

**THAILAND**

**EVALUATION REPORT FOR  
THE FIRST TWO YEARS OF THE  
HILL AREAS COMMUNITY BASED EDUCATION PROJECT**

**BY Dr. George H. Axinn  
Dr. Scott F. McKabb  
Dr. Thomas M. Olson**

**RFE/FTS Evaluation Mission  
Nonformal Education Collaborative  
Creative Associates, Inc.**

**Dated: July 24, 1982**

**BASIC PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA**

1. Country: Thailand
2. Project Title: Hill Areas Community Based Education
3. Project Number: 493-0297
4. Project Dates:
  - a. First Project Agreement: March 10, 1980
  - b. Final Obligation:
  - c. Project Activity Completion Date (PACD): February 28, 1985
5. Project Funding:
  - a. A.I.D. Bilateral Funding (loan or grant): \$1,600,000
  - b. Other Major Donors:
  - c. Host Country Counterpart Funds: \$958,000

TOTAL \$2,558,000
6. Mode of Implementation (specify contractual arrangements and numbers):
7. Project Design (A.I.D. and contractor):
8. Responsible Mission Officials:
  - a. Mission Director (s): Robert S. Queener
  - b. Project Officer(s): Robert M. Traister
9. Previous Evaluation and Reviews  
See section 3.3 (below)
10. Cost of Present Evaluation:
  - a. Direct Hire:
  - b. Contract:
  - c. Other:

## INTRODUCTION

Two years of vigorous, creative, difficult, and often heroic achievement in project implementation, based on several earlier years of planning and development, cannot be fully comprehended by a small team of three evaluators in a thirty-day period. Our observations are based on visits to five of the six field sites, interviews with government officials in various ministries, and discussions with members of the Secretariat.

However, this evaluation team wishes to acknowledge that it has had only a brief glance at the complex realities of the Project, and cannot claim the depth of insight which might come from a longer study period. We express our deep gratitude to Project staff who made our field mission possible, and who contributed so much to what we learned.

This evaluation team made its observations after only two years and three months of the five-year implementation period. It is like looking at a young mango tree whose seed was planted only two years ago, and of a variety which typically requires six years to bear fruit. After the first two years an observer may note that the tree seems to be alive and well, and does appear to be a mango tree. It would be foolish to uproot the tree and discard it on the basis of its lack of fruit production in its first two years. On the other hand, a supportive observer might make suggestions for the care and maintenance of this tree. Those who planted the tree might take pride that it had weathered the storms of its first two years, and seemed to be growing toward fruition.

The Project is ambitious, perhaps overly ambitious. The sheer physical challenge of putting learning centers, teachers, head teachers,

and village committees together in remote hill areas is formidable. This Project staff have done that, and should be commended for it. To go beyond that and develop and test new models for evolution of individualized, village-centered nonformal educational programs with a high level of beneficiary participation in their planning, implementation, and management, may not be feasible in five years, much less two. This report, therefore, concentrates on what has been achieved thus far, which is significant. Beyond that, the writers attempt to be helpful in summarizing what they have learned, offering guidance when it seems appropriate, and making recommendations. Readers should understand that the evaluation team was greatly impressed with what it saw, and is supportive of future developments.

Many people helped the evaluation team. We especially thank Dr. Nished Suntornpithug, Mr. Damri Janapiraganit, Ms. Chanida Janyapet, Dr. Cherdsak Choommoom, and Dr. Ken Kampe. We also appreciate the help provided by the other Secretarial Staff and the HTWD Operations Unit Chiefs. Finally, we thank the head teachers and the village teachers, who helped feed us and house us in their remote villages, sympathized with our struggles up steep and muddy paths, helped us as we slid down those paths, and demonstrated their dedicated commitment to hill tribe people in many ways.

The team's operations were significantly assisted by Dr. Annop Pongwat, translator/interpreter; Yongpon Angla, typist; and many others, particularly at the Northern Regional Nonformal Education Center at Lampang, where Mr. Parpan Koohamuk made facilities and transportation available, and served as a gracious host. Also, special thanks go to Verendar K. Chopra, of USAID/Bangkok.

## **iii Table of Contents**

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Basic Program Identification Data .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Table of Contents .....</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>1. Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Conclusions and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Background of the Evaluation .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4. Discussion of Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>4.1 Project Objectives and Approaches</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>4.2 Project Management</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>4.3 Curriculum and Materials Development</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>4.4 Institutionalization and Replication</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>4.5 Adequacy of Beneficiary Participation</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>4.6 Supervision</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>4.7 Staff Development</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>4.8 Inter-Agency Involvement</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>5. Evaluation Team Procedures</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>5.1 Scope of Work and Methodology</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>5.2 Travel Schedule</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>5.3 Persons Interviewed</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>5.4 List of Documents Reviewed</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>5.5 Evaluation Team Composition</b>	<b>90</b>

## 1. Executive Summary

The purpose of the AID Hill Area Community Based Education Project in Thailand, as stated in the Project Paper is: "to develop and test, through inter-agency involvement, in 6 sites and approximately 36 villages a community-based and replicable non-formal basic education model more appropriate to the needs and conditions existing in remote hill areas than presently available education. This model will make extensive use of village level resources and participation in all phases of model development."

"The major purpose of this evaluation," according to its Scope of Work, "is to assess project progress to date, and identify problems and make appropriate recommendations to improve project implementation."

The three-person evaluation team from Creative Associates, Inc. travelled in Thailand for one month, from 19 June 1982 to 24 July 1982. Most of its work was in the North, where it headquartered at the Northern Regional Nonformal Education Center at Lampang. From there, team members travelled to five of the six clusters of villages, interviewed all six head teachers, and interviewed 46 individual village teachers, observing many of them teaching both morning and evening classes. Since the evaluators actually lived in the villages for several days in each cluster, they were able to witness the whole range of nonformal teaching in which teachers were involved beyond their classroom work, including health, agriculture, construction, community development, and various other "village advocate" types of functions, with much variation among villages. They also interviewed some village leaders and villagers.

In addition, team members had discussions with officials of the Ministry of Education at district and provincial levels, with staff of the Hill Tribes Welfare Division of the Ministry of Interior, and with others in Lampang, Chiangrai, Mae Hong Son, and Chiangmai. In Bangkok, both before and after their northern travels, they met with many members of the staff of the Department of Non-Formal Education and other Departments of the Ministry of Education, as well as personnel of the Department of Technical and Economic Cooperation; the Division of Hill Tribe Affairs, Department of Public Welfare, Ministry of Interior; and the U.S. Agency for International Development.

The implementation phase of the Project being studied has been in operation for only the first two of its five years. From that perspective, the evaluation team was greatly impressed with achievements thus far. The village education centers are in place in most villages, with young, vigorous and dedicated teachers trying to get a broad scope of program activity started. There are head teachers in each cluster of villages, elected by the other teachers, and serving as coordinators of cluster-village activities. There are also good working relations with the local chiefs of the Hill Tribes Welfare Division Operations Units in most cases.

The Secretariat is also in place at the Northern Regional NFE Center. Its staff is committed to the Project's objectives, and doing a highly creative, innovative, and difficult job. They have already completed preparation of a special curriculum for basic education for the hill tribes area, and it has been officially approved by the Ministry of Education. They are also providing supervision to the work of the teachers in village clusters.

Major problems identified by the evaluation team relate to program discontinuities, administrative management, and personnel management.

In the program itself, the main emphasis has been in carrying out basic education for children and young adults in the villages. While this activity is much less formal than ordinary elementary education in Thailand, it is not "community-based," nor does it make "extensive use of village level resources and participation" in its planning, implementation, management, and evaluation. This may be necessary in any such program designed centrally with goals of achieving literacy and numeracy. In fact, to achieve literacy in Thai among non-Thai speakers may require significant "outside" contributions.

The major use of time and resources by both the Secretariat and the initial establishment of field operations and village personnel has been on basic-education. Individualized village participation in programming is much more evident in teacher's work on health, agriculture, construction, community development, etc. There is opportunity for shift in emphasis.

While the Secretariat has been successful in getting the Project started and creating procedures for recruiting and training staff, as well as in developing curriculum, it has been less than adequate in maintaining positive relationships and coordination with other units of the Royal Thai Government, both in its own Ministry and in others. It has also had problems with day-to-day management and supervision of the field work of the Project.

The evaluation team recommends that higher priority be placed on participatory and individual village-centered educational activity and lesser priority on the centrally planned standardized basic education classes. A larger role in the latter could be taken on by the Regional NFE Center.

Also recommended for the Secretariat is the development of a timephased action plan for the integration of successful elements from the Project into the larger NFE program in the hill areas. Some reorganization of the Secretariat into fewer functional units with clear lines of authority and responsibility; establishment of more effective communication, cooperation, and coordination with related units; regular reporting/planning summaries; better use of teacher's diaries; greater use of materials developed by others; more effective mechanisms to implement their decisions; and more direct regular involvement in the villages are recommended for the Secretariat.

Similarly, there should be a firm plan for integrating the supervisory roles of the Secretariat and other relevant units and persons which deal directly with teachers. Coordinating units of this Project should expedite more timely cash flow to village teachers.

The Secretariat should develop means to insure a continuous supply of teachers at the village level. Several alternatives are discussed. A system of scholarships for further study, and attention to development of a volunteer program are suggested. Training for such staff should also be expanded in content, and continuously redeveloped.

## 2. Conclusions and Recommendations

The major findings and conclusions of the evaluation team are summarized in this chapter. Where appropriate, each is followed immediately by one or more recommendations that derive from the respective conclusion or finding. These are organized according to primary and secondary tasks assigned to the team in the AID scope of work. Further discussion and details upon which these findings and conclusions are based are presented in chapter 4 in sections with corresponding headings and numbers.

### A. Primary Tasks

#### 2.1 Project Objectives and Approaches

According to the Project Paper (USAID/Thailand, March, 1980) the main purpose of the Project is to develop and test a "community based and replicable nonformal basic education model more appropriate to the needs and conditions existing in remote hill areas than presently available education." The Paper emphasizes development of models for village-level participation, inter-agency involvement, staff development, curriculum and materials development, administration and supervision, and program evaluation.

Given the context of the hill areas of northern Thailand, or any other remote rural area, the accomplishment of such a broad and ambitious set of objectives requires more than a heroic effort. It may also require much more than five years of time. Nevertheless, the seed has been planted, and the tree is alive. The dedicated, vigorous, creative perseverance of a small group of young Thai teachers in the isolated village clusters of this project is, in itself, a splendid mark of achievement.

Few of the objectives will be easily accomplished, but all appear to be "realistic," or at least worthy of the effort. Two, however, tend to conflict. These are the development of learner-centered, individualized village education programs on the one hand and the development of centrally-based curricula and supporting materials which require approval in Bangkok on the other. The Project has placed more emphasis on "basic education" (Thai literacy and numeracy) than on the village-centered aspects of the program. This basic education tends to be formal, but it is still much less formal than education in the schools.

Some progress has been made towards the achievement of all the original goals. Volunteer teachers are teaching in 44 villages in six clusters. The Secretariat has been established and is functioning. The curriculum has been completed.

The Project strategy (inputs) for accomplishing the Project objectives seems to be suitable and working. The strategy of "continuing involvement of at least six regional agencies in Project activities" has been revised to two regional agencies, and this is working well.

#### RECOMMENDATION 1:

Village teachers, head teachers, and Secretariat staff should place higher priority on participatory and individual village-centered educational activity and lesser priority on the centrally planned standardized activity, particularly the basic education classes.

(This is a matter of emphasis and time-use, not of elimination of any aspect of the program).

**RECOMMENDATION 2:**

The Project Secretariat, working with the Northern Regional NFE Center and the Department of Public Welfare, as well as other concerned units, should develop a time-phased action plan for the integration of successful elements from the Project into the larger NFE program in the hill areas.

**2.2 Project Management**

The loose democratic form of organization in the village clusters is excellent from a creative and village-centered educational point of view, but has some weaknesses when it comes to line administration. The Secretariat also features a colleagial-type organization, with a highly motivated group of people in a stimulating situation. It has not been as effective in administering and supervising the Project, or in coordinating with other outside units, as it might have been with clearer lines of authority and responsibility.

There is a communication gap between the Secretariat and most other units, from the Northern Regional NFE Center, where it is housed, to Provincial and District Education Officers and Hill Tribes Welfare Development Centers. This makes for poor coordination, weak public relations, and will cause difficulties in later institutionalization of Project activities.

Personnel management, particularly for village level teachers, can be improved. More attention should be given to developing a system for recruitment, selection, placement, transfer, salary management, allowances, rank, volunteer development, and training of village teachers.

The team was impressed by the excellent performance of some village teachers and head teachers. But there are problems of turn-over and competence. Questions are raised in this report regarding teachers who are most likely to succeed in developing individualized village-level programs and others who might be better qualified to teach the central basic education curriculum.

With respect to Project monitoring, documentation, and planning, the teacher's daily diaries seem to be an excellent device. There are opportunities for further use of these. Other reporting and planning seemed sporadic, focused more on activities than on achievement of objectives, and not well used in securing communication, cooperation, and coordination.

Financial management has been a particular problem, with delays in cash flow to teachers through a long series of steps involving many. However, the situation seems to be improving. There are also problems in other aspects of management and administration at levels outside the cluster villages.

#### Project Management Recommendations

##### RECOMMENDATION 3

The Project Secretariat should be reorganized into a smaller number of units, with clear lines of authority and responsibility to the head of the Secretariat, and from there to the Director of the NRRFEC.

##### RECOMMENDATION 4

The Secretariat should establish more effective communication, coordination, and cooperation with other related units at district, provincial, and national levels.

**RECOMMENDATION 5:**

Personnel management at the village level should be more effective. This could include provision of special rewards, making teachers' fringe benefits more like those of civil servants, development of a special program of volunteer service, or a shift to selection of teachers from within hill tribe villages.

**RECOMMENDATION 6:**

Reporting, planning, and project documentation should be standardized at the Secretariat level. Regular reporting/planning summaries, based on Project objectives, along with mechanisms for the use of this information in decision making, should be established.

**RECOMMENDATION 7:**

Reports from village teachers, including teachers' diaries, should be more fully used for both coordination and for public relations purposes.

**RECOMMENDATION 8:**

The Project should make greater use of materials developed by other units, especially the NRNFEC. These include such items as slides, tapes, wall newspapers.

**RECOMMENDATION 9:**

The sponsoring and coordinating units of this Project should expedite more timely cash flow at all levels of the Project. The need of teachers should always receive top priority.

**RECOMMENDATION 10:**

The Secretariat should develop more effective mechanisms of implementing their decisions.

### 2.3 Curriculum and Materials Development

Many significant achievements have been made by the Project in the development of a centrally-planned basic education curriculum. Development of other, more individualized and villane-centered non-formal education programs, while they have been started in many fields, are given much lower priority by all levels of personnel.

While the basic education program is not learner-centered and individualized, it is much less formal than education usually offered in elementary schools. This could be called "Less Formal Education." A curriculum for approximately six years of instruction has been developed, and present plans are for a major effort in materials development during the next three years. This major achievement has taken the attention of both Secretariat and villane cluster staff away from other aspects of the Project such as health, agriculture, village-level construction, community development, personal counselling, and teacher involvement as village advocate.

#### RECOMMENDATION 11:

The Project Secretariat should devote more of its staff and other resources to helping village teachers with teaching techniques, skills, and materials for local programs in the health, agriculture, construction, community development, counselling, and other non-formal education aspects of the program, and less to the basic education program. These latter functions can be increasingly assumed by the regional and provincial NFE Centers.

## 2.4 Institutionalization and Replication of Project Activities

Some aspects of the program, such as the cluster concept, are already being replicated under other programs. Others, however, like the development of individualized village planned and implemented and managed education have yet to be accomplished within the project itself. The techniques used in developing and testing the basic educational literacy program may well be replicable in other areas. Foreign support and the image (and reality) of the project's comparative wealth and the relative independence of the Secretariat in the early stages of the Project may hinder replication and institutionalization. Economic analyses are needed to determine the necessity of extra financial support for continued project operations. The use of volunteers has mixed implications for replication and institutionalization. If institutionalization is a major goal of the project, a strategy should be developed which identifies the major dimensions of the model and plans for their organizational acceptance.

### RECOMMENDATION 12:

Extension of the implementation phase for another period should be considered by sponsors of the Project, with a specific focus on field testing/refinement, expansion, and villager participation/management.

## 2.5. Adequacy of Beneficiary Participation

Villagers are participating in a wide variety of less formal and nonformal project activities. The literacy component of the Project was designed to respond to villager expressed desires for education; attendance is a clear measure of participation.

Villagers decided where the education centers would be built and participated in their design and construction. Villagers are also participating in the medical component of the program, which opens opportunities for individualized non-formal education in health. In many villages the people have proposed problem areas to the teachers and therefore participate in the planning of nonformal activities.

Villagers have not, however, shared very much in the planning, management or evaluation of the project at this stage. This is not unusual in such projects. Village committees have yet to play a significant role in the Project in most villages, but provide a great opportunity for the teachers to increase village participation. Secretariat staff have sometimes acted as a proxy for the villagers. To sum up, beneficiary participation has been more adequate in implementation than in planning or management.

RECOMMENDATION 13:

Village teachers should be given special training in methodologies and skills for generating participation by village committees.

B. Secondary Tasks

The evaluation team focused its efforts on the primary tasks described above. The secondary tasks were to be done only if time permitted. While the team spent much less time and effort on these tasks, we did come to some conclusions and make some recommendations which are summarized below.

2.6 Supervision

One of the strengths of this Project is the comradeship and esprit d'corps of the teachers in the cluster villages. The super-

visory style of a head teacher who is elected by the other teachers for a one year term contributes to this working relationship. It seems to provide adequate coordination at the village level, and a democratic working group atmosphere.

As mentioned in the section on management, above, it is weak with respect to line administration. For the goal of individualized village-centered educational programming, it seems to be quite satisfactory.

Outside of the village clusters there is some confusion about the roles, functions and lines of authority of the various agencies. In some cases the government officials complained that they were not informed adequately about the Project. Others said they were better informed and were more supportive of the Project.

RECOMMENDATION 14:

There should be a firm plan for organizing, and integrating the supervisory role of the Project Secretariat, the Chief of the HTWD Operations Unit the Head Teachers, and various units of the M.O.E., with clear lines of authority and accountability.

## 2.7. Staff Development

The Project has recruited and trained three groups of village teachers. There have been follow-up seminars, regular teachers meetings, some travel-study trips and individualized nonformal training by members of the Secretariat, head teachers and fellow teachers. At present, however, it is not feasible to assess the soundness of the

conceptual framework for staff development because it is still in the trial and modification stage. Evidence needs to be collected on the characteristics of the more effective teachers, appropriate subject matter, training techniques and teaching/learning styles for the staff development model.

The Secretariat has done a fine job of supporting some of the teachers in the field and needs to expand this effort. The monthly teachers meetings provide a good opportunity for more Secretariat support.

At present the teachers are temporary volunteers who have a low fixed salary, low rank and general low status. Their future is uncertain at the end of the Project. Incentives need to be developed to encourage good performance and reduce future turnover, especially in year five.

RECOMMENDATION 15:

Designated members of the Secretariat and provincial NFE officials should attend at least one day of monthly teacher's meetings in each cluster.

RECOMMENDATION 16:

A system of scholarships for further study should be developed as rewards for performance by village teachers, head teachers, and other Project staff.

RECOMMENDATION 17:

Training modules for villagers additional topics should be explored, based on village needs assessment, using villager expertise, and made available to village teachers from time to time as appropriate. For example, these might cover such topics as grain marketing, health of pigs, small fruit production, savings, cooperatives, and others if they are requested by village committees.

## 2.8 Inter-agency Involvement

The Project did not exhibit the continuous involvement of as many agencies as was anticipated by its planners. Mechanisms for appropriate relationships with most other agencies have yet to evolve.

### 3. Background of This Evaluation

#### 3.1 Thai Hill Areas Context for this Project

The Hill Areas Community Based Education Project may be viewed within the framework of current Royal Thai Government policies and the social context of northern Thailand. This section provides a brief background on the geography, society, culture, economy, government policy and educational programs of the hill areas of the northern region. Portions of the following discussion were adapted from a recently published HAE pamphlet describing the Project.

##### 3.1.1 Geography

The vast majority of Thailand's approximately 400,000 hill tribe people live in small villages scattered throughout the hill areas of the northern provinces. Most of these villages are not accessible by road and must be reached on foot. Travel in some areas becomes particularly difficult during the rainy season. The Project operations are currently being conducted in remote areas of the following four provinces in the far north: Mae Hong Son, Lamphang, Chiangmai and Chiangrai.

##### 3.1.2 Society, Culture and Economy

The Project has cooperating villages with all six of the major hill tribe groups (Yao, Meo, Akha, Muser, Lisu, Karen). Each of these groups has its own distinctive language, dress, traditions and religious beliefs. The majority of the hill tribe people are animists, and sometimes these beliefs are held in conjunction with Buddhism or Christianity. Usually villages have some system of internal leadership, generally led by a headman or a spiritual leader. All the major groups have traditionally engaged in swidden (slash and burn) agriculture, and all except the Karen migrate from region to region periodically in search of new land. As subsistence farmers their crops include rice as well as corn, sesame, poppies, soybean, coffee and fruits and vegetables. Pigs and chickens are also raised for ceremonies (and later consumption and sometimes for sale.

One of their most lucrative cash crops is opium.

The economic status of the people in the hill areas is considerably lower than that of the average Thai. Standards of health, nutrition, housing and education are far below the national average. Most hill tribe people are not functionally literate in Thai and the majority lack house registration and citizens' identity cards. Because of their lack of language skills and Thai citizenship the hill peoples are restricted in their rights and privileges and are frequently at a disadvantage in marketing their produce, purchasing goods and requesting government services.

### 3.1.3 Royal Thai Government Policy

In recent years the RTG has become concerned about the impact of hill tribe agriculture on Thai natural resources such as forests and watersheds, their illegal growth of opium, their quickly increasing population (with additional refugees migrating from Laos and Burma) and their potential security threat to the nation. The Hill Tribes Development Plan for the Period of the 5th National Economic and Development Plan (1982-1986) outlines the problems caused by "the traditional life style and livelihood" of the hill tribes and calls for their "permanent resettlement." According to the Plan, as economic development is accelerated in the hills and as the hill tribes learn "permanent occupations with adequate income for their livelihood" they will develop into "quality citizens able to help themselves." In remote areas of the hills not as yet touched by Thai administration, efforts will be made to "accelerate the establishment of a relationship in order to foster good understanding and spiritual bonds toward the nation, religion and monarchy."

Thus, the RTG policy is the eventual integration of the hill tribes into Thai society. The RTG's programs are designed to stimulate a

sense of loyalty to Thailand and to promote occupational roles benefiting the country. The RTG's various development agencies have also stated their policy commitment to respect and protect the cultural uniqueness of the various hill tribes during the process of integration into the larger society.

#### 3.1.4 Education

Numerous agencies are involved in educational endeavors in the hill areas of northern Thailand. A small number of hill tribe children have been educated in lowland Thai schools and some have received training from missionaries. Since the Hill Tribe Welfare Division of the Department of Public Welfare began sending officials to hill tribe villages in 1959, the following government agencies have joined them in sponsoring educational activities among the hill tribes: the Border Patrol Police, the Forestry Department, and three departments within the Ministry of Education (Department of General Education, office of the Primary Education Commission and Department of Nonformal Education).

Within the Department of Nonformal Education there are currently three education projects involving hill tribes: the U.N. sponsored Drug Abuse Education Project with 30 teachers in Chiangmai and Nan provinces, the functional literacy "walking teacher" program with approximately 100 teachers throughout the northern hill region, and the Hill Areas Community Based Education Project with its 67 teachers in four provinces.

#### 3.2 Project Background

In 1976 the public Welfare Department of the Ministry of Interior requested that the Adult Education Division of the Ministry of Education develop adult education programs for hill tribe communities in the Department's zonal development program. Supported by a USAID grant, World Education Inc. provided assistance to the Adult Education Division in developing a 36 month pilot program called the Adult Functional Literacy Program for Hill Tribes. On the basis of their experience with this project, the Adult Education

Division decided to propose another project in this area. In November 1978 the planning phase for the Hill Areas Community Based Education Project began.

During the planning period, staff of the Department of Nonformal Education (established in March 1979) studied the recent history of development efforts among the hill tribes. Seminars were held with all agencies involved directly or indirectly in the hill areas of the North, and field research was conducted in villages selected to represent the development efforts of the various government agencies. Teachers were interviewed in depth.

The research revealed the bureaucratic constraints and the personal challenges involved in education work with the hill tribes. The researchers found a lack of sustained coordination of development activities among agencies. They also discovered that often considerations other than educational or developmental factors predominate in decision making, and that often the educational activities which do exist are not appropriate for the hill peoples..

The researchers also learned of the personal challenges associated with creating community based educational programs in remote areas of the North. Physical conditions are rugged. Cultural and linguistic differences between Thais and hill tribes are significant; acceptance into village life does not come easily. Previous contact between Thai officials or others and hill people have not always been positive. While some hill tribe groups seem anxious to become literate in Thai, others are not as motivated. Hill people are usually subsistence farmers and sometimes in poor health; economic and health priorities are often more pressing than class attendance. Opium addiction is prevalent in some villages. By comparison, teaching in lowland Thai areas is considerably easier.

Cognizant of these bureaucratic and cultural/educational challenges, the planners chose to emphasize hill tribe involvement in their program (participation has not been a central point in most other development activities among the hill tribes) and to stress cooperative efforts with the HTWD. In addition, they pledged to make their nonformal educational efforts appropriate to the needs of the hill tribes, who are increasing their contact with Thai society.

In late 1979 the Project villages were chosen in consultation with the Department of Public Welfare. In March, 1980, the Project Grant Agreement initiating the implementation phase of the Project was signed with USAID. In April, 1980, the Secretariat was established to begin the substantive work of the Project, and in May, 1980, the Secretariat moved from Bangkok to its current home in the Northern Regional Nonformal Education Center in Lamphang.

### 3.3 Other Recent Evaluations

#### 3.3.1 Compton's Critique - A Review of the Literacy Component of the Hill Areas Education Project

In October of 1981, Dr. Carol Compton of Cornell University made a study of the literacy component being developed by Hill Areas Community Based Education Project. During her stay she interviewed 12 teachers and observed 8 classes. Following a discussion of her observations and the language backgrounds of the teachers, she made several recommendations. Her recommendations included in-service workshops for teachers on methods for teaching Thai, a linguistic emphasis in materials production, on-site technical assistance for teachers, and more careful documentation of project activities, including workshops and on-site observations of classroom teaching. Compton concluded her report by praising the Secretariat as a group "composed

of many dedicated and diligent people who are striving to create a better and more appropriate learning environment for the hill peoples," and stressing that the teachers should be provided with "better methods and materials for teaching the Thai language..."

### 3.3.2 Kampe's Critique - An Analysis of the Hill Areas Education Project: April 1980 - December 1981.

Dr. Kampe's document is the most comprehensive evaluation completed on the Project thus far, including a synopsis of Project goals, concepts and methods, a short history of the Project, a presentation of Project organization and operation, and an analysis of Project operations. Kampe makes suggestions in his report in the following areas, among others: decision-making in the Secretariat, project documentation, inter-agency cooperation (USAID and DTEC), in-service training for teachers, research in villager participation, testing and adapting the new curriculum, training for staff of NRNFECC, head teachers, HTWD and district and provincial educational staff, study tours and redefining the advisor's duties. In an earlier report Kampe also identified strengths of the Project and obstacles to project goals. Under strengths he includes the hill area residents interest in the Project, the commitment of the teachers and the Project staff, the cooperation of agencies such as the HTWD and the Tribal Research Center, the appropriateness of the cluster model and the curriculum developed by the Secretariat and other supporting staff. Kampe also discussed the following weaknesses: problems in the reimbursement system; less than optimal interaction with NRNFECC; communication problems with DNFE, DTEC, and USAID, and the very slow starts on research and evaluation as well as technical assistance.

#### 4. Discussion of Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

##### A. Primary Tasks

The primary tasks in the AID Scope of Work for this evaluation team were to assess the project progress, identify problems, and make appropriate recommendations in the following five areas: (1) Project Objectives and Approaches, (2) Project Management, (3) Curriculum and Materials Development, (4) Institutionalization and Replication of Project Activities, and (5) Adequacy of Beneficiary Participation in Project Activities. These are presented below.

##### 4.1 Project Objectives and Approaches

The Project Paper (USAID/Thailand, March 1980 p.1) calls for the development and testing of a "community-based education model (which) will provide non-formal education activities for both children and adults. These activities will be relevant to the target population's everyday needs and problems and accommodate their cultures and work schedules. Examples of probably non-formal educational activities are sessions on literacy, group discussions on citizenship requirements, seminars on simple marketing, experiments on growing various crops, and any other practical learning experiences desired by the hill peoples in target areas."

The Project Paper goes on: "The Project will give major emphasis to two factors: (1) decision-making and participation by the consumers (i.e. hill peoples) and (2) coordinated and cooperative efforts on the part of various agencies assuming responsibility for the development of hill tribe populations especially the Departments of Non-Formal Education (DNFE) and Public Welfare (DPW). To ensure project response to the needs of the beneficiaries, committees composed of local villagers will play a key role in determining the curricula at each site and managing the local operation of the Project."

Later, the same document specifies: "The sector goal of the Project is the provision of educational opportunities in a context of individual and village level decision making, thereby contributing to the improvement of the quality of life of disadvantaged people residing in the remote hill areas of Thailand."

"The overall purpose of the Project," as further specified in the Project Paper, "is to develop and test, through inter-agency involvement, in 6 sites and approximately 36 villages a community-based and replicable non-formal basic education model more appropriate to the needs and conditions existing in remote hill areas than presently available education. This model will make extensive use of village level resources and participation in all phases of model development. It will result in increased numbers of educated hill peoples, thus contributing to the Project Goal. Key factors leading to the achievement of this purpose will be consumer participation, inter-agency involvement, and the development of supporting staff development, curriculum and materials development, administration and supervision, and program evaluation models. A Project Secretariat will be instrumental in activating, coordinating and follow-up all inputs. End of Project Status (EOPS) will be indicated by the following: community-based Non-Formal Education programs and staff operating in all sites; community decision making and participation in all phases of program development and implementation; employment of village manpower and material resources in development of individualized village education programs; initial steps taken to provide for post-project replication and expansion of availability of the education model; strong community and individual participation in the educational activities in each project site; and enrollment of approximately 60% of village children and 30% of adults in the educational programs.

#### 4.1.1 Extent of "realism" in project objectives

Having been asked to assess the extent of realism in Project objectives, the evaluation team finds some of the objectives more

realistic than others. For example, non-formal education activities are to be provided for both children and adults. Both children and adults were participating in the basic education programs, as well as in the health and community development activities. Thus this objective is realistic.

The activities are to be "relevant to the target population's everyday needs and problems and accommodate their culture and work schedules." The classroom basic education work is able to accommodate to work schedules, and that portion of the objective appears realistic. But the literacy exercise itself except in some adult classes, is not tuned to everyday needs and problems. Perhaps the objective would be more realistic if it specified that an increasing portion of the activities would be tuned to "everyday needs and problems," while other portions would be more appropriately standardized for the whole Thailand, or at least the whole Hill Areas.

The stress in the sector goal on "individual and village level decision making" reflects one of the important components of the philosophy of "Kit Pen," <sup>1/</sup> on which this project is based. This objective seems to be more realistic for such non-formal educational activities as public health education associated with the dispensing of pain-relieving pills, agricultural N.F.E. regarding the health of pigs or insects attacking rice plants, or even meetings of the village committee to explore community

Kit Pen refers to a process/philosophy long employed by the DMFE. Literally, "Kit Pen" means ability to think. In practice, it refers to a critical/rational thought process, whereby the individual or group analyzes data on several fronts (personal, social, academic/technical), develops alternative courses of action, and selects that course of action which maximizes one's happiness within existing restrictions and conditions.

effort in building a rice bank. However, at this point most activities seem to be generated by the teachers, rather than originating from the villagers.

Turning to the stated End-of-Project Status (EOPS), it is, of course, too early to know the extent to which that status will have been achieved by 1985. The goal of having a program and staff operating at all sites, exhibiting the core village and satellite cluster organizational arrangement is realistic. The extent to which the program will be primarily "community-based non-formal education" is uncertain. This objective is extremely difficult to achieve under any circumstances, and has rarely been demonstrated on a sustained basis in other development projects. However, it is a worthy objective which should receive major attention. It may take the first five years to get the program established in the village clusters, and supported appropriately by relevant units of the Royal Thai Government. It could be that the "community-based non-formal education" which has already had its beginnings within this Project will grow more rapidly in the second five years, and only then become the dominant characteristic of this activity.

The goal of "community decision making and participation in all phases of program development and implementation", is also very difficult to achieve. The team found evidence of participation in some phases of the project. The probability of increasing participation is likely to depend on (1) the ability of the Project to recruit and train dedicated young teachers who are committed to the philosophy of "Kit pen" and who are willing to keep changing their programs in response to villagers' expressed needs, (2) the freedom and encouragement given to the teachers for such flexibility by their supervisors at various levels,

(3) the extent to which local villagers invest of their own resources in the project, and are allowed to control how it is manifest in their area, and (4) the extent to which the basic education classes continue to dominate project activities.

The same may be said for "individualized village education programs." This may have been an unrealistic goal. It will certainly be easier for all Ministries concerned to standardize the activities, and attempt to deliver the same program to all. This has been the history in other parts of the world where such projects have been attempted. Only where the recipients of such a project actually control its personnel and its programs have individualized village education emerged. It is difficult, if not impossible, for "outside" resources to buy "inside" control.

The goal that "initial steps would be taken to provide for post-project replication and expansion....." is more realistic. Initial steps have already been taken to have salaries and other reimbursements flow through the District Education Office, and to place the Regional N.F.E. Center in charge of training of village teachers.

The goal of "strong community and individual participation in the educational activities at each project site," was also realistic with some of the limitations suggested above. The development of cooperative stores in a few villages is an example of such participation. At another level, the frequency with which villagers come to the teacher's house to get medicines or borrow construction tools is another indicator of participation. Attendance in the basic education classes is a demonstration of participation. These are reflections of different qualities of participation. If "strong" participation means attendance, then it was a realistic goal. If "strong" participation means deciding what should be learned, when, and

by whom, then it was less realistic. But that type of participation in a program sponsored by "outsiders" may not be feasible until teachers have won the confidence of village people, and been given the freedom to respond to expressed village needs. Both of these characteristics have been demonstrated to the evaluation team in some villages. Some teachers have the "spirit" of the Project goals, and the villagers can see that they are basically a "friend of the village," or "village advocate." Among these, the "strong participation" goal may be realistic, given sufficient time.

Finally, the goal of "enrollment of approximately 60% of village children and 30% of adults" is realistic if "educational programs" are defined to include all of the personal counselling, public health NFE, community development and everything else in which teachers are involved. If it is interpreted to mean enrollment in the formal basic education classes, then the numbers seem excessively high. The percentages could grow, of course, as the new curriculum is installed, as instructional materials are made available, and as village participants see the possibility of completing the course of study and acquiring the promised certificates. At present, in what was described to the evaluation team by Secretariat staff as the most successful cluster of villages (Pangsa), attendance was running from 10% to 30% among the villages. (Since this is a cluster in which some of the most dynamic and dedicated personnel have been involved for over six years, it does not seem likely that the EOPS figures of 60% and 30% will be achieved. In another village cluster where an evaluation team member collected data, in fact, attendance at these classes was down in 1982 compared with 1981.

In light of its findings with regard to the objectives, the evaluation team concludes that some objectives were more realistic than others. Putting the project in place in six clusters of villages was realistic. Having individualized village-centered educational programs was less realistic.

#### 4.1.2 Project Progress Toward Achievement of Original Goals

Given the context of the Hill Areas of Northern Thailand, or any other remote rural area of this world, the accomplishment of such a broad and ambitious set of objectives requires more than a heroic effort. It may also require much more than five years of time. Nevertheless, the seed has been planted, and the tree is alive. The dedicated, vigorous, creative perseverance of a small isolated group of young Thai teachers in the village clusters of this project is, in itself, a splendid mark of achievement.

On the positive side, this Project has been unusually successful in putting key inputs in place. The evaluation team visited five of the six clusters of villages and interviewed the head teachers from all six. It also interviewed 46 individual village teachers and observed many of them teaching both morning and evening classes in their village education centers. These were built with Project funds complemented by local materials and labor and sometimes additional village funds. There is no doubt that teachers are, in fact, in place and teaching in these villages. The special buildings in which they live and teach were constructed to fit among other village housing.

In light of the roughness of the terrain, the lack of motor roads to most villages, walking distances of as much as 4 hours from core villages to some of the satellite villages, and the long

distances from the Secretariat in Lampang to the core villages (from 2 to 5 hours in dry weather) the Project must be credited with outstanding achievement in getting things started.

Further, several aspects of program activity are also under way. These are described below in section 4.3. They are further evidence that the "seed has taken root, and the young tree is growing."

While applauding these strengths and appreciating the long hours of hard work that they indicate the evaluation team also identified some areas of potential weakness. The reader is reminded that this is an assessment of progress toward achievement, not of end-of-project status.

As mentioned above, emphasis was to be given to decision-making and participation by the hill peoples. Committees composed of local villages were to play a key role in determining the curricula at each and managing the local operation of the Project. Individual and village level decision making, although called for in the Project documentation, was not apparent to the evaluation team at this early stage in the major activities. This may be explained by four factors: (1) the difficulty of the task; (2) the relative inexperience of the teachers; (3) the nature of other Royal Thai Government development efforts among the Hill Tribes people and (4) the emphasis on the basic education aspects of the program, particularly, literacy and numeracy in Thai language.

The studies of the hill peoples during the planning phase of this Project indicated that they expressed a desire for literacy in Thai, and the Project has called for this significant component. However, the Secretariat and the village teachers seem to have concentrated on this one project component at the expense of the more non-formal aspects of the project.

The very nature of literacy education is associated with this problem. While there has been successful experience with literacy among Thai speakers, successful achievement of literacy among non-Thai speakers is difficult if not rare. (See World Education study of Integrated Nonformal Education in Northern Thailand, 1978; and Carol J. Compton A Review of the Literacy Component of the Hill Areas Education Project, 1981). It is usually achieved through formal education, using rote memory, and a "banking" style of learning strategy.

From the perspective of the AID Project Paper this creates a dilemma. The Project is supposed to be Nonformal Education, individually tailored to the needs of each village, and thus learner-centered. But, in the press to get on with basic education, the Secretariat has invested heavily of itself in the development of a new curriculum, recently approved at the Ministry level in Bangkok. It is designed for use in all project villages, and hopefully even more broadly throughout the hill areas. And now the Secretariat plans to devote a major portion of its resources during the remaining three years in the development and testing and refining of a graded set of instructional aids designed to help village teachers implement six class years of that curriculum leading to formal certification equivalent to the regular formal primary school. With the exception that local teachers will be encouraged to do what any good teacher in formal education does in drawing examples from locally relevant events and phenomena, using the "teachable moments" as they arise, this cannot be construed as an educational program individually tailored to separate villages with villager participation in its planning, implementation, and management.

However, from an alternative perspective, much of the formal instruction in basic education may be a necessary legitimizing activity,

which enables the teachers to carry on the non-formal aspects of the educational program described in the Project Paper, such as those in health, agriculture, construction, community organization, and local problem solving. It may be that the basic education curriculum and relatively formal nature of the instruction are necessary in order for village people to accept the idea of an outsider living in their village. Perhaps it is also necessary in order to have support and approval from various relevant units of the Royal Thai Government. It seems that only after the basic education activity is in place will the staff have the opportunity to further develop and test a community-based educational model. Cast in that light, the formal literacy program may be the genius which allows this non-formal educational project to exist, and it should be carefully nurtured and encouraged,

A further finding with regard to that aspect of the Project is that basic education in this project is much less formal than in the regular schools. As "less formal education" it is characterized by (1) taking place outside the usual school building, (2) at various times of day to fit learners' needs, (3) with no requirement for school uniforms, (4) with no penalties for sporadic attendance, (5) without age grading of student clusters, and (6) with easy access to the teacher, individually or in groups, at any hour of the day or night. As "less formal education" this aspect of the project floats between formal and non-formal, without the learner-centered dimensions espoused by the project designers, but with a set of characteristics which may be much more appropriate.

#### 4.1.3 Suitability of Project Strategy (Inputs) for Accomplishing Project Objectives.

Based on the Project Paper, the Logical Framework, and other documents, the evaluation team selected what seemed to be the most significant elements of the project strategy (inputs). These include the establishment of six cluster villages, continuing involvement of at least six regional agencies in project activities, a centrally-based curriculum, the establishment of the Secretariat, and certain supply and equipment inputs. These are discussed in this section.

The project strategy of establishing six clusters of villages, each with a head teacher, a village teacher and a village education center in each village seems to have been suitable for accomplishing project objectives. The question remains as to what the most appropriate qualifications are for such teachers. This is discussed in section 4.2.3 below.

The strategy of "continuing involvement of at least six regional agencies in project activities," may have been suitable, but apparently was not feasible. The Project staff made the deliberate decision to concentrate on only two agencies, the Department of Nonformal Education and the Department of Public Welfare. This has been highly effective in clusters where the Welfare Operations Units provide strong support and encouragement to teachers, and where the head teacher is actually a key person on the staff of the Unit. Since each agency tends to have its own program, and these tend to be centrally determined, it was probably not suitable to seek "continuing involvement" from such agencies as agriculture, forestry, or public health. Such involvement would have been another pressure against individualized, community-based, educational programs in the villages.

The idea of centrally-based curricula is inconsistent with the goal of individualized village education programs. This may be an anomaly of project design, or it may be a necessity given the objective of the Royal Thai Government to integrate the Hill Tribe peoples into Thai society.

A major aspect of the project strategy was to establish the Secretariat. This was essential in getting the project started. The Secretariat has initiated and stimulated the field activity which has taken place and has developed a Hill Areas curriculum. However, its continued existence may cause problems in replicating the project and institutionalizing it within the Thai bureaucracy. This is discussed below in section 4.2.1.

Equipment and supply inputs are another aspect of the strategy which has both pros and cons. The project is difficult; being posted to a remote rural village is not considered attractive by many. Additional equipment, such as a knapsack, flashlight, and a motorcycle (for the head teacher) probably boosts morale.

A radio/tape player or a battery operated slide projector can also contribute significantly to the nonformal educational activities. Some individuals, outside the project, however, have pointed out that the "walking teachers" don't have these things, and neither do the other teachers assigned to hill areas. At the Provincial NFE Center at Chiangrai the Evaluation Team was told that there are 70 teachers in the hills in that province who do not have the extra perquisites, and who have an average tenure on the job of 5 years. This does put the suitability of some of the equipment and supplies in question. Again, on the plus side, if the Project didn't have these, it probably would not have made as much progress as it has. If these are viewed by others as

excessive perquisites, then they will make replication and institutionalization very difficult.

#### 4.1.4 Similarities and Differences in Concepts and Goals Among Sponsoring Institutions: DNFE, DPW, DTEC, USAID

All of the key institutions which are sponsoring this Project state a basic commitment to the welfare of the Hill Tribes people, to preservation of their cultural uniquenesses, and to their integration into the large Thai society. There seem to be differences, however, among priorities, both in terms of objectives and in terms of implementation. DPW and DNFE seem to share the commitment to settling the Hill Peoples, as much as possible, in stationary villages, where they will tend to give up their patterns of swidden (slash and burn) agriculture. They share the goal of integration into Thai society through less formal education for literacy in Thai language. The Project Paper, on the other hand, reflecting planners at DNFE and USAID, seems to place priority on a model of non-formal education which is village-centered; down-up in program planning, implementation, and management; individualized; and features participation in all aspects by the "beneficiaries." These differing perspectives may be a basis for misunderstandings and confusion.

#### 4.1.5 Recommendations for Reformulation of Objectives or Approaches

##### RECOMMENDATION 1:

Village teachers, head teachers, and Secretariat staff should place higher priority on participatory and village-centered educational activity and lesser priority on the centrally planned standardized activity, particularly the basic education classes. (This is a matter of emphasis and time-use, not of elimination of any aspect of the program).

**RECOMMENDATION 2:**

The Project Secretariat, working with the Northern Regional NFE Center and the Department of Public Welfare, as well as other concerned units, should develop a time-phased action plan for the integration of successful elements from the Project into the larger NFE program in the Hill Areas.

**4.2 Project Management****4.2.1 Project Organization**

The two major structural elements in the organization are the cluster villages and the Secretariat, both of which are discussed in this section.

The cluster villages seem to be an effective organizational device for local level project management. A head teacher, located in the core village, is usually able to visit each of the other teachers at least once each month at his or her satellite village. And the monthly teachers' meetings also provide an opportunity for communication and learning among teachers, and for program coordination.

Management at this level is apparently working well, in an unusually collegial, democratic fashion. The teachers select one from among their number as head teacher. That person does not continue to teach, but becomes part of the management staff of the HTWD Operations Unit. He or she stays at the core village, and serves the other teachers from there.

Teachers' monthly meetings usually rotate from village to village, with the local teacher responsible for a two to three-day agenda. This sometimes involves some construction or improvements to the local educational center, some agenda items of special concern to the host teacher, and a chance for all teachers to discuss their problems, successes, and

other concerns with the others. These meetings have contributed to a high esprit d' corps among the teachers, and to group togetherness.

The "line of command" at the local level appears indistinct, with multiple supervision responsibilities shared among the Chief of the local HTWD Operations Unit, the District Education Officer, and various personnel of the Secretariat. This form of organization was highly appropriate to the goal of "development of individualized village education programs," relatively free from bureaucratic constraints, but it has also tended to alienate district and provincial education officials who felt passed over in the early stages of the project. If the project is to be successfully integrated into the Thai bureaucracy in the future, this problem must be addressed.

One problem relates to money flow. The most immediate management person, the HTWD Operations Unit head, is not in the line of money flow at all. The basic salary is paid by the Education Ministry, through the District Education Officer. These payments seem to be flowing well. A special allowance (Baht 350 per month, called overtime pay) to teachers and head teachers, however, flows from DTEC to the NFE Department to the Secretariat and thence to the District Education Officer. Similarly, teachers' travel allowances and reimbursements for operating expenditures (such as kerosene, paper, pencils, and batteries) flow through this route. The evaluation team heard many complaints from teachers, head teachers, and Secretariat staff in regard to these latter types of payments. These were reported to be "always" late, ranging from a few months to approximately one year.

Other matters of relationship are discussed below. The point here is that the loose democratic form of organization at the village level is excellent from a creative educational perspective, but has some weaknesses when it comes to line administration.

The Secretariat staff, who have promoted the collegial-type organization at the cluster village level, also attempt a democratic structure for themselves. A diffuse leadership style seems to be deliberate. However, some staff members complain that nobody sets priorities, that excellent discussions are followed by inaction, and that decisions are often not implemented.

Thus the Secretariat gives the image of a highly motivated and dedicated group of creative people, unwilling to hamper each other's potential contributions through firm commitment to a work plan. As a work environment, it seems to be both stimulating and frustrating. As a management unit providing administrative support to field operations it seems weak and ineffective. Perhaps part of the problem is the vast scope of work taken on by the Secretariat staff.

Although the functional organization chart shows eleven functions, the three-year operations plan for 1983 through 1985 shows only seven areas of work. Probably the whole project would be strengthened if the Secretariat were reorganized into fewer units, with a clear statement of authority. This would not preclude some of the teaming-up in work groups which now occurs, but it would enable management to know who is accountable for what, and to see to it that things get done in a timely manner. Teamwork and participation should still be encouraged in developing project ideas and planning.

Also, some reorganization might put the basic education curriculum in context, reduce the emphasis on it, and, for example, allow the materials development group to develop materials for such other aspects of the village programs as public health, agriculture, cooperatives, water systems, etc. One possibility would be to regroup the functions into

three units. A small administrative unit could have responsibility for managing the internal affairs of the Secretariat and its relationships with all outside units. That would include the Northern Regional NFE Center itself, as well as DPW, DTEC, DNFE, USAID, and various other units. Then there might be two internal units. One could be responsible for supervision, and coordination of field operations, including liaison with those who select and train teachers. The second would be the program support unit, concerned with the evolution of village NFE programs, curriculum and instruction support, community development, and other aspects of program. All production of materials could be handled by the regional and provincial NFE Centers, or in the villages themselves.

This particular reorganizational suggestion is only one of many. It could be done by regrouping as follows:

New Unit	Old Unit
Administration	Office of Secretariat Finance Inter-Agency Coordination Technical Assistance
Supervision and Coordination	Supervision Staff Development Field Operations Hill Tribe Affairs
Program Support	Curriculum and Instruction Development Community Development Research and Evaluation

As the Project gradually phased over into the already existing units of the Department of NFE, the transition might be time-phased, so that, one at a time, each unit's functions are gradually taken over by the relevant existing branch of the Royal Thai Government, with the Administrative Unit remaining until last, and monitoring the transition of the others.

The above recognizes that it is not highly probable that village clusters will develop increased autonomy over the years, gaining more local control of resources, personnel, and NFE programs. It speculates, rather, that the future lies in full integration into the Thai bureaucracy. If the alternative of local autonomy were probable, then continuity of a loosely organized creative group to facilitate exchange of experience and ideas among the village clusters, and to bring them occasional outside stimulation might be preferred.

The evaluation team has also considered another alternative for reorganization and institutionalization which may be worthy of discussion. The Secretariat might be gradually reorganized into a research and development (R&D) unit for the Northern Regional NFE Center. As such, it would continue to experiment with other innovations in non-formal education beyond this project. As the present Hill Areas Education Project completes its next three implementation years, each of its present operating functions might be gradually phased over to the appropriate unit of the NRRNFE. A small core of creative personnel might remain, however, and become the base for the new unit. This might include both some aspects of the present Secretariat and one or two of the clusters of villages. These might become a "social laboratory," in which new ideas for approaching the problems and opportunities of non-formal education specifically designed for Hill Area peoples could be tested and refined. From time to time, ideas generated in this R&D unit would be turned over to the Department of Non-Formal Education for either further field testing or for general use. With this perspective, instead of replicating or attempting to institutionalize the present Project, those elements of it which seem most effective would be selected for replication, while other elements would continue to be refined.

#### 4.2.2 Project Linkages

The achievement of coordination, cooperation, communication,

and control is important in any management situation. It is particularly important for an innovative project which aspires to be replicated elsewhere and to be institutionalized into a larger, pre-existing organization. The development of such linkages by the Hill Areas Education Project seems to be inadequate, particularly with respect to division of duties and responsibilities among various related organizations.

The local Hill Tribe Welfare Department Operations Units may be the exception to this. In most cases there seemed to be excellent working relationships, and effective coordination. In two cases these were cemented by marriage bonds between key personnel of the Project and the local Operations Unit. The shared goals and the shared ideology at the local level made for strong linkages.

Two of the three District Education Officers interviewed did not express such satisfaction. They complained that they did not have sufficient information about the Project, and were sometimes responsible for personnel and activities about which they were uninformed. They did process the flow of monthly reports from village teachers to higher units, however, and some took the trouble to read and comment on these reports, passing copies back to the relevant teachers. Further, they are the key individuals in the flow of money to teachers at the local level, and seemed to be performing well in that function.

Provincial NFE Centers may be another matter. One outspoken NFE center head complained about both the Secretariat and the village teachers. He saw little need for the secretariat and urged that it be "destroyed" at the end of the project. He thought the village teachers were too well treated and too protective of their villages. He clearly did not share the doctrine and special spirit of the Project, and seemed to wish to fold it into his normal operations.

The Department of NFE in Bangkok is well linked to the HAE Project, and supportive at its level. Personnel there are well informed about both project achievements and operating problems, and are a source of support. There seems to be effective coordination between the Department's Bangkok office and the Secretariat.

The linkage between the project and the Provincial Hill Tribe Development and Welfare Centers has had several problems. The evaluation team interviewed one of the four Center directors involved with the project. This Director complained that in some districts new teachers were unqualified because of the failure to follow proper selection criteria. He stated that because teachers had no fixed curriculum or certificates to offer, adult learners became discouraged and stopped attending class. He also claimed that teachers were expected to perform too much agricultural and health extension work, which detracted from their primary teaching responsibilities. He also stated that in his province the turnover rate seriously disrupted teaching/learning activities. His concluding remark about teachers was that ineffective teachers were not punished. The Director also criticized the Secretariat's poor administrative coordination, claiming that his office was not properly consulted in terms of planning and field operations.

The Tribal Research Center in Chiangmai has had continuous supportive relationships with the Project. Its director and others have assisted in the planning of the project, the training of teachers, with the baseline studies, curriculum development, and many seminars. Nevertheless the staff of the Center reported several areas of concern or weakness in the project implementation to the evaluation team. They reported that there have been training sessions and meetings where agreements were reached, but never implemented or followed through by the Secretariat. They claimed that

a wide gap exists between the theory of the project and the practice in the field, and also stated that only a few people on the secretariat, and even fewer teachers, really understand the project's philosophy. They criticized the project supervision and management, and what they reported as a lack of control and communication within the Secretariat. At the field level they said teachers are expected to do far too many things. They blamed the fall-off in adult education attendance on the inexperience of the teachers and the lack of tight project supervision from the Secretariat. To correct this they recommended further training, the use of local experts as consultants and the development of incentives for the teachers such as scholarships for further education.

The Department of Technical and Economic Cooperation, DTEC, plays an important role in channelling financial support, both from USAID and from its own other sources, to the Project. DTEC audits every receipt or voucher submitted by the Secretariat or the Department of NFE for reimbursement. It also oversees such activities as the hiring of personnel or the purchase of equipment to ensure that all the requirements of the contract or terms of reference are satisfied. It also turns over its audited statements to AID for reimbursement, and when it receives the funds, sends them to the appropriate place. Since it is in the middle and can sometimes cause serious delays if a receipt is not "properly authorized," or the proper form is not used, it has been seen by both the Project staff and AID as an obstacle at times. However, DTEC assured the evaluation team that the staff has now been instructed to complete the audit within sixty days, and that they should try to facilitate the correction of any errors as quickly as possible.

The Hill Tribe Welfare Division of the Department of Public Welfare has been highly supportive of the project's goals and activities. The

Director points to this project as a model of interagency cooperation.

The U.S. Agency for International Development is also linked to the Project in a variety of ways. Besides normal monitoring of its funding for the Project, it provides funding for one advisor who has been in frequent contact with the USAID Office of Human Resources and Training in Bangkok. The Chief of that office and one assistant have each visited the Project Secretariat and hill village clusters. USAID officials seem to be quite well informed regarding progress and achievements of the Project. DNFЕ officials state that they have been criticized for not spending the funds quickly enough.

A most critical linkage is that between the Project Secretariat and the Northern Regional NFE Center. While personal relationships seem to be positive, programatic linkages seem inadequate. The Secretariat calls on the Center's resources and personnel for implementation but not for planning or decision making. Some of the Center staff have reported that the Secretariat seems uninterested in other Center activities. For example, the NRNFEС produces and distributes slide sets to teachers and others throughout the North. It even publishes a small catalog, describing available slide sets, and procedures for acquiring them. And each village teacher in the HAE Project has a battery-operated slide projector. However, when asked about slides available from the NRNFEС, not one teacher had ever used them. In fact, according to the teachers not one of them had ever heard that such slides existed, or had seen the catalog. Similarly, the NRNFEС produces radio programs, and has facilities for duplicating tape cassetts. Village teachers in this Project all have been supplied with tape player radios. There was some use by the Project of the support from the Center, but not as much as their potentially could be.

Reflecting on the above, there seems to be a communication gap between the Secretariat and most other units, from those closest at the home base, NRRFEC, to those in Provincial and District Education Offices and HTWD Centers. Besides the poor public relations which results, and the lack of coordinated activity, these linkage problems will make it difficult to institutionalize the program into the larger NFE program in the hill areas.

#### 4.2.3 Project Personnel

The village teachers are at once the most successful aspect of the Project, about whom all can take pride, and the most significant future problem. At present they are called volunteers. While they are the beneficiaries of the perquisites listed earlier, they are temporary employees on a fixed, low salary, without the possibility of increments. They receive minimum fringe benefits, such as health insurance only for themselves, not for parents, wives, or other dependents. Their benefits are less than regular permanent staff of the Government. Those interviewed by the evaluation team tended to have a minimum formal education preparation, MS 3 or MS 5 (10th grade and 12th grade), with a few graduates of Teacher Training Colleges or Commercial Colleges. Approximately one third of the teachers are from the Hill Tribes, and others are learning local languages. Many of them have achieved fluency and are using it in their daily work. About one half are female; one half are male. The average age seems to be around 23 years.

After two years of operation of the Project, evidence of personnel turnover can be only indicative. In one of the best clusters, the present group of ten teachers had been with the project from 8 to 24 months, with an average of 17 months. There had been some shifting among villages, however, and turnover of the head teacher, so that average tenure in the present village was only 13 months.

Much of the success of this effort hangs on the spirit and the dedication of individual village teachers. They are called volunteers because they agree, in the beginning, to a tough assignment in a difficult situation with minimum reward. For a few who have other choices, but who are committed to the philosophy of the Project, there is something special about this "volunteer" status. For others, they are just out of school, with no other job open to them, sometimes after a period of unemployment, and this assignment represents their only chance for professional work.

Some people told the evaluation team that it would probably be better if the Project were staffed with permanent personnel. They would have liked to see all of the present teachers made into regular staff of the MOE, with all of the job security, promotion opportunity, and other benefits pertaining thereto.

Others suggested that as such personnel become more senior in the public service, their willingness to take assignments in remote hill villages is likely to diminish. The probability is that more experienced and more highly trained Government officers would not consider such a post, in spite of the opportunities for creativity, innovation, and service to the disadvantaged.

One possibility would be to further develop the "volunteer" concept. There have been successful projects in Thailand such as the Thammasat Graduate Volunteer Program, in which university graduates have volunteered for short assignments in remote places. Other nearby nations have programs in which every young person who completes formal education must give one year to national service of some kind. Such a program might provide a continuous flow of idealistic vigorous young people who would go to hill villages for one year. Some might even stay for a second year. The training needs would be critical, but the long run benefit might exceed the cost by a greater ratio than present arrangements.

A second possibility would be to shift to more local village personnel as teachers. People in the same age bracket - 18 to 25 - regardless of formal education background, might be selected within each village by the village committee. Training requirements would be a greater challenge, and more time and staff would be needed in supervision. But, again, the potential for achieving project goals, particularly individualized village-centered educational programs, would be much greater. The world experience suggests that there are some disadvantages in having the village teacher actually serve in his or her parents' village, but such a group of teachers could be assigned to similar villages in other locations.

It was suggested by one of the Secretariat staff who works most closely with village teachers that the "spirit" of the teacher is the most important criterion for success. She also indicated that about 50% of the present teachers had the necessary "spirit." With only three years of implementation as a special Project ahead, it would probably be inappropriate to experiment with other models of village teacher personnel management. However, if there were further external support, this could be one of the most fruitful areas for development.

Head teachers are a very special group. Since they are selected by the other teachers, they are the key to the democratic and informal relations within the cluster team of teachers. Since their strength is personal relations, rather than any special experience or skill in teaching or non-formal education program development, they cannot be expected to provide supervision or training. They do provide coordination, and in some cases do it eminently well.

For both village teachers and head teachers, some kinds of additional rewards might well be considered. For example, if the teachers

cannot be given increases in salary, perhaps one or two of them could be given a special commendation each year.

On the matter of personnel for village level work there is also a question of conflicting goals. If the goal of individualized village-centered educational programs predominates, then use of local people as teachers and head teachers is more appropriate. And the head teacher role of coordinator is also appropriate. But if the goal of basic education according to a national curriculum dominates, then it might be more appropriate to have a head teacher who has more experience and training than the other teachers, and who can, in fact, supervise their utilization of the standardized curriculum and instructional materials.

The Secretariat personnel are a different matter. They seem to be highly professional, committed, and dedicated people, willing to put in long hours of hard work for a cause in which they believe. Since only four of the seventeen are permanent civil servants (one DNFE, two NRRFEC, and one DPW) it must be assumed that they view this assignment as a five-year opportunity to gain some experience and make a contribution. Each individual will either be transferred to some other unit, or terminated. While this is not inconsistent with the needs for creativity and innovation, it may tend to militate against interest in effective project management. Expediting the logistic, financial, and administrative aspects of the project does not seem to be high on anyone's priority list. The lack of clear lines of authority and responsibility to village teachers flows from this personnel problem.

The Project advisor seems uniquely qualified for his post, and plays a crucial catalyst role. As an advisor, however, he has been frustrated by some of the discontinuities in objectives, lack of suitability of inputs, and administrative arrangements mentioned elsewhere in this report.

The mix and adequacy of the management staff have been described above. The problems seem to be organizational and managerial in nature. Some recommendations are made below. But personnel management, particularly for village level personnel, represents an opportunity for further Project adjustment. Perhaps more attention could be given to a regularized system for recruiting, selecting, placement, transfer, salaries, allowances, rank, and training of village level personnel.

#### 4.2.4 Project Monitoring, Documentation and Planning

At some levels the documentation within the project seems adequate; at others it is less than adequate. Each teacher completes a report each month. These flow through the HTWD Unit Chief to the District Education Officer, and on up the bureaucracy. Teachers complain that they frequently don't know what is going on in the Project. The current monthly report form itself should be evaluated. Secondly, an improved system of processing, summarizing, and circulating these monthly reports would probably help with monitoring, and would also help with strengthening the linkages mentioned above.

Also at the village level, most teachers keep daily diaries. These were most helpful to the evaluation team. They give insight into what is actually going on which is not available elsewhere. More use could be made of these diaries. They should be particularly helpful in briefing future outside technical assistance personnel. Excerpts from the diaries could make the base for an excellent public relations effort in other agencies and in the relevant offices in Bangkok. They mirror the human side of this Project more effectively than straightforward reporting systems. In addition the Secretariat publishes a monthly magazine for the teachers, which contains articles by teachers and Secretariat members. This magazine, too, is a rich source of more informal information about the Project.

Other reports of Progress and Current Status, in English and Thai, have been produced regularly during the life of this Project, perhaps every two to four months. These fulfill an important function. They tend to be more of a list of activities than an accounting of the achievement of objectives, or progress toward goals. They might be more useful to the Project if combined with the planning process, both in format and content as described below.

There are also written Project plans. And there are detailed lists of goals set in the plans, and the extent to which they have been accomplished by a certain date. Each of these seems to have a different format and a different time period.

A possible improvement, particularly at the Secretariat level would be the development of a regular format for use either on a monthly or on a quarterly basis. For each major objective of the Project, and for each reporting period, the document should state achievements during the last period and plans for the next time period. Categories should fit with the AID Project Paper (for AID purposes), as well as the expectations of the RTG. Prepared at the Secretariat level, it could include a summary of village reports for the relevant time periods. If the focus is not on activities but on accomplishments in the direction of goals, then it should have multiple uses in strengthening the weak linkages mentioned earlier in this report.

The development of a research and evaluation dimension of the Project had not yet taken place at the time of this evaluation team effort. The team was informed that some research was being contracted out to other organizations. The opportunity for research and comparative testing of the various elements of what is being tried in this Project is great.

Such systematic learning of which approaches seem to be most appropriate and successful, and which need further refinement is necessary if the Project is to develop models for others to replicate.

#### 4.2.5 Management and Administrative Systems

Financial management seems to be a major problem, particularly from the perspective of village teachers. The teachers have no "clout" when it comes to competition for available funds, and tend to get what is left. Their allowances, travel reimbursements, and other moneys tend to be very late.

In part, the cash flow problem relates to the period of growth of the Project. Regular expenditures were greater in the second year than the first, and cash advances from DTEC to DNFE to the Secretariat were increased. But the growth in expenditures exceeded the size of the advance, and the length of time required for replenishment was longer than anticipated,

The cash flow problem relates to the cumbersome series of steps (over 20) from the village teachers to USAID (actually the U.S. Embassy) and back again. At the beginning of the project, this process was prone to error. The Project staff were not familiar with the proper forms and procedures required by DTEC, and claimed that they were often not informed about such forms and procedures until after a long delay. Staff at DTEC claimed that they often received packages of receipts and vouchers for two or three months at a time, which were difficult to audit because of the large number of papers.

The Secretariat, USAID, DNFE, and DTEC are concerned about this problem, and have taken steps to improve the situation. DTEC has instructed their staff to complete their audits within 60 days and to

be more helpful in providing information. The cash advance has been increased to Baht 1,500,000, enough for about one to two months, but this should probably be further increased to be enough for four months of expenditures. The Secretariat should submit their vouchers and receipts more frequently, perhaps twice a month or weekly, to speed up the flow of cash.

Program coordination, among the teachers and with the local HTWD unit heads, seems most effective within each cluster of villages. It seems least effective between the Secretariat and other relevant units, particularly Hill Tribes Development and Welfare Centers. A combined planning, reporting, and public relations effort as mentioned in the last section above might be useful in this regard.

Academic and technical coordination may be another area of management opportunity. There should be greater coordination of what is available at the Regional and District NFE Centers with what is actually in use by the teachers. The Secretariat tends to produce materials for the village cluster operations rather than looking at what other units are doing which would be helpful to teachers.

Leadership and supervisory styles are a personal matter, and seem to be consistent with the philosophy of this Project. The leadership styles at the clusters and the Secretariat appear to be highly democratic and participatory. This is effective in promoting ideas and creativity, but has caused problems in providing administrative support to field operations and in Project implementation. It would be helpful to separate the planning functions, which require more creativity, from the management functions, which require definite day-to-day decisions which must be implemented and followed through. A highly participatory, democratic style can be very effective in planning and program design, but

it is not as appropriate in the day-to-day management decisions. Specific roles and functions must be determined and agreed upon for the implementation of the plans.

#### 4.2.6 Project Management Recommendations

##### RECOMMENDATION 3:

The Project Secretariat should be reorganized into a smaller number of units, with clear lines of authority and responsibility to the head of the Secretariat, and from there to the Director of the NRRFEC.

##### RECOMMENDATION 4:

The Secretariat should establish more effective communication, coordination, and cooperation with other related units at District, Provincial, and National levels.

##### RECOMMENDATION 5:

Personnel management at the village level should be more effective. This could include provision of special rewards, making teachers' fringe benefits more like those of civil servants, development of a special program of volunteer service, or a shift to selection of teachers from within Hill Tribe Villages.

##### RECOMMENDATION 6:

Reporting, planning, and project document should be standardized at the Secretariat level. Regular reporting/planning summaries, based on Project objectives, along with mechanisms for the use of this information in decision making, should be established.

**RECOMMENDATION 7:**

Reports from village teachers, including teachers' diaries, should be more fully used for both coordination and for public relations purposes.

**RECOMMENDATION 8:**

The Project should make greater use of materials developed by other units, especially the NRNFEC. These include such items as slides, tapes, wall newspapers.

**RECOMMENDATION 9:**

The sponsoring and coordinating units of this Project should expedite more timely cash flow at all levels of the Project. The needs of teachers should always receive top priority.

**RECOMMENDATION 10:**

The Secretariat should develop more effective mechanisms to implement their decisions.

### 4.3 Curriculum and Materials Development

This section of the report addresses first the basic education program for children and adults, and then turns to the other aspects of the program which tend to be more village-centered, such as health services, agriculture, works and maintenance, the village education center, community development and organization, personal counseling, and other "friend of the village" functions of the teacher.

#### 4.3.1 Basic Education Program for Children and Adults

The Basic Education Program is clearly of high priority to the Royal Thai Government, and seems to dominate this Project. It reflects the greatest achievements thus far. It is also at the root of the major conceptual gap between what is called for in the USAID Project Paper and what is happening in the field.

The major activities of village teachers are the morning classes for children and the evening classes. While these latter are sometimes called adult classes, they tend to include some children, and a teen-age unmarried group. Adults are defined by DNFE as anyone 14 years of age or older. At the time of this evaluation, classes were being offered regularly, and some students were attending, although attendance was said to be down this month because of the heavy demands of rice planting and corn weeding.

The teachers must be credited with heroic achievement with respect to this program, as they have been teaching for up to two years without a standard curriculum and without being able to give tests to their students or give them any official report of progress. No student has received any certificate for successful completion of any units. Nevertheless, the work goes on. Teachers use bits of old curricula, textbooks they buy locally, or get through the Project, and seem to put together the classes in an ad hoc fashion.

Most of the classes observed by the evaluation team were not learner-centered non-formal education. They were generally teacher-centered rote memory of letters and numbers, geared to achieve a minimum basic education in Thai. It would have to be classified as formal education, except that it is considerably less formal than what usually goes on in the Thai schools. If one is to consider the older adults who sometimes stand under the eaves of the village education centers repeating words aloud along with the students inside, or the friendly gatherings at the teacher's home after class, sometimes involving all students, what the team observed is certainly less formal than ordinary school. Perhaps any program whose goal is functional literacy must be at least this formal. What it lacks, and may inevitably lack, is the individualized village-centered program called for in the Project Paper. That may be a weakness of the Project Paper.

Concurrently with the establishment of the teachers in the satellite villages of each cluster and construction of teachers' houses and village education centers, with their reading rooms and bulletin boards, the staff of the Secretariat has been involved in curriculum development. They have produced a curriculum designed for use in all hill villages, recently officially approved by the Ministry of Education in Bangkok. This curriculum meets established standards, and provides approximately six years of instruction for children and 1½ to 2 for adults. Completion of this curriculum is equivalent in "all rights and privileges" to the standard six year elementary curriculum.

From the perspective of the evaluation team, this achievement by the Secretariat staff represents a major significant contribution, and they should be recognized for it.

Now the Secretariat staff is engaged in the development and testing of support materials for each hour of instruction. Individuals are contracted to produce particular units, after seminars in which the philosophy and intent of the curriculum are discussed. Then the materials are reviewed in special group seminars and tested by actual teachers in the field. Finally, materials for each unit will be printed and made available to all teachers.

Each unit contains a statement of objectives, basic content, and the teaching/learning strategy to be used. It may have workbook-type exercises for the students, and it contains a test of achievement so that both student and teacher can know if the objectives of the unit have been achieved by the student. These instructional aids will also be used as a placement device. Since many students are already involved in the program, teachers will be trained to administer the test portion at the end of the lesson unit first. A student who already knows what is to be learned will be given credit for that, and may proceed directly on to the next unit.

This may be more significant with the adult groups than with the children. The same curriculum is to be designed for both children and adults, with some possible variation in instructional materials.

At the date of this writing, while some of the support materials have been tested in the villages in draft form, none of the units have been printed and distributed. This will be a long and difficult task. The head of the Secretariat says that it will be completed during the next three years, although others have expressed doubt.

Since the materials themselves have only been glanced at in early draft stages and in only a few segments, it is not possible to determine the adequacy of the research and decision making process regarding the curriculum and materials development at this time. Early indications are that the Secretariat and its predecessors in the Project planning stage have done an adequate job of making baseline studies in the villages and trying to assess needs there. The extent to which this will be taken into account by those who actually develop the materials remains to be seen. There has been little use thus far. It constitutes a major monitoring task ahead of the Secretariat.

However, the whole curriculum was designed to fit a prescribed set of specifications. It was predetermined that it had to have 35% devoted to skills in Thai language and arithmetic. The other 65% deals with various elements under the heading "Life and Social Experiences," and is supposed to feature the "Kit pen" approach to process and philosophy. In terms of the needs assessment, the evaluation team was told at the NRNFECC that it was 20% needs of the hill people; 20% needs of the Government; and 60% needs of the larger society. All of that certainly puts limitations on

the potential adequacy of the research and local decision making process in curriculum development.

With respect to the adequacy of village-level participation and the mechanism for such participation, it is minimal in the basic education program compared with other aspects of what village teachers are doing. Villagers do not participate in deciding what is to be learned, or how it is to be learned. They do participate in deciding when and where it will be learned, and who will attend.

Replicability may be the major strength of the new curriculum and its support materials. What it lacks in not being individually tailored to each village or each tribal group it gains in the breadth in which it may be usable. If the curriculum is successful within the Hill Areas Education Project, it should be replicable throughout the hill areas. Whether or not there will be financial support for such replicability is another question, beyond the scope of this evaluation.

#### 4.3.2 Health Service and NFE

Each teacher has a supply of medicines, made available by AID and DTEC project funds. These include salves, pain relievers, malaria suppressants, etc. Village people come to the teacher's house at any hour of day or night, complaining of pains, or needing first aid. Teachers have been given some training in this, and seem to do an acceptable job. When a serious case needs further treatment, the local teacher advises the patient to see a doctor or go to a hospital, and often helps in transporting the patient there. In some clusters, the HTWD Operations Unit provides the transportation and authorizes free medical treatment. Some teachers use such occasions to provide non-formal education in public health and preventive medicine. They also featured health posters on bulletin boards and in schools.

This aspect of the program puts the teacher in direct contact with village adults. It also casts the teacher in the role of a friend who is there to help. It is apparently a successful part of the strategy. And, the health work of the teacher does tend to be individualized to each situation, and in response to expressed needs of villagers. It fits the village-centered objectives of the Project. A number of people, however, have concerns about making the villagers "drug dependent" rather than relying on prevention and herbal medicines.

#### 4.3.3 Agricultural Service and NFE

Each teacher is surrounded by agriculture. In the village, pigs and chickens run loose, and buffalo and horses are much in evidence. Development of kitchen vegetable gardens has been a successful project for some teachers. And the work of most people each day has to do with growing rice or corn or other crops.

Some village teachers stated that they needed more training in agriculture. Help was available from an agriculturist at the core village HTWD Operations Unit, but some teachers tended to be unsatisfied with that. They pointed out the agriculturist did not come to their village very often. They had to go to see him, often a long walk. He did have information on the problems they brought, but it was generally partial. One teacher, in pressing for more training, said that villagers asked him more questions than he could handle, and that when he brought back technical advice from the agriculturalist, villagers had follow-up questions which he could not handle. Referral to the agriculturalist tended to be less satisfactory, from the teachers' perspectives, than referral in the health field.

One reason for this may be that the agriculturalists have their own programs. They told members of the evaluation team about their

goals of containing villagers as near to the home village as possible, and converting them away from the swidden (slash and burn) agriculture. In one village, the agriculturist promoted a poultry project in which fifty baby chicks were to be supplied, along with the feed to feed them, if the villagers would build a poultry house in which to contain them, and agree that someone would take responsibility for their care and feeding. Since chickens are seen in abundance in all villages, and participate along with pigs in consuming the refuse from human beings and then scratching out their own living, they already have an appropriate niche in the hill tribe farm family eco-system. The innovations being suggested by the agriculturalists may lead in the direction of making villagers more dependent on outsiders.

Thus, what the agriculturists had to offer was a program designed outside the village for larger social purposes. What villagers came to the teachers seeking was agricultural information which would fit their already existing farming systems. This difference makes a significant opportunity available to the village teachers, if they can develop the capability to respond appropriately. Local expertise should be used.

Villagers also brought social problems relating to agriculture to the teachers. In two instances there were complaints that pigs were damaging kitchen vegetable and fruit gardens. In one case the teacher met with the village committee and worked out an agreement that owners of pigs would keep them fenced in. In the other case, the village agreement was that those with gardens would build fences around the gardens.

This analysis suggests that there are opportunities for the development of individualized village education programs in the field of agriculture.

#### 4.3.4 Works and Maintenance Service and NFE

Another part of the Project design was to make a kit of hand tools available to each teacher for loan to village people. These were much in evidence, and being borrowed regularly. One teacher had a chalkboard in his house on which names of people who had borrowed tools were listed, along with the particular item borrowed. While the teachers complained that the quality of the tools was poor, and that they often broke, lost handles, or were inadequate to the task, the tools were, in fact, being used.

This dimension of the project could easily be improved. It gives the teacher access to village people. It provides teachers an opportunity for "Kit pen" teaching. It opens the door to teacher involvement in planning works with the villagers, and serving their needs. In several cases teachers had been involved in planning or helping with village water systems. In some cases teachers had been able to help when a villager's house burned down.

#### 4.3.5 Multiple Functions of the Village Education Center

In addition to the classroom, most village education centers had a room where magazines and picture books were available to villagers for casual browsing, and bulletin boards where posters could be placed. Some also had games for the people to play. These were evidence of non-formal education, and appeared to be in use. While there was not much evidence of materials from the Regional NFE Center, the opportunity was certainly there for expansion of those aspects of non-formal education.

#### 4.3.6 Community Development and Organizational Activity

One successful aspect of the Project, at the village level, has been the organization of cooperative stores. When local teachers are

able to meet with village committees, facilitating discussion of significant problems, encouraging "Kit pen" approaches, and sometimes bringing suggestions from other villages, the program actually demonstrates what a community-based education model can do.

This can be approached in many ways. Some special training of teachers might be appropriate. Tours of village leaders, not only to other nearby villages, but perhaps to successful village projects in the lowlands or even in other nearby countries are possibilities. In exchange, villagers from elsewhere have much to learn from some of the ingenious local technology developed by hill tribe people, such as the bamboo water systems.

Opportunities for community development projects will probably grow as individual teachers stay in their village long enough to gain the confidence of the village people. Some teachers have already built strong rapport with village people. The flow of individuals in and out of teachers' houses at all hours further testifies to this confidence. In other areas, for a variety of reasons, this kind of rapport has been slower in developing.

#### 4.3.7 Personal Counseling

Along the same lines, teachers are often approached by individual villagers with special problems. It may be a matter of a possible marriage, or it may have to do with the health of an animal. Teachers do their best to listen to what people have to say, and respond to their needs. More training especially in listening skills and feedback for this special non-formal education function could be highly fruitful.

#### 4.3.8 Village Advocate

Teachers are also called upon to represent the village to outsiders, such as, representatives of various branches of the RTG.

Teachers have been asked to explain villager behavior to them. Teachers also serve as links between villagers and the head of the local HTWD Operations Unit.

As non-formal educator and facilitator, when the teacher is established in the village as its friend, advisor, and advocate, the opportunity develops for a great range of NFE activities in response to needs as they arise. This aspect of the Project might well be further supported, but mechanisms should be established whereby villagers eventually become their own advocates.

#### 4.3.9 Curriculum Recommendations

##### RECOMMENDATION 11:

The Project Secretariat should devote more of its staff and other resources to helping village teachers with teaching techniques, skills, and materials for local programs in the health, agriculture, construction, community development, counseling, and other nonformal education aspects of the program, and less to the basic education program. These latter functions can be increasingly assumed by regional and provincial NFE Centers.

#### 4.4 Institutionalization and Replication of Project Activities

##### 4.4.1 Replication of the Conceptual Framework

To answer the question of the extent to which the conceptual framework of this project is replicable, the evaluation team identified three key concepts, as follows: (1) the village cluster organization, (2) a program which features individualized, village planned, implemented, and managed education, and (3) and which could be institutionalized after only five years of operation.

Some aspects of the concept of the Hill Areas Education Project are certainly replicable. The extent to which they are eventually institutionalized remains to be seen.

The village cluster organization is probably the most replicable feature. This structure was being used by the HTWD Operations Units before the project started, and the idea is already spreading. Members of the evaluation team have received reports of use by provincial education officers of the cluster village concept in two other programs in two provinces.

The concept of a program which is more than simply a basic education literacy class offered in a more remote location than would otherwise be feasible -- and especially the concept of associating it with individualized village planned, implemented, and managed education -- is not emphasized within the project itself, and thus less likely to be replicated.

As for institutionalization, it may require more than the initial five-year support of implementation. Perhaps an extension of outside donor support for field testing/refinement, expansion, and villager participation/management would go a long way toward increasing the probability of institutionalization.

#### 4.4.2 Adequacy of Development and Testing Arrangements

Development and testing arrangements have been more focused on the basic education literacy program than on other aspects of the Project. Perhaps the techniques used in this effort, as well as the resultant curriculum and support materials are the most likely part of the Project to be replicated. There is every indication that what is now being developed will be widely expanded throughout the hill areas of Thailand, and perhaps in other remote areas as well.

As for institutionalization, it is not in the interest of any educational system for its curriculum to become institutionalized. Formal education throughout the world suffers from this phenomenon, which results in so much obsolete formal education -- teaching students how to cope with yesterday's world and solve yesterday's problems. The evaluation team hopes that the curriculum serves its purpose well, is continuously modified and updated, and never becomes institutionalized. The 20% of the curriculum that is community based must be emphasized in order to ensure adequate response to community needs.

#### 4.4.3 Financial Constraints and Liabilities

As indicated in earlier sections of this report, the image of having too much money militates against replication and institutionalization. Better communication and public relations, particularly by the Secretariat may be able to overcome the "wealthy project image."

The question is: How much in the way of extra financial support is really necessary in order for a project like this to function adequately in the field? Without Project transportation, the Secretariat staff couldn't get to the cluster villages as easily, and head teachers might not be able to get to all of their villages as frequently.

An economic analysis of these aspects of the Project would help the Secretariat in its relationships with other units as they attempt to replicate the Project.

#### 4.4.4 Foreign Support Image and Replication

Since the Project is known to enjoy support from USAID, there will probably be reluctance on the part of officials who have not been involved in the Project to take on responsibilities without the special incentives assumed to be part of the package. Thus, while some aspects of the Project could not have been tried at all without foreign support,

these will have to overcome that image before they are accepted on their merit alone. Persons at the provincial and district level have pointed out to members of the evaluation team that similar Thai projects, without the extra foreign money, are not essentially different from this Project. Whatever the facts of the case may be, the foreign support image is likely to make replication more difficult.

#### 4.4.5 Secretariat Independence and Replication

As mentioned above, the Secretariat has not paid sufficient attention to its linkages with other relevant units. (See section 4.2.2 above.) That may have been necessary in light of the heavy work load, the relatively small staff, and the existing priorities. However, the attitude of independence from others during the formative stages may interfere with replication and institutionalization, even of those aspects of the Project which demonstrate their success.

#### 4.4.6 Concept of the Volunteer

The idea of a village teacher who is basically a volunteer may have mixed consequences when it comes to replication and institutionalization. If such teachers were part of a permanent staff, those who do well in a satellite village in one cluster could later be sent to other clusters to help get them started. Also, personnel with such field experience could be developed into management staff at higher levels. But a temporary volunteer, who either returns to a more urban world or seeks a more permanent job wherever it may be found, is not likely to result in experienced staff who are available to assist with replication. The concept of the volunteer teacher has been used successfully for many years in the Adult Functional Literacy Program.

Further, institutionalization is more than a structural and

programmatic phenomenon. It also involves people. If people are permanently assigned to an organization, it is much more likely to become institutionalized than if it is staffed entirely with those who are temporary.

#### 4.4.7 Institutionalization of Innovation

Some of the comments above are not specific to this Project. They could be made about any project. If institutionalization is a major goal, then a strategy should be developed which identifies, in clear written form, the major dimensions of the model. These should include the doctrine, the leadership, the resources (including human and financial resources), the organizational structure, the program, and the critical linkages with other organizations. Then a time-phased action plan might be worked out which identifies the achievements to be emphasized and the barriers to be overcome.

#### 4.4.8 Recommendations

##### RECOMMENDATION 12:

Extension of the implementation phase for another period should be considered by sponsors of the Project, with a specific focus on field testing/refinement, expansion, and villager participation/management.

#### 4.5 Adequacy of Beneficiary Participation

The opportunity for village people to participate in this Project is great. In many tangible ways, their continuous participation is demonstrated. For example, most of the villages visited by the evaluation team had village education centers. Although some funds had been provided by the Project, local people contributed materials and labor and sometimes money. They also participated in decision making on such matters as where to locate the building, as well as details of its design and construction.

Participation in the construction process itself represents an aspect of non-formal education. For example, in many cases there was an enclosed toilet, sometimes with running water, near the education center. Those who participated in its construction learned how to make similar facilities for their own houses, and some did. Posters on the bulletin boards often supported this with pictures and diagrams of appropriate designs.

But in assessing the adequacy of the participation in Project activities, it is necessary to go beyond this level of acceptance by local people. Before going on, however, readers should be aware that the very acceptance of the teacher by local people, and the willingness to make him or her part of the village community, represents a significant achievement in participation.

#### 4.5.1 Participation in Planning

The Project Paper specifically calls for villager participation in planning, implementation, and management of activities. With respect to planning, it is evident that local villagers expressed a desire for schooling for their children and youth. That is interpreted to mean literacy and numeracy in Thai. Having expressed the need, and participated in the establishment of facilities mentioned above, that tended to be the extent of villager participation in the planning of basic education in this project.

The goal of individualized village-centered literacy learning, where the words to be learned each spring from the needs and interests of village people, is not part of the design for this Project. From the Project Paper and AID Logical Framework, plans called for a "centrally-based curriculum and materials". And that may be the most suitable and adequate type of planning for this kind of basic education.

Turning to the more non-formal aspects of the Project, a much higher level of day-to-day beneficiary participation in planning is

evident. Each recipient decides whether or not to go to the teacher for first aid or for medication. With each new health problem presented to the teacher by the "beneficiary," there is a new opportunity for individualized non-formal education in health.

Some villagers have discussed food shortages, and worked with teachers in developing rice banks. Some have come to the teachers with sick and dying pigs. In one village, a woman asked the teacher to help her get a tea plant so she could try growing her own tea. Many more examples could be added.

The point is that in these non-formal aspects of the village education programs, there is apparently beneficiary participation in planning project activities at the village level. Furthermore, in many villages it seems to be gaining momentum.

#### 4.5.2 Participation in Implementation

In a sense, there is adequate participation in Project educational activities. All of the activities described in section 4.3 above are being implemented with beneficiary participation. In the basic education dimension, attendance is a reflection of such participation. This and other participation in implementation are documented in regular monthly reports of village teachers.

#### 4.5.3 Participation in Management

Management of the total Project and of the day-to-day affairs of each cluster of villages is a different matter. Here there seemed to be very little evidence of participation by village people. Most villages have village committees, and they were involved in initial facilities development and in management of such community projects as the rice bank or the cooperative store. But these represent a very small

proportion of the total Project activities. For the bulk of the activities, there did not seem to be beneficiary participation in management.

#### 4.5.4 Village Committees as an Institution

Each village seems to have a village committee, although the form and structure varies from tribe to tribe. Sometimes they were not identified as, or referred to as village committees but some group of village elders, or a village headman and his associates, perform this function. These generally were not organized by the village teachers. Instead, they were discovered by the teachers.

In some cases it was not actually a committee. It was merely that the leaders of the village had established patterns of legitimizing decisions by checking with certain others. Naming those as a village committee by the teacher, and stimulating it to meet from time to time, may be a significant non-formal education contribution in itself.

In many villages teachers told the evaluation team that they were invited to all meetings of the village committee. In others, the teachers met with the village committee only when there were issues to be discussed relating to the Project. Some groups met only once or twice a year, while others met as frequently as once a month. Such meetings tended to be more on a "as needed" basis than on a regular calendar schedule. In many cases the village committees or other groups do not seem to understand their role with respect to the Project, nor has a process been established to achieve this.

The existence of village committees provides a great opportunity for the teachers to increase village participation in planning, implementation, and management of nonformal education activities. The teachers need to develop skills and methodologies in group discussion, teamwork, and management to promote the development of these committees.

#### 4.5.5 Participation in Evaluation

While there has been very little opportunity for beneficiary participation in formal evaluation of the Project, there is constant participation in non-formal evaluation. Sheer attendance in the classes demonstrates that somebody thinks they are worth going to. And anyone who goes to the teacher's house to ask for first-aid must have evaluated previous health care delivery by that teacher, and valued it highly enough to make the visit. After two years, continuous use of a variety of the services of the village teacher, as well as attendance in the basic education literacy classes, demonstrates participation in this type of evaluation.

#### 4.5.6 Secretariat Staff as Proxy

Beyond the above, the Secretariat has taken several steps to deliberately build in beneficiary participation in the Project. It has been systematically adding people to its staff who are from the hill tribes (4 persons from 3 tribes) should be encouraged to develop into leaders and managers of this Project. It also includes sensitive individuals who have made a deliberate effort empathize with village people, tune in to their perceptions of the world, and reflect these in the activities of the Project. Thus, the staff has been able to act as proxy for the hill tribe people in some matters, and substitute that type of participation for first-hand involvement of the villagers themselves. While that is qualitatively different from actual participation, it is more feasible in some situations, and is a positive step towards participation.

Thus, the evaluation team concludes that beneficiary participation has been more adequate in planning and implementation of some aspects of the program (the least formal aspects), and less adequate in other aspects. Such participation has been more adequate in the implementation than in planning, management, or evaluation.

#### 4.5.7 Recommendation

##### RECOMMENDATION 13:

Village teachers should be given special training in methodologies and skills for generating participation by village committees.

#### B. Secondary Tasks

As mentioned above, the primary tasks assigned to the evaluation team focused on the five aspects of the Hill Areas Education Project described to this point. The other items in the scope of work were described as secondary, and include: (1) supervision, (2) staff development, and (3) inter-agency involvement.

#### 4.6 Supervision

4.6.1 One of the strengths of this Project is the comradeship and esprit de corps of the teachers in the cluster villages. The supervisory style of a head teacher who is elected by the other teachers for a one year term contributes to this working relationship. It seems to provide adequate coordination at the village level and a democratic working group atmosphere.

As mentioned in the section on management the Project is weak with respect to line administration and staff training. For the goal of individualized village-centered educational programming, it seems to be quite satisfactory.

4.6.2 The Secretariat has some responsibility in supervision of village level teachers and head teachers, but it is only one of many supervisors. The multiple supervision involving both the personnel of the HTWD and of the District Education Officers probably contributes to some of the confusion about administrative lines. This causes serious problems in terms of eventual replication and institutionalization.

Nevertheless, some of the supervision provided by members of the Secretariat is outstanding. Evaluation team members saw vigorous, sensitive, dedicated Secretariat staff members walk from village to village, systematically get feedback from members of the village community, observe satellite village teachers in action in the classroom, carefully read their

daily diaries, write appropriate comments and suggestions to them, and then sit down for intimate counseling sessions in which suggestions were made to those teachers. This was an excellent demonstration of first rate supervision in action. In some clusters, however, supervision was less systematic and comprehensive.

4.6.3 The District Education Officers are also in the line of supervision. They receive monthly reports from individual teachers, and provide cash salary and other payments to them. One of them seemed to follow the Project with interest, not only reading teachers' reports, but taking time to add comments to them and send these back to teachers. However, they also reflected some lack of involvement in the Project, and complained about not being informed about what is going on and not receiving adequate funds from the Project to supervise the teachers.

4.6.4 One provincial NFE officer was less charitable. Since he was not involved in direct supervision of the teachers, he tended to downgrade the role of the Secretariat, and suggested that there was no need for all of the extra supervision going into this Project. Personnel of the DIFE suggest that provincial and district officers could use further exposure to "Kit pen" philosophy.

4.6.5 For purposes of project implementation, since the head teacher is more coordinator of cluster teachers than supervisor, there is need for more supervision from the Secretariat level. If more of the Secretariat staff invested more of their time in cluster villages, and if they did it with the professionalism and skill demonstrated by the supervisors mentioned above, the whole project would be strengthened. This may, however, make problems with later replication.

4.6.6 Rationalization of the supervisory roles of the Secretariat staff, the Chief of the Operations Unit of the HTWD, and District and

Provincial personnel of the MOE would also contribute to more effective Project implementation. That should be accomplished before attempts are made to replicate or further institutionalize the Project.

#### 4.6.7 Recommendation

##### RECOMMENDATION 14:

There should be a firm plan for organizing and integrating the supervisory roles of the Project Secretariat, the Chief of the HTWD Operations Unit, the Head Teachers, and various other units of the MOE, with clear lines of authority and accountability.

#### 4.7 Staff Development

4.7.1 The "Model" for Staff Selection and Staff Development under the Hill Areas Education Project has been well described in an undated publication just released by the Northern Region NFE Center. However, a set of minimum requirements and preferable qualifications along with a list of eight characteristics were used in the first selection of village teachers. There was considerable variation within the group. Of the 70 teachers who were recruited and trained in July 1980, 19 teachers had left by March 19, 1982 and two further groups were recruited.

At present, however, it is not feasible to assess the soundness of the conceptual framework for staff development. Partially that is because no firm simplified description of that model is available. There is a description of the 21 different meetings and seminars which were held by the Secretariat between 8 May 1980 and 30 March 1982. This reflects much development effort, and the evolution of a program. Just which aspects of that are to be refined into a "model" of how staff development might be handled for such projects, which might then be replicated elsewhere, is not apparent.

The staff has done some analysis of its experience, and has developed two models. Perhaps if the staff continues to be innovative in its personnel selection and training, by the end of the five-year implementation period it may be able to analyze its experience and suggest revised models.

#### 4.7.2 Recruitment of Teaching Staff

There are several alternatives for staff selection, discussed above in section 4.2.3, which might well be explored. Some matching of job performance with different qualifications might well be done during the remaining three years of the current phase. That might be helpful in answering such questions as: (1) Who tends to do better as a classroom teacher, those with Teacher Training College certificates, those with MS 5 or those with MS 3? (2) Of the same three groups, which tends to do better as a non-formal education community development worker? (3) Is there any relationship between teachers' prior experience and the extent to which individualized village-centered educational programs emerge? (4) Do persons who come from the hill tribes have a measurable advantage over persons with other backgrounds?

Beyond that, it might be worth exploring the potential of volunteers who come for one year after completing formal education compared with "professional" teachers who take this job because it is the best they can find. Would the Project be more effective with a rather high turnover of dedicated and idealistic volunteers, or would it be better to have permanent government employees who tend to stay for longer periods of time? If they were permanent government employees, would they be willing to be assigned to remote rural villages for longer periods of time? Or, might turnover be just as high?

The answering of these and other questions about recruitment remains ahead.

### 4.7.3 Teacher Training Process

Teacher training has been given serious and creative attention in this Project. The training was in three parts: a combined pre-service and selection screening which lasted for 18 days, a further field exercise lasting 2½ months, and then 2 additional weeks in the regional center. Further, it has been followed up by formal seminars, regular teachers meetings, some travel-study trips, and individualized non-formal training by members of the Secretariat, head teachers, and fellow teachers as well as cluster level training in health, and final screening. An appropriate next step might be continuous analysis during the next three years, revision of the content and process in further experimental training programs, and eventual description of a series of modules which might be identified as the training model.

### 4.7.4 Curriculum in Teacher Training

Thus far, the curriculum in the teacher training program has included components on education, hill tribes culture, health and sanitation, community development, field data collection, silk screen printing, group dynamics, and the study tours. Although agriculture is listed as training content for teachers, it has not as yet taken place. Within the education component, 25 topics are identified. There are similar lists of topics in health and community development. Modules in agriculture, forestry, fisheries, marketing and cooperatives, money management, food and nutrition, clothing, and a broad range of other topics have not yet been developed.

There is considerable opportunity within the Project for the Secretariat to expand its efforts in these directions in the future. Choice of topics should be based on continuous needs assessment within the villages.

### 4.7.5 Field Support for Teacher Growth and Development

An excellent demonstration of supervision was described in

section 4.6. The Secretariat has done a fine job of providing field support for the growth and development of some of the teachers. An appropriate next phase might be further expansion of this field work.

#### 4.7.6 Rewards System for Teachers

At present, the teachers are temporary volunteers who have a fixed salary which is low, a fixed low rank, and general low status. As indicated above under personnel management, some system of regular promotions of some kind might help keep teachers in place. Other special awards should be considered. Perhaps scholarships should be offered to teachers for their own further study after successful completion of certain periods as village teachers.

#### 4.7.7 Staff Development for Head Teachers

The head teachers, selected by their peers for a one year term, which could be renewed, are a special case. Most seem to be doing outstanding work with a minimum of preparation and a minimum of reward. Special training for them, and various aids in their jobs are important. There should be some plan for their future. This may include scholarships, raises in rank and salary, or perhaps some combination. The present system is incomplete without some kind of career pattern suggestion.

#### 4.7.8 Staff Development for Secretariat

As indicated above, the preponderance of staff in the Secretariat are also temporary personnel on contract. The question of their future personal development should also be raised. Perhaps a system of scholarships and overseas participations should be considered for them.

#### 4.7.9 Recommendations

##### RECOMMENDATION 15:

Designated members of the Secretariat and provincial NFE officials should attend at least one day monthly teachers' meetings in each cluster.

**RECOMMENDATION 16:**

A system of scholarships for further study should be developed as rewards for performance by village teachers, head teachers, and Secretariat staff.

**RECOMMENDATION 17:**

Training modules (for villagers) in a broad range of additional topics should be explored, based on village needs assessment, using villager expertise, and made available to village teachers from time to time as appropriate. For example, these might cover such topics as grain marketing, health of pigs, small fruit production, savings cooperatives, and others if they are requested by village committees.

#### 4.8 Inter-Agency Involvement

The scope of work for this evaluation team includes, among the second priority items, the question of inter-agency involvement. This team has not, therefore, given extensive consideration to this point. It has been mentioned above in various contexts. Certainly, mechanisms for continuous involvement of other agencies in project activities have yet to evolve. It is viewed as a two-edged sword. Since each agency is likely to have its own centrally-dominated program, the more agencies which participate in this Project, the less the chance that there can be individualized village-centered programs. On the other hand, from time to time the technical expertise from many different agencies may be required. How to get access to the technical competence of other units without becoming dominated by their respective programs is a challenge. This has been accomplished by

involvi g those agencies on an ad hoc basis. Certainly, the flow of communication between DNFE and other agencies, in head offices and in the field, should enhance the appreciation of this Project by the others, and perhaps protect it so that it can continue to be innovative and responsive to the unique needs of hill tribe villages. The coordination which might result from such communication would be a bonus.

## 5. Evaluation Team Procedures

### 5.1 Evaluation Scope of Work and Methodology

The Scope of Work for this evaluation was described in an unclassified telegram from Bangkok to Washington (BANGKOK 08541 FEB 32) as follows:

**"Background:**

The Project has been underway for approximately 2 years and is regarded as fairly successful. Some difficulties have arisen regarding implementation of some elements of the project such as evaluation and research, supervisory and staff development, and supporting materials development which need to be examined.

**"Purpose:**

The major purpose of this evaluation is to assess project progress to date, and to identify problems and make appropriate recommendations to improve project implementation.

**"Scope of Work:**

**1. Project Objectives and Project Approach**

A) Assess if the objectives set forth in the project paper are realistic. Examine project strategy, including project inputs, for suitability in accomplishing project objectives.

B) Recommend appropriate changes affecting reformulation of objectives and approach, if any, with detailed justification.

**2. Project Management**

A) Assess adequacy of project organization and project management. Areas to be examined, among others, include: Appropriateness of roles of donor agency (USAID), RTG coordinating agency (Department of

Technical and Economic Cooperation (DTEC), Project Implementation Staff, Northern Regional Non-Formal Education Center (NRNFEC), project advisor and other supervisory field units and personnel; interrelationships; mix and adequacy of management staff; communication linkages; decision-making process; support from field and head office staff, etc.

B) Provide recommendation if appropriate.

### 3. Curriculum and Materials Development

A) Review status of curriculum and materials development and testing. Main concerns to be addressed include: Progress to date in the development and testing of basic education curricula for children and adults. Plans for development and testing of supporting materials and adequacy of the process; adequacy of research and decision-making process regarding curriculum and materials developed; adequacy of village-level participation and mechanism of such participation; mechanisms for continuing adaptability; replicability; etc.

### 4. Supervision

A) Examine progress to date in the development of supervision model. Determine adequacy in meeting needs of teachers and overall project implementation.

B) Make recommendations where appropriate.

### 5. Staff Development

A) Examine progress to date in the development of staff model. Specifically: Soundness of conceptual framework for the development of this model; recruitment of teaching staff at various levels; teacher training process; curricula adequacy of teacher training program including provision of cultural awareness and sensitivity of community needs.

B) Make recommendations where appropriate.

## 6. Inter-Agency Involvement

A) Review: Mechanisms (formal and informal arrangements) of involvement of other agencies in project activities; adequacy of their involvement; flow of communication between DNFE and other agencies both in the head offices and in the field, and communication among various agencies concerning project activities; coordination of this and other project activities through the involvement of other agencies.

B) Recommend ways to improve inter-agency involvement.

### Institutionalization and Replication of Project Activities

A) Examine current arrangements and future plans towards institutionalizing project activities. Evaluate the conceptual framework and adequacy of development and testing arrangements of the whole education model for its replicability in like situations.

B) Recommend improvements where needed.

### 3. Adequacy of Beneficiary Participation in Project Activities

A) Study arrangements and plans for meaningful involvement of local village population in the planning, implementation and management of project activities. Assess current and proposed arrangements for institutionalizing the role of village people in project activities.

B) Recommend improvements where appropriate."

Based on that Scope of Work, USAID/Bangkok later arranged for Creative Associates, Inc. to send a three-person team for only 30 days, and to reduce the number of items to be covered. Items number 1, 2, 3, 7, and 8 were identified as first priority. Items number 4, 5, and 6 were designated second priority, to be pursued to the extent that time was available.

The methodology used by the evaluation team was as follows. First, all members read a series of reports on the project before arriving in Thailand.

Then in Bangkok the three-person team met jointly with relevant officials of the USAID, the Department of Non Formal Education, and the Advisor for this Project. In Lampang, the team was further briefed by the Director and Staff of the Northern Regional Non-Formal Education Center and by the Secretariat of the Project. Again there was opportunity to study a significant quantity of Project documentation.

Then the three-member team divided itself in various combinations and personally visited five of the six village clusters, with individual members walking into almost every village. Interviews were conducted with the head teachers from all six clusters; 46 village teachers; many different villagers, either in their homes or at the village education centers; HTWD Operations Units chiefs and other officers; and other personnel from the Secretariat or the DNFE who participated in some of the field visits. In addition, team members observed both morning and evening classes, watched village teachers in action in a broad variety of functions, ate and slept in the villages, and otherwise collected first-hand information on the nature of the Project at village and cluster level.

In addition, evaluation team members visited the offices of many other district and provincial level units, interviewed relevant personnel, and assembled other data. Then the team returned to the NRNFEC where more meetings with Secretariat and Center staff took place, the earliest drafts of this report were prepared, and discussions of this report were conducted with relevant staff.

Finally, back in Bangkok, the evaluation team reviewed its preliminary findings and recommendations with personnel of USAID, DNFE, DIEC, and others. Then the draft report was further revised. Copies of the draft were left

in appropriate offices in Thailand, as well as taken back to Washington for final typing and reproduction.

## 5.2 Travel Schedule

18 June 1982	Evaluation Team Leader arrives in Bangkok (Axinn)
20 June 1982	Other Team Members arrive in Bangkok (McNabb and Olson)
21-22 June	Meetings in Bangkok with USAID; Department of Non-Formal Education
23-24 June	Lampang. Briefings and interviews at Northern Region NFE Center (NRNFEC)
25-27 June	Khun Haeng Cluster, Lampang. Visit core and satellite villages and Ngao District offices (Axinn, McNabb, Olson)
28-29 June	Lampang. Review findings and interview NRNFEC staff
30 June	Chiangmai. Interviews at Provincial NFE Center; Iribal Research Centre, and Hill Tribe Welfare and Development Center
1-4 July	Pangsa Cluster, Chiangrai (Axinn and Olson) Mae Sawan Cluster, Mae Hong Son (McNabb)
5 July	Lampang. Review findings, develop report strategy.
6-8 July	Mae Pao Cluster, Chiangrai (McNabb) Huay Nam Jang Cluster, Chiangmai (Olson) Lampang. Drafting report (Axinn)
9-12 July	Lampang. Complete first draft, review with NRNFEC staff
13 July	Chiangmai. Complete interviews; revise recommendations
14 July	Bangkok. Interviews; float draft report; revise report
19 July	Bangkok Debriefing of USAID staff.
20 July	Departure from Bangkok (Axinn)
24 July	Departure from Bangkok (McNabb)
30 July	Departure from Bangkok (Olson)

## 5.3 Persons Interviewed

In addition to the individuals listed below, evaluation team members interviewed many village people - children, young adults, more senior adults, and village officials as well as village teachers. While their

names are not listed below, the team is indebted to them for the valuable insights they contributed. Others with whom the team members met include:

**BANGKOK**

(Ms) Khun Ying Aree Kultan	Director-General, DNFE
Dr. Nched Suntornpithug	Deputy Director-General, DNFE (admin)
Mr. Suntorn Sunanchai	Deputy Director-General, DNFE (acad)
Dr. Charoenphol Suwannachote	Director, Operations Division
Dr. Tongyoo Kaewsaiha	Director, NFE Dev. Div.
Ms. Chanida Chanyapet	Chief, Functional Literacy Unit
Dr. Cherdzak Choomnoon	Staff, " " "
Mr. Narong Pinsan	Staff, " " "
Ms. Tossaporn Sariyant	Staff, Educational Services Section
Mr. Weetoon Tongrom	Director, Hill Tribes Welfare Div., Public Welfare Department
Mr. Kasem Unahasuan	Deputy Director-General, UTEC
Ms. Kasama Voravan Na Ayudhya	Dept. of NFE
Mr. Robert Traister	Director, O/HRT, USAID
Mr. Verendar Chopra	Asst Project Off, USAID
Dr. Basharat Ali	O/PPD, USAID

**LAIPANG**

Mr. Prapan Koohamuk	Director, Northern Region NFE Center
Mr. Rewatsutham	Chief, NFE Dev Section
Mr. Bounsong Kuwarangkul	Chief, Ed Tech Section
Mr. Nakorn Surasaen	Staff, Staff Development

**Secretariat**

Mr. Dauri Janapiraganit	Staff, DIIFE
Mr. Chanchai Saensong (Meo)	Contractor
Ms. Pornpimon Trichot	Contractor

Ms. Tueanjai Kunchorn Na Ayudhya	Contractor
Ms. Apinya Winworanat	Contractor
Ms. Tiamta Prasai	Contractor
Mr. Samrit Sawangkam	Staff, Dept Pub Wel
Mr. Sa-nguan Laklaem (Karen)	Contractor (DTEC)
Mr. Songwit Chueamsamsakul (Meo)	Contractor (DTEC)
Mr. Attakorn Wongratanamacha (Lisu)	Contractor (DTEC)
Dr. Ken Kampe	Contractor

-----

Mr. Ongat Wongtana	District Education Officer (Ngao District)
--------------------	-----------------------------------------------

-----

#### Operation Units Heads and Head Teachers

<u>Cluster</u>	<u>Head Operations Unit</u>	<u>Head Teacher</u>
Khun Haeng (L)	Wanchai Salawasri	Kamoltham Chuenpan
Mae Sawan (MHS)	Nakorn Mukkara	Prayat Charoenphol
Huay Deua (CM)	(not interviewed)	Suriyawut Soiswing
Pang Sa (CR)	Tanuchai Deetet	Nit Puangkaew
Mae Pao (CR)	Pichit Promboom	Jamnong Tuaysalpa
Huay Nam Jang (CM)	Preeda Hooknama	Weerasak Pethan

Khun Haeng, Ngao District, Lampang  
Mae Sawan, Mae Sariang, Mae Hong Son  
Huay Deua, Fang, Chiang Mai  
Pang Sa, Mae Chan, Chiangrai  
Mae Pao, Paya Meng Rai, (Subdistrict), Chiangrai  
Huay Nam Jang, Samerng, Chiang Mai

#### CHIANGMAI

Suwat Kaewsaitong	Director, Chiangmai NFE Center
Erawat Chantraprasert	Director, Chiangmai Hilltribe Development and Welfare Center

<b>Wanat Prueksasri</b>	<b>Director, Tribal Research Center</b>
<b>Prawit Potiart</b>	<b>Researcher, " " "</b>
<b>Chantaboon Sutti</b>	<b>Researcher, " " "</b>
<b>Nipatwet Suebsaent</b>	<b>Researcher, " " "</b>
<b>longchai Tonguthaisri</b>	<b>Agricultural Experiment Station, Fang</b>
<b>Teerawat Charayon, Fredric Neumann Foundation</b>	

**CHIANGRAI**

<b>Weerayut Jaemtiangtrong</b>	<b>Education Unit, Chiengrai Hilltribe Welfare Development Center</b>
<b>Buonlop Kaitong</b>	<b>Staff, Chiengrai IIFE Center</b>

**Mae Hong Son**

<b>Boonchuay Moonfong</b>	<b>Staff, Mae Hong Son NFE Center</b>
<b>Chindarabinta</b>	<b>District Educational Officer</b>
<b>Seri Laopram</b>	<b>Assistant Head, Mae Hong Son Hilltribe Development and Welfare Center</b>

#### 5.4 List of Documents Reviewed

Compton, J. Lin, Integrated Nonformal Education to Promote Development Among Hill Tribes in Northern Thailand: A Critical Factors: Analysis of a Three Year Pilot Project, World Education, N.Y. July 1979.

Compton, Carol J., A Review of the Literacy Component of the Hill Areas Education Project, USAID, Bangkok, November 1981.

Griffin, Robert S., Formative and Summative Evaluation of the Radio Correspondence Project, UNESCO, Bangkok, October 1981.

Tate, Sean A., Integrated Nonformal Education to Promote Development Among Hill Tribes in Northern Thailand: The First Year: A Case Study, World Education, N.Y., February, November 1978.

Vorapipatana, Kowit, and Kasama Voravan, Between Formal and Non-Formal Education, mimeo. 15 January 1981.

Kampe, Ken, An Analysis of the Hill Areas Education Project, April 1980 - December 1981. mimeo. January 1982.

National Education Commission, Statistical Analysis and Charts: Economic, Social, and Educational Conditions of Hill Peoples, Office of the National Education Commission, Office of the Prime Minister, 1981.

NFE Department, The Non-Formal Education Department: Its Structure and Component Units (mimeo), NFE Development Project, Operations Division, NFE Department, Ministry of Education,

NFE Department, Model for Staff Selection and Staff Development Under the Hill Areas Education Project, mimeo, Northern Regional NFE Center, Operations Division, Department of Nonformal Education, Ministry of Education, undated.

**Adult Education Division, The Adult Education Division, Thailand:**

**Some New Program Trends and Activities**, mimeo, Adult Education Division, General Education Department, Ministry of Education, Bangkok, Thailand, 1978.

Ministry of Education, Department of Non-Formal Education, mimeo, Ministry of Education, undated.

Department of Nonformal Education, Northern Regional Nonformal Education Center, printed by the Educational Services Section, NRNFEC, 1981.

The Hill Areas Education Project, Dept. of Nonformal Education, Ministry of Education and Dept. of Public Welfare, Ministry of Interior, Northern Regional NFE Center, 1982.

Hill-Tribe Sub-Committee for Policy and Planning, Hill-Tribes Development Plan for the Period of the 5th National Economic and Social Development Plan (1982-1986), Document No. 11, mimeo, undated.

Hill Areas Education Project Evaluation Plan (new), mimeo, undated.

Hill Areas Education Project Progress and Current Status Report, 1 April 1980 - 31 July 1981, Northern Region NFE Center, Operations Division, Dept. of Nonformal Education, Ministry of Education, mimeo, undated.

Hill Areas Education Project Progress and Current Status Report, 1 August 1981 - 31 October 1981, Northern Region NFE Center, Operations Division, Dept. of Nonformal Education, Ministry of Education, mimeo, undated.

Hill Areas Education Project Progress and Current Status Report, 1 November 1981 - 31 January 1982, Northern Region NFE Center,

Operations Division, Dept. of Nonformal Education, Ministry of Education, mimeo, undated.

Hill Areas Education Project Progress and Current Status Report,

1 February 1982 - 30 April 1982, Northern Regional NFE Center, Operations Division, Dept. of Nonformal Education, Ministry of Education, mimeo, undated.

Hill Areas Education Project Implementation Plan, Transition Period

FY 82, NRNFEC, mimeo, undated.

HAE Operations Plan - Final 3 Years, NRNFEC, mimeo, undated.

PROJECT PAPER, Thailand - Hill Areas Education, 493-0297,

USAID/Thailand, March 1980.

Nakabutr, Anek, Analytical Observations on the Hill Tribes Functional Literacy Program, (February 1979).

Paireepinath, Lekha and Kampe, Ken, Hill Tribes Project: Report on Follow-up Meeting on Year 1 Activities, (April 1978).

Jananiraqanit, Damri and Chanyaoate, Chanida, Hill Tribes Integrated Nonformal Education Project: Report on Year II Activities (March 1979).

Race, Jeffrey, "The War in Northern Thailand," Modern Asian Studies, Vol. 8, No. 1, January 1974.

Durrenberger E. Paul, "Understanding a Misunderstanding: Thai-Lisu Relations in Northern Thailand," Anthropological Quarterly, Vol. 49, No. 2, April 1975.

Durrenberger E. Paul, "Law and Authority in a Lisu Village," Journal of Anthropological Research, Vol. 32, No. 4 Winter 1974.

Durrenberger E. Paul, "Lisu" in The Hill Tribes of Thailand, R. Cooper, ed "in press)

- Durrenberger, E. Paul, "Rice Production in a Lisu Village,"  
Journal of Southeast Asian Studies, Vol X, No. 1, March 1979
- Durrenberger, E. Paul, "The Regional Context of the Economy of  
a Lisu Village in Northern Thailand," Southeast Asia  
Vol III, No. 1, Winter 1974.
- Bernard, Anne K., and Armstrong, Gregory, "Implementing an  
Educational Philosophy: 'Kit pen' in Thailand,"  
Convergence, Vol. XII, No. 4, 1979.

## 5.5 The Evaluation Team

Members of the evaluation team, assembled by Creative Associates, Inc., included Dr. Thomas M. Olson, of the International Institute for Rural Reconstruction in the Philippines; Dr. Scott F. McIlabb, of the University of Iowa; and Dr. George H. Axinn, of Michigan State University.

Dr. Axinn, who served as Team Leader, is Professor of Agricultural Economics and Adjunct Professor of Non-Formal Education. He also serves as Assistant Dean of International Studies and Programs at his university, as Associate Coordinator of the Center for Advanced Study of International Development, and as Chairman of the Farming Systems Research Group. He has worked in non-formal education as field staff, as trainer, as consultant, and as evaluator in the U.S. A. and in such other countries as Thailand, Nepal, Nigeria, Kenya, Malawi, India, United Kingdom, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Taiwan. Other evaluations of rural NFE projects which he has conducted were sponsored by such organizations as the World Bank, the Ford Foundation, the Kellogg Foundation, and the U.S. Agency for International Development. He is the author of two books on this subject and many papers and articles.

Dr. McIlabb is an Assistant Professor in the College of Education at the University of Iowa, teaching courses in comparative/international education. He has spent five years in Thailand, three as a Peace Corps instructor in the Economics Faculty at Thammasat University and two as a researcher conducting doctoral research on the Mae Klone Integrated Rural Development program which was based at Thammasat. His continuing research interests include the politics of foreign aid, and the education of Indochinese Refugees in the U.S.A.

Dr. Olson is the Director of Sectoral Operational Research at the

International Institute of Rural Reconstruction, a private, not-for-profit development organization registered in the U.S. with field operations in the Philippines. He has lived in the Philippines for the past four years, and earlier lived in Thailand as a Peace Corps Volunteer for about four years. His work centers on village-level research, especially on nonformal educational techniques for group development and problem solving.