

Mechanisms of Implementing the CGPP Activities after January 2007

I. Introduction

Community participation in education is one of the strategies promoted to achieve the goals of the Ethiopian Education Sector Development Program (ESDP). The Ministry of Education (August 2002) *Directive for Educational Management, Organization, Community Participation & Finance* ("Blue Book") states that participation intends to allow the community, especially parents, to fully and actively be involved in education administration, mobilizing financial resources and the overall activities of schools.

In accordance with the directives in the Blue Book, Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs) and Education and Training Management Boards (ETMBs) have been established at school and kebele levels for the management of schools. Communities are making considerable contributions for the construction, expansion, and rehabilitation of schools all over Ethiopia.

The USAID Basic Education Strategic Objective II (BESO II) Community-Government Partnership Program (CGPP) Cooperative Agreements with the three implementing partners, Save the Children-U.S. (SCF/U.S), Tigray Development Association (TDA), and World Learning Inc (WLI), will come to an end in January 2007. Therefore, in this paper, materials from the Blue Book, the BESO II CGPP mid-term evaluation and implementation documents, study on Community Participation in Primary Education: Education Sector JRM 2005, and other relevant materials are intensively treated to provide USAID with information and analysis that will help to make decisions related to the design and implementation mechanism for continuing the CGPP beyond January 2007.

II. The Blue Book

Inspired by the accomplishments of the Community School Grants/Activity Program (CSGP/CSAP) implemented in Tigray region and Southern Nation Nationalities and People's Region (SNNPR) during BESO I, the MOE published a guideline to facilitate community participation. The Blue Book states that the main principle of the educational system is to realize decentralized system. The school committees and the woreda education and training leadership boards that had been established to facilitate the community participation had not been found to be successful in their activities. Some of the reasons that lead to the failure of their activities were the limitation and lack of transparency in the objectives around which School Management Committees (SMCs) and boards had been established, lack of specificity in the responsibility and duties of these committees, they had not been given authority, and they had weak ties and connections with the schools.

After the political decentralization and the establishment of national regional governments in Ethiopia, the principle of decentralized operation has become the hallmark of the Ethiopian educational management. Under the Ethiopia constitution, every national regional government has the right to administer its own region. Proclamation No. 4/95 specifically delineates the division of

power and responsibility between the federal government and the governments of the regional states. Since 2002, efforts have been made to improve upon the previous failures in terms of organization. The kebele and woreda ETMBs and the PTAs have been established on a new basis. Among the items that have been improved are selecting the members of education and training board members at kebele and woreda levels from among the community, giving them the authority to decide on major educational issues, giving the right to the PTA, and the school director to improve the disciplinary situation in the schools, to improve the parent-teacher relationship and play a role in solving problems within the school.

Below, the composition, duties and responsibilities, line of accountability of KETMB and PTA; as well as use and handling of school finance are explained.

Kebele Educational and Training Management Board

Since rural schools are situated at longer distances from woreda centers, decisions requiring counseling between the ETMBs and that of leading woreda education management bodies have been hard to come by. Meetings could not be held pretty often and hence, the relationship between the two bodies could not be productive. To solve this problem, it has been found essential to establish an ETMB at the kebele level.

The establishment of the KETMB has made it possible to mobilize the efforts of the local community to solve problems faced by the schools. This helps the schools to get faster decision to their problems at close range. In addition, KETMBs help children, youngsters and adults who, for different reasons, did not get the chance to attend formal education programs to get the opportunity for education; help women who, because of cultural influence or other reasons are not sent to school to come to school as well as to be assisted not to drop out of school. Furthermore, KETMBs help the efforts of opening up and expanding private schools.

The members of the kebele educational training management board are

- Representative of the kebele administration Chairperson
- Director of the school Member & Secretary
- Three parents from PTA members Member
- Representatives of women and youth associations... Members
- Representative of the teachers association of schools in the kebele... Member

- If one school is serving more than one kebele, people representing the different kebles can be represented in the KETMB;
- If there is a feeling that some personalities within the woreda should have been included, they could be included in the board;
- In a woreda in which technical and vocational schools are located, a representative of the production and service sectors will be a member of the board.

The KETMB is accountable to the kebele council where the school is found. The KETMB's period in office is the same as that of the kebele council. If, at any time, the community feels that it should

change or recall its representatives, it can do so. The KETMB has the following duties and responsibilities:

- adopt the yearly plan and budget of schools and follow its implementation;
- implement and follow-up the expansion of formal and non-formal education together with the relevant bodies;
- devise ways and means by which schools could expand their internal incomes and follow-up its implementation;
- undertake an awareness development work within the community so that school age children come to school without interruptions;
- support extra-curriculum education activities that can strongly support the teaching-learning process;
- monitor the proper upkeep of school property and see to it that it is put to be used for educational work;
- supervise and control the school director, teachers as well as other school personnel in managing the teaching-learning process;
- plan, coordinate and implement mechanisms by which the community supports the construction and expansion of schools, and mobilizes financial and technical support for educational activities;
- study and solve problems faced by teachers, such as housing problem, by mobilizing the local community so that teachers would love their profession and hence could stay at their assignment for longer periods of time;
- decide on petitions presented by teachers when decisions of school director regarding teachers who are alleged not to have properly executed their duties are appealed;
- pass a decision and present a motion to the woreda ETMB regarding the case of a school director who failed to perform his/her duties;
- pass a decision on the promotion of teachers when the case is supported and presented by the school director;
- review and adopt quarterly implementation report of schools;
- get the necessary teachers and other employees hired as per the requirement of each school;
- enable functioning of newly built schools by community;
- coordinate local community contribution in finance, material and labor for the purpose of enhancing the capacity of schools;
- encourage the efforts of school income generating activities;
- put up a criteria to select locations for building schools and follow-up its implementation when the woreda budget for school construction are assigned to the kebele by government;
- prepare a plan for the prevention and control of HIV/AIDS; and actively work by mobilizing those forces that support its implementation;
- undertake other duties that strengthen educational activities in the kebele.

The organizational set-up described above are in most cases, useful to rural areas. Urban areas organized under municipalities should establish municipal ETMBs instead of woreda ETMBs. The structure and functions of the municipal ETMB is similar to that of the woreda.

In big cities like Addis Ababa, where there could be more than one municipalities or sub-municipalities, they shall have their ETMB. Their structure and function is similar to that of the woreda ETMB.

Parent-Teacher Association

The new education structure includes the concept of the PTA. The PTA has a greater contribution in educational and administrative matters in every school. It plays a facilitation role to

- enhance the participation of the community in educational activities by strengthening the relationship between parents and the school;
- make schools conducive to teaching-learning;
- enable teachers to closely observe the problems faced by students and provide adequate psychological and academic support; and help the relationship between teachers and students be based on disciplinary and educational grounds;

Members of the parent-teacher association are

- A parent chosen by the parent teacher congress Chairperson
- Two teachers (one male one female) chosen
by the parent-teacher congress..... Members
- Up to four representatives of parents..... Members

The number of PTA members depends on the number of teachers in the given school. The parent-teacher ratio must however be 2:1. Whenever it is necessary, teachers, unit leaders and school director would be present in PTA meetings and parent-teacher congresses as resource persons and hence give necessary explanations.

The PTA is accountable to the parents and teachers congress; its time in office is three years. Nevertheless, when the congress deems it necessary, it can at any time, change or dismisses its members. PTA has the following functions:

- instill in the students an upright ethics;
- make sure that teachers are correctly performing their duty;
- advise and improve teachers who do not properly fulfill their responsibility; identify those that do not heed to advice and forward them to the school director together with a reprimand motion;
- advise and improve any school director who does not properly discharge his/her professional responsibility; when found not heeding to advice, pass the case over to the KETMB;
- if the issue of lack of discipline by teachers and other staff can not get resolution within the school, present the issue to the KETMB for a speedy solution;
- ensure that teachers respect students' right to ask and to know;
- monitor the proper execution of the school program in accordance with plan, and give support to its execution;
- advise and criticize those students with disciplinary problems and present a motion to the school director to penalize and dismiss those students that can no more be advised, and follow-up its implementation;

- with the school management and the ETMB coordinate the participation of parents and enhance school income generating activities;
- evaluate the role of parents in the PTA in the assessment of teachers;
- give awards, in kind or in cash, to teachers and other school members whose performance has become a role model for others;
- strengthen the relationship between the school and the parents and find solutions to problems that need to be solved together with the school director, parents and the KETMB;
- prepare work plans, in line with their duties and responsibilities, for each academic year, and submit it to the school director for implementation and follow its implementation;
- encourage students not to drop out of school; find solutions with the parents of students who have dropped out of school to bring them back to school;
- comment on the preparation of school annual plans, methods of their implementation, and on the preparation of school internal rules and regulations;
- prepare an implementation plan for the functions enumerated above; at the beginning of each year get the plan approved by the parent-teacher congress; present progress report at the middle and at the end of the year.

Use and Handling of School Finance

The decentralized economic policy adopted in the country has necessitated the full empowerment of woredas to wield power over their resource. This power wielding empowerment applies for the latitude conferred upon the woreda to plan and implement the budget in its own way. The Woreda Education Office (WEO) budget design starts from the school.

The financial income of a given school consists of state provided block grant, school generated income and community provided resource in the form of grants and support. The need to have a clear quantification of the woreda resource and resource utilization makes it imperative that the year-end reporting should account not only for the budgeted but also for the extra-budget resource the school utilized in the course of the year. The report also includes the monetized form of labor and material the community chips in. The task of ensuring that an adequate financial management and expenditure is firmly in place is that of the joint endeavor of the school director, school accountant and the financial office.

Based on the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MOFED) Budget Reform Design Manual, a budget plan preparation has three functions: a) unit cost estimate; b) program review: the review of the Fiscal Year's mid-term performance provides workable data for the development of the next year's budget; and c) work plan development in which the plan is developed in a way that would include new tasks and other tasks to be carried forward to the new fiscal year.

The WEO and schools prepare their budget in the period between September 30 and March 15. The budget design is implemented as follows: a) schools complete their Work Plan Development within the prescribed ceiling and submit it to the WEO; b) The WEO, verifying that the school budget is within the prescribed ceiling, compiles the woreda budget and it submits to the Woreda

Council; and c) The Council, after due review, approves the annual budget of the schools under its jurisdiction.

The WEOs, after appropriate utilization of the budget, report to the executive unit above them immediately. The report takes the following shape: a) schools complete their reports and have them reviewed under the chairmanship of the KETMB and finally submit it to the WEO as Quarterly Report, five days after completion of the work; b) The WEO prepares its own report (based on the schools' and its own report) and first have it reviewed under the chairmanship of the Woreda ETMB before it is submitted to Woreda Council, The Zone Council and the Regional State Education Bureau for approval, 15 days after the start of the Fiscal Year Quarter. Reports are submitted every quarter as well as yearly; c) One month after the start of the FY Quarter, the Regional State Education Bureau (RSEB), compiling the reports submitted to it by the WEO, submits a report on the finance utilization aspect of the education to the Regional State Council and to the Regional Bureau of Finance and Economic Development (BOFED); and d) The Regional BOFED in turn compile a financial report and submits it to the federal MOFED.

According to the Blue Book, woreda auditing would be hardened into a standard institution to ensure that planned tasks and financial utilization are in accordance with financial rules and regulations. Consequently, the WEO auditor makes sure that the woreda education finance is properly utilized through an audit review at the end of every FY Quarter. The next round of auditing is that of the Woreda Office of Finance and Economic Development (WOFED) which is carried out twice a year in mid-term and year-end to ensure that auditing is strictly implemented. The last round is that of the Regional Audit which takes place at the end of the year to ensure that auditing is strictly implemented. This procedure is carried out systematically and in a sustained fashion. Following the audit report, where necessary, rectification measure is taken at all levels of the public mechanism. Since the Block Grant management is a new phenomenon, the finance management and auditing aspect adheres to the woreda finance management procedure.

Ideally, procurement procedure of services and materials for school conforms to state Procurement Procedure. However, if creditors or donors insist that it be done otherwise, obviously the procedure they had agreed in their negotiation with the government, prevails. Procurement requisition that involves huge volume, for the woreda schools, is done by the woreda as this type of purchase would benefit from discount. Petty procurement is of course left to the school submitting the requisition. In view of the diversity of educational organization at woreda, zone and regional levels, procurement committees are organized accordingly.

III. Implementation of BESO I and BESO II/CGPP

The Basic Education System Overhaul I (BESO I) was a seven-year (1994-2001) cooperative effort of the GFDRE and USAID to improve the quality and gender equity of primary education in Ethiopia. The BESO I implementing partners were Academy for Educational Development (AED), Tigray Development Association (TDA), and World Learning Inc (WLI). The Community School Grants/Activity Program (CSGP/CSAP) was one component of BESO I and was implemented in Tigray region and Southern Nation Nationalities and People's Region (SNNPR) in partnership with regional and lower level government structure staff. Its aim was strengthening the capacity of School Management Committees (SMCs) to enable them manage their own educational

development. TDA implemented the CSGP in Tigray region and WLI implemented the CSAP in SNNPR. Under a Federal restructuring and decentralization of education in Ethiopia in mid 2002 (after the CGPP design had been concluded and implementation had begun), SMCs were disbanded and replaced by newly established Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs) and Kebele Education and Training Management Boards (KETMBs) at the community level.

The objective of BESO II (2002-2007) is similar to that of BESO I: Enhance Quality and Equity in Primary Education. In general, “quality” refers to the efficacy of the teaching and learning process, and “equity” refers to the special needs of underserved and disadvantaged populations with specific reference to girls and pastoralist populations. During BESO II, there are different contractors and grantees. The principal ones are AED, Pact, Save the Children-US (SCF/US), TDA, and WLI. The contractor, AED, works to improve teachers’ capacity and teaching-learning methods, strengthening efficiency of educational management, distribution and logistics of educational materials, enhancing personal and professional support for women teachers, and improving monitoring and evaluation. Pact is working on Non-formal Primary Education Program for disadvantaged children and adults, including pastoralists and Muslims. The 5-year three Cooperative Agreements (CAs) were signed in February 2002 with the three Community Government Partnership Program (CGPP) implementing partners (IPs): SCF/US, TDA, and WLI. During BESO II, USAID has expanded its support with the CGPP from two regions to eight.

Save the Children-U.S.(SCF/U.S) is implementing BESO II/CGPP in Afar, Gambella, Oromiya and Somali regions; TDA in Tigray region; and WLI in Amhara, Benishangul-Gumuz and SNNP regions. The CGPP targets 3,700 primary schools out of the over 13,000 primary schools in the country. The broader CGPP implementation strategy seeks to improve quality and equity in project primary schools through strengthening local capacities at school, community and decentralized government levels to enable them manage the development of their schools. In addition, the BESO II/CGPP program supports flexible education for children in disadvantaged circumstances.

CGPP is being accomplished through newly established PTAs, KETMBs, and increased participation at the school level by parents, community members, and other external government and non-government bodies. However, CGPP does not provide pedagogical support (curriculum, textbooks, in-service teacher training, etc) to individual schools or government agencies. Nor does it provide institutional-strengthening support for educational administration (e.g. in areas such as personnel management, etc.).

BESO II CGPP developed a set of indicators to measure the impact of the project. The assumption is that this set of indicators would address the extent to which the *Community Government Partnership is strengthened and hence Quality and Equity in primary education system enhanced* as a result of Implementing Partners’ (IPs) intervention.

The four main indicators of CGPP under the three Intermediate Results (IRs) are:

- IR Indicator 3.1: percent of CGPP schools with dropout rate for grades 1-4 below the regional average.

- IR Indicator 3.2a: percent of educational issues raised by PTAs, KETMBs and GACs annually to the community and/or the local government of which two are related to quality and equity issues;
- IR Indicator 3.2b: percent of educational issues raised by PTAs that are responded to by local government and/or communities;
- IR Indicator 3.3: percent of PTAs that have taken actions of which 50% are related to equity and quality.

Training program for SDAs, woreda education officials, PTAs, KETMBs, GACs, and school directors are the core elements of CGPP. IPs work with the decentralized education institutions- from the Regional State Education Bureaus to schools and communities through the KETMBs and PTAs. School Incentive Awards (SIAs) are given to schools. SDAs communicate with WEO, PTA and KETMB members as well as other community level institutions for better results. Assigning SDAs helps to develop effective mechanisms for working jointly to: assess educational needs, establish priorities, develop strategies, mobilize resources, and undertake actions that ensure quality and equity in primary education.

The basic tasks of the IPs are developing materials for training and a guideline that enhance community participation in education, conducting woreda orientation workshop, selecting schools for the project, recruiting SDAs and providing them with trainings, conducting school orientation workshop, and finance the project with the USAID-fund. SIAs motivate community towards school improvement project through its full participation; and the SDAs are the key persons in the work of the education improvement through community participation.

Duties and Responsibilities of School Development Agents

The SDAs are experienced primary school teachers and/or school directors who have been seconded by the WEO to implement the BESO II CGPP at school and woreda levels. SDAs support community's capacity building geared towards enabling communities to plan, coordinate, manage, mobilize resources, monitor and evaluate educational activities at school level. This is mainly done through training and the SDAs working directly with schools and local communities.

The SDAs are responsible for carrying out the following duties:

- Inform the community, the school and other bodies about the goal, objectives, strategies and programs of BESO II CGPP;
- Collect, organize and report school and community baseline data;
- Give technical support to the PTA, KETMB and schools to identify and prioritize school problem;
- Assess potential community resources for supporting school improvement initiatives and mobilize the community to commit resources for school improvement;
- Give technical support to PTA, KETMB and school to develop school strategic plans, action plans and simple project proposals, to write grant proposals and make the community participate in school improvement initiative;
- Give technical support in instituting proper financial record-keeping, reporting and material management;

- Give technical support in raising school participation of all students and especially that of girls in their enrollment, retention and academic success in primary education;
- Establish a strong relationship between the school and the community served by the school;
- Analyze school calendars and children's attendance in relation to the demand for child labor in different seasons within the school catchments area and;
- Manage and run the BESO II CGPP in schools and woredas;
- Analyze the difference before and after implementation of CGPP in target schools using baseline and other data;
- Conduct meetings with schools, PTAs, KETMB and parents and provide feedback to project office on changes and progresses made;
- Submit monthly and quarterly reports to the IP's Field Coordinator; and attend monthly meetings with the SDAs in other zones to share information and to solve problems;
- Follow up implementation of BESO II CGPP, for improvement of quality and equity of primary education in their woreda;
- Communicate with Woreda Education Office, Woreda Administration and other NGOs for effective implementation of CGPP.

School Incentive Award

The CGPP School Incentive Award (SIA) is given to CGPP schools upon meeting structured criteria in phases. These criteria are intended to stimulate community and parental participation to improve quality and equity in education. Schools receive SIA based on set criteria and the SIA to encourage parental and community members' continuous engagement in school improvement activities.

The purpose of setting the SIA criteria is to:

- Stimulate community and parental involvement and support for schools, children and related CGPP project goals;
- Improve quality and equity in education through improvement of facilities and school resources;
- Strengthen communities by building internal decision making capacity related to education;
- Promote transparency and effective management of community funds and other resources; and
- Strengthen relations between the community and local government.

BESO II CGPP schools receive three phases of School Incentive Awards upon meeting the conditions set. Almost all CGPP schools receive first and second phase SIAs. But, the third phase SIA is provided to schools on a competitive basis.

The primary objective of the phase I SIA is to establish the relationship between the CGPP project (represented by the SDA), local government including the Kebele and Woreda officials, the school, parents, and community members. The community is expected to understand the goals of the project, the problems of the school and their role in improving the conditions of teaching-

learning process. In addition, they are expected to establish the basic mechanisms, structures and procedures necessary to implement the project at the community level.

To receive the first phase SIA, the KETMB and PTA are required to meet the following criteria:

- The KETMB and/or PTA identifies and prioritizes major school problems;
- The KETMB and/or the PTA hosts or conducts community meetings/workshops to launch the project in collaboration with the SDA assigned to the community;
- The KETMB and/or PTA generate resources for their project from the wider community (encouraging the wider community to commit or pledge resources including labor, materials and/or cash);
- The KETMB and/or PTA prepare a strategic plan for school development and select the activity to be completed during the first phase of the project. This includes a brief project description, budget; and timeline for completion;
- The KETMB and/or PTA begin implementing the approved project with the resources generated from the community before the SIA is distributed;
- The KETMB, PTA and school staff (school director and teachers) facilitate the collection of baseline data for the project;
- The KETMB and/or PTA discuss plans to give support for the education of girls including the need to establish a formal Girls' Advisory Committee (GAC) in accordance with IPs' guidelines;
- The KETMB and/or PTA begin discussion of a School-Community Sustainability plan to ensure continued support for the school;
- The first level project plan is reviewed and approved by the appropriate authority (PTA or KETMB). The appropriate authority signs a SIA agreement with the IPs obligating the KETMB and PTA to the terms stated; and
- The KETMB and/or PTA establish record keeping and financial management procedures in accordance with IPs' project guidelines.

Phase II SIA is designed to encourage schools to continue their efforts to improve the quality of education and gender equity beyond infrastructure development. Important emphasis is placed on building the capacity of the KETMB and PTA in school management and leadership, establishing programs that sustain quality and equity at the school level and enhance long-term sustainability for the community government partnership in support of education.

Phase III SIA is provided on a competitive basis. This means that approximately two-thirds of participating schools will receive an award based on the quality of their planning for the third phase as well as the quality of the progress that they have already made in implementing the first two phases of the program. This especially relates to meeting goals of quality and access, effective implementation and sustainability.

Community support for school should go beyond the physical infrastructure development and focus on improving educational quality in different ways. Such as improving the quality of learning and teaching materials, blackboards, improvement in the use of reading rooms, improvements in parent-school relations, developing strategies to improve girls' achievement and success. The criteria suggest possibilities but do not necessarily state the specific activity.

Each SDA closely observes the school environment, meet with teachers, students and discuss with PTA and KETMB and the community on the problems of the school, identify problems related to the criteria and prioritize problems and suggest solutions for them based on assessing the impact of the problem on education quality and equity.

Committees established at the woreda and regional levels manage the phase III SIA competition. The Woreda Selection Committee selects eligible schools (based on their proposals and accomplishments) and forwards them with justification to the regional level. Members of the Woreda Selection Committee include: Woreda Capacity Building Officer, Woreda Education Office Head, Woreda Women's Affairs Head, and School Development Agent working with the school.

Similarly, the Regional Selection Committee is responsible for approving proposals forwarded by different Woreda Selection Committees. Members of the regional selection committee are the Head/Deputy Head of Regional State Education Bureau, RSEB Formal and Non-formal Education Unit Head, and IP's Regional Office Director or IP's Head Office staff.

Girls' Advisory Committees

A Girls Advisory Committee (GAC) works to transform the whole community as a supportive agency for girls; GACs work to create a more positive environment for girls at home and at school by changing behavioral patterns through awareness raising training and by implementing a wide range of projects, each with a specific goal that is designed to (a) enable girls to stay in school, (b) reduce the likelihood that girls will drop out, and (c) encourage girls to return to school if they drop out. GACs recognize that a girl's education benefits the entire community and that it is worth the effort to educate girls, parents and community members in the individual, household, and societal benefit from girls having greater opportunities to stay in school and learn.

GACs have several variations but common elements include participation by a number of female students (7-10) along with a female teacher who serves as a chairperson and an advisor, other female teachers, and depending on the communities, one or two mothers. Some GACs also have male teacher and student members. The students serve as linkages to the whole school population and especially girls, to report on issues of concern (early marriage, abductions, harassments, etc) to them. A vital element of the success of a GAC is that it focuses on the specific needs of girls of varying ages at the specific school. It is this body, especially through the female teacher advisor or specific girls that information about serious threats to the health and safety of girls is reported to the School Director and the PTA. The PTA decides on courses of action that may lead to discussions with community elders, parents, religious leaders and the government authorities. In addition, a broad range of activities to support girls is undertaken by GACs.

Girls' Advisory Committees (GACs) function to:

- create an environment conducive to discuss and solve problems that girls face at home, in school, and in the community;
- create a school environment where information on sexual abuse, harassment, gender discrimination, reproductive health, and sexually transmitted diseases are discussed

openly and are carefully addressed in the context of the girl's age and understanding;

- assist girls in participating fully in schooling by making sure they attend regularly and strive to achieve to their full potential;
- create a school environment where girls are treated equally to boys in all ways and are given the same opportunities;
- increase awareness among administrative bodies, parents and community members about the issues girls face and to encourage their positive and active involvement in the successful participation of girls in schooling;
- arrange tutorial classes for girls;
- contact Woreda Police, Women's Affairs, and Justice Office to get governmental support for problems that require legal actions.

Non-formal Education

CGPP has been supporting local NGOs and WEO to run non-formal education centers in woredas where flexible approaches to schooling might benefit children, especially girls in disadvantaged circumstances. CGPP has seven partner NGOs running NFE in 25 centers; and 17 NFE centers supported by WEO.

Budget for the Cooperative Agreements

The Cooperative Agreement (CA) initial budget for each IPs: Save the Children Federation, Inc. Tigray Development Association, and World Learning, Inc. is indicated in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Initial CA budget

No.	Cost Elements	SCF/U.S.	TDA	WLI
1	Program Costs ¹	\$3,378,723	\$410,284	\$4,522,680
2	Community grants	\$1,193,022	\$689,655	\$1,201,820
3	Procurement	\$265,761	\$78,089	\$334,380
4	Sub awards	\$1,591,594		\$1,007,044
5	Indirect Costs	\$820,900		\$1,184,076
6	Audit, Monitoring & Evaluation		\$29,172	
7	Operating Support Costs		\$138,777	
8	Capacity Building		\$154,023	
9	Total	\$7,250,000	\$1,500,000	\$8,250,000

The aforementioned cooperative agreements have non-federal contributions: 18.7% of SCF, 20% of TDA, and 23% of WLI total cost of their cooperative agreements. The community grants of SCF, TDA and WLI are 16.46%, 46% and 14.57% of the total cost of their agreements, respectively. About \$3,057,220 (42.17%) of the SCF budget, and \$2,541,560 (30.81%) of WLI and \$280,745 (10.98%) of

¹ Program costs includes salaries, fringe benefits, travel and transportation, allowances and short term consultant salaries, other direct costs like office rents, communications, utilities, vehicle maintenance and repair, insurance, training and workshops, A133 audit, etc.

TDA budget are being used for direct labor and fringe benefits (excluding per diem and in-country and international travel).

SCF has two international partner NGOs: Creative Associates International, Inc. and CARE International. SCF and WLI use home office technical backstopping and have expatriate staff; but TDA doesn't. SCF has Ethiopia Field Office staff, Headquarter staff, zonal (Zonal Coordinators) and woreda office (SDAs) staff; TDA has head office and woreda office (SDAs) staff; whereas WLI has Home Office staff, Field Office staff, regional, zonal (Zonal Coordinators), and woreda offices (SDAs) staff.

Table 2: Expatriate staff expenses

Cost Elements	SCF/U.S.	TDA	WLI
Direct Labor			
a. International staff	\$703,783		\$397,845
b. Field Office/Home Office Staff	\$37,956		\$108,907
Fringe benefits and allowances (expatriate staff)	\$546,905		\$116,553
Travel and per diem	\$41,846 ²		\$77,893
International consultants (contractual)	\$52,899		\$59,241
Sub-agreement for Int'l NGOs	\$2,886,567		
a. CARE	\$1,433,026		
b. CAII	\$1,453,540		
Total	\$4,278,956		\$760,439
% of total CA	28.03		9.22

Out of the CARE's \$1,433,026 sub-agreement budget, \$225,970 is used for expatriate staff; and out of the CAII's \$1,453,540 sub-agreement budget more than \$422,845 is used for expatriate staff. At a minimum, 28.03% of SCF's budget and about 9.22% of WLI's budget are used for expatriate staff expenses; whereas TDA has no expenses for expatriate staff.

In March 2003, USAID amended the CAs to implement Complementary Drought Assistance (CDA) Program in BESO II which provided \$5,394,000.00 to the recipients, by realigning the Non-Project Assistance Program, to intervene in drought affected areas. Currently, the total revised budget for each IPs is indicated below in Table 3.

Table 3: Revised budget for CGPP plus CDA

No.	Cost Elements	SCF/U.S.	TDA	WLI
1.	Program Costs	\$3,930,025	\$494,127	\$4,757,375
2.	Community grants	\$933,025	\$689,655	\$2,839,194
3.	Procurement	\$296,381	\$334,584	\$316,623
4.	Sub awards	\$4,779,747		\$25,061
5.	Indirect Costs	\$970,437		\$1,402,599
6.	Monitoring and Evaluation		\$33,349	

² This is excluding in-country travel expense for international staff

7.	Operating support cost		\$208,540	
8.	Capacity building		\$770,375	
9.	Summer Internship		\$26,139	
10.	Total	\$10,909,615	\$2,556,769	\$9,340,852

The community grants of the three IPs after CDA budget is included are 10.84%, 27% and 30.4% of SCF, TDA and WLI total cost of the revised agreements respectively. Since items that should have been recorded under procurement are recorded under community grants, WLI's community grants has become 30.4% of the total budget.

The total amount of Community Grants to be disbursed by SCF throughout the lifetime of the project will be around \$1,183,000. The noticed decrease in the Community Grants element in Table 3 is due to the fact that the Community Grants disbursed through CARE International (around \$250,000 total in Community Grants) has been placed in the Sub Awards element.

IV. The CGPP mid-term evaluation

The CGPP mid-term evaluation focused on five regions: Afar, Amhara, Oromiya, SNNPR, and Tigray. In the field, 3 Regional State Education Bureaus (RSEBs), 10 Woredas (districts), 20 Formal Schools, 1 Alternative Basic Education Center, 20 PTAs/KETMBs, 20 Girls' Advisory Committees (GACs), 3 Regional Project Offices, 5 Zone Coordinators (ZC), 12 School Development Agents/Coordinators (SDAs/SDCs), and 4 other participants, a total of 98 were interviewed over a course of two weeks. Data was also collected from the head offices of the IPs, USAID and host government counterparts. Following are lessons learned, challenges of the CGPP, and recommendations of the mid-term evaluation.

Lessons Learned

The lessons learned over the course of the two and a half years of CGPP implementation are many and varied. In all schools visited, communities are strengthening their ownership of the schools; PTAs/KETMBs are managing the finance of the schools; communities are raising funds to match and go beyond the amounts provided by the CGPP's School Incentive Awards (SIAs); girls' enrollment is increasing and dropouts are decreasing; and schools have or are creating sustainability plans to be implemented as the project ends.

Significant variability in project approach among the IPs are observed: SIA size and competitive process, project schools graduation, zone coordination, sustainability aspects, gender resources, M&E systems and information flow, and PTA/KETMB management of financial resources. Each IP has different annual targets it seeks to meet in accordance with the Intermediate Result (IR) indicators.

IPs have developed a significant amount of training materials to train all levels of project participant, from woredas to schools and field staff. Community results of the schools visited are impressive. For the SIAs the CGPP granted to school PTAs/KETMBs, communities leveraged up to four times the SIA for use in the improvement of school quality and equity. Each school-community comes together to identify and prioritize problems, develop action plan, mobilize

resources, implement and evaluate its achievements at the end. The activities, though based on each school's needs, include construction of classrooms, latrines, pedagogical centers, libraries, and in some cases addressing socio-economic problems of girls to enable them to continue schooling and enhance enrolment.

Religious and legal institutions have supported changes on gender issues resulting in more support by communities to girls' education. The foundation for community resiliency has been established through the CGPP. Through increased focus on the schools and the education needs of children, communities have been empowered to take actions and make decision on their children's and their school's behalf. This new, self-help mentality has given community members the know-how to address their own problems and to take actions to resolve them. CGPP has helped establish a democratic process resulting in increased voice by community leaders for their rights, thus demanding services from local government bodies. This grassroots-driven process is increasing governmental accountability to the people it is supposed to serve. This is the essence of the Community-Government partnership that the project seeks to create. PTAs/KETMBs, along with community members, have raised many issues with the woredas.

Selected woreda officials have received training through a Training of Trainers approach in which they are equipped to provide training to PTAs/KETMBs.

Challenges

Despite all of the above successes, there are a number of challenges the CGPP has to overcome. Girls Advisory Committees (GACs), established through the CGPP initiative to provide support to girls, require more training. Training programs for SDAs and PTAs need to be better organized and be given in a sustaining and developmental manner, with training materials readily available.

External factors have interfered with the implementation of the CGPP, with the most intrusive being the high turnover of KETMB Chairs, School Directors, teachers, and government employees at the RSEB and district (woreda) levels. The high staff turnover at all levels has overburdened the CGPP staff since repeated training workshops were needed to be organized to bring new ones in tune with the project.

There are competing demands on the communities from different development partners. The demands from the communities on their time and resources have overstretched their ability and involvement in development work. The self-help burdens being placed on communities have implications for the sustainability of CGPP.

Although grant sizes vary with implementing partner, results in terms of community mobilization and contributions are similar; Graduation is not welcomed by schools because they do not wish to "go it alone"; even in Tigray, where 400 schools remain in the CGPP program for the full term of implementation.

ZCs serve a vital function in supervising, coordinating, and supporting the work of SDAs, and in providing them ongoing informal training. However, they have limited supervision and management expertise and little or no training in these areas.

Remoteness of SDAs from regional supervision and technical support has posed a setback to their work efficiency, effectiveness and morale.

Sustainability at the school level is fostered by a clear understanding of project principles and practices; at the woreda level it is fostered through the design and implementation of policy that integrates the principles and practices of CGPP into everyday work plans; at the RSEB level it is fostered by an understanding of the larger picture of how CGPP is creating an impact in school development and management. Since commitment demonstrated at each level varied, more must be done to produce sustainability.

SDAs are so overburdened with their regular work and data collection that the time they spend at schools providing technical assistance presents a challenge. Without appropriate transport to reach schools that are farther from the towns they reside, SDAs must walk as many as 30 kms to visit a school. This has presented a great challenge to the SDA in their efforts to build the capacity of PTAs/KETMBs.

External factors such as RSEB policy to downgrade schools (from grades 1-6 to grades 1-4) and end shifts has motivated communities to build grade 1-8 schools so that children don't have to walk any farther to attend grades 5-8. The apparent conflict between the perspectives of government and community in an environment of increased assertiveness from communities means that government must be prepared and able to dialogue with communities about these policies.

PTAs/KETMBs play an instrumental role in bottom-up planning and implementation of school improvement initiatives since they are linking communities to schools. PTAs/KETMBs have the know-how to mobilize communities, to identify problems, prioritize them, develop action plans to solve problems, and implement the plans. This process can be further strengthened with more capacity on participatory decision making and more consistent follow-up.

Summary of key issues in the CGPP mid-term evaluation

a) Variation in Project Design/Implementation

IPs variability in the management and utilization of resource has limited comparison of program effectiveness and results among IPs or across regions.

- TDA has continued to support BESO I schools through allocation of BESO II funds while WL and Save selected new schools under BESO II.
- The amount of grants available to each school is variable, and this determines the magnitude and quality of works the schools engaged in.
- While some schools have enjoyed the non-competitive process of getting the grant others had to work hard to be eligible for the grants.
- The timing of program graduation varies among IPs. The two year period adopted by WL is too short while lack of plan at TDA is unacceptable strategy.
- While WL and Save employed Zonal coordinator to backup SDAs work, TDA didn't.

b) Program Sustainability

Uncertainty over government commitment and lack of explicit plan for transferring responsibility has put program sustainability at risk.

- *There is no official agreement among stakeholders (IPs, Schools, RSEBs and Weredas) or plan to maintain the results of the program intervention areas, and to retain the services of SDAs in Tigray.*
- *Frequent turnover of staff at regional, 'wereda', and school levels resulted in interruption of program activities. Decelerate the momentum generated.*
- *A one off training or workshop on sustainability does not ensure sustainability. Refresher courses for existing staff and CGPP awareness and orientation to new staff do not exist.*

c) *Impact on Beneficiaries*

Insufficient training, shortage of training materials, lack of manuals or guidelines and shortage of funds limited to attain the anticipated capacity at all levels. Communities could not fully participate in the program as expected due to overstretched needs.

- *Transfer of core personnel (Principals, teachers, KETMB chairs) of the areas affected maintaining the skills and knowledge acquired through the program.*
- *New staff assume responsibility without orientation or training on CGPP activities*
- *Handouts on specific training materials were not available for future references*
- *GACs in most of the schools are overburdened with tasks unmatched with their skills, and are ineffective to bring about the required change. Neither training on gender nor a guideline or manual have been made available to undertake their responsibility.*

d) *Lack of focus on Monitoring and Evaluation Activities*

The data collection process is complex and difficult to generate information timely.

- *IPs collect data beyond IR or objectives overburdening SDAs responsibility*
- *Insufficient or lack of training on data collection and processing*
- *Logical linkage between data being collected and existing IRs or objectives has not been developed, and program attribution for the result is unclear.*
- *IPs do not provide feed back on information generated through their respective M&E system to SDAs and others in the loop.*

e) *Other Issues*

Besides the issues in a) to d) above, the following issues are mentioned in the document

- *The need for timely replacement of core IPs staff*
- *The need for reaching the remotest school (increase the number of SDA or transport facilities)*
- *Narrowing gaps in understanding of the CGPP program among regions, weredas, and Kebeles*
- *The need for information exchange among implementing partners*

CGPP mid-term Evaluation Recommendations

- Government agencies are making unrealistic demands on communities for their contributions, which may jeopardize the sustainability of CGPP activities on behalf of schools. Community

resources are being stretched to cover other sectoral development needs. The kebele is the coordination unit for these activities, and the KETMB chair is overextended. How the project can remain in the forefront of kebele administrators should be determined and an action should be taken on whatever is learned.

- Variability in government commitment threatens sustainability. Government agencies should be required to submit sustainability plans that include the future of the SDAs for the remainder of the project implementation period and three years after.
- Turnover rate among School Directors, teachers, KETMB chairs and others has created a gap in CGPP knowledge and expertise among new employees. Therefore, implementing partners should design and implement “refresher” or “catch-up” training, beginning with CGPP orientation, for all those new personnel who have not benefited from the first phase of training or who would like a refresher.
- Tremendous responsibility is placed upon the GAC and their ability to address girls’ problems in school, with parents, community members, and male teachers. In addition, GACs are expected to raise awareness and act as change agents on gender inequality and the harmful effects of traditional social structures and cultural practices. Therefore, a participatory and practical, rather than didactic and theoretical type of training program, should be designed for GACs to teach them how to counsel girls and address problems and barriers to girls education.
- CGPP activities in Schools should not end after two years, but after three years - when the school demonstrates its ability to generate its own action plans and resources.
- SDAs and ZCs serve a vital human resources and management function. However, SDA and ZC training is limited and needs to be expanded to reflect best practice in leadership/management and adult education methodologies.
- SDA training should begin with a two-week orientation that includes field experience, and then be updated at least quarterly with formal training to build their capacity for excellence.
- SDAs need to cover large geographic areas and therefore have to be provided with means of transport like motorcycles.
- The CGPP M&E systems are very complicated, though elegant, and there are significant problems with data collecting, encoding, and entering. IPs should simplify their data collection processes and instruments and then provide appropriate training to SDAs.
- Sub-IR indicators tell more about a school’s progress than some of the IRs; therefore M&E systems should track and report on all the Sub-IR indicators as well as the IR indicators.
- Woreda (district) Education Offices’ responses to issues raised by schools are either not readily forthcoming or are not given altogether. The CGPP has to provide the necessary capacity building and support to woredas to enable them to be more responsive.

- Insufficient materials are provided to workshop participants at all levels and to woreda officials. Hence, handouts on all topics covered in trainings should be provided to training participants; and a manual that describes the project and the role of the Woreda in the project during implementation and when the project is finished should be given to the Woreda Education Office Heads and Woreda Council members.
- Field-based gender training materials that can provide on-going training and capacity building to GACs to better enable them to address the difficult socio-cultural barriers faced by Ethiopian women and girls should be developed and given to GACs.
- IPs function best when they have the full contingent of professional staff. IPs need to ensure that vacant staff positions are filled in a timely manner so as not to disrupt project implementation.
- The BESO II TWG as the body providing oversight to all of BESO II can be more supportive and responsive to raise points on and discuss policy issues. The TWG should determine how best to approach other GFDRE agencies to reduce the amount of competition with CGPP activities for community contributions.

V. Study on Community Participation in Primary Education: Education Sector JRM 2005

The Education Annual Review Mission (ARM) 2004 and the Education Joint Review Mission (JRM) 2004 both recommended that a study be undertaken to assess the nature and scale of community participation, its impact on the community and on educational achievements. The study was initiated and commissioned by the education donor group

The objectives of the study were to explore community participation in governance of primary schools and contributions in cash and in kind to primary school building and other education-related inputs. The team of consultants had visited Amhara, Oromiya and SNNP regions. In consultation with the RSEB, one food secured and one food insecure woredas were selected in each region and a total of twelve primary schools in six woredas were selected for the survey. In each woreda, one urban primary school and one rural primary school were selected in consultation with the WEO where discussions were held with the communities, the PTAs and boards and also teachers. Guiding questions and checklists were used for discussions with various stakeholders of primary education. However, the number of woredas is only 6 out of more than 600 woredas in the country and that the findings of the study need to be interpreted cautiously. In addition, the analysis of the effects of community contributions on their livelihoods and the opportunity costs requires household level survey which was beyond the scope of this study. Therefore, the team has made estimations using the available quantitative and qualitative data.

A brief summary on implementation of the Blue Book, school block grant system, community contribution and the role of government, management of ABECs, sustainability issues, conclusions and recommendations of the study are explained below.

Implementation of the Blue Book

According to the study, implementation of the Blue Book on *Educational Management, Organization, Community Participation & Finance* has some limitations. Besides this, the book consists of some important issues that are not clearly addressed and need to be revisited in the future.

The school block grant system

Allocation of block grants for non-salary recurrent expenditures to schools by WOE is not uniformly implemented in the Amhara region. Some woredas do not allocate block grants to schools at all, whereas most do in accordance with the basic principles set out in the Blue Book.

As per the directives in the Blue Book, school block grant from woredas is calculated based on number of students. The ideal unit (per student) cost for first (1-4) and second (5-8) cycle primary school is Birr 10 and 15 (1USD = 8.67 Birr) per annum, respectively. But this has not been applied and it appears not realistic in the context of prevalent budget limitations. With the building of new schools and expansion of existing ones, hence increasing number of students, the rates applied per student have become lower and lower from year to year. For instance, in Bure woreda of West Gojam Zone (Amhara region), 51% of the woreda budget was allocated for education (only 49% of the woreda budget for all other sectors) but the block grant allocation for first cycle primary schools was calculated based on Birr 0.35 per student. According to the WEO, in FY 2003/04 (1996 E.C), it was Birr 1.20 for the same level. In FY 2004/05 (1997 E.C) the budget for Nefas Mewcha primary school in Lay Gaynt woreda of South Gonder Zone was calculated based on Birr 2.75 per student per annum. In SNNPR Alewo Arfe School, the block grant in FY 1997 was calculated based on Birr 1.75 per student. Similarly, in Oromia region, the WEO allocates very low amount of money as a block grant that cannot cover the running cost of the schools. In 1997 E.C., the amount of block grant was a flat rate of Birr 1.65 per student at all levels of schools in Boset woreda and Birr 3.00 in Hitossa woreda. Therefore, the schools had to generate additional resources from sales of school products such as hay and sometimes from community contributions.

The Blue Book was apprehensive of such possibilities and the consequences of under allocations. It states that it would be hardly possible to carry out educational activities, if the unit (per student) non-salary recurrent expenditure is below 75 percent, i.e. less than Birr 7.50 and Birr 11.25 for the first and second cycle primary education respectively. But this has been the case with all its implications. Schools suffer from budget shortages to run their activities and increasingly rely on community contributions and internal income sources. In the Amhara region woreda Education Offices reported that this has created problem in budgeting since schools tend to plan their activities and demand funds based on the number of students as instructed by the Blue Book.

Community contributions and the role of government

In the study, limitation in the implementation of the Blue Book is also observed with respect to consideration of community capacity in determining the role of government and community contribution. Although the Blue Book clearly spells out the roles and responsibilities between the government and communities, the government appears to be less successful in adhering to its responsibilities in terms of providing textbooks, furniture, teachers, etc to primary schools.

Actual and potential effects of community contribution on livelihoods and schooling especially in poorer areas and among poorer communities (in rural and relief dependent areas) are well apprehended by the government at woreda as well as regional levels. In spite of community's commitment and willingness to contribute towards the development of their schools, reports of complaints have been noted during regional meetings. Complaints were mainly attributed to similar claims by other sectors (particularly health and agriculture, but also water) on the financial, labor, and material resources of the community and to declines by the government in discharging its roles. In Bure woreda of the Amhara region the government has built no standard primary school since 2003/04 (1996 E.C); all the new schools have been built with community contributions. There is a tendency that the government is increasingly leaving responsibility for the construction of primary schools, supply of furniture as well as payment of salary of guards, and other recurrent costs to communities. This may worsen the teaching environment and may lead to the loss of interest and motivation by the communities.

The situation appears more serious in Oromia and SNNP regions where parents and communities contribute for salaries and other recurrent expenditures of schools. In SNNPR, contacted PTA and board members and other administrative staff of woreda Education Offices say that reduction of government's involvement seriously affected availability of school facilities. Community alone cannot afford all construction expenses, provision of various school supplies, and establishment of libraries and laboratories. Likewise, in Oromia WEO was expected to employ sufficient teachers in all schools, because the community cannot pay appropriate salary to qualified teachers.

The levels of involvement of the government in school management have been minimized to provision of teachers and block grants only. The government seems to have withdrawn from construction of new blocks, expansion of classrooms, purchasing of desks, chairs, and other necessary supplies to primary schools. In general, informants stressed that the government needs to reconsider its level of involvement in school matters. In this regard, the Blue Book's consideration of economic capacity of communities in determining the role of the government and community contribution seems to have not been applied. In spite of variations in terms of economic capacity and vulnerability across woredas, it appears that communities cover 100% of school construction costs in both rural and urban areas. Evidences from both food secured and food insecure communities in all the regions show similar approaches and practices of community participation. In principle, the contribution to the education sector varies according to communities' economic capacity.

For convenience purpose, the Blue Book divided urban and rural communities living standards into three categories based on per capita income and expenditure prepared by MOFED and/or the classification of woredas into surplus (medium and high income groups) and non-surplus producing (low income) woredas by the Ministry of Agriculture. The capacities of community are classified as higher, medium and lower. Accordingly, in rural areas 100% and 65% (35% cash and 30% in-kind contributions) of the cost of construction is covered by higher and medium capacity communities respectively. In the case of section of the community with lower capacity, the participation of the community is confined to labor and material contribution and the government would fully cover the other costs needed for construction and post-construction activities.

In all cases, the government assigns teachers and supplies laboratory equipment and textbooks. In urban context, when an urban community gets prepared to build schools from grade 1-8 through their own initiative, the government covers 50% of the construction cost, furnishes the school, and assigns teachers³. In reality, these have never been the case; and both 'high' and 'low' income communities are increasingly expected to cover all costs of construction. The community seriously question withdrawals of the government from investment on school buildings and related activities. The people expect tangible inputs from the government to shape up their schools.

Moreover, the study indicated that the Blue Book lacks detailed procedures and formats with respect to the collection, recording, monitoring, and reporting of community contributions.

Management of ABECs

Expansion of non-formal education and creating educational access to those children, youth, adults and women who could not pursue their formal education due to various reasons are included in the mandate of ETMBs. However, it appears that the management and financing of Alternative Basic Education Centers (ABECs), as distinct from formal schools and the role of community in the management of them is not incorporated in the national Blue Book. Currently, each consisting of a Chairperson, Cashier, Secretary (one of the facilitators), and two members, are responsible for the management and facilitation of the activities of ABEC in Amhara region. Except the facilitator (who serves as the ABEC Secretary of the committee), other members are recruited from the community. Each ABEC has a representative who reports to the nearby formal school director.

Sustainability

Development and implementation of regional Blue Book on *Directive Education Management, Organization, Community Participation & Finance* is an important step in ensuring sustainability. In the Blue Book responsibilities of the different players is clearly described. On the part of the government, increased commitment is required in the recruitment of teachers, supply of textbooks, and allocation of adequate budget for recurrent expenditures. In this regard, external assistances in capacity building and provision of matching construction funds will be crucial to sustain the system. Further, enhanced capacity of WEO to supervise, monitor, etc and provide support to schools and PTAs is also crucial to strengthen activities at the school level.

Community acceptance of and support to the education sector, and their continued/increasing commitment to contribute for the improvement of their schools and sense of community ownership of schools, and shared responsibility for school management and continued support are indications of sustainability. However, although communities are willing to contribute in cash and in kind, sustainability could be unrealistic in the event of external shocks when communities may not even be able to feed themselves. This is mainly the case in food insecure woredas that are covered by the safety net program of the government. For example, in 2004/05, 20 of the 42 kebeles in Boset woreda of Oromiya were affected by drought and had bad harvest in which case the community contribution was hampered. In such circumstance, NGOs have paid the school contributions on behalf of the community. This indicates that the community contribution may not be sustainable

³ With regard to the construction of secondary schools (from grade 9-12), the community would cover the entire construction cost, equips the school with the necessary facility, and assigns teachers.

due to various factors including external shocks that affect the livelihood of the community. One good example could be the hiring of teachers locally which is risky as the community may not be able to continue paying the salaries of the teachers. Evidences in Oromiya indicate that teachers hired by the community (locally) usually do not plan to stay with schools since there is no guarantee of continuity. As a result, they leave the schools creating gaps in the teaching-learning process.

The quality of the community built schools is another area of concern for sustainability. The quality of most schools built by communities is not up to the standard. The standard as well as the unit construction cost of community built schools in rural areas and smaller towns is much lower than those built by the government. Locally available and cheap construction materials (typically mud, straw, and sticks) and skills are used to build such schools. Classrooms are constructed of wood and mud with little light or ventilation, topped with corrugated metal roofing sheets (without ceiling) that produce high heat in sunshine and unbearably loud noise in rain. The earth floors are poorly leveled. And schools are often without access to potable water. Community-built schools also lack basic furnishings, including desks and chairs, textbooks and other learning materials. In most schools, poorly made benches and stones are used as seats.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

The study shows that community participation and contribution for primary education is encouraging in all regions and woredas visited. Communities and parents have made considerable contributions (in cash and kind) for new school building, expansion, and rehabilitation of existing schools, construction and rehabilitation of office rooms and residential units for teachers, fences, latrines, etc and in few cases for salaries of school guards and assistant teachers and facilitators. The PTAs are the driving forces for community mobilization, participation and contributions. PTA members are elected by the parents. The PTAs consist of five from the community and two school teachers. They have limited capacity in planning, reporting, preparations and record keeping. Some training programs that are focused on planning, reporting, community participation and contributions, and record keeping have been conducted by the WEOs and the BESO II project for the PTAs. It was learnt that the training programs have brought some positive changes, especially for those who are relatively qualified (teachers). The PTAs are engaged in planning of the school activities with the schools.

There are some variations across regions and woredas and also schools regarding the roles and responsibilities of the PTAs and also the per capita contribution by the community. For instance, in Amhara region, the PTAs are not responsible in managing the collection and utilization of the money contributed by the community, while in SNNPR and Oromiya region, PTAs are responsible for these activities. In some schools, all community members regardless of having or not having children in schools contribute. In most of the schools visited however, only the parent households are expected to contribute. Furthermore, in some schools, community contribution is per student, while in others the contribution is per parent household.

Communities through PTAs are engaged in the management of schools and in improving efficiency, quality of education and gender equity is encouraging. The active participation of communities has increased student enrolment rates in the region and improved enrolment and retention of girls. PTAs are involved in planning and budgeting processes and in the monitoring of the teaching-learning process. They specifically deal with disciplinary problems of teachers and students and consult parents on continuous basis with respect to children's school attendance.

In general, community participation has positively affected school attendance and quality of education. Communities in visited areas view their participation in the past as meaningful, and they are proud of their achievements. They also have developed confidence with respect to their ability to further improve their schools and create good learning environment for their children. The participation of the communities in educational activities and in the management of schools can therefore be seen as an empowering and positive endeavor for communities.

However, there are some problems associated with community participation and contributions for primary education. In order to minimize any strain on communities, the various actors should properly discharge their respective responsibilities stipulated in the Blue Book. Specifically the government has to provide necessary materials, budget and recruit teachers and facilitators for schools. Effectiveness of community participation can also be maximized with appropriate capacity building interventions and support services targeted to school management bodies and schools by the government, donor agencies, and NGOs. The following are the specific recommendations of the study.

Recommendations

- Role of KETMB was found to be minimal, especially in Oromiya region, and there are some duplications of responsibilities; and steps are being taken to empower the PTAs as an important strategy for effective community mobilization. This needs further exploration on whether the two should be merged or remain separate.
- Communities are generally willing to contribute but could be constrained by lack of resources. Therefore, the government needs to contribute for primary school as per the Blue Book and reduce the burden on the communities. In the case of food insecure areas, it is recommended that the community contributes only labor and materials for the construction of schools and other school development.
- The regionally adopted Blue Book should clearly define procedures and include formats on collection and recording, monitoring, and reporting of community contributions. It should also incorporate the management of non-formal education, particularly ABECs, and their linkages with the formal education system.
- The community-built schools are of poor quality and do not necessarily follow the government standards. Therefore, the WEOs or RSEBs need to provide technical assistance so that the schools could meet the minimum standards.
- It was learnt that in some schools, all community members contribute for primary education as they are direct and indirect beneficiaries of primary education. This is a good practice of community participation and should be replicated to other regions and schools as well.

- The timing of community contributions affects the livelihoods of the communities, especially that of the poor households. Therefore, contributions should be made after the harvest.
- There is community fatigue that the government is not assisting the schools and gradually leaving the responsibilities to the communities and this could hamper community contributions. Therefore, to encourage community contributions, the government needs to avail the necessary resources according to the Blue Book.
- Community contribution generally has its own risks. For instance, hiring of teachers by the community does not have continuity and is not guaranteed and may result in the departure of teachers creating gaps in the teaching process. Therefore, the WEO needs to budget for hiring of teachers for community-built schools.
- One of the reasons for promoting community contributions is meager resource allocations from the government to the education system. This situation will continue increasing the burden on community. Therefore, two options can be considered:
 - Increase the regional block grant that will accordingly increase the share the education sector for primary education
 - Establish special pool fund to support primary schools.
- The capacity of KETMBs and PTAs are limited and there should be orientation programs on regular basis on their roles and responsibilities as well as other relevant matters with strong follow up to improve their performance and commitment. In some of the primary schools in the country, the capacities of the PTAs have been reinforced by the WEOs and the BESO II project as well as the World Food Program. However, the training programs seem to be more relevant for teachers who have the qualifications. Therefore, the capacity building program needs to take in to account the fact that most of the PTA members have low education level and relevant training programs need to be tailored.
- It is proposed that a study be conducted on willingness to pay and affordability of the community for primary education with larger sample sizes of woredas and school communities.

VI. Suggested Options to Implement CGPP after January 2007

CGPP is consistent with the GFDRE's Education Sector Development Program (ESDP). The major emphasis of CGPP is on the project activities. In the remaining nine to ten months, the CGPP implementing partners need to move quickly to complete all the tasks required to meet the target outputs, complete implementation of the eight regional states CGPP implementation plans, provide follow-up support to ensure that the inputs to date are fully operational, and the desired impact is achieved and measured.

Overall, beneficiaries report a high degree of satisfaction with the CGPP and they have provided indications of the impact of it on schools. The CGPP serves as a means of raising communities' sense of ownership of schools and empowering them for improvement of education provision. They are involved in all aspects of decision making: planning, budgeting, dealing with disciplinary problems of teachers and students, monitoring the overall teaching-learning process, and resource mobilization. Communities are providing support to female students, and benefiting from GACs for sharing experiences. They claim that these have resulted in increased enrollment of girls, lower dropout rates, and lower repetition rates. Most importantly, CGPP is empowering the community

to demand services from local government bodies. PTAs/KETMBs, along with community members, have raised many issues with the woredas.

However, at this point, it appears that WEO personnel turnover is high and the time allowed to meet the results of CGPP in each project region is short. This has made it difficult to focus and to achieve sustainable impact. Further, it is not clear whether there are sufficient resources currently in the Cooperative Agreements that can be used beyond January 2007. Therefore, IPs should conduct a thorough analysis of the activities they expect to complete before January 2007 and their associated costs, and inform USAID the amount that will remain unspent.

In the new ISP, the Mission proposed to reach 5,000 schools and currently 3,700 schools are covered in the program. If resources are available, the Mission can continue with 1,300 new schools for a period of three years. Therefore, based on the above reviewed documents, should USAID in consultation with the Ministry of Education choose to continue with CGPP beyond January 2007, the following options are suggested.

Option 1: Continue with the present CGPP implementing partners using the existing implementation mechanism to work in the new 1,300 schools.

USAID should identify BESO CGPP best practices and experiences which can be scaled up; CGPP skills in facilitating community participation and instilling a sense of ownership of projects; non-formal education intervention; and strengthening Girls Advisory Committee. Further, since technical assistance is a means to sustainable development, woreda education personnel, PTAs, KETMBs, and RSEBs, capacity on planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and reporting should be enhanced. However, USAID should implement a strategy for achieving greater clarity and transparency in financial and technical support and in terms of cost-effectiveness related matters. Further, the implementing partners should conduct a careful analysis of their corresponding administrative requirements, including the type and number of their staff.

Option 2: USAID redesign CGPP in light of the new strategic plan and lessons learned to date and conduct an open competition among Local/Ethiopian NGOs, such as the Amhara Development Association, SEPDA in SNNPR, and Tigray Development Association, that are implementing grassroots education development programs in their respective regions; and the international NGOs to function in the emerging regions where there is a limited number of strong community based organizations and the WEOs are not strong.

The above mentioned Local/Ethiopian NGOs get assistance from their members and partners and had positive results through regional development projects by involving communities in identifying problems and needs, problem solving and decision making; they encourage and build the capacity of community to help themselves and independence rather than dependence, etc. However, there may be a need to provide the Local NGOs with trainings on managing USAID funds and reporting procedures.

Option 3: Since woreda development program may not necessarily work for pastoralist communities and NGOs can work nearer to pastoralists, USAID should redesign CGPP to use

NGOs in the emerging regions and local decentralized government system/Woreda Education Offices in the strong regions.

Schools are found at the lowest administrative levels - inside kebeles and within each woreda. Woredas proximity to the schools creates a situation conducive for them to provide their professional and technical support. ETMBs have been formed at woreda and kebele levels consisting of representatives of relevant institutions and community to monitor and manage financial and educational activities.

Since power and implementation responsibility is devolved to the woredas, the Mission could accept the GFDRE approved plan of action, accounting capacity and statements of expenditure as the basis for liquidation. Woreda Education Offices can be held accountable based on GFDRE and USAID/Ethiopia audits. Legal responsibility and accountability must remain with the woredas. Whatever USAID resource is transferred to the woredas, the RSEBs and BOFEDs can be notified. Original documents can be kept at woreda level; and the woreda can send copies of the documents to respective RSEBs and BOFEDs. Further, establishing a mechanism of information sharing is very crucial. Quarterly budget and implementation review can be carried out during TWG meetings at regional and central levels.

However, this needs making sure that the GFDRE system/structures are compatible with USAID's rules and regulations, i.e. financial utilization, performance reporting, etc. Further, it may demand USAID/Ethiopia to strengthen the RSEBs and BOFEDs to monitor and evaluate USAID's activities at the woreda level; and auditors in each region to be oriented to see the USAID resources allocated are utilized for their intended purposes.