considers that the Education Departmental Directions work as a link between the Macro and Micro levels. The Education Departmental Directions are bodies mandated to plan, guide, coordinate and execute education actions in each department of the Republic. Departmental Directions depend directly of the Minister’s Office and jointly with the Regional Technical Directions and General Directions that may correspond, work towards the integration, coordination and supervision of the activities in the Departmental Directions (Article 1st, Creation of Departmental Directions, 1996).
This research presents the meso level as follows:

Graph 7. Meso Level Organizations

The micro level refers to the education community and the school centers where the education process is carried out. For the purposes of this research, there are two ways to analyze this level. The first is based on its geographic location, for which the municipality is considered since this is the local space where different education communities and schools coincide. For the purposes of this research, the local level is circumscribed to an education community and its school center within a municipality.

The second perspective is to consider the interaction and operation of the different actors in the education community and the school centers. As can be seen in the following graph, each education community has different stakeholders that affect, in one way or the other, the organization and operations of the education process. The roles and the level of incidence of the social, government and non-government actors in an education community differ depending on the demands and conditions of the local context. So, in an education community, judges might be closely linked to education centers, while in another it might be the mayors, just to provide examples. The main point in this research is to consider that the education community and the school center operate around each student. As stated in the beginning, inclusive education systems try to adapt and respond to each person. In vulnerable contexts, to achieve access, acceptance and participation is probably only possible when the different actors and government and non-government organizations join efforts to reach this objective.

Example of all the actors that participate at the micro level supporting school centers and attending the demands of the school population and the community in general.
According to the National Education Law, the Education Community is the unit that when interrelating with the different elements that participate in the teaching-learning process contribute to the achievement of the principles and objectives of education, maintaining every element of its autonomy (Article 17). It is formed by students, parents, teachers and organizations that work for purely education purposes (Article 18). The previous graph shows only the actors involved without making a distinction between levels of incidence and power to take decisions.

The following graph shows the inter-relation of the different actors at the Micro level. It is important to visualize that this level is articulated to the other two levels of the Education System through education supervision or Technical-Administrative Coordinators (CTA) and that it must be guided by the policies and standards of the Macro level.

The education supervision is a technical-administrative function of advisory, guidance, follow-up, coordination and evaluation of the teaching-learning process of the National Education System (Article 72 of the National Education Law). They are also known as Technical-Administrative Coordinators CTA.
From a systemic point of view, it is necessary to take into consideration that the inter-action dynamics and the results at the micro level also depend on what happens within a more concrete micro-system at the school itself.

Finally, the Education System as a whole is part of other government systems with whom it works to guarantee the delivery of the education services that the State must provide to the population. This research considered important to do a general analysis of Municipal corporations given their growing support to and investment on education in their respective municipalities. Furthermore, an analysis of the Urban and Rural Development Councils –CDUR- system was also done since they also do public investments in education. In other words, they are resources that, without belonging to the National Education System, affect the general results that education is achieving in the country.
Graph 10. Systems Related to the National Education System

Administration of Policies and Education Projects

The coordination and execution of education policies in Guatemala is responsibility of the Ministry of Education –MINEDUC-, on behalf of the State, pursuant to Article 8 of the (National Education Law, 1991). There are also other entities that manage and administer programs and projects related to education, like the Urban and Rural Development Councils –CDUR- and the Municipal Corporations; each of the three entities has its own funds to invest in education. For this reason, the functions, responsibilities and resources of each entity will be briefly addressed.

Urban and Rural Development Councils –CDUR–

The CDUR is a system that contributes to economic and administrative decentralization. Its legal base is in the Political Constitution of the Republic of Guatemala, the Peace Accords and the Law for the Urban and Rural Development Councils. The Political Constitution of the Republic of Guatemala, 1985, in Article 119, letter b) states that it is responsibility of the State to “systematically promote economic and administrative decentralization to achieve the proper regional development of the country”, and Article 224 states: “the administration is decentralized and development regions are to be created” In the peace agreement related to Socio-Economic Aspects and Agricultural Situation the following is established: “it is necessary to promote the urban and rural development councils system”.

In 2002 the Urban and Rural Development Councils Law was created, through Decree No. 11-2002 of the Congress of the Republic of Guatemala, to regulate the participation of the Guatemalan population in public management. Pursuant to Article 3 of said law, the purpose of the councils is: “to organize and coordinate public administration by formulating development policies, plans and budgetary programs and by promoting inter-institutional coordination, public and private.”
The development councils system is formed by five levels: a) Community Development Councils – COCODE; b) Municipal Development Councils – COMUDE; c) Departmental Development Councils – CODEDE; d) Regional Urban and Rural Development Councils; f) National Urban and Rural Development Council; pursuant to Article 4 of the Law for Urban and Rural Development Councils.

The Rules of the Law for Urban and Rural Development Councils, Government Agreement No. 461-2002 and its amendments Agreements 229-2003 and 241-2003, in Article 4, establish that one of its specific purposes is to: “Transmit to the Executive Branch, through the National Urban and Rural Development Council, the opinions that will contribute to a better coordination of public administration, to better execute and manage the process to formulate the public policy for development, planned and coordinated through the System of Councils”, as presented by the following graph.

Graph 11. Process for the Formulation of Public Policies

The Regulations for the Councils Law stipulates that: “each Community Council for Development has the purpose of reuniting the community members with an interest in promoting and carrying out participative policies, to identify and prioritize projects, plans and programs that will benefit their community” In this sense, the law stipulates that the inhabitants of a village or urban area must define and prioritize their needs through the COCODES. These needs can be in the areas of education, health, security, among others. When the local community defines its priorities, these must be transmitted to the COMUDE.

One COMUDE is organized in each municipality of the department. It is formed by the municipal mayor, who coordinates it, the trustees and councilmen named by the municipal corporation, representatives of the COCODES, representatives of public entities with presence in the community; representatives of local civil society entities summoned pursuant to Article 11 of the Urban and Rural Development Councils Law. The COMUDE’s attributions pursuant to the law are: “To contribute to the strengthening of municipal autonomy through the support provided to the municipal corporation in the coordination of the public institutions associations amongst each other and from these...
towards the private sector, through the development of long, medium and short term plans”.

Furthermore, the COMUDE must “propose to the municipal corporation the policies, plans, programs and development projects developed, based on the proposals of the community development councils, [...] to be incorporated into the development policies, plans, programs and projects of the municipality”, pursuant to Article 44 of the (Regulations of the Law for Urban and rural Development Councils, 2002) of the CDUR Law.

In addition, Article 45 of these regulations stipulate that “when exercising municipal autonomy, and pursuant to the Law, the Municipal Corporation must support the Development Councils of its municipality, both at the municipal and community levels”. In this sense, they must be informed and approve the proposal of development policies, programs and projects presented by the Municipal Development Council. Once these are approved, they are presented to the CODEDE through the Municipal Mayor, among other functions.

The CODEDE is formed by the Governor of the Department, who chairs and coordinates the Council, the municipal mayors of the department, the head of the departmental office of the Secretary for Planning and Programming of the Presidency, who acts as secretary, one representative of each public entity appointed by the Executive Branch, and representatives of the civil society organizations prescribed by law.

Some of the attributions of the CODEDE pursuant to Article 36 of the regulations of the CDUR Law are: “To make recommendations to the Regional Urban and Rural Development Council [...] about maximum amount of resources of pre-investment and public investment, from the proposed General Budget of the Nation for the following fiscal year” Furthermore, it “must be informed, must discuss and approve the development plans that have been prioritized by the COMUDES pursuant to the National Public Investment System, and which are not being financed with municipal resources, to include them in the departmental development agenda”.

Pursuant to Decree 70-87 of the Congress of the Republic, there are VIII regions in the country, and a Regional Urban and Rural Development Council must exist in each one of them. According to Article 8 of the Urban and Rural Development Councils, they are formed by the Regional Coordinator, who chairs and coordinates; one mayor on behalf of the municipal corporations, the Governor of each department in the region; a representative of each of the public entities appointed by the Executive branch; and representatives of the civil society organizations prescribed by law.

One of the attributions of the Regional Development Council, pursuant Article 8 of the Law for Urban and Rural Development Councils is to: “formulate the development policies, plans, programs and projects in the region, taking into account the departmental development plans, and sending them to the National Council for their incorporation into the Development Policy of the Nation”.

The National Urban and Rural Development Council is formed by: the President of the Republic, who coordinates it; one mayor on behalf of the Municipal Corporations of each region, the Cabinet Ministers appointed by the President, the Coordinators of the Regional Urban and Rural Development Councils, four representatives of the Mayan people, one of the Xinca and Garifuna people, one representative of organizations and associations; two representatives of women’s organizations; and other stakeholders as stipulated by law.

Some of the functions of the National Urban and Rural Development Council pursuant to Article 6 of
the Development Councils law is: “To formulate urban and rural and territorial order development policies; promote and facilitate the effective organization and participation of the population and its organizations in the prioritization of needs, problems and solutions, for the integral development of the Nation; formulate development policies, plans, programs and projects at the national level, taking into consideration de regional and departmental development plans, and sending them to the Executive Branch for their incorporation into the Development Policy of the Nation”.

For the management of development policies, plans, programs and projects at the national level, the Development Councils system shall have the mandatory cooperation of all public entities pursuant to Article 30 of the CDUR Law.

The financial support for the Urban and Rural Development Councils system comes from the central government, pursuant to Articles 229 of the Constitution and 21 of the Urban and rural Development councils Law. This must be done within the framework of what is established in the Political Constitution of the Republic of Guatemala in Article 223 which states: “Financial contributions of the central government to the departments. The regional and departmental councils shall receive the financial support necessary for their operation from the Central Government” and Article 237 states: “bodies, decentralized and autonomous entities, may have their own budgets and funds when so stipulated by the law. Their budgets must be informed every year to the Executive Branch and the Congress of the Republic, for their inclusion in the General Budget of the Nation”.

In this sense, the general income and expenses budget of the nation for 2013 according to the (Ministry of Public Finances, 2014) allocated TWO THOUSAND TWENTY-EIGHT MILLION THREE HUNDRED FORTY-FIVE THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED SIXTY-THREE QUETZALES (Q. 2,028,345,363.00) to the Urban and Rural Development Councils of the TWO HUNDRED NINETY-NINE MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED SEVENTY-SIX THOUSAND TWENTY-NINE QUETZALES (Q. 299,776,029.00) allocated to education. This amount was allocated for activities and infrastructure. Below you will find a chart that shows the distribution of expenses for education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Amount (Q)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School Education</td>
<td>20,163,145</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Education</td>
<td>166,895,871</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>58,820,955</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversified or High School Education</td>
<td>15,333,928</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Stage of University or Superior Education</td>
<td>5,115,250</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education not linked to Any Level of Schooling</td>
<td>33,446,880</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>299,776,029</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Chart 1 shows that 14.78% of the budget of the Urban and Rural Development Councils system is used for education. Furthermore, the budget of the CDUR system includes support to other basic services (electricity, drinking water, roads, health, among others), which could indirectly benefit the services required at the education centers.
Municipal Council

According to Article 9 of the (Municipal Code, Decree Number 12-2002), “the Municipal Council is the superior body for the deliberation of and taking of decisions on municipal business. Its members are solidarly and jointly responsible for the taking of decisions […]. It is formed by the mayor, the trustees and the council members. The mayor is the person in charge of executing and following up on policies, plans, programs and projects authorized by the Municipal Council”.

The Municipal Code stipulates that it is responsibility of the Municipal Council to establish a Commission for Education, Bilingual and Inter-Cultural Education, Culture and Sports. Article 37 of said code stipulates that the commissions shall present to the Municipal Council proposals for necessary actions for increased efficiency in municipal public services and the general administration of the municipality. Furthermore, the Municipal Code contemplates that one of the competencies of the municipality is the management of pre-school and elementary education, as well as programs to teach to read and write and bilingual education.

Article 131 of the Municipal Code states: “The municipality must do an equitable distribution and administration of the annual budget to rural and urban communities, indigenous and non indigenous, taking into account the population density, unmet basic needs, health and education indexes, environmental situation and availability of financial resources”. Furthermore Article 142 of the Municipal Code stipulates that it is necessary to guarantee at least, with no exception, the establishment, operations and administration of public services for drinking water, sewage, general piping, and house connections, areas for leisure and sports, schools, among others…

The authorized policies, programs and projects are executed with own funds and constitutional contributions as per the Political Constitution of the Republic. Furthermore, Article 257 stipulates that “the Executive will include every year in the General Budget of Ordinary Incomes of the State, a ten per cent for all the Municipalities in the country. […] and destine at least ninety per cent to education, preventive health, infrastructure and public services programs and projects, to improve the living conditions of the population” According to (ASIES, 2014), based on ICEFI’s data, in 2006, 5.5% of the constitutional allocation was invested in education by the municipalities in place at that time.

According to the (Ministry of Public Finances, 2014) in 2013 the budgetary execution of the municipalities was ELEVEN THOUSAND NINETY-FOUR MILLION SIX HUNDRED FORTY-TWO THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED FIVE WITH FOURTEEN CENTS (Q. 11,094,642,205.14) of which SIX HUNDRED EIGHTY-ONE MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED SIXTY-FOUR THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED THREE WITH THIRTY CENTS (Q. 681,764,103.30), that is 6.1% was destined to education. Following is a graph that shows the distribution of expenditures on education.
According to the previous graph, the municipal council invests mainly on pre-school and elementary education. The (National Education Campaign, 2012) in the Municipal Agenda for Education with Quality highlights that Municipalities presently carry out the following actions in the area of education: opening of Municipal schools, construction of schools, classrooms, hiring of teachers, municipal contributions to cooperative institutes, basic services, playgrounds, walls, scholarships, training to teachers, libraries, uniforms and shoes, psychology clinics, cafeterias, and food, amongst others.

**Ministry of Education**

As noted in the legal frameworks section, the Ministry of Education is responsible for the coordination and execution of public policies. The Internal Organic Regulations of the MINEDUC, 225-2008, in Article 2 stipulate that: “The MINEDUC is the institution within the Executive Branch that is responsible for the application of the legal regime related to the education services provided by the school and extra-school subsystems in all the country and it must plan, execute and assess public policies based on that”

To plan, execute and assess public policies related to education, the MINEDUC carries out substantive, administrative, management, technical support and internal control functions (see Annex 1).

Each of the MINEDUC Directions is responsible for proposing policies and implementing plans, programs and projects in their areas of specialization, to promote the development of education policies in the country. Furthermore, the Education Departmental Direction –DIDEDUC- is responsible
for proposing policies and implementing plans, programs and projects within their jurisdiction, based on the identification of the local needs of the department, as per the MINEDUC’s Internal Organic Regulations.

For the MINEDUC directions and entities to develop policies and implement plans, programs and projects, they must work on an annual operations plan –POA– with the advisory and support of DIPLAN, pursuant to MINEDUC’s Internal Organic Regulations. The POAs of the different internal entities of the MINEDUC must be unified and prioritized by the Minister’s office and must be presented to the executive branch to be added to the general budget of the Nation.

Pursuant to Article 89 of the Political Constitution of the Republic of Guatemala, the Financial Economic Regime for National Education is constituted by at least 35% of the ordinary revenues of the General Budget of the State; furthermore, it is possible to obtain economic resources from donations, contributions, assistance, and any other type of current and capital transfers from individual or legal persons, national or international.

Below is a graph representing the investment on education from 1992 to 2012. Furthermore, a division of what is invested at the level of the MINEDUC and what is invested by the education sector (including the expenses of the San Carlos University of Guatemala and the central administration) and what does it represent with respect to the Gross Domestic Product, GDP.

Graph 13. Evolution of Indicators of Investment on Education

The graph shows that there has been a significant increase in investment on education during the course of the years; however, it is still not enough. In 2012, 80% of said budget was used for payroll (teacher wages) and only 20% for other budgetary lines (Pos, 2013). It is also important to mention that in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 the budget of MINEDUC included the social fund called “Mi Familia Progresa” (My Family Progresses).

According to the National System of Indicators, the highest investment is on elementary school,
followed by pre-school. It is interesting to note that 2008 was the year with the lowest investment on elementary education, with an increase in investment on pre-school education. This year also saw a larger investment in secondary (junior high school). The diversified cycle (senior high school) is the one with the least investment. 2010 was the year with highest investment on this cycle.

Graph 14. Percentile Investment of Public Expenditures by Level

With respect to support programs, 58.3% is destined to food, while 4.04% for the pedagogical bag of the teachers. 81.14% of the support programs are destined to the rural area, where 84.79% is invested on food.

Chart 2. Support Programs Updated to May 31, 2014

In conclusion, the National Education System has its own resources and receives support from other entities within the central government and local governments who invest resources on education.
2 Background Information Guatemala

2.1 Socio-Demographic Profile of Guatemala

According to (UNICEF s/f), in order to understand the reality of Guatemala it is necessary to see the country in a post-war scenario due to the armed conflict (1960-1996) whose causes were rooted on the inequity in the distribution of assets and capital, mainly land distribution, and discrimination against indigenous peoples. The end to the internal conflict with the signature of the Peace Accords sought to, among other things, help in the transition towards a more equitable society with better opportunities to reach a sustainable human development.

Guatemala’s population is diverse, as is the national territory they inhabit. To this diversity it is necessary to add deep social inequalities which, according to (UNDP, 2013) divide the country and are seen in actions of inclusion-exclusion, racism and discrimination. Although the Peace Accords were signed in 1996, deep wounds remain in the country’s social fabric, while the State remains weak and poverty and inequity persist.

Infobox: Main Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Guatemala

| According to the population projections of the National Statistics Institute INE for 2012, the number of inhabitants of both sexes was 15,073,375 million. Of this total, 48.8% are men and 51.2% women. 40% of the population at the national level self-identifies as indigenous. There are 22 language communities of Mayan origin, plus the Garifuna and Xinca peoples. In 2012 the average age range of the population was 17 years. 51% of the population lives in rural areas. |
| The Illiteracy Rate for 2012 was 16.6. The (INE, 2013) reports that in 2012 the schooling index to the elementary level reached 66.1%, while the rate of approvals was 85.7%. On the other hand, the rate of retention; that is, students who enrolled and continued with their studies during the elementary cycle, went from 95.2% to 95.1%. |
| At the secondary level, in 2012 the schooling rate reached 22.2%, while the rate of approval was 68.2%. The rate of retention in the basic cycle went from 94.8% to 93.1%. In the diversified cycle, in 2012, the schooling rate reached 17.4%, while the rate of approval was 77.3%. The rate of retention went from 95.4% to 96.6%. |
| According to the results of the National Employment Survey ENEI 2-2013, approximately 9.9 million persons have 15 or more years of age, which are considered Population with Age to Work (PET). 5.9 million of these form the Economically Active Population (PEA), which means that at a national level, 60 of every 100 persons have enough age to work, are working or looking for a job. The same survey reports that the index of participation of women in the PEA is lower than men’s. The national total for men is 82.9 and for women 40.6. The largest difference lies in the rural area, where the participation index for women is half of men’s. This survey also highlights that 69.2% of the employed population at the national level is working in the informal sector of the economy. In the rural area, almost 8 of every 10 workers are employed in this sector. In view of the link with inclusive education, it is important to underline the data related to child work, which is defined in the ENEI 2-2013 as any form of economic activity undertaken by children. At the national level, 9.5% of the children within the age range of 7 to 14 perform some kind of economic activity and the largest rate of child employment is found in the rural area, while the lowest is found in the metropolitan urban area. Furthermore, at a national level, 68.6% of the children who are engaged in some sort of economic activity are indigenous children. |
| According to World Bank data (2012) and Unicef (2012), the Gini Index (statistic that measures inequity) for Guatemala is 55.9%. According to the ranking of the Gini Index, Guatemala occupied position 148 out of 160 countries; Norway appears in number 1, with an Gini Index of 0.226, whereas the Republic of Seychelles occupied the position 160, with a Gini Index 0.658. |
According to previous studies (Artiles, Harris-Murri, & Rostenberg, 2006) there are multiple approaches regarding inclusive education, some more focussed on the individual and others on equitable distribution of resources, in particular specialized services and/or common education services to any individual regardless of their private challenges. In developing countries the inclusive education discourse takes different forms, basically because the socio-economic and cultural context and/or the ecosystem in which the boys and girls live and grow, which is characterised by adverse and unequal conditions common to the majority of the population with sufficient age to attend school. That is, social vulnerability is an overarching condition and it is hard to point to groups that exclude each other, as is the case in developed countries. Contrary to the debate of specialized services versus better distributed services and/or individualistic approaches versus community approaches, the subject seems aimed to social justification of the school as a space for socialization, training and a platform for the development of competencies for life.

**Poverty: Scenario for Inclusive education**

Poverty is a common denominator in Guatemala. More than 50% of the population lives in poverty, which determines the development context for the population with sufficient age to attend school and the scope of public services, education among others, which the State can offer to its citizens.

The National Survey of Living Conditions by the National Statistics Institute (2011) presents indicators for extreme poverty, non-extreme poverty, total poverty and no poverty.

The line of extreme poverty (LPE) relates to the cost of acquiring food staples that fulfill the minimum caloric requirements per year per person. The persons under this classification are persons whose total annual expenditures is under said cost, Q4, 380.00 that year.

The line of non-extreme poverty (LPNE) includes the cost of food stables and the percentage of expenses for other goods and services. All persons whose total annual expenditures are above (LPE) and under (LPNE) are included in this category, which was Q9, 030.93 that year.

Econvi explains that the addition of both results, LPN plus LPNE gives the total poverty number. The rest of the population is classified as Not Poor, see Chart 3.

**Chart 3. Poverty in Guatemala**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Extreme Poverty %</th>
<th>Non-Extreme Poverty %</th>
<th>Total Poverty %</th>
<th>Not Poor %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>40.38</td>
<td>53.71</td>
<td>46.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Survey of Living Conditions 2011. INE

INE reports significant differences in the living conditions of urban households and rural households. The results show that at the national level, total poverty in the urban area was of 34.97% and in the rural area of 71.35%.

The immediate development context of children; that is, their place of residence, composition of their family, social protection services, cultural practices that determine how children are cared for and educated, and their social and historic background, has an impact on the possibilities of families
to generate revenues, acquire food staples, provide health care, and ensure the adequate growth of each child in the household, as well as access basic services like drinking water, lighting and proper housing.

According to UNICEF (as quoted by [Icefi & Unicef, 2011]) “the structural problems of society, like poverty and inequity of incomes, are the main causes for multiple phenomena that keeps children away from school; among them: child work, armed conflict and violence in general, language, religion, socio-economic level or social class among others (p.25)”.

In the particular case of Guatemala, the factor of vulnerability linked to poverty is malnutrition. According to the National Survey for Mother-Child Health ENSMI (2008-2009), the total percentage of girls and boys between the ages of 3 to 59 months with chronic malnutrition is 43.4 % and 16.1 % of them show severe malnutrition. Indigenous populations are the most affected since 58.6% present chronic malnutrition.

In addition, as described by the World Bank (2009), poor homes are also more vulnerable to events like reductions in remittances, variations in food prices, crime and violence, and climatic phenomena that constantly threaten the Guatemalan population.

According to [Icefi & Unicef, 2011] the population out of school PFE reached 1.9 million boys and girls between the ages of 3 and 18 for 2007 and 2008, and 1.7 million boys and girls for 2009.

As mentioned, the boys and girls between the ages of 3 to 6 that should be at the first level of education and/or pre-school are mostly out of school because only two of every five attend an education center. This group is followed by children between the ages of 13 and 18. In 2009 only three of every five children were enrolled in school. In 2009, 31.6% of the women between the ages of 3 and 18 experienced a more critical level of exclusion than men (28.65%) for this same age group.

The reference report adds that when analyzing boys and girls out of school as a result of their economic situation, in 2006 it was found that 72.8% live in conditions of poverty or extreme poverty. Finally, the report explains that exclusion from school refers to boys and girls who are not entering elementary school or pre-school, as well as those who deserted school or who had a delayed entry into the school system, and thus show an age problem.

Among the factors that determine exclusion identified by ICEFI- UNICEF (2011) we can name: ethnic group (greater probability for enrolment of non-indigenous at some levels), gender (greater probability for men than for women), age (less probability of enrolment for youngsters aged between 13 and 18) and place of residence (rural populations that must attend elementary school and/or middle school or diversified school with less possibility of being enrolled). It is also asserted that household incomes are a decisive factor for boys and girls to have access to an education.

In summary, social inequity resulting from poverty surrounding children in Guatemala presents and maintains challenges and barriers to their inclusive education.

**Guatemalan Children, Poverty and Education Performance**

According to UNICEF, Bristol University, and London School of Economics, as quoted by [Cepal-Unicef, 2010], child poverty is understood as the “lack of rights to health, education, information, adequate nutrition, water, sanitation and housing”. From this multi-dimensional perspective, the
study undertaken by CEPAL-UNICEF (2010) showed that around 45% of the Latin American population under 18 lives in poverty.

In Guatemala, there is evidence of previous investigations about social inequity, development variables and school performance.

In (2009), the Direction General of Evaluation and Education Research DIGEDUCA, carried out an investigation that, adapting the Gini Index, measured social inequality (a value of 0 indicates perfect equality and 1 perfect inequality) applied to the education system using existing statistics like the number of years of schooling for the population over 15 years of age.

The initial premises of the study indicate that an inequitable access to education sets limits to the individual and the population in general, which has an impact on income generation and economic growth. According to the results, in 2006 the education inequality index at the national level was 0.483 with greater inequality for women (0.522) than for men (0.438) and for rural populations (0.563) than for urban areas (0.381).

Results show a reduction of inequality when compared to the Education Gini coefficient for 1995, 0.571, and for 2002, 0.531. It also reports an education Gini reduction trend and an increase in the average of schooling years in 1994 and 2006, which confirms that an increase in the number of years of schooling reduced inequality.

On the other hand, the Departmental Education Gini showed a negative and moderately weak correlation with the health index. It also shows a positive correlation between the Education Gini coefficient and the percentage of indigenous population at the departmental level; that is, departments with a high indigenous population will have a high education inequality. Finally, the Education Gini coefficient shows a strong positive correlation to total poverty and extreme poverty. The study concludes that the Ministry of Education must continue fostering policies for access to education for women, rural populations and Mayan populations, while working on the quality of the education.

(Moreno, 2012) carried out an investigation on social inequality and learning of reading and mathematics among sixth grade students. The study recognizes the importance of education in the quality of life of a person, as well as the impact of quality of education in the economic growth of a country. Moreno, M. (2012) states that previous studies in the education field which have assessed the socio-economic status, mainly take into consideration aspects that relate to the parent’s education level, the prestige of their occupations and the family income. For this investigation, the following categories were taken into account: electric appliances in the household, construction materials of the house, existence of a kitchen separate from the rest of the house facilities, fuel used for cooking, water source, type of sanitation facilities, and use of electric power, trash collection and finally, education of the parents.

The main findings of the research conclude that when analyzing the composition of the socio-economic status of schools, it is possible to confirm that Guatemalan students have unequal learning opportunities determined by their socio-economic status. Those students with a lower socio-economic status in less affluent schools have a lower performance than students in similar conditions studying in more affluent schools. Another important finding relates to the fact that a change in the socio-economic status of the students in a same school does not have a statistically significant impact
on their performance in Mathematics. However, in the case of Reading, an increase in the heterogeneity of this factor in a same school causes a reduced performance in Reading. For future investigations it is important to analyze the impact of the type of teacher (training and years of experience) as factor to determine education quality and education performance in unequal socio-economic contexts.

2.2 National Education Context

The purpose of this section is to provide information about the country’s education situation. To this effect, we have taken into account not only education indicators, but also indicators that allow to interpret the country’s economic and social situation. As stated, the reason for this is that when following a systemic perspective, the country’s education situation may not be understood when separated from the economic and social situation, as these are inter-dependent systems. That is, each works independently from the other, but the decisions taken or not taken in each or all directly or indirectly affect the other. It might be easy to forget this, because at times the impact of these decisions is obvious only in the long term.

Several indicators were taken from the Marchesi (2000) proposal, which suggests 14 education indicators, grouped in five levels, to understand education inequality based on its relation with social inequality. We are not including those that refer to the results, as this is not part of the design of this investigation.

The information is presented starting with education situation, followed by social situation, and finally economic situation. The reason for this is to understand and respond to questions about the education situation based on its relation with the social and economic context.

The years studied are 2009 to 2012 because these are the years that appear in the design of the research. The indicators were consulted and taken from: (a) National system of Education Indicators and Statistic Year Books of the Ministry of Education – MINEDUC; (b) National Statistics Institute – INE; (c) UNESCO, and (d) reports by different institutions.

2.3 How is the education context?

In the country most schools at the pre-school and elementary school level are public schools, followed by private schools. Only 0.33% and 0.40% of the schools at the pre-school and elementary levels are municipal.

Chart 4. Number and percentage of schools at pre-school and elementary levels, by sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School</td>
<td>15,835</td>
<td>13,083</td>
<td>82.62</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>19,414</td>
<td>16,415</td>
<td>84.55</td>
<td>2,922</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DIPLAN (2014)

As can be seen, the majority of pre-school level schools follow the monolingual Spanish model (77.82%) and, regardless of their model, most are located in the rural area (76.19%).

Only 4.48% of pre-schools with the bilingual model are located in the urban area.
Chart 5. Number and Percentage of Pre-School Entities by Modality and Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School</td>
<td>12,323</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,601</td>
<td>29.22</td>
<td>8,722</td>
<td>70.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>77.82</td>
<td>95.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School Bilingual</td>
<td>3,512</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>3,343</td>
<td>95.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,835</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,770</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>12,065</td>
<td>76.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: DIPLAN (2014)

The data related to elementary school shows the same trend of the pre-school level, where 59.48% of the elementary schools are monolingual in Spanish and regardless of their modality, 80.85% are located in the rural area. Only 5.92% of bilingual schools at the elementary level are located in the urban area.

Chart 6. Number and Percentage of Elementary Schools by Modality and Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Monolingual</td>
<td>11,548</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,497</td>
<td>30.28</td>
<td>8,051</td>
<td>69.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>59.48</td>
<td>94.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Bilingual</td>
<td>7,866</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>7,646</td>
<td>97.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>40.52</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19,414</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,717</td>
<td>19.15</td>
<td>15,697</td>
<td>80.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: DIPLAN (2014)

At the pre-school level, there are three types of schools: (a) graded, (b) multi-grade, and (c) uni-teacher. Graded schools are those that “have one or more teachers for each grade”, multi-graded “have teachers who serve several grades” and uni-teacher, as implied by the name “have one teacher who serves all the grades”. According to the data, 55.68% of the elementary schools are multi-grade and uni-teacher.

Chart 7. Number and Percentage of Elementary Schools by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Graded</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Multi-grade</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Uni-teacher</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primaria</td>
<td>16,118</td>
<td>7,144</td>
<td>44.32</td>
<td>6,795</td>
<td>42.16</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>13.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: DIPLAN (2013)

According to the population projections of INE, in 2012 Guatemala had 15,073,375 inhabitants, 41% of them under 14 years of age. The following chart presents the data for 2009 to 2012.

Chart 8. Total Population, Population Aged from 0 to 14 and Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Population aged 0 to 14</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>14,017,057</td>
<td>5,876,659</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>14,361,666</td>
<td>5,968,677</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>14,713,763</td>
<td>6,059,476</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>15,073,375</td>
<td>6,148,946</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INE’s population projections show that in 2012, 55% of the boys and girls formed the population of age to attend elementary school, followed by 25% of youngsters of age to attend the basic secondary school cycle (Chart 5).

Chart 9. Population of Age to Attend School, by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Population of Age To Attend School</th>
<th>Pre-School 5 to 6 years old</th>
<th>Elementary 7 to 12 years old</th>
<th>Basic Secondary 13 to 15 years old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4,061,874</td>
<td>811,741</td>
<td>2,242,118</td>
<td>1,008,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4,139,010</td>
<td>824,714</td>
<td>2,283,326</td>
<td>1,030,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4,217,299</td>
<td>837,938</td>
<td>2,325,140</td>
<td>1,054,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4,297,735</td>
<td>851,572</td>
<td>2,368,090</td>
<td>1,078,073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MINEDUC Statistic Year Books

As can be seen in Graph 15, elementary school is the level with more entries, whether or not the students have the age required for this cycle. Pre-school and basic secondary cycle have the lowest number of enrollments.

However, between 2009 and 2012, there has been a reduction in the number of boys and girls that enrolled at the pre-school and elementary levels. For example, in 2009, 72% enrolled, while in 2012, 63.30%. The opposite is true for the basic secondary level, since in 2009, 66.7% enrolled and in 2012, 69.2%.

Graph 15. Gross Schooling Index, by Year and Level-Cycle

The data shows how both at the elementary and basic secondary cycles, more men than women enroll, regardless of their age. However, the opposite is true for pre-school, where more girls enroll than boys.
Chart 10. Gross Schooling Index by Year, Level-Cycle and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School</td>
<td>71.40%</td>
<td>72.70%</td>
<td>69.40%</td>
<td>70.70%</td>
<td>67.30%</td>
<td>68.30%</td>
<td>62.90%</td>
<td>63.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>121.30%</td>
<td>115.90%</td>
<td>118.30%</td>
<td>114.10%</td>
<td>115.60%</td>
<td>111.90%</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>105.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Secondary</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>63.30%</td>
<td>74.90%</td>
<td>66.90%</td>
<td>74.60%</td>
<td>65.90%</td>
<td>73.50%</td>
<td>64.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National System of Education Indicators

When reviewing the data about the number of boys, girls and youngsters who enter the different levels and the basic secondary cycle, but within the expected age range, it is evident that elementary is the level in which most of the population is enrolled. However, despite this, not everyone does; in 2012, 10.1% did not enroll in elementary school.

For the pre-school and basic secondary cycles, there is even a larger gap. For example, in 2012, 55.1% of the boys and girls within the age range for pre-school level did not enroll, while 56.8% of the youngsters did not enroll in the secondary cycle.

With the exception of the basic secondary cycle, the data shows a reduction in the number of boys and girls who enroll in pre-school and elementary cycles. In 2009, 57.1% enrolled in pre-school and 98.7% in elementary school, while in 2012, 44.90% enrolled in pre-school and 89.1% in elementary school.

Graph 16. Net Schooling Index by Year and Level-Cycle

Both at the elementary and the basic secondary cycles, more men enrol than women, with the basic secondary cycle showing the largest gap. At this level the difference goes from 1.90% (2009) to 3.2% (2011). The gap for elementary school is less since in 2009 the difference was of 2.2% and in 2012 of 1% (2012). It is important to keep in mind that the number of boys and girls that entered at this level was also less.
In pre-school, for 2009 and 2010, more women enrolled. However, in 2011 and 2012, more men enrolled. As it happens in elementary school, it is important to keep in mind that the number of boys and girls who enrolled in elementary school has been decreasing.

Given that the transition from one level or cycle to the other could be interpreted as a breaking point because some students leave the system at this time, below is some information about the percentage of students that enrolled in pre-school, 1st, 3rd, and 6th grade of elementary school, and 1st grade of basic secondary school, who are in the age range for this levels.

The previous data (Graph 17) allows on one hand to know which grade has more enrolments as well as whether or not there are losses in the number of students during the transition from one grade to the other throughout the years, based on an observation of the cohort.
other hand, in 6th grade of elementary school and 1st grade of basic secondary school, there has been an increase in the number of students enrolled. In 2009, 30.4% and 23.6% enrolled to 6th grade of elementary school and 1st grade of secondary school respectively. In 2012, 33.1% enrolled in 6th grade of elementary school and 26.6% in 1st grade of basic secondary school.

When exploring the data by cohort, a trend appears towards the loss of school population, which is even more evident in 1st to 3rd grade of elementary school.

First grade of elementary school is where most boy and girls enrol, but few continue until the third grade of elementary school. Of 76.4% boys and girls who enrolled in 1st grade of elementary school in 2009, only 40.70% enrolled in 3rd grade of primary school in 2011. That is, 35.7% possibly dropped out or repeated.

In 2009, the percentage of boys and girls who enrolled in 3rd grade of elementary school was 40.5, and in 2012, 33.1% enrolled in 6th grade of primary school. The reduction is of 7.4%. It is also possible to observe a decrease in the number of students during the transition from 6th grade of primary school to 1st grade of basic secondary school, which was from 4.8% (2009-2010), 4.9% (2010-2011) and 5.2% (2011-2012).

An analysis of previous cohorts suggests that a lot of students enrolled in the 1st grade of elementary school, but several of them were not able to reach the 3rd grade of elementary school. However, those who do reach the 3rd grade of elementary school have better possibilities of also reaching the 6th grade of elementary school. The same happened during the transition between 6th grade of elementary school and 1st grade of basic secondary school. The reason for this seems to be that the percentage of students lost between these two transitions is lower in comparison to the transition between 1st and 3rd grade of elementary school. It is important to interpret this with caution because the changes could be subject to specific characteristics of a cohort. However, if this suggestion were true, who would be the students that remain in the system? Would it be students who have not repeated a grade, who have the proper age and/or have more cultural capital at home?

When exploring the data by gender, we remarked that in the third and sixth grades of elementary school, more girls enrol than boys. The opposite is true for the first grade of elementary school and the first grade of basic secondary school. At the pre-school level for 2009 and 2010, the percentage of girls enrolled was larger than the percentage of boys. However, after 2011, the percentage of boys and girls enrolled was the same.

Chart 12. Net Index of Schooling per Year, Level-Cycle of Transition and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level-Grado/Gender</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st elementary</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd elementary</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th elementary</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st basic secondary</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National System of Education Indicators

Based on the previous results, it could be suggested that there are still boys, girls and youngsters who never enrol in school. This makes it particularly important to know how many of these boys, girls
and youngsters did enrol and remain during one full school year.

A high percentage of boys, girls and youngsters who enrolled in pre-school, elementary school and basic secondary school do finish the school year (Graph 18). Furthermore, the data shows that throughout the years, the trend is to have more boys, girls and youngsters conclude the school year. The only two exceptions are 2010 for the pre-school level (90.77%) and basic secondary level (89.71%) and 2012 with the basic secondary level (93.11%), which showed a decrease. Another interesting point is the increase in the rate of retention in 2011 for all levels and the basic secondary cycle.

Graph 18. Retention Rate by Year and Level-Cycle

Upon a review of data (Chart 9), at the pre-school and elementary school levels, segregated by gender, it is noted that the number of boys and girls who conclude the school cycle is very similar through the years.

At the basic secondary school cycle, in general more women conclude the school year than men. When comparing the net schooling rate and the retention rate segregated by gender, it is interesting to note that although the number of women who enter the basic secondary cycle is less in comparison to the number of men, there are more women who finalize the school year in said cycle.

Chart 13. Retention Rate by year, Level-Cycle and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level-Cycle/Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>92.03%</td>
<td>92.33%</td>
<td>90.46%</td>
<td>91.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>93.78%</td>
<td>94.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Secondary School</td>
<td>91.09%</td>
<td>92.56%</td>
<td>89.14%</td>
<td>90.35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistic Yearbook MINEDUC
As in the previous section, the data by grade (Graph 19) shows that most students finish the school year, with third and sixth grades of elementary school as the years with more students concluding. Despite the fact that the percentage of students who enter the 1st grade of basic secondary school is low (Graph 17), most do finalize the school year.

**Graph 19. Retention Rate by Year and Level-Cycle of Transition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level-Cycle/Gender</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st primary</td>
<td>92.05%</td>
<td>91.05%</td>
<td>92.16%</td>
<td>92.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd primary</td>
<td>95.54%</td>
<td>94.81%</td>
<td>96.02%</td>
<td>95.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th primary</td>
<td>96.44%</td>
<td>95.70%</td>
<td>97.21%</td>
<td>96.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st basic</td>
<td>89.65%</td>
<td>85.98%</td>
<td>91.66%</td>
<td>89.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistic Year Books MINEDUC

In 1st grade of elementary school and 1st grade of basic secondary school, more women conclude the school year than men. However, in 3rd and 6th grades of elementary school, the percentage of boys and girls who conclude the school year is very similar.

**Chart 14. Retention Rate by Year, Level-Cycle of Transition and Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level-Cycle/Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st elementary</td>
<td>91.55%</td>
<td>92.59%</td>
<td>90.46%</td>
<td>91.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd elementary</td>
<td>95.31%</td>
<td>95.79%</td>
<td>94.66%</td>
<td>94.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th elementary</td>
<td>96.58%</td>
<td>96.29%</td>
<td>95.83%</td>
<td>95.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st basic secondary</td>
<td>88.62%</td>
<td>90.82%</td>
<td>85.17%</td>
<td>86.92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistic Year Books MINEDUC

Based on the data, it could be concluded that most of the students who enrol in school remain in school until the end of the school year. However, how many of these boys, girls and youngsters are promoted?

In pre-school, students are automatically promoted, so we only present data for elementary and basic secondary school.

The data in Graph 20 shows that most of the students in elementary school who conclude the school year, pass. However, for the basic secondary school, the number of students who approves is less, in 2009 and 2012 between 68.4% and 68.2%.
Both at the elementary and basic secondary levels, more women pass than men (Chart 11).

### Chart 15. Promotion Rate by Year, Level-Cycle and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level-Cycle/Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>85.60%</td>
<td>87.20%</td>
<td>84.20%</td>
<td>86.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Secondary</td>
<td>64.80%</td>
<td>72.30%</td>
<td>62.60%</td>
<td>70.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National System of Education Indicators

A revision of the data in Graph 21 for pre-school shows that as students advance through the school system, the percentage of students that approve is higher.

In 2012, 96.50% of 6th grade students passed, followed by 86.1% of students in 3rd grade. This in comparison to 74.5% of students who passed the 1st grade of elementary school.

In 1st grade of basic secondary school, the number of students who pass goes down, between 66.4% for 2009 and 62.2% for 2012.

When comparing 6th grade of elementary school and 1st grade of basic secondary school, it is interesting to observe that in 6th grade of elementary school, a lot of students pass, but not in 1st grade of secondary school. Could this be a reflection of the break between the elementary and secondary cycles? Could it be linked to the competencies and skills of the students when they finish 6th grade?
In all grades and throughout the years, women have better results than men.

Although it is true that based on the previous data it is possible to have an idea of the education situation of the country, it is important to include data related to repetition and students above the standard age, since both are relevant to education in Guatemala.

As can be seen in (Graph 22), the repetition rate is greater in elementary school than in basic secondary school. This has been true throughout the years in elementary school, with the highest rate in 2010 (11.90%) and the lowest in 2011 (10.92%). For the basic cycle, the rate has changed more, and in 2012 it grew to 5.63%.
For 2009 and 20112, both at the elementary and basic secondary levels, the rates for repetition are very similar between men and women, but in 2011 and 2012, more men repeated.

Graph 23 shows the grade in which there is a higher repetition rate, which is 1st grade of elementary school, while there is a lower repetition rate in 6th grade. 2010 shows a higher repetition rate in 1st grade, while in the other grades it was 2012.
The data shows that more men repeat than women, with the exception of 6th grade, where the percentage is very similar; the only year when more men repeated than women was 2012.

Why are there more students repeating in 1st grade? Could it be because this is the grade where most students begin their schooling? What are the characteristics of these students? Why are there less women repeating than men? Is it because they have better skills or is it that only successful women continue with their education?

According to MINEDUC’s definition, the over-age rate refers to “the relation between students with two or more years of delay with respect to the ideal age for their grade” (MINEDUC Statistics Year Books). Beginning in 2009, the number of over-age students within the school system has dropped; for this year the rate was 51.69% and in 2012, 21.78%. Most over-age students are found in the rural area.

As an example, in 2012 there were 100 students in the rural area, 25 over-aged, while in the urban students, 11 out of 100 were over-aged. This means that there are 2.27 more over-age students in the rural area than in the urban area.
Graph 24. Over-Age Rate by Area and Year

When comparing the over-age rate by gender, it is noted that there are more men than women. Furthermore, there are more over-age men than women in the rural area than in the urban area.

Chart 19. Over-Age Rate by Year, Area and Gender

This suggests that there is still a marked difference between the urban and the rural areas, implying that there is also a difference with respect to future opportunities, both with respect to education and economy.

As happens with the repetition rate, we pose ourselves the question: why the percentage of over-age women is lower than men’s? Is it because only successful women continue with their studies? Why were there more over-age students in 2009 than other years? Why are there more over-age students in the rural area than in the urban area?

In summary, indicators seem to show that throughout the years, there have been improvements, in particular at the elementary level. This is the level with the largest numbers of enrollments and, although there are more boys than girls enrolled, the gap has decreased from 2.2% in 2009 to 1% in 2012. However, it is important to take into account that there are boys and girls who are not enrolling in school at this level. Furthermore, it seems that there is an increase in the number of boys.
and girls who have the minimum age to study and who have not enrolled at this level. In 2012, 10.9% did not enroll in comparison to 1.3% in 2009.

With respect to retention and promotion, there has been an increase in the number of students who conclude the school year and pass it. However, 1st grade is the one with the least number of students promoted in comparison to 6th grade, and it is the grade that shows higher percentages of repetition and the grade in which most of the population enrolls.

Pre-school and basic secondary are the cycles with the least rate of enrollment. In pre-school, in 2009 and 2010 more women enrolled than men, while in 2011 and 2012, the percentage was the same. At the basic secondary cycle, more men than women enroll, but there is a subtle increase in the number of women that do enroll. The percentage of women who enrolled in 2009 was 39.3%, while in 2012 it was 41.7%. The retention rate shows that most of the students do finish the school year. It is interesting to observe that at the basic secondary level it is more women who finish the school year than men, although less women begin the year. The same happens with the promotion rate. At the basic secondary level, more women pass than men. The largest numbers of repetition at the basic secondary level was in 2012, with 5.63%. In general, more men repeat than women. This can also be seen when analyzing the data segregated by gender. In 2012, 9.23% of men in 1st grade of basic secondary school repeated in comparison with 5.88% of women.

The over-age rate shows that from 2009 to 2012 there was a drop in the number of students with over-age. However, this is more evident in the rural area where there are more over-age students. In the rural area there are 2.27 more students with over-age than in the urban area. At the national level, there are less women with over-age than men, but there are even more men with over-age than women in the rural area.

A number of concerns result from this. On the one hand, what is the cause for the difference in indicators between 2009 and 2012? Why are there fewer women with over-age or who repeat? Why do most students pass the 6th grade of elementary school but not the 1st grade of basic secondary school? What is the reason for the percentile drop between 2009 and 2012 on some of the indicators? What are the characteristics of the students who remain in the system? What are the characteristics of those who don’t?
3 Background of Inclusive Education in Guatemala

The adoption of inclusive education in Guatemala originates from the special education services promoted by parents in the 60s. Below is a general review of the road and evolution of this topic and the approaches and differences adopted by institutions and individuals interested in the matter, to identify the opportunities, barriers, limitations and answers that inclusive education has found to this date in the country.

According to the review made, it can be concluded that the term inclusion in Guatemala has been garnering relevance, which acquired strength after the approval of the Inclusive Education Policy for Populations with Special Education Needs linked or not to Disabilities, in 2008. Consequently, few studies have been found that refer specifically to the topic of inclusive education as conceived nowadays. For this reason, one of the strategies followed in the search for background was the use of terms like: education of girls, ethnicity, bilingual education, disability, poverty, vulnerable groups, equity, and equal opportunity. This was done in order to take into consideration groups that had been previously identified for the difficulties they faced to access education.

Taking into consideration the criteria herein described, 12 research works, 2 reports and 2 papers were chosen (a National Report and a Report by the Archbishop’s Office). Some are included as they relate to inclusive education understood as access to, acceptance of and participation by everyone in the opportunities offered by the national education system. There is great diversity of institutions and individuals interested in this topic, some non-profit private institutions, academic institutions, State entities, and international organizations.

With respect to the methodology used in the different studies, it is important to underline that most studies are qualitative, although there are papers with a mixed approach. The consulted reports document actions and interventions to provide assistance to particular cases; that is, they reflect unique experiences that were not necessarily replicated or generalized.

As can be seen, the approaches to this topic are diverse, but they relate to the lack of opportunities for disadvantaged and vulnerable people who can’t have access to the benefits of a quality education. It is important to underline that the studies analyzed report an inter-relation between the different vulnerable groups. As highlighted by Burgos. & Paiz (2012), different problems co-exist, such as over-age, no promotion, repetition, desertion lack of attention to special education needs and/or bilingual education, exclusion of girls, among others. The following chart presents a summary of the documents analyzed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES AND/OR GENERAL ISSUES</th>
<th>RESULTS AND/OR CONCLUSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Study on the situation of inclusive education in Guatemala</td>
<td>World Bank through the Canadian Association for Community Life</td>
<td>Definition of a Public and Regulatory Policy for mentally-retarded population, curricular changes. National diagnostic study.</td>
<td>Some of the results show that the public sector offers multiple services, promotes the integration of girls and boys to the regular system at the local and regional levels. There is coordination through the Multi-Sectorial Commission for Education Integration. The main obstacles for integration are lack of training for teachers, lack of communication channels, excessive number of students for the classrooms, lack of collective projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Current situation of special education in Guatemala</td>
<td>ASCATED Education Ministry - DICADE-Canadian Integral Development Agency</td>
<td>Obtain updated information on the different aspects of special education in Guatemala</td>
<td>Some results show that the special education centers remain concentrated in the capital city and urban areas, most belong to the public sector but lack infrastructure, which is an obstacle, most of the population served is “ladina” (non-indigenous), teachers are not trained, work is done in coordination with the parents, who are also trained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Fight against all forms of discrimination related to boys and girls in Central America</td>
<td>Save the Children Sweden, Paniamor Foundation</td>
<td>Learn about the perceptions and situations that affect the rights of boys and girls. Gather opinions from key State and Civil Society stakeholders Document policies and programs.</td>
<td>Assertion that Guatemala has no problem to ratify laws; however, their enforcement is limited. Therefore, the majority of boys, girls and teenagers lack opportunities to overcome inequity, social, political and economic exclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>AUTHOR</td>
<td>OBJECTIVES AND/OR GENERAL ISSUES</td>
<td>RESULTS AND/OR CONCLUSIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Inclusive education: Changing the future. A shared challenge. 2008-2012 National Report</td>
<td>Education Ministry</td>
<td>2008 -2012 Education Plan</td>
<td>Presentation of policies for implementation. Presentation of advances in the areas of study; for example, creation of a Direction general of Special Education. Reflections on the challenges to maintain the trend of improvement in equity, strengthening of coverage with quality, especially for girls, indigenous groups and vulnerable populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Current Situation of Special Education in Guatemala 2008</td>
<td>Education Ministry, DIGEESP</td>
<td>Show the advances achieved with respect to inclusive education</td>
<td>The report presents in general terms the actions carried out to date by the recently created Direction General of Special Education - DIGEESP- such as training workshops for teachers, supervisors and departmental staff and printing of materials, among others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>The pedagogic process of uni-teacher and multi-grade rural schools in Central America.</td>
<td>National University of Costa Rica Central American Education and Culture Coordination</td>
<td>Assess the situation of uni-teacher and multi-grade schools in Guatemala, Costa Rica and Honduras.</td>
<td>Uni-teacher and multi-grade schools serve disadvantaged populations in rural areas. They constitute the main opportunity of these populations to access the school system. These schools, according to the report, are many. However, their impact is not considered important and seems invisible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>The meaning of legal identity in a context of poverty and social exclusion</td>
<td>IDB, Inter-American Development Bank, Mia Harbitz, María del Carmen Tamargo</td>
<td>Deepen the knowledge about the inter-relation between gender, ethnicity and lack of identification documents.</td>
<td>A factor that determines and worsens social, economic and political exclusion, both for men and women, is the lack of an identification document, as asserted in this research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Note: The table provides a snapshot of key documents and their findings related to education, legal identity, and social exclusion in Guatemala. The entries include the year, title, author(s), objectives and general issues, and results and conclusions.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES AND/OR GENERAL ISSUES</th>
<th>RESULTS AND/OR CONCLUSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Transformation in Maya-Mam communities in Huehuetenango, Guatemala: migration and language flows</td>
<td>Andrea Álvarez Díaz</td>
<td>Assess family dynamics in pluri-ethnic contexts</td>
<td>One of the main results shows that bilingual education programs are deficient because bilingual teachers working in Mam communities speak other languages like kaqchikel, k’iche’, kanjobal, chij, popti, awateko, and only teach in Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Where are the absentees? Analysis of the mechanisms, costs and forms to eliminate education exclusion in Guatemala, 2012-2021</td>
<td>ICEFI, Central American Institute of Fiscal Studies UNICEF</td>
<td>Plan public intervention policies that in ten years will mitigate inequalities in access to and quality of education in 125 municipalities with the largest social vulnerability indicators.</td>
<td>Some of the main results are: population out of school –PFE- of 1.9 million girls and boys aged 3 to 18 for 2007 and 2008, and 1.7 million girls and boys for 2009. In 2009 31.6% of the women aged 3 to 18 were more excluded from school than the men (28.65%) in this same group age. Among the factors that determine exclusion are: ethnic group, gender, age and place of residence. The income of their households is the determinant factor for girls and boys to have access to education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Social Inequality and Learning to Read and Mathematics for 6th Grade Students</td>
<td>Education Ministry of Guatemala, DIGEDUCA, M.Sc. Mario Raúl Moreno Grajeda</td>
<td>Determine the existence of a significant relation between the results of exams and the socio-economic status of the students.</td>
<td>The results show that the students with greater socio-economic disadvantages are the ones with the worst results in reading and mathematics. Furthermore, the students who attend the schools with worst socio-economic conditions obtain bad results in reading and mathematics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>AUTHOR</td>
<td>OBJECTIVES AND/OR GENERAL ISSUES</td>
<td>RESULTS AND/OR CONCLUSIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Education Backwardness in the Guatemalan School System and the Over-Age Student Program -PEPS-</td>
<td>Education Ministry, Direction General of Education Evaluations and Investigation. Alice Burgos Paniagua and Irma Yolanda Paiz Contreras</td>
<td>Provide material to the authorities responsible for the improvement of the program</td>
<td>We verified the existence of problems linked to over-age: lack of promotion, numerous repetitions, drop offs resulting from irrelevance and quality, undiagnosed and untreated special education needs, irrelevant bilingual education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Inclusive education of the Poqomchi’ Community in the Municipality of San Cristóbal, Department of Alta Verapaz</td>
<td>José Arturo Choc Chen Masters Degree Thesis Work</td>
<td>Discover the elements that determine exclusion and education segregation for children with disabilities and special education needs.</td>
<td>Discrimination, exclusion, segregation and rejection of individuals with disabilities and special education needs happen as a result of negative criteria of the teachers at the elementary level and the existence of stereotypes and social stigmas relating the parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Service to students with special education needs at metropolitan education centers of the diversified senior high school level</td>
<td>Laura Magaly Menéndez Sanchez, Masters Degree Thesis Work</td>
<td>Characterize the intervention models adopted by the metropolitan education institutions at the diversified senior high school level for inclusion of students with special education needs in regular classrooms.</td>
<td>Student inclusion is more successful with private institutions because they have better furniture, more and better resources, comfort and areas and equipment, follow-up strategies and teacher support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Disability, Poverty and Education: Perceived Barriers and (Dis)connections in Rural Guatemala</td>
<td>Shaun Grech</td>
<td>Shows the impact of disabilities in the formal education of disabled populations in Guatemala’s rural area.</td>
<td>The barriers faced by disabled populations in rural areas related to access to education are social, physical, economic, political, personal, related to school infrastructure and to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>AUTHOR</td>
<td>OBJECTIVES AND/OR GENERAL ISSUES</td>
<td>RESULTS AND/OR CONCLUSIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Report on the Situation of Children and Teenagers in Guatemala 2013</td>
<td>Office of Human Rights of the Archbishop of Guatemala</td>
<td>Raise awareness about the global panorama of the situation and the violations to the rights of children and youth in the country.</td>
<td>One of the results is that in 2009 coverage reached 98.7% and there is a negative difference of 200 thousand students enrolled. Furthermore, it reports that 292 elementary schools are Inclusive. This represents 1.54 of the total.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2014 | Assessment of the Level of Inclusion of Public and Sectorial Policies for Children and Youth | FLACSO: Latin American Social Sciences Faculty                          | ● Level of inclusion of the policies and regulatory frameworks  
● Good practices, barriers and gaps  
● Prepare an action plan.                                      | ● Insufficient regulatory frameworks to promote social inclusion  
● The civil society organizations are the ones that promote good practices related to education and work inclusion and work training  
● Urgent problems: Little inclusive education, weak policies, lack of staff, insufficient budget  
● Critical Routes were designed as a contribution as well as a diagnosis of the issue. |

The sources consulted show that the research in this country has used at times concepts that are opposed to the notion of inclusion. We found notions like exclusion, inequity, social inequality, segregation. This shows the need to work to build a concept of inclusive education starting with the nature of the social context of developing countries characterized by generalized conditions of socio-economic vulnerability.

It is also evident that there is a lack of longitudinal studies that can describe the evolution of a phenomenon at different times, its development, changes and advances. In addition, the reports related to interventions consulted refer to isolated experiences, with limited resources, which shows the need for the adoption of measures to expand the successful practices that resulted from this experiences to create the same opportunities for all children, taking into account all the characteristics and conditions that might put them in danger of having their rights violated.
The document review allowed us to verify that poverty and “rurality” work as central axes that contribute to the education exclusion of different groups; that is, pose barriers to inclusive education.

Another outstanding data relates to the lack of an identity registry. According to (Harbitz & Tamargo, 2009) the phenomenon of lack of personal identification documents among ethnic groups living in rural areas is larger and women are the most affected, which shows that inclusive education encompasses multi-dimensional actions that require the participation of different entities.

As can be seen, inter-institutional efforts are key to achieve the inclusion of groups considered vulnerable. Among the efforts there is a project promoted by UNESCO by the name of: Project for the Strengthening of Inclusion in National Disability Policies “Women for Inclusion”, whose objective is to promote inclusion of disabled women and a gender focus in the National Policy for Disabled Populations in Guatemala”.

According to the information provided by Virginia Herzig de Stwolinsky on July 2, 2014, the expected results are: a) to create a space for dialogue through the creation of a Support Committee for the inclusion of disabled women in public policies; b) strengthen legal knowledge on attention to disabled populations by departmental stakeholders; c) exchange of tools and successful experiences in the area if productive and social development; d) the Support Committee impacts the process for inclusion and respect of the rights of disabled women.

The institutions that to date conform the committee are: CONADI, UNESCO, Direction of Special Education of the MINEDUC, USAC, Margarita Tejeda Foundation, Trickle Up, SEGEPLAN. In addition, we hope to include other institutions that address the topic of disabled populations and promote similar initiatives.

The evidence shows that it is important to continue studying practices that favor inclusive education (for example, scholarships programs), as well as studying other vulnerable groups in Guatemala who face challenges to be included in the national education system; for example, migrant populations who abandon school, child mothers, education offer for over-age populations, education offer in rural areas, education offer for boys and girls with special talents, among others.
4 Vulnerable Groups

This investigation studied a number of vulnerable groups within the school population and identified from the design stage the indigenous population and their attention in the context of the National Education System; girls and their access to school and populations with special education needs, linked or not to disabilities. Initially poor children and youngsters were taken into consideration, however, poverty is a structural condition of the country. Following is information of the three groups mentioned.

4.1 Indigenous Population and Bilingual Education in Guatemala

This analysis is based on the idea that in Guatemala, despite significant advances made during more than 30 years of work in Inter-Cultural Bilingual Education, the indigenous population continues to be considered as a vulnerable group since the education system hasn’t been able to guarantee access to, acceptance of and participation in school for boys, girls and youngsters from different indigenous groups in the country. The following information explains this assertion.

According to the information published by the Direction of Inter-Cultural Bilingual Education DIGEBI, Guatemala has a total of 24 languages, 22 of which are Mayan Languages, plus Xinka, Garifuna and Spanish. Five of these languages including Spanish have 300,000 to one million speakers each. The number of people who speak the other languages is between 120,000 and 20,000 speakers. (DIGEBI, 2009)

Inter-Cultural Bilingual Education, EBI “is the development and education modality planned and developed in two languages: the mother tongue or first language (L1) and Spanish (L2); which promotes the harmony between people from different cultures, for the four cultures that live together in the Guatemalan territory: Maya, Garífuna, Xinka and Ladino.” In addition it is asserted that the EBI is the foundation for the construction of identity and provides the necessary tools to expand opportunities for the local, regional and national growth of all Guatemalans (DIGEBI, 2009).

Nineteen of the 22 departments are currently receiving attention and inter-cultural bilingual education covers the following language communities: Q’eqchi’, Achi’, Kaqchikel, Ch’orti’, Poqomam, Mam, Q’anjob’al, Garífuna, Mopán, K’iche’, Tz’utujil and Xinka (DIGEBI, 2009).

However, Guatemala has been working on EBI since the 80s. Guatemala’s indigenous population has been historically excluded from the services provided by the State, among others, access to education. This relates to conditions of poverty, which is worse for indigenous populations living in rural areas. Furthermore, indigenous peoples have had less access to the work market, which has had an impact on their income level (ICEFI-Save the Children, 2011).

Following are the results of the investigations that explain the current status and challenges that EBI faces in Guatemala.

The study carried out by ICEFI-Save the Children (2011) reports the following findings after an analysis of the internal efficiency indicators (enrollment, retention, promotion and repetition) for EBI during 2000-2012. Results show that in the case of elementary school, enrollment in pre-school has dropped every year as a percentage of the total enrollment, although during the last years it stagnated. It is also reported that attention to boys and girls following the bilingual model is focused
in Alta Verapaz, El Quiché, Huehuetenango, Sololá and Totonicapán, which represents 77% of EBI enrollments. The enrollment level shows advances with respect to gender equity and a reduction of the desertion rate. Retention rates for the EBI modality at the elementary level for 2009 were of 95.5%. In addition, the mentioned study shows that the bilingual modality presents lower desertion rate and lower rates of promotion to the elementary level, which is explained as a weakness of EBI in the classroom. It is underlined that the mother tongue is a means of communication, not of learning. In addition, both Mayan boys and girls have higher levels of repetition in elementary that monolingual children, although this indicator has improved in the last ten years as mentioned.

According to data from the Finance Ministry quoted by ICEFI- Save de Children, the State spent in EBI in 2011 a total of Q901.6 million. It asserts that the budget has grown 6.3 times between 2001 and 2011. The mentioned study analyzed the first three grades of elementary school for 2000-2010 and confirmed that the country saved a total of Q197.3 million, which allowed to provide attention to 136,095 more students from what was originally budgeted. When reducing the costs of repetition, there were still savings of Q86.0 million, which shows the social and economic benefits of EBI for Guatemala. Finally, the study shows that with a continued investment of Q1, 551 million (0.4% of GDP) in 2012 up to Q5.636 million (0.8% of GDP) in 2021, coverage could be increased from the current 18.5% to 90% in 2021.

(ASIES-UNICEF) carried out an evaluation of the situation of Bilingual Education in Guatemala with a mixed model and a total of 118 urban schools and 411 rural schools visited. The study took into consideration the participation of stakeholders within the education community, supervisors and education technicians, municipal authorities and members of the Cocodes. Among the main results we can underline that the mother tongue of the principals, teachers and students is Spanish. When analyzing the group of teachers and principals and the group of parents whose mother tongue is Mayan, the first assert that they can read and write in it, while the latter state that they can’t. More than half of the parents stated that their children did not speak the same mother tongue as their parents. With respect to the EBI, both the school personnel and the parents showed ambiguous opinions. Some teachers recognize the importance of EBI for learning and culture, while others disagree as they think it is useless. Parents appreciate learning in Mayan languages but prefer Spanish and English and learning languages. The study shows advances at the level of the State to support the bilingual education policies, recognizing gaps related mainly to the education model and its implementation in the classroom.

(USAID/Reforma Educativa en el Aula, 2013) carried out a qualitative study about the perception of local stakeholders about inter-cultural bilingual education because they know about positions and questions about EBI, by both the teachers and the parents. They worked with a sample of parents with children studying in the first grades of elementary school in public schools in two municipalities of the department of El Quiche. The main results show a favorable perception by the parents towards EBI. Both mothers and fathers consider that it is necessary to teach in the two languages, and feel that Spanish plays a critical role in their relationship with other people, while their mother tongue is a critical element to maintain their cultural identity. Furthermore, mothers consider that knowing both languages favors the trust of the individual. This research differs from what was reported by ASIES (s/f) as the parents consulted expressed that they do teach their children to speak their mother tongue first.
(Rubio, 2007) anticipated that some of the challenges of the next decade are valid today. They are: a) education challenges and socio-linguistic environment, mainly with respect to an inter-cultural curriculum that can be applied to the classroom and strengthening teaching in Mayan culture, which means a trained teacher force and available education materials; b) political challenges to achieve more equity, increase participation and reduce discrimination; c) challenges of information and raising awareness among the education community; namely, parents and non-indigenous people about the academic, cultural and economic value of EBI.

4.2 Education for Girls in Guatemala

Objective number five of the Movement Education for All proposes to: “suppress the disparities between genders in elementary and secondary school between now and 2005, and achieving before 2015 equality between genders with respect to education. In particular, guaranteeing girls will have full and equitable access to basic education of quality, as well as good performance” UNESCO, (2003 p. 7)

The information presented below comes from the USAID study (2014, in the media) that analyzes the work carried out in the country in favor of education for girls and shows the advances and pending challenges. The purpose of this study was to establish the evolution of education of girls in relation to the education of boys during the last two decades and it is based on secondary sources from available cross-cutting reports.

As in other countries, the education of girls has been and continues to be part of Guatemala’s education agenda because, due to, on the one hand, the recognition of the existing inequity in the access to education opportunities which has prevailed and, on the other hand, the strong evidence presented by previous studies about the positive impact of education to girls on the quality of life of women and their families when their education level improves (Rubio, Fernando; Gabriela, Nuñez, 2014).

The first statement to underline is that the education of girls has been a topic of interest and has received attention from the Education Ministry, as well as national and international organizations. One of the main purposes has been to improve the education conditions and the equitable inclusion of girls in the education system. Early in the 90s there were different efforts by government and non-governmental organizations supported by international cooperation to promote coverage and school promotion, attention to the curriculum of studies, teacher training, development of education materials, access to scholarships, awareness campaigns, and more. Despite the notorious advances mentioned above, there are still some education demands that need to be satisfied, as well as new challenges related to the education of girls such as gender violence, teenage pregnancies, reproductive health, eradication of discrimination and exclusion, among others (p. 10).

Institutionally, efforts encompassed three relevant aspects: a) the creation of specific education policies to guide the work in favor of the education of girls; b) development of strategic plans that covered more than one decade, and c) in 2011, the creation of the Gender Unit with Ethnic Pertinence, under the Direction for Planning of the Education Ministry. Policies have highlighted access, attendance, retention and promotion of girls up to the 6th grade and have moved to a larger focus towards gender, equity, ethnicity and inter-culturalism (Lavareda, Rubio, Segura, Spross &

From a larger perspective, since the 90s there was a process that enabled the creation of the Presidential Women’s Secretariat and the formulation of the National Policy for Promotion and Development of Guatemalan Women and the Plan for Equitable Opportunities 2001-2006 which has been updated with a marked emphasis on education of women at all levels and better work opportunities (Mendizábal, Segura & Asturias, 2010 quoted by Rubio & Núñez, 2014).

With respect to the evidence reported in relation to education indicators in the mentioned study, it is concluded that gender inequity in the enrollment from pre-school to diversified secondary studies has dropped in the last twenty years (p. 37). In the case of elementary school, starting in 2001 there has been a sustained reduction of this inequity and by 2013 there were 93 girls for every 100 boys.

Gender inequity in the net coverage from pre-school to diversified high school has gone down. At the elementary level specifically there has been a substantial improvement in the national average. However, there are important differences at the departmental and municipal levels, as well as by education level, and gender inequity at the elementary level is considered a common issue (p. 22).

With respect to gender inequity in the transition from a grade to the following at the elementary level, the study reports that starting in 2004 the percentage of girls in each cohort enrolling in fourth grade and in the following grades was over the percentage of boys enrolling in the same grades, which represents a change in the pattern shown during the nineties (p. 37).

4.3 The student population with special education needs: a vulnerable group within vulnerable people

This research took into consideration individuals with special education needs, linked or not to disabilities, as a vulnerable group given their limited possibilities for access and acceptance, as well as to participate in the formal education system. Important advances took place in the country in this area, although there remain alarming gaps as mentioned by UNESCO UNESCO and FLACSO (2013).

In Guatemala, the Special Education Law (Decree No. 58-2007 of the Congress of the Republic), in Chapter II Article 3 Paragraph A defines disability as: “any restriction or physical, mental, sensorial, speech or visceral deficiency, whether permanent or temporary, which limits the ability of individuals to exercise one or more activities of daily life and which could be caused or worsened by the physical, economic and social surroundings. For the effects of this law, a deficiency is understood as originating from permanent or temporary education needs of the population (p. 2). In paragraph c of the same article it is stated that: special education needs are those experienced by people in particular circumstances, in conditions of disadvantage and who have greater difficulty to benefit from the education curriculum that corresponds to their age, and will thus require of special techniques or resources to facilitate their learning.

Inclusive education in the country is linked to the work that has been done to achieve equality of opportunities for boys and girls with special education needs linked or not to disabilities. The following chart summarizes the evolution of special education and how a perspective of specialized and segregated services is sought in the promotion of inclusion of this population in regular classrooms within the Guatemalan education system, a path that has not been finished but that it is
headed towards inclusive education for all.

Graph 25. Historic Development towards Inclusive Education

Once the specific Law was published, State institutions were strengthened through the creation of a Direction General of Special Education DIGEEESP within the Education Ministry, entity in charge of the application of the law and the public policies for the development of individuals with special capacities. The duties of the DIGEEESP relate to an extensive and complete spectrum of actions which include, among others: a) access to an education curriculum of quality and access to regular education centers and/or special education centers according to the level of special attention required by each individual; b) detection and early assistance to special education needs in regular centers; c) regulation of integration and social participation strategies to ensure the inclusion of a person in education, labor and social life; d) advisory and technical support to regular schools and specialized education centers; e) promotion of the active participation of parents; f) training of teachers and others (Special Education Law (Decree No. 58-2007 of the Congress of the Republic).

Starting in 2008, according to reports from the Education Ministry, a number of actions were put in place linked to education policies of the Education Ministry, in particular the following a) Policy for education quality through training to different actors of the education community, handing of materials and monitoring of students with special capacities; b) Coverage policy through attention of pre-school and elementary school students in integrated classrooms. Furthermore, support to groups
of boys and girls with learning, speech, emotions or behavioral problems during short periods of time and special education schools for students with intellectual, motor, multiple and sensorial disabilities that require of additional support and who do not benefit from temporary or permanent regular education; c) Equity Policy with a proposal for a scholarships program.
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As part of the process promoted and as foundation of their work, the Education Ministry has oriented its actions with a vision of inclusive education, for every student, which means a deep transformation of the systems to overcome the different barriers that the different students could face in their school life. Inclusive schools propose to satisfy the needs of every student making changes that each might require (UNESCO -Mineduc, 2013). These legal and institutional advances mean an important achievement towards inclusive education and specifically for this segment of the population.

**Characteristics of the Population with Special Education Needs**

According to the data of the National Survey of Disabilities INE (2005) – which is the most recent data – the total population at a national level with some form of disability was of 401,971 and among the characteristics of the disabled populations aged 6 or more, we would like to underline the following:

**Chart 21. General Characteristics of Disabled Populations (aged 6 or more)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rate for every thousand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Indigenous</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 17</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 59</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or more</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>170.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Survey of Disabilities 2005 INE.

According to the types of disabilities reported in this survey (2005) and the data at a national level, the percentages of disability from lower to higher are: visual 27%; muscle-skeletal 21%; hearing 18%; mental 13%; of the central nervous system 12%; speech 6%; visceral and others 1%.

The Survey shows that 43% of the disabled people reported that they had never received specialized attention and 66% at the national level indicated that the reason for this was lack of funds. At a national level, the data indicates that 50.3% do not know how to read and write and 5 of every 10 indicated that they had no education level. 37.5% of the people surveyed stated that they had studies at the elementary level, like this: from first to third grade of elementary school 19.8 % and from fourth to sixth level of elementary school 17.8%. In addition, according to the same survey, 98% of the persons with disabilities do not receive training for work.

Furthermore, according to the 2002 census, 53.8% of the households with one or more disabilities
are located in the rural area and 46.2% in the urban area.

More recently, UNESCO and FLACSO (2013) published an assessment to the policies and regulatory frameworks that relate to disabled children and youth in Guatemala. Existing barriers and gaps were identified and critical paths were proposed for the public policies and regulatory frameworks. Of particular importance for this research is what this report says with respect to the relation between poverty and the living conditions of the disabled populations. As mentioned, those homes with a disabled person in them and doubly vulnerable when living in poverty or extreme poverty. The same report affirms the existence of different “disabling obstacles” (p.11) that affects the living conditions and the fulfillment of human rights of disabled individuals. In addition to complying with the right to health, security, social assistance, as well as the right to work, the report underlines the situation that relates to the right to education. To this respect, it is affirmed that Guatemala has no program of early detection of disabilities. The low education levels reached by disabled individuals are underlined as mentioned before. Furthermore, the main services have a focus of segregation not inclusion (special classrooms, recourse classrooms). This topic is addressed below.

**Education Services to Attend Persons with Special Education Needs**

Education attention to populations with special education needs linked or not to disabilities in Guatemala has brought a change in the approach, leading it more and more towards a perspective of inclusion of individuals in regular school, based, among other things, on the recommendations of the evaluation of some programs by the Ministry (DIGEDUCA, 2012).

Among the background work on this matter, it is important to note a research carried out by ASCATED in 2005, which indicates that at that time there were three types of special education attention provided by the public sector in relation to education. First, the one known as integrated classrooms program and the resource classrooms located in national schools, which served boys and girls with learning programs and mental disabilities, hearing, sight and physical problems. Second, the Special Education Schools in Guatemala’s rural area, in charge of teachers from the Ministry, and which served people with different types of disabilities. Third, institutions of the Social Welfare Secretariat of the President’s Office which served mentally retarded persons. In addition, there were reports of special education private services and semi-private services, which showed a mixture of support from the Education Ministry, parents and other institutions.

To date this offer of public and private services still exists, as well as other services outside the realm of ordinary school and services of inclusive education in inclusive classrooms (UNESCO-FLACSO 2013). The following chart summarizes information about the population served in 2012 and 2013. The data for 2012 was published by UNESCO-FLACSO (2013). The data that corresponds to 2013 is data from the Planning Direction DIPLAN of the Education Ministry. In both cases, the data includes all the population served in those years. Then the population reported by the Special Education Direction DIGEESP is mentioned. This includes only populations served by different programs under its supervision and reported by its staff.
In 2013 DIPLAN reported 2% of the students in diversified senior high school, 1% in elementary for adults, and 1% in bilingual pre-school. A relevant piece of information for 2013 is that 53% of the students with special education needs linked or not to disabilities were located in the urban area and 47% in the rural area (DIPLAN). The majority (22,544 students out of 22,713) attend a daily or regular plan.

With respect to the total number of education establishments that served this segment of the student population in 2013, DIPLAN reported a total of 6,295 establishments in the whole country, 4,873 of which are official, 1,277 private, 133 cooperatives and 12 are municipal.

According to DIGEESP, in 2013 the Education Ministry offered services in three ways. The first was Special Education for boys and girls with special education needs linked or not to disabilities (intellectual or sensorial, physical or multiple) which given the complexity of their particular requirements cannot attend regular school. These establishments are official and serve the levels of pre-school and elementary school, working with the National Basic Curriculum with the corresponding modifications.

The second way is Inclusive Schools; that is, those that receive at different levels (pre-school to diversified senior high school) persons with special education needs linked or not to disabilities and talented individuals. These schools aim to transforming their operations and methodology to integrate the students. This service has the support of itinerant pedagogic advisors, who provide accompaniment to the teachers in regular classrooms. In some cases they have a special education teacher as part of their team. Other school have the accompaniment of itinerant pedagogic advisors specialized on Special Education.

The third modality is a scholarships program for disabled students in public schools, aimed to providing financial support to the students to help them finish pre-school, elementary and middle school. These yearly scholarships are given taking into consideration the departments of the country that show higher poverty and exclusion indexes, to ensure that the students remain in the regular education system.

To illustrate the work, below you will find a chart developed by DIGEESP (2013), which summarizes

---

**Chart 22. Population served according to DIPLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of students with Special Education Needs, NEE, linked or not to disabilities, at the national level, registered before a public or private service.</th>
<th>Year 2012</th>
<th>Year 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28,796</td>
<td>22,713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total by type of disability</th>
<th>Year 2012</th>
<th>Year 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12,548 intellectual disability</td>
<td>9,583 intellectual disability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,129 sensorial disability</td>
<td>5,815 sensorial disability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,219 speech problems</td>
<td>3,825 speech problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,745 physical disability</td>
<td>3,825 physical disability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,155 multiple disabilities.</td>
<td>1,034 multiple disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of students enrolled by level</th>
<th>Year 2012</th>
<th>Year 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 % Pre-school</td>
<td>10% Pre-school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86% Elementary</td>
<td>77% Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7% Middle School</td>
<td>9% Middle school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the services offered that year.

Chart 23. Summary of Programs and Services of the Special Education Direction General 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Special Education School</th>
<th>Inclusive School with Special Education teacher (before the resource classroom)</th>
<th>Inclusive Education with itinerant pedagogic advisor - Apis</th>
<th>Scholarships with disabled students by Special Education Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>2,010 students with special education needs linked or not to disabilities</td>
<td>7,435 students with special education needs linked or not to disabilities</td>
<td>2,824 students with special education needs linked or not to disabilities</td>
<td>3,935 scholarships given to disabled students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishments</td>
<td>81 establishments by code</td>
<td>191 establishments by code</td>
<td>1,021 establishments by code</td>
<td>2,015 official establishments with at least one disabled student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Pre-school and Elementary</td>
<td>Pre-School and Elementary</td>
<td>Pre-school, basic secondary school, diversified senior high school</td>
<td>Pre-school, basic cycle and diversified senior high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>Official and Private</td>
<td>Official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers in service</td>
<td>178 teachers in special education schools</td>
<td>180 special education teachers</td>
<td>40 acting itinerant pedagogic advisors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular teachers advised</td>
<td>2,309 regular teachers advised in the public sector, private sector and cooperatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MINEDUC (2014) Figures and Percentages of Programs and Services of the Special Education Direction DIGEEESP

In addition it is reported that non-indigenous women achieve more years of study than non-indigenous men (6.3 grades for women and 6.1 for men). However, indigenous women achieve less schooling than indigenous men (4.3 grades of schooling for women and 5 for men). As mentioned, at a national level in the group of 15 year olds, schooling is the same between men and women (5.7 years of schooling in average).

Finally, it is important to underline that the study ratifies that sustained education policy oriented to the education of girls has been successful and suggest that it should be re-focused considering the inequality in the advances when making a departmental and municipal analysis.
5 Conclusions

The document review allows us to summarize some ideas which are presented below.

In principle, poverty is a structural barrier that limits access to, acceptance of and participation in the school population. The evidence confirms the impact of social inequality on learning processes. This allows to anticipate that in order to achieve inclusive education systems it is necessary to consider an articulated work with systems for the protection of children and youngsters.

The policies of the Ministry of Education and the current legal framework favor the vision of inclusive education systems, although the lack of regulations for the specific Education Law is an obstacle to the consideration of future actions.

The organizational structure of the Ministry of Education opens the opportunity to expand the existing education offer within the National Education System, whether focused on vulnerable groups who entered the system but could abandon their studies before graduating and/or groups that might need support alternatives to achieve their goals. Also for those who are excluded from the existing programs and do not have access to them.

Public investment has expanded with the participation of other systems within the public apparatus which directly or indirectly support public education in Guatemala. However, it would seem that there is a need for coordination tools between the different systems and/or entities involved to maximize said investment.

Information on the education context confirms that there is progress with respect to access to school at the elementary level; however, there are important delays among which we can underline access to the pre-school and middle school levels, and difficulties to remain in school during the transitions between one cycle and the other.

Indigenous populations living in rural areas face more complex challenges to achieve inclusive education systems when comparing them to other vulnerable groups. The conditions of poverty and extreme poverty and thus the limited opportunities in their immediate surroundings explain the complexity of the challenges to face.

According to the Ministry of Education Statistics Yearbook, in 2012, the school-age population comprised 28.51% of the total population, from which 55.10% were between 7 and 12 years old. In Guatemala there are 15,835 preschools and 19,414 primary schools; independently of the level, the majority of schools are located in the rural area and are monolingual (the language of instruction is Spanish). In Guatemala, there are three types of school for the primary level, namely: regular (one or more teachers serve one grade); multigrade (one teacher serves two or more grades in one classroom); and one-teacher schools (one teacher serves all grades of primary level). From the total number of primary schools, 55.68% are conformed by multigrade and one-teacher schools (DIPLAN, 2013). The Education System has 195,270 in-service teachers, from which 80% work in the rural area, 82% serve primary level, and 68% are women. Only 17% of preschool teachers and 15% of primary level teachers work in bilingual schools (Sistema e-SIRH, Junio 2014).

In Guatemala, the notion of inclusive education was built from attention to populations with special education needs linked or not to disabilities. It is necessary to work in a concept of an inclusive education which directly or indirectly allows to anticipate that in order to achieve inclusive education systems it is necessary to consider an articulated work with systems for the protection of children and youngsters.
education system that can be transferred or generalized among other vulnerable groups who might not be represented in the notion of special education needs and/or vulnerability.

There are advances in the process towards inclusive education within the population with special education needs linked or not to disabilities. Among these we can name the strengthening of public institutions (through DIGEESP), legal support and the creation of a specific public policy.

There is background that relates to attention of two vulnerable groups of interest in this research: education of girls and education of indigenous populations. However, the processes reported show affirmative action policies rather than a transformation of the National Education System.
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Annex 1 (within main Annex 6.4). *Agreements, Conventions, and Declarations subscribed by the Government of Guatemala*

- Declaración Universal de los Derechos Humanos, 1948
- Convención sobre la eliminación de todas las formas de discriminación contra la mujer, 1982
- Convención internacional sobre la eliminación de todas las formas de discriminación racial, 1982
- Convención sobre los derechos del Niño, 1990
- Declaración de las Naciones Unidas sobre los derechos de los pueblos
- Pacto Internacional de Derechos Económicos,
- Convención sobre los derechos de las personas con discapacidad, 2008
- Convención relativa a la lucha contra las discriminaciones
- Convención sobre los derechos de las personas con discapacidad, 2008
- Declaración de las Naciones Unidas sobre los derechos de los pueblos
- Pacto Internacional de Derechos Económicos
- Convención sobre la eliminación de todas las formas de discriminación contra la mujer, 1982
- Convención internacional sobre la eliminación de todas las formas de discriminación racial, 1982
- Convención sobre los derechos del Niño, 1990
- Declaración Universal de los Derechos Humanos, 1948
### Functions of the Directorates of the Ministry of Education of Guatemala

**Annex 2 (within main Annex 6.4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funciones</th>
<th>Entidades internas del MINEDUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Sustantivas** | Despacho ministerial (Ministro y Viceministros)  
Dirección General de Acreditación y Certificación – DIGEACE  
Dirección General de Educación Bilingüe Intercultural – DIGEBI  
Dirección General de Gestión de Calidad Educativa – DIGECADE  
Dirección General de Coordinación – DIGECOR  
DIRECCIÓN GENERAL DE CURRÍCULO – DIGECUR  
DIRECCIÓN GENERAL DE EVALUACIÓN E INVESTIGACIÓN EDUCATIVA – DIGEDUCA  
DIRECCIÓN GENERAL DE EDUCACIÓN ESPECIAL – DIGEEESP  
DIRECCIÓN GENERAL DE EDUCACIÓN EXTRAESCOLAR – DIGEEEX  
DIRECCIÓN GENERAL DE FORTALECIMIENTO DE LA COMUNIDAD EDUCATIVA – DIGEFOCE  
DIRECCIÓN GENERAL DE MONITOREO Y VERIFICACIÓN DE LA CALIDAD – DIGEMOCA  
DIRECCIÓN GENERAL DE PARTICIPACIÓN COMUNITARIA Y SERVICIOS DE APOYO – DIGEPSA  
DIRECCIONES DEPARTAMENTALES DE EDUCACIÓN  
DIRECCIÓN GENERAL DE EDUCACIÓN FÍSICA – DIGEF |
| **Funciones Administrativas** | DIRECCIÓN DE ADMINISTRACIÓN FINANCIERA – DAFI  
DIRECCIÓN DE COMUNICACIÓN SOCIAL – DICOMS  
DIRECCIÓN DE COOPERACIÓN NACIONAL E INTERNACIONAL – DICONIME  
DIRECCIÓN DE ADQUISICIONES Y CONTRATACIONES – DIDECHO  
DIRECCIÓN DE DESARROLLO Y FORTALECIMIENTO INSTITUCIONAL – DIDEFI  
DIRECCIÓN DE DESARROLLO MAGISTERIAL – DIDEEMAG  
DIRECCIÓN DE INFORMÁTICA – DINFO  
DIRECCIÓN DE SERVICIOS ADMINISTRATIVOS – DISERA  
DIRECCIÓN DE RECURSOS HUMANOS – DIREH  
JUNTA CALIFICADORA DE PERSONAL  
JURADO NACIONAL DE OPOSICIÓN |
| **Funciones de Gestión y Apoyo Técnico** | DIRECCIÓN DE PLANIFICACIÓN EDUCATIVA – DIPLAN  
DIRECCIÓN DE ASESORÍA JURÍDICA – DIAJ |
| **Funciones de Control Interno.** | DIRECCIÓN DE AUDITORÍA INTERNA – DIDAI |