

MID-TERM EVALUATION

**BESO II  
COMMUNITY-GOVERNMENT  
PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM  
(CGPP)**

**FINAL REPORT**

Nancy E. Horn, Ph.D., Team Leader

**Virginia Seitz, Ph.D.  
Alemayehu Gebrehiwot, Ph.D.  
Kassaw Ali**

**Juarez & Associates**

**July 2005**

## **ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

AED	Academy of Educational Development
BESO - I	Basic Education System Overhaul I
BESO – II	Basic Education Strategic Objective II
CBO	Community-Based Organization
CMC	Center Management Committees
CGPP	Community-Government Partnership Program
COW	Community Orientation Workshop
CSGP/CSAP	Community School Grants/Activity Program
EDP	Educational Program Department
EMIS	Education Management Information System
EMRDA	Ethiopian Muslim Relief and Development Association
ESDP	Education Sector Development Program
GAC	Girls’ Advisory Committee
GEAC	Girls’ Education Advisory Committee (same as GAC)
GFDRE	Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
GoE	Government of Ethiopia
KAP	Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices
KETB	Kebele Education and Training Board
IP	Implementing Partner
IR	Intermediate Result
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MES	Monitoring and Evaluation System
MoE	Ministry of Education
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
PMS	Project Management Specialist
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
PTA	Parent-Teacher Association
RC	Regional Coordinator
RD	Regional Director
REB	Regional Education Bureau
RFA	Request for Assistance
RSC	Regional Steering Committee (for Tigray)
SAVE-USA	Save the Children – United States of America
SCF-US	Save the Children – United States of America
SDA	School Development Agent
SDC	School Development Coordinator (same as SDA)
SEB	State Education Bureau (same as REB)
SIA	School Improvement Award
SIP	School Improvement Plan
SMC	School Management Committee
SNNPR	Southern Nations’, Nationalities’, and Peoples’ Region
SO	Strategic Objective
SOW	School Orientation Workshop
SP	Strategic Plan

T&P Officer	Training and Program Officer
TDA	Tigray Development Association
TWG	Technical Working Group
TOR	Terms of Reference
TOT	Training of Trainers
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WAT	Women's Association of Tigray
WCBO	Woreda Capacity Building Office
WETB	Woreda Education and Training Board
WEO	Woreda Education Office
WLI/WL	World Learning International
WOW	Woreda Orientation Workshop
ZC	Zone Coordinator

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
List of Tables .....	viii
<hr/>	
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
II. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION .....	4
III. BACKGROUND .....	6
1. Introduction .....	
2. BESO I and BESP II .....	
3. Implementation Strategy .....	
4. Changes in USAID's Strategic Plan .....	
5. BESO Under USAID's Two Strategic Plans .....	
IV. METHODOLOGY .....	10
1. Introduction .....	
2. Selection of Regions .....	
3. Selection of Woredas and Schools .....	
3.1 Selection Process for SNNPR .....	
3.2 Selection Process for Amhara .....	
3.3 Selection Process for Tigray .....	
3.4 Selection Process for Oromiya and Afar .....	
4. Team Division .....	
5. Data Collection Instruments .....	
6. Data Collection Process .....	
6.1 SNNPR .....	
6.2 Amhara .....	
6.3 Tigray .....	
6.4 Afar .....	
6.5 Oromiya .....	
7. Summary .....	
V. ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS .....	16
1. Introduction .....	16
2. Project Design Variations .....	17
2.1 Link to Beso I .....	
2.2 Grant Size and Competitive Process .....	
2.3 Graduation .....	
2.4 Zone Coordination .....	
2.5 Aspects of Sustainability .....	
2.6 Gender Resources .....	

2.7 M&E Systems and Information Flow (Transparency) .....	
2.8 PTA/KETB Financial Management of Resources .....	
3. Targets .....	23
4. Impact on Beneficiaries – Meeting Perceived Needs .....	27
4.1 Beneficiaries .....	
4.2 Capacity Building and Training .....	
4.2.1 World Learning in SNNPR and Amhara .....	
4.2.2 TDA in Tigray .....	
4.2.3 Save the Children-US in Afar and Oromiya .....	
4.3 Mechanisms of Community Participation and Support.....	
4.3.1 SNNPR .....	
4.3.2 Amhara .....	
4.3.3 Tigray .....	
4.3.4 Afar .....	
4.3.5 Oromiya .....	
5. Project Management/Turnover of Key Personnel .....	57
5.1 Turnover and Changes at USAID .....	
5.2 Technical Working Group .....	
5.3 World Learning .....	
5.3.1 Structure and Staffing – Head Office .....	
5.3.2 Regional Operations – SNNPR .....	
5.3.2.1 Zone Manager Roles & Responsibilities...	
5.3.2.2 SDA Roles & Responsibilities .....	
5.3.2.3 Governmental Roles & Responsibilities...	
5.3.2.3.1 REB .....	
5.3.2.3.1 Woreda .....	
5.3.3 Regional Operations - Amhara.....	
5.3.3.1 Zone Manager Roles & Responsibilities.....	
5.3.3.2 SDA Roles & Responsibilities .....	
5.3.3.3 Governmental Roles & Responsibilities .....	
5.3.3.3.1 REB .....	
5.3.3.3.2 Woreda .....	
5.4 Tigray Development Association – Tigray .....	
5.4.1 Structure and Staffing - Head Office .....	
5.4.2 Field Manager Roles & Responsibilities .....	
5.4.3 SDA Roles & Responsibilities .....	
5.4.4 Governmental Roles & Responsibilities .....	
5.4.4.1 REB .....	
5.4.4.2 Woreda .....	
5.5 Save the Children-US .....	
5.5.1 Structure and Staffing – Head Office .....	
5.5.2 Zonal Operations – Afar .....	
5.5.2.1 Zonal and Regional Coordinators .....	

5.5.2.2 SDCs .....	
5.5.2.3 Gender .....	
5.5.2.4 Save's Management Relationship with Subcontractors .....	
5.5.2.5 AB ECs – Structure and Management .....	
5.5.2.6 Governmental Roles & Responsibilities .....	
5.5.2.6.1 REB .....	
5.5.2.6.2 Woreda .....	
5.5.3 Regional Operations - Oromiya .....	
5.5.3.1 Zone Manager Roles & Responsibilities.....	
5.5.3.2 SDA Roles & Responsibilities .....	
5.5.3.3 Governmental Roles & Responsibilities.....	
5.5.3.3.1 REB .....	
5.5.3.3.2 Woreda .....	
<b>6. External Factors .....</b>	<b>74</b>
6.1 Cross Regional Similarities .....	
6.2 SNNPR .....	
6.3 Amhara .....	
6.4 Tigray .....	
6.5 Afar .....	
6.6 Oromiya .....	
<b>7. Project Relation to Mission Plans and the Development of Community     Resiliency .....</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>VI. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>79</b>
1. Introduction .....	
2. Differences in Project Design .....	
3. Meeting Targets .....	
4. Impact on Beneficiaries	
4.1 Capacity Building and Training .....	
4.2 Mechanisms of Community Participation and Support .....	
5. Project Management .....	
6. External Factors .....	
7. Conclusion .....	
<b>VII. LESSONS LEARNED .....</b>	<b>86</b>
1. Introduction .....	
2. Differences in Project Design .....	
3. Meeting Targets .....	
4. Impact on Beneficiaries	
4.1 Capacity Building and Training .....	
4.2 Mechanisms of Community Participation and Support .....	
5. Project Management .....	
6. External Factors .....	

7. Other .....	
<b>VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>91</b>
1. Introduction .....	
2. Differences in Project Design .....	
3. Meeting Targets .....	
4. Impact on Beneficiaries	
4.1 Capacity Building and Training .....	
4.2 Mechanisms of Community Participation and Support .....	
5. Project Management .....	
6. External Factors .....	
7. Other .....	
<b>IX. BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>96</b>
<hr/>	
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
<b>A SCOPE OF WORK .....</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>B INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED .....</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>C TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP GUIDELINES .....</b>	<b>121</b>
<b>D MINISTRY OF EDUCATION GUIDELINES “BLUE BOOK” .....</b>	<b>123</b>
<b>E DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS .....</b>	<b>129</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

- 3.1 Comparison of BESO-II, IR3 and New IR 14**
- 4.1 Woredas and Schools, SNNPR
- 4.2 Woredas and Schools, Amhara
- 4.3 Woredas and Schools, Tigray
- 4.4 Woredas and Schools, Afar and Oromiya
- 4.5 Summary of Field Research Activities
  
- 5.1 Implementing Partner Targets**
- 5.2 Progress in Meeting Targets, Cohort 1, World Learning
- 5.3 Changes in Enrollment, SNNPR and Amhara, 2002/03 - 2003/4**
- 5.4 Annual Accomplishment Report, TDA, 2003/04
- 5.5 Progress in Meeting Targets in Selected Schools, Cohort 1, Year 2, Save the Children**
- 5.6 Enrollments and Dropouts, 2 Schools and 1 ABEC, Afar
- 5.7 Enrollments and Dropouts, 2 Schools, Oromiya, 2003/04
- 5.8 School Improvement Plans Made and Achieved - Five Schools in SNNPR
- 5.9 Community Contributions to School Improvement, Five SNNPR Data Collection Schools**
- 5.10 Sample of Issues Raised with the Woreda and Woreda Responses, SNNPR
- 5.11 Girls' Problems and Solutions Developed by GAC, SNNPR
- 5.12 School Improvement Plans Made and Achieved - Five Schools in Amhara
- 5.13 Community Contributions to School Improvement, Five Schools in Amhara**
- 5.14 Sample of Issues Raised with the Woreda and Woreda Responses, Amhara
- 5.15 Girls' Problems and Solutions Developed by GAC, Amhara
- 5.16 TDA/BESO 2<sup>nd</sup> phase Grant Receiving Schools (11/2004 – 10/2005)
- 5.17 Community Contributions, Two Schools, Afar
- 5.18 Girls' Problems and Solutions Developed by GAC, Tigray
- 5.19 Girls' Problems and Solutions Developed by GEAC, Afar**
- 5.20 Girls' Problems and Solutions Developed by GEAC, Oromiya

## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this mid-term evaluation of the Basic Strategic Objective II (BESO II) Community-Government Partnership Program (CGPP) is to determine the management, implementation progress and overall results of the project to date. The findings and recommendations of the evaluation will inform USAID/Ethiopia and the deliberations of the Government of Ethiopia (GoE) in determining future strategies for BESO II to enhance quality and equity in education.<sup>1</sup> It will also inform the CGPP partners in their efforts to maximize project effectiveness.

The objective of BESO II (2002-2007) builds on that of its predecessor BESO I: Enhance Quality and Equity in Primary Education. In BESO II, the principal grantees are the Academy for Educational Development (AED), Save the Children-US (Save), Tigray Development Association (TDA), and World Learning (WL). This evaluation concerns only the work of the three CGPP Implementing Partners (IPs) – Save, TDA, and WL.

Save is implementing BESO II/CGPP in Afar, Gambella, Oromiya and Somali; TDA in Tigray; and WL in Amhara, Benishangul-Gumuz and SNNPR. Save is responsible for 1500 schools; TDA for 400 schools; and WL for 1800 schools. The field research undertaken by the Juarez & Associates team (two Americans and two Ethiopians) focused on five regions: Afar, Oromiya, Tigray, Amhara, and SNNPR. The team was composed of two American female consultants, and two Ethiopian male consultants. The team was subdivided into two groups to conduct the field research. In the field, we interviewed 3 Regional Education Bureaus (REB), 9 Woredas, 21 Schools, 20 Parent-Teacher Associations/Kebele Education and Training Boards (PTA/KETB), 20 Girls' Advisory Committees (GACS/GEACS), 3 Regional Project Offices, 5 Zone Coordinators (ZC), 12 School Development Advisors/Coordinators (SDA/SDC), and 4 other participants, for a total of 97 interviews over the course of two weeks. Research was also conducted at the head offices of each of the IPs over the course of the five weeks, and was followed up with telephone calls to TDA.

The parameters of this formative evaluation were set by USAID in the Scope of Work (see Appendix A). After a week of orientation with USAID and Implementing Partners (IPs), we were given two weeks for field data collection, one week to develop the draft report, and one week to develop the final report. The findings we present are limited to the people and organizations interviewed, although our findings are suggestive of patterns of activities that will be borne out in a more rigorous final evaluation at the end of the project.

Findings indicate significant variability in project approach among the IPs in several areas: the links to BESO I,<sup>2</sup> Grant Size and Competitive Process, Graduation, Zone Coordination,

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 (quoted from the Scope of Work for this evaluation).

<sup>2</sup> During the writing of this report, TDA confirmed that 3 of the 4 schools visited had been BESO I schools (two had received two grants and 1 had received 1). That TDA schools had significantly more resources (funding, training,

Sustainability Aspects, Gender Resources, M&E Systems and Information Flow, and PTA/KETB Management of Financial Resources.

Each IP has different annual targets it seeks to meet in accordance with the Intermediate Results (IR) indicators. Information was available only for the first cohort of schools included in CGPP owing to the nature of the data collection process (information collected annually). This shortfall notwithstanding, all but one school visited have increased their enrollments and decreased dropouts at varying rates.

Two IPs have developed a significant amount of training materials to train all levels of project participant, from Regional Education Bureau and woredas to schools to field staff; TDA has not produced any training manuals to support a finding that they have a well-developed training system. There is no formal training provided to GACs/GEACs at schools, but the SDA provides informal training. Materials from trainings were not readily available at schools for the researchers to review as many school participants indicated that they did not have the materials because either 1) they were not provided any, or 2) those to whom they were given had left the school with the materials.

Community results for the schools visited are impressive. Using the School Improvement Awards (SIAs) each IP provided to school PTAs/KETBs, communities leveraged up to 400% of the grants for use in the improvement of school quality and equity. Each school-community comes together to identify and prioritize problems, writes an action plan, raises funds for its implementation, and then proceeds to construct classrooms, latrines, pedagogical centers, and libraries, and to address the socio-economic problems of girls to increase their enrollment. PTAs/KETBs, along with community members, have raised many issues with the woredas, but the woredas have often not been able to respond.

Many external factors have interfered with the implementation of the CGPP, with the most intrusive being the many replacements of KETB Chairs, School Directors, teachers, and government employees at the REB and woreda levels. Much staff turnover is due to the unintended consequence of civil service reform and the policy implementation gaps regarding transfers (School Directors must be in their positions between 2 and 3 years before they can request a transfer, but many are transferred before two years). This has meant that CGPP staff has been overburdened with the informal catch-up training they must conduct with all new school and government staff.

Another bothersome GoE policy to the project – and to the communities – is the downgrading of schools, along with the edict that two shifts will no longer be allowed. Although this policy seeks to rationalize the school system, parents are not happy that their children, especially their daughters, will have to walk longer distances to attend the 5<sup>th</sup> through the 8<sup>th</sup> grade, and that, due to the discontinuation of shifts, they will not have the domestic labor of children, especially their daughters, during the day. Communities are also being asked to contribute to projects fostered by other ministries, to the extent that many communities are overstressed. The self-help burdens being placed on communities have implications for the sustainability of CGPP.

---

and SDA support) over a longer time period than other schools compromises the comparative analysis of this research.

On the positive side, religious and legal institutions have supported changes in gender issues that have resulted in a more supportive community of girls' education.

The foundation for community resiliency has been established through the implementation of CGPP, at least at the school-communities visited. Through a focus on the schools and the education needs of the community's children, communities have become empowered to take action 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 action to resolve them. CGPP has established a democratic process of bringing to the attention of local government the needs that the community cannot meet on its own. 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.

The Lessons Learned over the course of the 2-1/2 years of project implementation are many and varied. It is clear that the project is working in all communities visited, that communities are exerting ownership of the schools, that PTAs/KETBs are exerting financial management of the schools, that communities are raising funds to match and go beyond the amounts provided by the SIA grants, that girls' enrollment is increasing and dropouts are decreasing, and that schools have or are creating sustainability plans to be implemented as the project ends.

Despite all of these successes, however, many improvements – in the nature of adjustments - can still be made. Because of the high turnover rates of school and government staff, many participants do not understand the depth and breadth of the project. Moreover, the policy of government to choose certain participants for one training and others for another has meant that project commitment has been limited on certain levels. Hence, there is a need for “refresher” or “shoring up” training at both schools and government departments.

More capacity building is also needed for SDAs to do their jobs efficiently and effectively, especially in building community leadership and school management capacity, and in annual and quarterly data collection. That SDAs must travel far distances to arrive at schools is also a problem that needs to be addressed with the provision of transport, not just transport allowances. The information flow from bottom up provides data for analysis at the head office, in accordance with each IP's Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP). This information, once analyzed, however, is not shared with SDAs and then with participant schools so that they know how well they are doing in comparison with other schools in the woreda and in the region. This must be resolved by sending reports to Regional Coordinators, ZCs, and SDAs.

A stronger linkage is being forged with the AED portion of BESO II, with several CGPP schools being chosen to become AED BESO II recipients. We believe this is a step in the right direction and should grow over the time remaining for CGPP implementation. When conducting the Final Evaluation, care must be taken on two counts, especially: 1) to measure the differential impact on schools in Tigray that have benefited both from BESO I and BESO II, and 2) to measure the differential impact on schools that have received CGPP and AED attention.

## II. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of the evaluation of the Basic Strategic Objective II (BESO II) Community-Government Partnership Program (CGPP) is to determine the management, implementation progress and overall results of the project to date. Specific objectives of the evaluation include:

- Assess the effectiveness of the CGPP implementing partners in their respective CGPP targeted regions
- Assess the effectiveness of project management and its impact on the implementation of the program
- Measure the CGPP's impact on communities and local education government agencies to date
- Understand key external factors that influence project implementation
- Identify and analyze implementation issues
- Assess the impact of changes in key personnel (such as Chief of Party, Deputy Chief of Party, and Deputy Director for Programs) of implementing partners on project activities
- Identify lessons learned and making recommendations for improvement for the remaining life of the project.

The findings (limited to the beneficiaries consulted) and recommendations of the evaluation will inform USAID/Ethiopia and the Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (GFDRE) deliberations in determining future strategies for BESO II to enhance quality and equity in education. It will also inform the CGPP partners in their efforts to maximize project effectiveness.

In response to the objectives of this evaluation, this Final Report is organized in the following manner:

- **Section III, Background** – provides the context of educational change in Ethiopia, a brief history of BESO II and how it relates to its predecessor, BESO I, and how both of these projects sought to support the Government of Ethiopia (GoE) in its efforts to improve quality and equity in schools.
- **Section IV, Methodology** – sets out the research methodology employed, including team composition, sampling strategies, and data collection instruments.
- **Section V, Analysis of Findings** – analyzes the data collected on the following topics: Project Design Variations among the three implementing partners; Targets of the three partners and whether these targets have been met to date; Impact on Beneficiaries in terms of Capacity Building and Training and Community Participation and Support; Project Management from both the implementing partner and government perspectives; External Factors that have influenced and challenged the implementation of CGPP; and how the results of the project to date relate to USAID's new Strategic Plan objectives to create community resiliency.
- **Section VI, Summary of Findings** – summarizes the discussions and findings of Section V on all topics.
- **Section VII, Lessons Learned to Improve Project Design and Performance** – reviews the critical elements of the project in which improvements are needed to enhance project effectiveness and efficiency.

- **Section VIII, Recommendations for Improving Project Design and Implementation Strategies** – makes recommendations on how different aspects of the project should be changed to achieve greater impact and sustainability.
- **Section IX, Bibliography** – is a listing of all the documents consulted to conduct this mid-term evaluation.
- **Appendices** – provide CGPP information external but contributing to our analysis.

### **III. BACKGROUND**

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Under the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESDP II), the Government of Ethiopia is pursuing five goals for primary education:

- 1) Increased access to educational opportunities at the primary level to achieve universal primary education by the year 2015
- 2) Improved quality of education
- 3) Enhanced efficiency in the use of resources
- 4) Increased equity between males and females, among regions, and between rural and urban areas
- 5) Increased relevance of education to students to bring about behavioral changes that bring about development.

The successful implementation of these goals requires close cooperation between the education sector and a range of stakeholders, including parents, local communities, NGOs, and religious organizations, all of whom will be called upon to assume significant roles in the finance and management of schools. It also requires continued financial support from international partners contributing to the education sector.

#### **2. BESO I AND BESO II**

To assist the GoE in reaching its goal, USAID has undertaken, successively, two projects: Basic Education System Overhaul I (BESO I) was a seven-year (1994-2001) cooperative effort of the GoE and USAID to improve the quality and gender equity of primary education in Ethiopia. The BESO I implementing partners were the Academy for Educational Development (AED), SCF/US, TDA, and WLI. The Community School Grants/Activity Program (CSGP/CSAP) was one component of BESO I and was implemented in the 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 to 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 project 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 Boards (KETBs) 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 BESO II, there are different contractors and grantees. The principal ones are Academy for Educational Development (AED), 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. The three grantees, SCF/US, TDA, and WLI, are implementing BESO II/CGPP. In BESO II, USAID has expanded its support from two regions to eight regions for the CSGP/CSAP, now called the Community Government Partnership Program (CGPP) in 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.

Save the Children-US (SCF/US) is implementing BESO II/CGPP in Afar, Gambella, Oromiya and Somali regions; TDA in Tigray region; and WLI in Amhara, Benishangul-Gumuz and SNNPR regions. Working with 3,700 project schools, communities and government partners to strengthen local capacities at school, community and decentralized government levels, CGPP allocations among the implementing partners are broken down as follows: TDA -- 400 schools, SCF/US --1500 schools and WLI --1800 schools. In addition, the BESO II/CGPP program supports flexible education for children in disadvantaged circumstances.

### **3. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY**

The broader CGPP implementation strategy seeks to improve quality and equity in project primary schools through increased community participation and support of the school’s educational program. It is being accomplished through newly established PTAs, KETBs, and increased participation at the school level by parents, community members and other external government and community 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 and budgeting). Such support is the responsibility of the other BESO II implementing partner not covered under this evaluation. Furthermore, although the USAID-approved project designs of each CGPP IPs is generally similar, important differences in implementation approaches, resources provided, and management structure exist among the partners.

### **4. CHANGES IN USAID’S STRATEGIC PLAN**

Under USAID’s Integrated Strategic Plan: FY2004 to FY2008, priorities changed due to the increased cycles of drought and famine throughout most of the country and the dire results of the 2002-2003 famine. The current strategy represents a paradigm shift: it is designed to increase the capacity to predict, prepare and manage shocks and disasters through an integrated strategy to achieve food security. The goal is to increase household and community resilience and decrease vulnerability to build a foundation for reducing famine vulnerability, hunger and poverty. The new guiding hypothesis of the strategy is: “If famine is to be prevented, then the Ethiopian people must reach a stage of development in which they have the resiliency to prevent widespread decline in livelihoods following shocks that bring food crisis.”<sup>3</sup> In terms of communities, economic and social resilience means the capacity of individuals and their communities to withstand shock without exhausting coping mechanisms, without sliding into destitution. To achieve resilience the following BESO II-CGPP-related requirements are: increasing primary school enrollment, with girls’ parity; and communities managing social services, e.g., schools, health care, water supply, HIV/AIDS.

---

<sup>3</sup> USAID Mission to Ethiopia. 2004. *Foundation Established for Reducing Famine Vulnerability, Hunger, and Poverty. Integrated Strategic Plan: FY 2004 to FY 2008.* Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: USAID.

## 5. BESO UNDER USAID’S TWO STRATEGIC PLANS

Under the BESO-II Results Framework, Strategic Objective 3 – Quality and Equity in Primary Education, and Intermediate Result 3 – Community-Government Partnerships in Education Strengthened - has been a critical element in developing resilient communities through the development of PTAs and in creating quality and equity in primary education. Under the FY2004-FY2008 Plan, Strategic Objective 14 – Human Capacity and Social Resiliency Increased, the BESO-II, IR3 results have been taken to the next level, as seen in Table 3.1: Comparison of BESO-II, IR3 and New IR 14.

**Table 3.1 : Comparison of BESO-II, IR3 and New IR 14**

<b>IR 3: Community-Government Partnerships in Education Strengthened</b>	<b>IR 14.3: Use of Quality Primary Education Services Enhanced</b>
Sub-IR3.1: Regional, zonal and woreda support to community involvement in school management strengthened.	Sub-IR14.3.1: Community participation in the management and delivery of primary education services strengthened.
Sub-IR3.2: Parents and community leaders more engaged in school management.	Sub-IR14.3.2: Planning, management and monitoring and evaluation for delivery of primary education services strengthened.
Sub-IR3.3: Community-government innovations and alternative approaches to education developed.	Sub-IR14.3.3: Quality of primary education improved.
	Sub-IR14.3.4: Equitable primary education services strengthened.

The sub-intermediate results remain the same under both plans:

- Sub-IR3.1: Regional, Zonal and Woreda Offices supported to increase community involvement in school management strengthened
- Sub-IR3.2: Parents and community leaders more engaged in school management
- Sub-IR3.3: Access to and survival in education of children (especially girls) in disadvantaged circumstances increased

The Results Indicators developed under the first plan continue under the second. They are:

- 3.1: Percent of CGPP schools in focus regions that have a weighted-average dropout rate for grades 1-4 below the national average (from a benchmark of the average for the last three years)
- 3.2: Percent of PTAs that have raised at least 5 education issues to community and/or local government of which 2 are related to education quality and equity.
- 3.3: Percent of education issues raised by PTAs that were responded to by local government and/or community
- 3.4: Percent of PTAs that have taken actions of which 50% are related to education equity and quality.

The results framework that was developed for IR14.3 in the new Plan builds upon that of IR3 in the old Plan. Whereas the implementing organizations contracted to meet the goals of IR3 in the old Plan sought to improve equity and quality of schools (by strengthening woredas under the decentralization plan of the MOE, helping develop and strengthen PTAs to identify and provide

school needs (thereby creating community ownership of schools), addressing the needs of girl children in schools, and creating greater community-government partnerships), IR14.3.1 in the new Plan seeks to enhance the ability of the community (represented first by the PTA) to manage the delivery of primary education. With that skill developed, PTAs can potentially give rise to CBOs that also address health issues that can be coordinated with school enhancement activities. The end result of incorporating health and education issues is a reduced dropout rate, increased enrollment (especially of girls) and improvement of the social environment. Without having laid the foundation in BESO II, CGPP, IR3, IR14.3.1 would have had to start at a much more foundational level.

Sub-IR14.3.2 seeks to strengthen the planning, management, and monitoring and evaluation for delivery of primary education services by assisting regional and woreda staff to achieve efficiency and effectiveness. IR3 IPs have provided significant training to regional and woreda officials, and KETBs, PTAs, GACs/GEACs and School Directors at schools. Without the BESO-II, CGPP, IR3 capacity building of these institutions, girls' education would most likely remain as it was when the project began.

Sub-IR14.3.3 seeks to improve the quality of primary education through improvement of teaching (BESO II, IR1 and IR2 implemented by AED) and improvement of educational inputs, as well as providing health, nutrition and water services for children in schools. The link to BESO-II, CGPP, IR 3 is found in the latter. PTAs were trained to undertake school needs assessments, write proposals, and were granted School Incentive Awards to enhance the quality and equity of their schools. Most built classrooms and latrines (the former strongly encouraged by the woreda), while others addressed school quality issues. That the new Plan will address these issues directly will emphasize what many PTAs have already accomplished and take them to the next level of their responsibility to achieve the well-being of the children.

Sub-IR14.3.4 seeks to expand non-formal basic primary education for children and adults in communities where children are hard-pressed to be a part of a highly structured, inflexible system. BESO-II, CGPP, IR3 implementing partners have established a "beachhead" in this area, especially in the pastoral areas of Somali and Afar. In these two regions, ABECs have been established with partner organizations with expertise in the management of centers and the delivery of alternative curricula. In each ABEC, they have also established Center Management Committees (CMC) for more direct management and resource mobilization. In some ABECs, adult literacy and numeracy classes are offered. Hence, the new Plan is building upon what has been undertaken under the old Plan.

The groundwork laid by BESO-II, CGPP, IR3 of the old Plan has given rise to a natural progression into IR14.3 under the new Plan. By so constructing the new Plan, USAID will be providing resources to the capacity building process to create resilient communities and increasing school enrollments to meet the ultimate government goal of universal primary education by 2015.

## **IV. METHODOLOGY**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

The parameters for this evaluation were set by USAID in the Scope of Work (see Appendix A), and under the constraints set, this mid-term evaluation was a formative rather than a definitive evaluation. The team was provided only two weeks for field data collection; this was the limitation placed on this research that led us to develop the methodologies and data collection instruments we did. The data collection instruments were reviewed, edited and approved by USAID, as was the research design. The research was not meant to be comparative, so we did not visit any non-CGPP schools. As is the nature of a formative evaluation, findings are applicable only to the participants of the research. However, we believe, because of our selection criteria and very rigorous data collection at each school that the results obtained are highly suggestive of patterns and trends throughout the project and should be treated as such in terms of how the IPs and USAID work together in achieving CGPP goals. When the final evaluation is conducted comparative inquiries should be made to determine 1) attribution of school quality and equity improvements between CGPP and non-CGPP schools, and 2) the relative improvements made in schools in Tigray where BESO-I AND BESO-II grants were awarded.

Several methodologies were employed in the performance of this evaluation: 1) document review; 2) interviews with implementing party Chiefs of Party and staff; 3) interview with the Head of Education Sector Development Program Planning at the Ministry of Education (and head of the Technical Working Group (TWG) of CGPP); 4) interviews with Regional Education Bureaus and Woreda Education Officials; 5) interviews with implementing partner regional and Zone Coordinators and School Development Agents/Coordinators; 6) participatory data collection with school PTAs, KETBs Girls Advisory Committees, and the School Director (and Deputy Directors, where appropriate); 7) interviews with other implementing organizations; and 8) where possible, interviews with senior opinion leaders of the community that were not included in any other interview (in several cases, community members just joined the PTA/KETB interview). The team worked with each implementing partner to select the target woredas and schools in which the bulk of the data collection occurred.

### **2. SELECTION OF REGIONS**

USAID asked the team to identify the four regions in which we would collect data. Given the inconsistent history of participation, Gambela was dropped from the list of choices. As the team considered the amount of time it would take to travel to each school in each of the regions, it was decided at first not to go to Afar, Bhenishangul-Gumuz, and Somali. Since many schools in these three regions are geographically dispersed, and since the time for field data collection was limited to two weeks, it was decided to go to the four regions in which the largest number of schools were being addressed. In our presentation to USAID of our choices, we were encouraged to find a way to visit at least some schools in the pastoral regions. It was decided, then, to group Afar with Oromiya in one trip, beginning with Awash where ABE and regular schools could be observed, and then move to one area in Oromiya for data collection on regular schools.

The selection of the four major regions was made on the following rationale: Tigray had to be included because the Tigray Development Association, the implementing partner for the region, covered only that Region. Amhara and SNNPR had to be chosen as World Learning, the implementing partner, covered 1693 schools in these combined regions. Oromiya had to be chosen because of Save the Children's high coverage of schools in that Region.

In summary, the regions in which data collection occurred included:<sup>4</sup>

- Afar
- Oromiya
- Amhara
- SNNPR
- Tigray

### **3. SELECTION OF WOREDAS AND SCHOOLS**

Several criteria were identified to select the schools in which data collection occurred:

- Geography/distance from a "hub" to woredas and schools
- Rural/urban
- Significant socio-cultural factors
- Number of School Incentive Awards
- Progress in achieving a lower dropout rate

The first "cut" was based on geography. A "hub" or home base was identified. For purposes of time, woredas and schools within a 1-1/2 hour radius of the hub were identified. From that cut, only rural schools were selected. From the rural schools identified, implementing partners were asked if there were any significant socio-cultural and/or economic reasons why a particular woreda should be chosen. In general, there were few compelling reasons for a particular woreda to be chosen. A cut was then made based on the number of School Incentive Awards that had been granted to different schools. A school was to have received at least two awards to be included. A final cut was made based on the weighted average of the dropout rates available, making sure that schools below and above the weighted average were included so that there could be a basis for comparison.

#### ***3.1 Selection Process for SNNPR***

The implementing partner for SNNP is World Learning. To help the team make the first cut based in geography, WL provided us with a map of the region divided by woredas. We identified Sidama is the geographically proximal Zone to Awassa, our hub. Within Sidama, we identified three potential woredas: Aletawondo, Dale, and Shebedino, all seemingly within a 1-1/2 hour's distance from the hub. We then identified only the rural schools in these woredas. We then asked WL staff if there were any significant socio-cultural or economic factors in any of these four woredas. We learned that Shebedino is a coffee growing area and that most households are involved in growing this cash crop. We also learned that the Sidama people

---

<sup>4</sup> That the team included a fifth region for data collection went beyond the scope of our original research design submitted to USAID prior to the award of the contract to Juarez & Associates.

engage in different gender-based practices that several GACs were addressing. We were then provided with the list of schools that had received at least two SIAs. This narrowed the universe of choice to four schools per Woreda. We then determined the weighted averages for dropout rates (benchmark was 0.27) to choose the highest and the lowest in each woreda.

After having made this determination, we called WL’s Regional Director for SNNP to make the final selection. At this point, we had to consider geography and road conditions. Local conditions (the rain had already begun in this region making many roads impassible), distance between the woreda and the school, and the time it took to conduct the evaluation at each school (between three and four hours) led to the choice of the following five schools for data collection:

**Table 4.1: Woredas and Schools, SNNPR**

<b>Woreda</b>	<b>School</b>
Aletawondo	Balesito
Dale	Dagaro
Dale	Debub Mesengela
Shebedino	Abela Lida
Shebedino	Murcaho Gucho

In SNNPR, we interviewed the Regional Education Bureau, one project zonal coordinators, three SDAs, the PTAs, KETBs, School Directors, and GACs at each school, and World Learning’s Regional Director.

### **3.2 Selection Process for Amhara**

WL provided a zonal map of Amhara to help make the first geographic cut in selecting the woredas and schools at which to collect data for the evaluation. It was initially decided that woredas in West Gojjam and South Gondar would be included, but the schools and woredas in South Gondar would take more than 1-1/2 hours to access from the hub of Bahir Dar. Hence, the decision was made to focus on West Gojjam. Four woredas were selected, again on the basis of geography – Achefer, Bahir Dar Zuria, Dangla, and Bahir Dar Special. It was decided that there were no overriding socio-cultural factors differentiating one woreda from the other, although the culture of the Awi people for one woreda and that of the Wet’o for another were decisive factors in choosing two. The weighted drop-out rates helped us make the penultimate selection. In Achefer, weighted drop-out rates at the end of 2004 were between 0.00 and 0.25, in Bahir Dar Zuria they were between –0.12 and 0.12, in Dangla they were between 0.15 and 0.30, and in Bahir Dar Special they were between –0.37 and 0.10. The benchmark for Amhara region was 0.26.

We then spoke with the WL Regional Director for Amhara to make a final cut on the basis of daily accessibility and clustering so that two schools might be covered per day. We had originally selected an ABE school in Yilmana Densa, but we learned the day before our visit that the roads might not be passable due to the rains. We substituted the urban school of Kulkualmeda for the ABE school so that we might collect data at five schools. The selection resulted in the following woredas and schools:

**Table 4.2: Woredas and Schools, Amhara**

<b>Woreda</b>	<b>School</b>
Achefer	Ayelew Mekonnen
Bahir Dar Zuria	Zegie
Bahir Dar Zuria	Andassa
Dangla	Ziguda
Bahir Dar Special	Kalkualmeda

In Amhara, we interviewed the Regional Education Bureau, three project zonal coordinators, four SDAs, the PTAs, KETBs, School Directors, and GACs at each school, and World Learning’s Regional Director.

### **3.3 Selection Process for Tigray**

The sample schools in the region were selected based on the core criteria preset for the evaluation, and in consultation with project staff both at regional and woreda levels. However, the “socio-cultural diversity” criterion was dropped because Tigray has a relatively homogeneous ethnic population. A key issues in the selection of schools was their accessibility. Four CGPP schools in two woredas were finally selected for the study.

**Table 4.3: Woredas and Schools, Tigray**

<b>Woreda</b>	<b>School</b>
Enderta	Michael Kelti
	Lahma
Houzen	Debrehiwot
	Endatsebela

Secondary information was obtained from a review of TDA’s documents relating to annual plans and implementation reports, quarterly progress reports, monitoring reports and from school statistics pertaining to enrolment and dropouts. Primary information was generated through a combination of PRA methods involving group discussions, and interviews with representatives from TDA, WEOs, TWGs, KETBs, PTAs, GACs and SDAs.

Limitations:

- It was not possible to get information from the REB as the Bureau Head and his deputy were not available during the survey period. In an attempt to fill this information gap, an overview of the CGPP and overall education development in the region was obtained through an interview with the chairman of the RSC.
- Because of the overlapping membership of PTAs, KETBs, and GACs, in almost all CGPP schools visited, it was not possible to hold separate group discussions with each of these entities

### **3.4 Selection Process for Oromiya and Afar**

Two regions were selected for joint data collection because of the need to cover ABE schools in pastoral zones. Awash is at the southwestern corner of Afar region and borders on Oromiya. Two schools and one ABE school were identified for data collection. It was also decided at the

USAID meeting that the REBureau for Afar did not have to be consulted as this would have necessitated a significantly longer journey into Afar than our schedules would allow. To cover schools in Oromiya, the same “cuts” were employed. The schools visited in these two regions included the following:

**Table 4.4: Woredas and Schools, Afar and Oromiya**

<b>Woreda</b>	<b>School</b>
Amibara – Afar	Amibara #2
	Hasoba
	Kel’at ABEC
Boset – Oromiya	Buta Badasa
	Dongorie Neye
	Doni
	Tedecha

#### **4. Team Division**

The team wanted to build upon its internal strengths. Since Dr. Alemayehu Gebrehiwot had experience working in Tigray and spoke Tigrinya, it was decided that he and Dr. Virginia Seitz would begin their data collection in Tigray. Since Dr. Nancy Horn had had data collection experience in SNNPR, specifically in the regions around Awassa, it was decided that she and Kassaw Ali would begin their data collection there.

During the second week, the team switched partners in order that we could benefit from what each other had learned in the previous week. Hence, the data collection teams were as follows:

- Week one – Team 1 – Nancy and Kassaw – SNNPR  
Team 2 – Virginia and Alemayehu – Tigray
- Week two – Team 1 – Nancy and Alemayhu – Amhara  
Team 2 – Virginia and Kassaw – Afar/Oromiya

#### **5. Data Collection Instruments**

By the end of our first week in country, the team had developed a number of protocols and PRA data collection instruments to be utilized when interviewing the many people we met at the REBs, the woredas, and the schools. These instruments were submitted to Ato Aberra Makonnen, Office Chief, Basic Education Services, USAID, for his review and revision. These were returned the next day with comments. The Team Leader then made appropriate revisions. The instruments are attached hereto as Appendix E – Data Collection Instruments.

#### **6. Data Collection Process**

Data collection was initially hampered by the difficult security situation. To secure the safety of the team, USAID provided transport and escorts (except in Tigray). In Afar/Oromiya and SNNPR, accompanying the team was Assefa Berhane, Project Management Specialist, with responsibility for Save the Children and World Learning, and in Amhara, it was Elfaged Amanuel, Program Manager Assistant. The USAID representatives were present for almost all of the data collection. A full presentation of the data collection schedule is located in Appendix B – Individuals Consulted.

## 7. Summary

In addition to all the meetings we had with USAID and with IPs, we conducted 97 interviews in the field. A summary of all the field data collection locations is presented in Table 4.5:

**Table 4.5 : Summary of Field Research Activities**

<b>Region</b>	<b>REB</b>	<b>WEO</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>PTA/ KETB</b>	<b>GAC</b>	<b>RO</b>	<b>ZC</b>	<b>SDA / SDC</b>	<b>OTHER</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Afar	0	1	3	2	2	1	1	1	1 CMC 1 ZC(Care)	13
Amhara	1	3	5	5	5	1	2	4		26
Oromiya	1	1	4	4	4	0	1	2		17
Tigray	0	2	4	4	4	0	0	2	1 WAT 1 VPReg	18
SNNPR	1	2	5	5	5	1	1	3		23
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>97</b>

## V. ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

### 1. INTRODUCTION

In this section we present the majority of the findings developed from the use of our data collection instruments found in Appendix E. We recognize that the findings herein are both partial and provisional in that we visited 21 schools mostly within a few hours' drive from a central location: the time and resources allocated to this mid-term evaluation by USAID determined the sample size and some sampling criteria. Nevertheless, the in-depth qualitative data obtained, especially from the school-community, provides a rich picture of project results to date. Although we cannot generalize our analysis to all schools, we are confident that the analysis provides USAID and the implementing partners with a valid representation of the project's strengths and weaknesses. We are also confident that there has been success in mobilizing communities to both support and participate in the management of primary education, and to become agents of change in addressing the gender inequalities and cultural practices that have denied girls full participation in education. In some cases, the data reveal serious structural issues that have implications for overall project design and management. In other cases, our analysis might address issues and constraints that may be unique to a particular implementation context. Overall, the results should provide USAID and IPs with the information needed to improve CGPP's ability to accomplish its ultimate goal of the empowering of civil society.

The findings are organized in accordance with the needs set forth in the Scope of Work included in Appendix A. In the Project Design Variations, we discuss the different approaches used by each IP. In the Meeting Targets section, we identify the specific targets each implementing partner projected in terms of the Intermediate Results and where they are in realizing each one. The Impact on Beneficiaries section is divided into two sub-sections: 1) Capacity Building and Training, and 2) Community Partnership and Support. Findings are presented for each Region in which the research took place. Within each Region, we discuss findings obtained from Regional Education Bureaus, Woredas, schools, and at the school level, what we learned from the PTAs, KETBs, GACs/GEACs, and School Directors.

The findings then move on to an analysis of the management function of USAID, the TWG, each IP and government agencies. The analysis for each IP includes head office operations, regional operations, and the roles and responsibilities of Zone Coordinators and SDAs, where these structures are present. The analysis then moves on to the many external factors that have influenced the implementation of the project (most negative). In many cases, government policies and actions have created difficulties, and in other cases local conditions have given rise to seemingly insurmountable obstacles.

We end our Analysis section with a brief presentation of information on the sustainability of the CGPP in the schools and communities visited. This analysis includes the additional demands placed on communities that, due to the burdens they face even in the best of times, create significant additional constraints on their ability to prioritize school needs. That communities have been stressed into taking on other "voluntary" activities also has implications for community resiliency in times of environmental stresses.

## 2. PROJECT DESIGN VARIATIONS

Each IP designed a program that would meet the needs of the projected number of schools it targeted for CGPP: WL – 1800; Save - 1500; and TDA - 400.

### 2.1 Link to Beso I

**World Learning** - WL implemented BESO I in SNNPR, and was asked by USAID to finish disbursing the school awards under BESO II. They did so after providing a training to prepare them to develop an action plan. WL did not work with BESO I schools under the BESO II design.

**Tigray Development Association** – *In three of the four schools visited, two had received BESO I phase 1 and 2 grants, and one had received a BESO I phase 1 grant (Phase 1, 2,750 birr, Phase 2, 8,250 birr). We heard reference to BESO I during the school interviews and attempted to confirm or disprove by requesting this information from TDA professional staff in Mekele. Staff responsible for Field Management, M&E and Education did not know if the schools we visited were BESO I grantees, nor were they able to produce a list of BESO I schools that we could cross-reference with the BESO II cohort 1 schools, including those we visited.*

*The project did provide an undated document (BESO Project Statistical Bulletin) that appears to report SIA activities and contributions, although the data are not disaggregated by schools as requested by the evaluation team. (A different document was presented by the TDA Project Director during the Stakeholders' Meeting on July 6.) In the document provided in Mekele and cited in the bibliography, the authors state that "the project believes that the capacity of the local community in managing school level project activities is in place, and the experience could be considered as a role model for other community based development programs." If this is true, we do not understand why BESO I schools were again funded under BESO II.<sup>5</sup>*

*Information on the overlap of schools visited with BESO I grants was eventually provided to the evaluation team during the writing of this report. We were also informed by USAID in its written comments on our first draft that "USAID made it clear that the schools to be covered in BESO II are new schools."*

*The lack of knowledge of lead TDA staff and USAID on the important point of overlapping BESO I and BESO II schools indicates the need for follow up by USAID in terms of contractual and internal management issues. What is equally troubling, however, is whether the heavy concentration of resources (money, training, support) from both projects in the same schools might well have had a negative impact in terms of promoting dependency. Indeed, it was difficult to see any marked improvement in PTA capacity when comparing schools of other implementing partners that had not benefited from BESO I. From this point of view, we confirm USAID's design assessment that CGPP resources could have been better used to assist schools that had not benefited under BESO I.*

---

<sup>5</sup> In TDAs critique of an earlier version of this report, they assert that they did provide this information to USAID via e-mail, but the team did not receive it. TDA also asserted that the choice of schools by woredas was based on dropout rates, and many BESO I schools had high dropout rates. TDA contends that non-participation in BESO I was not a criterion for selection, in contradistinction to what we were told in the USAID critique of our earlier draft.

**Save the Children-US** – *Save was not an IP for BESO I and the schools they cover in BESO II were not part of BESO I.*

## **2.2 Grant Size and Competitive Process**

**World Learning** - *WL offers three SIAs in the following amounts: Phase 1 – 2,500 birr; Phase 2 – 3,500 birr; Phase 3 – 6,000 birr. Phase 3 is competitive. For Phase 3, applicants must meet more criteria (including the submission of a sustainability plan), their applications are ranked by WEO and other officials, and approximately 67% of applicants are given the award. The third award is competitive because there were insufficient funds to provide a third grant to all schools.*

**Tigray Development Association** - *TDA offers two SIAs: Phase 1 - 5,800 birr; Phase 2 – 10,000 birr. All 400 schools receive each SIA.*

**Save the Children-US** - *Save has three grants, with the second and third grants competitive: Phase 1 - 3,000 birr; Phase 2 - 3,500 birr; Phase 3 - 3,500 birr. The first grant is provided to all schools through a review process that includes the SDC, woreda, and ZC. The head office of Save does the final review and grant processing. The second and third awards are based on a performance assessment “questionnaire” filled out by the SDC, a maximum of two WEO/WCBO representatives, and the SCOPE ZC. Areas covered in the questionnaire are: 1) enhancement of girls’ education, 2) action plan accomplishment, 3) congruence of PTA/community and BESO objectives (qualitative assessment), 4) substantial cost sharing, 5) activities accomplished beyond the plan, and 6) timeliness and cooperation in submitting M&E data. The second grant is available to 80% of those funded in the first phase. The third grant is available to 30% of those funded in Phase 2 and 5% of those who did not receive the Phase 2 funding but who have made significant improvements. Misuse of funds or award, lack of use of funds, or spending below 50% of planned expenditures is grounds for disqualification. Phase 2 and 3 grants are competitive because Save was not awarded a sufficient amount to provide grants to all schools.*

## **2.3 Graduation**

**World Learning** - *After two years in the program and the receipt of either two or three SIAs, WL “graduates” schools. This means that the technical assistance they receive from the SDAs is reduced to one visit per quarter. This is done mainly for two reasons: 1) to allow SDAs to address the needs of new cohort schools; and 2) to build in sustainability by slowly disengaging from the support process.*

**Tigray Development Association** - *All 400 schools continue to receive full technical assistance throughout the implementation period of the program; there is no graduation policy.*

**Save the Children-US** - *Save schools graduate in three years after participating in a graduation workshop where they develop a sustainability plan to be integrated into the WEO plan.*

## **2.4 Zone Coordination**

**World Learning** - *WL employs ZCs to oversee the work of the SDAs. By creating this intermediate structure, SDAs have frequent support, informal training at monthly meetings, the*

*work of the Regional Office is more efficient, and information flowing up and down has a more precise conduit.*

**Tigray Development Association** – *TDA does not employ ZCs; all 20 SDAs report directly to the head office. Although TDA has a position titled “Field Director,” all members of head office staff function in this management capacity.*

**Save the Children–US** - *Save has ZCs who are responsible for managing the SDCs and CGPP component in target schools in their zones. The ZCs receive technical support from the Regional Coordinator in headquarters.*

## **2.5 Sustainability Aspects**

**World Learning** – *WL provides training on sustainability from the beginning of the first WOW and SOW involving WEOs, PTA/KETB members and community representatives. WL provides specific sustainability training to all PTAs/KETBs, woreda officials and others at the end of the second SIA on how to write a sustainability plan for the school and each school submits the first draft of its sustainability plan at that time. This plan is reviewed by WL staff. Each school is required to submit a finalized plan with the application for the third SIA. Woreda officials participating in the competitive ranking exercise must review these.*

SDAs are current employees of the woreda (former school directors and teachers) and are seconded to WL for the duration of the project. SDAs and woredas reported that SDAs are directly responsible to the woreda for about 5% of their time to conduct woreda work. The woredas we visited do not have any sustainability plan on how to make the best use of SDAs once the project ends. Some indicated they wanted the SDAs to occupy a special position of community mobilizer and to build the capacity of the woreda Supervisors to help non-CGPP schools adopt the practices of enhancing school quality and equity that CGPP provided.

**Tigray Development Association** – We were not informed during our interviews with TDA professional staff about any training for sustainability provided to schools. When queried about sustainability, a TDA professional staff member commented: “Having schools for all the years, rather than graduating, this is a strategy for ‘sustainability’.”

During the Stakeholders’ Meeting on July 6, the TDA Project Director informed the evaluation team that 199 schools have had sustainability workshops, although we have no information on the content. When the fact that many of these schools might also BESO I schools is also considered, we have serious concerns about TDAs capacity to address sustainability. We suggest that USAID carefully examine the sustainability plans of schools funded under both BESO programs.

In Tigray, SDAs are current employees of the project/TDA and earn a monthly salary of 1100 birr with a monthly transportation allowance of 191 birr. It is not clear from our data how the SDAs will become a part of the woreda structure, if at all, after the project ends.

**Save the Children-US** - *Save’s sustainability model is based on schools developing an action plan with their respective WEOs indicating the continuing role of the SDCs in following up*

SCOPE activities as well as expanding SCOPE experiences to non-BESO schools through “Each One Teach One.” Graduating schools share their experiences with other schools. Save also worked directly with REBs to create sustainability plans for each region. SDCs are hired from a pool of eligible teachers or School Directors by the woreda in a joint selection process with Save. The SDC remains in the government system and his/her salary is topped up by the project. The monthly salary top-up is 420 birr with a 260 birr transportation allowance.

For ABECs, there is a formal agreement with the woredas that they will hire the facilitators after two years.

Save’s COP identified an issue of government support that affects sustainability:

*Once you train a government official, they are gone. How can you look at building the capacity of the system versus the individual when this is the case? A real question is what is the government doing to stop these system flaws? You can’t build system without continuity.*

The evaluation team has also noted turnover of government staff as a serious problem affecting the implementation of BESO II in all regions covered.

## **2.6 Gender Resources**

**World Learning** - *WL relies on its female ZCs and SDAs to impart their own personal stories and bring their personal insights to bear on helping female teachers and girls at schools. By doing so, they serve as role models in all of their school-community interactions. Their insights are shared especially with GACs. WL does not have a gender advisor nor does it provide specific formal training to GACs on how to identify and solve gender-related issues. Modules on gender are included in SDA training and target such specifics as how to deal with low enrollment of girls, poor retention of girls and poor performance of girls.<sup>6</sup> These lessons are then passed on by SDAs to GACs in informal training. Moreover, there is a gender component to each training provided.*

**Tigray Development Association** – *TDA relies on the Women’s Association of Tigray (WAT) for the gender content of its training activities. WAT conducts gender-specific training within the context of workshops organized by TDA and provides support to GACs. In addition, WAT has membership on the Regional Steering Committee, the woreda technical working groups, and at the community level. Based on our interviews with TDA staff and a WAT official, we do not believe that there is any formalized contractual arrangement with WAT for the substantial services provided. (We were informed that honoraria and per diem are provided.) In addition, based on our interviews with TDA professional staff, there appears to be little, if any, institutional learning within TDA about Gender and Education. The absence of a sub-contract for the provision of on-going activities should be evaluated by the USAIDS contracts office.*

**Save the Children – US** - *Save employs a Girls’ Education Specialist in the head office. Resources designed for SDC training include modules on: Gender and Education, GEACs,*

---

<sup>6</sup> Tahir Gero, 2004. *School Development Agent (SDA) Training: A Guide for Facilitators*. Addis Ababa: World Learning, pp. 41-43.

*Girls' Clubs, and Gender Policy. Save also has training documents on Gender Analysis Tools and Techniques, Gender Policy and Writing a Successful Grant Proposal.*

Recognizing that changing gender behaviors is extremely difficult, especially in the emerging regions, Save is using research to improve program design and materials. According to Save's March 31, 2005, Quarterly Progress Report, Save temporarily suspended "gender refresher training" in anticipation of the results of formative research ("positive deviance") to assist in identifying appropriate gender sensitization tools.

Save has also produced a training document on "Gender Responsive Participatory Techniques of Action Research and Grants Proposal Preparation," noted as Volume 4 (December 2004) of the Training Series.

Save's gender strategy includes developing indices for girl-friendly schools, with one expected from each woreda. PTAs are encouraged to develop school-specific gender policies and are trained in this topic by SDCs and in other training contexts.

## **2.7 M&E Systems and Information Flow (Transparency)**

It should be noted that no IP M&E system takes student transfers into account, so data reported on dropouts may not be accurate.

**World Learning** - *WL has a very complex PMP system and an architecturally elegant database system. The Monitoring System includes an Annual School Profile, data for which SDAs collect annually. Categories of information collected include: Identification of the School; Basic Characteristics and Demography of the School; School Infrastructure and Facilities; School Resources; Composition (teachers); Enrollments, Repeaters and Readmitted Students; Dropouts; Availability of Curricular Materials; and Strategies to Increase Girls' Enrollment. The Monitoring System also includes quarterly data collection on the administration and progress of each SIA grant (plan, implementation, completion, contributions, etc.), technical support provided by the SDA, woreda and others, and the results of that support, institutional meetings held, changes in facilities, and other changes in the school or community. All records are kept according to schools and utilize official MoE identifications numbers, which will allow for future analysis of data at the regional and national level.*

After conducting the baseline study, it was envisioned that data would be collected from schools monthly, when schools were located closer to the woredas and were more accessible. As more schools have been added in farther outlying areas, accessibility to schools has been reduced making it more difficult to reach each school in a timely manner. Hence, the data collection process was reduced to a quarterly exercise with data submitted 12 days after the close of the quarter.

After data is collected by the SDA, it is reviewed by the ZC, then forwarded to the Regional Office where the data is entered. It is then sent to the head office for cleaning and analysis. While the head office generates reports, they are not shared with the SDA to use in providing feedback to schools. WL is working on a "Community Report Card" that addresses this issue.

**Tigray Development Association** - *Data are collected on the IRs and some of the sub-intermediate results on a quarterly basis. Although TDA was able to provide performance data from their data management system, they were not able to provide information about BESO I funding. The documents provided did not demonstrate an appropriate or comparable level (to other IPs) of substantive content to provide meaningful monitoring information.*

**Save the Children-US** - Save conducted baseline research through a KAP study and developed School and Community Profiles at the inception of the project. Annual targets were established during the beginning of the project on 4 indicators (3.1, 3.2a, 3.2b, 3.3) and 15 sub-indicators (3.1.1 - 5, 3.2.1 - 4, 3.3.1 - 6).

SDCs are responsible for tracking woreda support to schools and in collecting and reporting performance monitoring information from PTAs and School Directors, and PTAs are trained to document all of their activities. Formal capacity-building activities are tracked by capacity-building specialists and other participating staff.

Data are collected on a monthly, quarterly and annual basis, mostly by the SDCs. ZCs are responsible for data cleaning before transfer to the Regional Coordinators. Monitoring tools, including in-depth, annual community and school updates, and forms for PTA data collection including schoolyard observation checklists, are available in a publication dated June 2003. Save also conducts special studies as necessary and to document best practices. The evaluation team did not receive all school level data when requested, and was informed during the Stakeholders' Meeting that this was due to a problem with e-mail messages not being delivered from the Save server during the relevant dates.

Save has described information flow as follows: SDCs to ZCs to the Grant Monitoring Officer to Database Officer to M&E Officer. The Non-formal Education Specialist, Capacity-Building Specialist and Girls Education Advisor provide review and feedback, which is directed towards the SDCs. There is no feedback loop described that carries information to the School Directors and PTAs, and no feedback loop is described to inform PTAs and Directors about the results of the grant selection process. There is also no specific description of how Community and School annual updates directly inform program design.

In Save's assessment of SDC capacity, it has recognized and recently addressed the enormous burden placed on SDCs in data collection and the need for substantial additional training and support on data collection and M&E in general.

## **2.8 PTA/KETB Financial Management of Resources**

**World Learning** - *Both PTAs and KETBs manage the financial resources received from the SIA and from the community. As a project requirement, bank accounts are opened for each school either with a bank, a microfinance institution, or the woreda finance office. Each account is registered in the names of the school with multiple signatures required for all transactions. Cosigners are: the KETB or PTA Chair, the School Director, and the school treasurer/cashier. When cosigners must travel to withdraw funds from the account, WL provides a one-time payment of between 35 and 45 birr to cover the costs of their transportation (if arriving at the financial institution requires travel). The practice of having several co-signers has facilitated*

greater financial transparency and encouraged community members to contribute to school support.

**Tigray Development Association** - The KETB (in Tigray known as the t'abia ETB) is solely responsible for financial authorizations and expenditures. Cosigners on the account include the T'abia chair and the Secretary (who is also the School Director).

**Save the Children-US** - Save has developed the financial management capacity of PTAs and negotiated with Oromiya, Afar, Somali and Gambella to allow PTAs to manage their financial resources.

### 3. MEETING TARGETS

The key issue in meeting targets in a mid-term evaluation is the determination of whether an organization is progressing in the meeting of its targets such that by the end of the project the targets will have been met. Given that an annual report is due in September and the data have not been collected yet for that report, we have no real basis on which to determine trends. We present the targets in CGPP in terms of the Intermediate Results in Table 5.1 and then present some school-based information on dropouts, as recorded by the schools:

**Table 5.1 : Implementing Partner Targets**

<b>Implementing Partner</b>	<b>IR 3.1 - % of CGPP schools that have a weighted dropout rate for grades 1-4 below the regional average (from a benchmark of the average for last three years)</b>	<b>IR 3.2a - % of PTAs that have raised at least 5 education issues to local government of which 2 are related to quality and equity</b>	<b>IR 3.2b - % of education issues raised by PTAs that were responded to by local government</b>	<b>IR 3.3 - % of PTAs that have taken actions of which 50% are related to equity and quality</b>
World Learning	2002/03 – 5% 2003/04 – 7.5% 2004/05 – 10% 2005/06 – 12.5% 2006/07 – 15%	2002/03 – 0% 2003/04 – 15% 2004/05 – 20% 2005/06 – 25% 2006/07 – 30%	2002/03 – 0% 2003/04 – 15% 2004/05 – 20% 2005/06 – 25% 2006/07 – 30%	2002/03 – 5% 2003/04 – 10% 2004/05 – 15% 2005/06 – 20% 2006/07 – 25%
Save the Children	Afar only: 2002/03 – 33.6% 2003/04 – 35.6% 2004/05 – 37.6% 2005/06 – 39.6% 2006/07 – 41.6%  Oromiya only: 2002/03 – 32.6% 2003/04 – 34.6% 2004/05 – 36.6% 2005/06 – 38.6% 2006/07 – 40.6%	2002/03 – 0% 2003/04 – 15% 2004/05 – 20% 2005/06 – 25% 2006/07 – 30%	2002/03 – 0% 2003/04 – 15% 2004/05 – 20% 2005/06 – 25% 2006/07 – 30%	2002/03 – 20% 2003/04 – 22.5% 2004/05 – 25% 2005/06 – 27.5% 2006/07 – 30%

Tigray Development Association	2002/03 2003/04 – 20% 2004/05 – 30% 2005/06 – 45% 2006/07 – 65%	2002/03 2003/04 – 15% 2004/05 – 25% 2005/06 – 35% 2006/07 – 45%	2002/03 2003/04 – 10% 2004/05 – 20% 2005/06 – 35% 2006/07 – 50%	2002/03 2003/04 – 50% 2004/05 – 65% 2005/06 – 80% 2006/07 – 100%
--------------------------------	---	---	---	--

Source: PMPs of each IP.

We are not clear on why there is the degree of variance in targets put forward in this table.

### **World Learning**

The results achieved by WL in meeting their regional targets are as follows:

**Table 5.2 : Progress in Meeting Targets, Cohort 1, World Learning**

Region	Benchmark*	IR 3.1	IR 3.2a	IR 3.2b	IR 3.3
Amhara	0.26	53%	100%	5.7%	100%
SNNPR	0.27	51.42%	98.6%	28.5%	91.4%

\* The benchmark refers to the Regional weighted average dropout rate for grades 1-4.

Source: WL Database

The figures in Table 5.2 reflect the results achieved during the first full year of implementation, 2003/04. More up-to-date data will be available in September 2005.

Information on enrollments at the 10 schools visited in SNNPR and Amhara indicates rates of change from the base year (2002/03) to enrollments after 1 year of project implementation (2003/04):

**Table 5.3: Changes in Enrollment, SNNPR and Amhara, 2002/03 - 2003/4**

Region	School	Baseline Enrollment 2002/03			Enrollment after a Year 2003/04			Rate of Change in Enrollment		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
SNNPR	Abela Lida	688	718	1406	1138	870	2008	0.65	0.21	0.43
	Muracho Gucho	327	119	446	417	184	601	0.28	0.55	0.35
	Debur Mesengela	335	284	619	479	350	829	0.43	0.23	0.34
	Balesito	312	325	637	422	426	848	0.35	0.31	0.33
	Dagara	390	335	725	491	432	923	0.26	0.29	0.27
Amhara	Zegie	1202	985	2187	1201	1041	2242	0.00	0.06	0.03
	Andassa	685	441	1126	686	481	1167	0.00	0.09	0.04
	Ayalew Mekonnen	1516	1458	2974	1763	1723	3486	0.16	0.18	0.17
	Zeguda	485	492	977	452	505	957	-0.07	0.03	0.02
	Kulkwalmeda	918	960	1878	861	880	1741	-0.06	-0.08	-0.07

Source: WL database

### **Tigray Development Association**

TDA has developed a PMP based on its intermediate and sub-intermediate results. 2002/03 is taken as a base year. Accomplishments for 2003/04 are presented in Table 5.4:

**Table 5.4: Annual Accomplishment Report, TDA, 2003/04**

<i>Performance Indicators</i>	<b>Planned (PMP)</b>	<b>Actual</b>
1. % CGPP schools that have a weighted average dropout rates for grades 1-4 below the regional average	20	24
2. % PTAs that have raised 3 education issues, which are related to quality and equity, annually to the local government	15	38
3. % Education issues raised by PTAs that were positively responded by local government	10	30
4. % CGPP schools that have taken actions to address education issues of which 50% are related to educational quality and equity	50	67
5. % CGPP schools that have reduced the weighted average dropout rate of girls for grade 1-4 at least by 50% from their respective female dropout rate in the same level	10	42
6. % CGPP schools that are visited by WEO at least four times a year	10	12
7. % CGPP schools that are visited by WEO at least twice a year	50	39
8. % CGPP schools that have jointly financed implemented school development project with WEO local government at least once a year	20	33
9. Average number of days/month in which at least half of the non-teacher PTA members visited their school	1.25	1.78
10. Average number of meetings/annum by PTAs in CGPP schools with parents and community members to discuss education issues	3.0	2.75
11. % communities that have contributed to school development activities as per their plan	75	83
12. % schools that have functional advisory committee	20	58

Source: TDA, July 2004

TDA has accomplished well above its targets on most of the indicators. However, the program did not perform well in terms of expected frequency of PTA meetings with parents and community members. These results must also be considered in light of how long schools have been supported by BESO I and BESO II.

### **Save the Children-US**

Save's targets are determined by region. Progress in meeting targets for the words visited in the research process are reported in Table 5.5:

**Table 5.5: Progress in Meeting Targets in Selected Schools  
Cohort 1, Year 2, Save the Children  
Afar, Amibara Woreda**

<b>Baseline*</b>	<b>Target 3.1</b>	<b>IR 3.1</b>	<b>Target 3.2a</b>	<b>IR 3.2a</b>	<b>Target 3.2b</b>	<b>IR 3.2b</b>	<b>Target 3.3</b>	<b>IR 3.3</b>
33.3	37.6%	62.5%	15%	100%	15%	100%	22.5%	30.8%

**Oromiya, Boset Woreda**

<b>Baseline*</b>	<b>Target 3.1</b>	<b>IR 3.1</b>	<b>Target 3.2a</b>	<b>IR 3.2a</b>	<b>Target 3.2b</b>	<b>IR 3.2b</b>	<b>Target 3.3</b>	<b>IR 3.3</b>
26.7	34.6%	<b>13.5%</b>	15%	93.8	15%	81%	22.5%	68.8%

\* Baseline refers to the regional weighted average dropout rate for grades 1-4.

Source: Save the Children Database.

Note: % calculations on 3.2a based on schools reporting issues not on total schools

Table 5.5 supports the finding that both woredas exceeded targets except for the performance of Boset woreda in weighted average dropout rates for Year 2. It is important to note that the target (32.6%) was exceeded in Year 1 (50%). The explanation given in the field was that the government had built many new schools and transfers were not accounted for. Data collection does not account for transfers to other schools, so data on dropouts may be highly unreliable.<sup>7</sup>

Table 5.6 reports field data, both verbally reported or written on school posters, from the schools visited in Afar:

**Table 5.6: Enrollments and Dropouts, 2 Schools and 1 ABEC, Afar**

<b>Name of School</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total Students</b>	<b>% Dropout In Year 2</b>
<b>Amibara #2 Primary School</b>	119	40	159 (posted)	7.8%
22 less students	102	35	137 (May)	
<b>Hasoba Primary School</b>	73	50	123 (posted)	No data for Year 2, but 30.1% in Year 1
SD states no drop outs				
<b>Kel'at ABE Center</b>	50	15	65 (estimated)	
No data on drop out				

At schools visited in Oromiya, the number of school dropouts for the last year – 2003/2004 – were printed on posters on the School Director's wall. We present these here for two of the schools visited:

<sup>7</sup> USAID reported to the evaluation team during a debriefing that Save had a data management system that accounted for transfers. This was not the perspective of Save staff in the field nor was this mentioned by head office staff.

**Table 5.7: Enrollments and Dropouts, 2 Schools, Oromiya, 2003/04**

School	Grade	Enrollments		Dropouts	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
<b>Tedecha</b>	1	143	93	37	19
	2	95	109	18	16
	3	88	65	19	6
	4	63	38	7	1
<b>Doni</b>	1	208	180	26	31
	2	131	118	12	15
	3	84	70	16	7
	4	71	66	5	4
	5	87	47	9	6
	6	51	22	7	2
	7	39	20	5	4

It appears that enrollments for the last two years of the project (see grades 1 and 2 enrollments) have increased in both schools, although the difference is more striking in Doni School. Of significance is the girls' enrollment rates at grade 3 and 4 in both schools – in both cases enrollments appear to be between one third and one half less than the previous grades. The double-digit dropout numbers for the first three grades are also telling.

#### **4. IMPACT ON BENEFICIARIES – MEETING PERCEIVED NEEDS**

In this subsection, we first discuss our definition of beneficiaries and then present the findings on Capacity Building and Training and Community Participation and Support by Region.

##### **4.1 Beneficiaries**

CGPP has directed its efforts in the capacity building and training of government officials and school-level organizations and communities. It is hypothesized that addressing the informational and know-how needs at the institutional level will create an impact on the ultimate beneficiaries, among which are girls, students in general, and the school as a whole. In our analysis, we take the position congruent with that of the project, i.e., that addressing capacity building needs at each level will ultimately result in greater quality and equity at the school level. We wish to address one point, however. The time allocated for data collection did not allow us to interview students. At best, we talked very briefly with student members of the GAC/GEAC. We believe that this lack of information detracts from an understanding of the needs of the true ultimate beneficiaries, the students.

##### **4.2 Capacity Building and Training**

Each of the IPs provides capacity building and training to REBs (informal communications at the outset of the project, and periodic meetings to exchange information informally), woredas, School Directors, community members, PTAs, KETBs, and GACs as beneficiaries of the project. Training is also provided to SDAs, who are seconded to the IP by the woreda in all of the Regions but Tigray. Because the SDAs report to the IPs, however, we have included their training and work activities under Project Management below. In some instances, training is formal, defined as being held at a location away from the office/community and follows a

schedule with a number of internal and/or external facilitators, and in other cases training occurs more informally as a function of SDA or ZC visitations. We consider both.

#### **4.2.1 World Learning in SNNPR and Amhara**

The many capacity building and training interventions described below have been offered both in SNNPR and Amhara.

#### **FORMAL TRAINING WORKSHOPS**

**REB** – This regional body is not provided any type of formal training, although some REB representatives sit in on the WOW described below. Initially, senior WL staff visit the REB, provide an orientation briefing on project goals, methods, objectives, and roles and responsibilities. Through periodic visits, the Regional Director updates the REB head or designee on changes, achievements, and implementation problems.

**WOW – Woreda Orientation Workshop** – *Since decentralization has begun, the woreda is the locus of implementation of all REB policies. WL, with assistance from the REB, delivers this orientation workshop for two days, to members of the WETB and WCBO. The workshop is offered when a cohort of woreda are admitted to CGPP. Because of financial constraints, WOWs have been combined with SOWs in newly-integrated woredas.*

**SOW – School Orientation Workshop** – Each of the woreda-identified schools receives this training. Five people from each school are invited – the PTA and KETB Chairs, the School Director, a community member of the PTA, and the school’s treasurer. They are introduced to the project, to their individual roles and responsibilities in the new management structure, and asked to consider the many problems that their schools face. The workshop is delivered largely by the head office Training Director and Program Director with support from regional project staff over the course of two days when a cohort of new schools has been identified for CGPP implementation.

**COW – Community Orientation Workshop** – Those who attended the SOW are charged with the responsibility of orienting their respective communities. Participants are introduced to the project and informed of what their duties and responsibilities are. The ½ - 1-day workshop takes place at the school and is offered once when the school begins to participate in CGPP. The ZCs and SDAs are in attendance to provide any assistance.

**TOT** – *The WEO heads and technical experts are invited to identify two individuals in the woreda to come for a TOT in which they are equipped to conduct school-level training in management functions and community mobilization. In general, the Education District Head, the Primary School Expert, the Training Head, or Supervisors are chosen. Training is provided for five days by WL head office staff, with the assistance of the regional WL staff. The TOT is offered when a new woreda is brought into the program. Topics covered: proposal writing, community mobilization, gender related issues, etc.*

**PTA/KETB Training** – Invited to this three-day training are the Chairs of the PTA and KETB, the School Director, the Chair of the GAC, and the Treasurer/Accountant/Cashier from each school. Delivered by the woreda officials who received the TOT, and supported by the SDAs,

this training is offered at the woreda level when a new cohort of schools is ready to commence participation in CGPP.

***Sustainability Training*** – After the second SIA grant has been disbursed and the strategic plan has been acted upon at school level, WL head office staff and ZCs/SDAs provide a two-day training to woreda officials (WEOs, WCBOs, Women’s Affairs Officers), PTA and KETB Chairs, and the School Director, on CGPP’s exit strategy. As a result of this workshop, PTAs/KETBs develop a three-year sustainability plan to continue their school improvement activities after the project has ended. This plan must be submitted in satisfaction of the criteria to receive the third and final SIA.

#### **CDA Transition Workshops**

WL was asked to undertake an additional project in SNNPR and Amhara as a result of the 2003 drought. The additional activities included school feeding (conducted by the Irish NGO, GOAL), school improvement, and special summer school and tutorial assistance to children severely affected by the drought. Upon the completion of these activities, to maximize the long-term benefits of the initial investments made in the CDA schools, WL decided – with appropriate woreda approvals – to incorporate the CDA schools into the Regular BESO-II CGPP program. To do this, WL organized Transition Workshops for the included schools and communities. Particular emphasis was placed on the importance of greater parental and woreda participation in school improvement as opposed to the infusion of external resources undertaken in the CDA project. In SNNPR, 120 people representing woreda and schools participated in the training; in Amhara 117 people participated.

#### **Alternative Education Center Coordination Committee**

In Amhara, WL has an additional responsibility: Capacity building, training and funding for a limited number of alternative schools. In accordance with woreda guidelines, WL is addressing the needs of underserved students. WL’s approach is to create “satellite” schools linked to formal schools in a particular woreda. The satellite shares a Director with the formal school, and regular teachers are assigned (paid by the woreda). WL assists in the training of satellite center coordinating committees.

#### ***INFORMAL TRAINING***

The SDA job description includes providing on-site training on a variety of topics to all school-level organizations and the community. When the SDA comes to the school, s/he, among other duties, will determine if an informal training session is needed on a particular topic. Topics can be identified by participants or chosen from a “menu” of topics the SDA is prepared to address. Training normally lasts between one and two hours, may specifically address the needs of GACs or other organizational units, and may occur at any time. It is basically an “on demand” type of training.

WEO employees who received the TOT have taken the initiative to share what they have learned about CGPP with non-CGPP schools. The informal training delivered by the woreda officials has served to motivate many non-CGPP schools to establish GACs, and to create greater efficiency in school management, although, we were told, not to the same degree as CGPP schools. We have no way of reporting on the impact of this type of training.

Another type of informal training takes place in the community when an SIA strategic plan has been completed. The community is invited to the school to observe the changes made with the SIA grant and the community's contribution. In this general assembly, participants are reminded of the goals of the CGPP and the community's role in meeting those goals. The PTAs/KETBs are responsible for this meeting, although the SDAs may be called upon to address certain points.

***GAC Training*** – The GAC does not receive specific formal training on how to provide assistance to girls at school. The SDA provides the guideline, roles and responsibilities of the GAC and then does follow-up activities. When we asked GACs how they cope with the issues the girls raise, many simply responded that the girls should be strong, raise any problems with the GAC, and see if the GAC can help resolve the issue. In cases where the GAC called all the girls together for a special “training” on a topic (like menstruation), they might call someone from the health post to help them. The GAC not only advises girls; it also intervenes directly with parents and community members to address the girls' problems. Many GACs have established income-generating activities to fund their priorities while the “larger” priorities are funded through the SIA.

## **TRAINING MATERIALS**

School Directors and others interviewed were hard pressed to comment on the types of materials they received in training. When we triangulated this lack of information (handouts, etc.) at the woreda, we learned that woreda trainers do not provide any written information when they conduct their workshops. We were told that the woreda neither has the facility nor the budget to provide written materials.<sup>8</sup> Because of this lack of information at the school level, SDAs are asked to provide a type of re-training on certain topics so that participants are more clear in what they are to do. We were told by the Regional Directors that SDAs have a number of handouts/guidelines to share, but this point was not discussed by SDAs.

The transfer of School Directors is a key determining factor of whether a school has a CGPP “file” with information and handouts. Often, when a Director is transferred, s/he takes all the files and leaves nothing on CGPP at the school. When a new Director is oriented by the SDA (the new Director is not invited to a SOW or PTA/KETB formal training), some of the materials may be replaced.

***Analysis*** – In general, the training provided at each level is a one-off training on specific topics. SDAs are charged with the responsibility of following up on these trainings and in augmenting any shortfalls in understanding. The Sustainability Workshop reinforces what has been learned before, but those who attend this workshop may not be the same as those who attended the earlier workshops. For sustainability purposes, we believe the school-community cannot become fully self-sustaining unless these workshops can be provided on more than a one-off basis.

The REB in Amhara was very well prepared to discuss GCPP and spoke directly to the way in which CGPP was managed. This was not the case in SNNPR where we learned that the CGPP was just “one of many” projects the REB was addressing. Whereas dedicated staff time was

---

<sup>8</sup> In the IP critique of an earlier draft of this report, the Regional Director indicated that this finding was true only for the woreda we visited, and that other woredas adapt the materials they are given and pass them along to schools.

provided by the REB in Amhara to CGPP, in SNNPR individual tasks were allocated to a team of individuals “as needed.” It is unclear whether a formal orientation and capacity building workshop for REBs would assist in the management of the project at this level.

#### ***4.2.2 Tigray Development Association in Tigray***

Some CGPP beneficiaries report that they have developed capacity to participate in the development of education in the region and cite the support of SDCs, the program’s orientation and training workshops, and joint planning and actions. However, any conclusions about the effectiveness of BESO II CGPP training must be considered in light of the participation of schools and woredas in BESO I. We are unaware of any substantive training materials developed by TDA. We were informed that WAT conducted gender training and that one training session was conducted in collaboration with USAID/BESO II staff.<sup>9</sup>

#### **REB**

TDA’s quarterly reports state that the participation of REB experts in planning, monitoring and evaluating CGPP activities has provided them with the opportunity of “learning by doing,” thereby enhancing their capacity in translating macro education policies and strategies into practice. Since we were not able to interview the REB, we have no field data to support this assertion. The evaluation team did meet with the chairman of the Regional Steering Committee who stated that experience gained from the implementation of the CGPP has provided a basis for identifying opportunities and constraints for the development of education in the region. For example, there has been increased policy recognition of the strategic role of PTAs and of the need to address education quality problems associated with increased turnover of teachers and Directors.

#### **Woreda**

According to TDA reports, the WTWG (woreda technical working group) and 20 SDAs received a series of CGPP capacity building TOT trainings, which started in the second half of 2002. The training included a familiarization workshop, a community orientation workshop, and an experience-sharing workshop.

In TDAs model, woreda experts contribute significantly to community-level training. This was confirmed in a meeting with the Enderta Woreda Technical Working Group. The WAT member of the group stated:

*Our role is technical assistance in the application of the project. For example, trainings are given on mass mobilization and finances. All members of the committee take part in giving the orientation and training on how to carry out the project. Training is scheduled by the project and they have their own roles. Here, members also participate in the discussion of the training and try to deepen the discussion concerning mass mobilization.*

The WAT representative also noted that she is “one of those who is involved in a number of ways in training regarding gender issues. Whenever there is a training focus on gender, participants are drawn from all over the woreda and [she] is responsible for providing the training.”

---

<sup>9</sup> TDA asserts that it provided many more documents. We refer the reader to the Bibliography where we list all the documents the team was provided.

### PTAs/KETBs/GACs

TDA reports also state that PTAs are trained every two years by the project. The first two-day workshop is given in collaboration with the woreda staff who plan and deliver content. The project has input and gives presenters an honorarium. The second workshop is provided by the woreda. During interviews with TDA professional staff in Mekele, workshop topics and persons responsible for workshops were described as follows:

- Objectives and strategies of BESO. Roles and Responsibilities of PTAs (SDAs and central office experts)
- School finance and documentation systems (WEO experts)
- Community Participation in Schools (woreda capacity building workshop)
- Girls Education Enhancement (WAT chairperson in woreda).

In 2003, the training workshops were conducted at various project woredas and were attended by PTA and GAC members from 199 project schools.

Despite the reporting of all of these training activities, we were provided no substantive training resources, such as manuals, exercises, or facilitation guides. We asked the TDA regional staff several times to produce these materials and what they gave us were proposals, agendas, and evaluations of training workshops. In a telephone communication with the Project Director during the writing of this report, he stated that TDA had no training director and no training manuals. This was supported by field interviews in the schools in the region.

The impact of the training and informal SDA training is mixed, as it is in all project areas. Although some PTA and GAC members cite the benefits of CGPP's assistance in developing their ability to mobilize and manage community resources and address girls' education issues, many communicate a more directive role by the SDA than one that develops community capacity for decision-making. For example, according to one PTA member:

*BESO comes and says: 'Here is 10,000 birr. How much can you contribute?' BESO sets the conditions, like a list of what we can do. Then we are asked to identify problems that can be addressed with these resources.*

Yet, another member of the PTA says of project training and support:

*Training has enhanced our skills of community mobilization, communication, how to address issues of dropouts and how to have balanced opportunities for boys and girls.*

This PTA, like others in Tigray, is very proud of their ability to now manage finances, although it conflicts with documents reviewed concerning who has authority for school finances:

*We were trained in finances and we are collectively responsible for the accounts. We are doing a good job!*

In two schools in Hawzen, the SDA (female) visits schools more frequently than in Enderta (every two weeks rather than once a month) and the PTA meets weekly. These PTAs report more specifics on capacity building but this may be attributed to how long these schools have been receiving training and support under BESO. (One of these schools reported it also received one grant under BESO I.)

*The SDA is our nearest source of assistance. She assists us with planning, bookkeeping, and the orderly implementation of planned activities. We have good records and accountability.*

All four GACs have been encouraged and supported by the SDAs in their work on gender equity and some members have received training delivered by WAT, as noted earlier. It is interesting that the training content mentioned with the greatest specificity concerns gender and education, such as:

- Problems with girls' education and the cultural priority for boys
- The right of children and the girl child
- How to tutor girls
- How to set up income generation projects for poor girls
- Improved household labor and energy saving (WAT has a project)
- How to organize events (dramas, poetry readings) to promote gender equity
- Guidelines for establishing a GAC

All of the GACs visited are actively involved in addressing gender inequalities. In one school in Enderta, for example, the GAC has given awareness training to students and parents. However, it remains difficult to draw any conclusions about the efficacy of training received by the GAC specifically under BESO II.

#### **4.2.3 Save the Children in Afar and Oromiya**

##### ***AFAR***

##### **REB**

The evaluation team did not visit the REB office in Afar. Afari schools were added to our research design to have some representation from an “emerging region.” Time and other constraints did not allow for a trip to the regional capital. Our information on CGPP’s impact at the regional level is based on interviews with the Save COP who reported that the Afar REB has approved all project plans, engaged in sustainability planning, and made a commitment to incorporating CGPP strategies into its regional education plan.

##### **Woreda**

The team visited the Amibara WEO in Afar, a government structure created just this school year. (During the beginning of the BESO project, education authority was at the zonal level.) Thirteen of sixteen schools in the woreda are CGPP schools. To the extent that this is a new WEO, its responses may not be representative of other woredas in Afar that have had more experience with the project. CGPP is being phased out in Amibara.

The WEO staff appreciates the training provided by CGGP (on minimizing dropouts and repeaters and on collecting data) particularly since the government does not give training due to resource constraints. They anticipate an AED training on school supervision.

The WEO respondents felt that there was “now a good atmosphere” between PTAs and their office and noted their participation in the SIA grants process through follow up with the School Director and PTA. They stated, however, that the circumstances are particularly difficult in Afar and that they “do not have capacity to perform BESO works if BESO stops.”

**PTAs/KETBs, GEACs, Teachers, School Directors and Kebele chair<sup>10</sup>**

Save the Children has a highly developed training program and training materials (see section on Oromiya) that are also documented in the bibliography. In a high performing school in Afar that is also a cluster school, members of the GEAC and PTA mentioned three training opportunities in addition to the SDC's more informal capacity-building activities. Unlike most other schools visited, this community cited "training" as a BESO SCOPE strength.

When community level beneficiaries have sufficient training, they are able to continue the "cascade" into the community:

*We have given a training to elders, boys and girls and religious leaders. We talked about sending their daughters to school, about equality of women and men. We asked clan leaders and religious leaders to send their daughters to school to teach others. They have been receptive because of the training. The number of children who go to school has increased, especially in grade 1.*

This perceived success is especially impressive in the context of challenges this school faced: a problem of embezzlement by a former School Director, the replacement of PTA members to assure that Afari as well as highlanders are on the PTA, and the general socioeconomic, climatic and cultural conditions in Afar.

In another school in Afar, low-performing on the criteria of weighted drop-out rate but with a much higher proportion of female students than the other Afari school (68% compared to 34%), the group interview participants described a training provided to the GEAC chairperson, a teacher, who was transferred to Addis and who took both the capacity gained and the materials provided by the project with her. This was a frequently reported problem created by the high rates of teacher and School Director transfer reported throughout the evaluation research.

The PTA of this school also reported a one-day training at cluster level, and teachers reported participation in training on teaching methodology that most likely was provided by BESO II AED. Again, training was cited as both a SCOPE strength and as a need at the community level. The PTA and GEAC at this school were especially empowered: the PTA was actively petitioning the woreda and was singularly confident in its successes. Four young girls on the GEAC were unusual in that they spoke openly and freely about problems rooted in gender-based violence and solutions in which they took part. Training and capacity building from both SCOPE and AED may be contributing to school empowerment, but this school had another striking difference: a woman school director who had been at the school for nine years.

**ABEC**

At the Kel'at ABEC, managed by EMRDA (Ethiopian Muslim Relief and Development Association), group interview participants consisted of members of the Center Management Committee (all male) and two female members of the community. The two facilitators, CARE ZC and SDC were also present. (We requested that the SDC translate from Amharic to Afari during our discussions.) In this semi-nomadic community, respondents were contradictory in their answers about training received: some said that they received training and others said no training was provided. In any case, they stated that they now understand that it is important to

---

<sup>10</sup> In both schools in Afar, the Kebele chair participated in the interviews.

send children, including their daughters, to school, despite massive economic and cultural barriers. One respondent had an especially interesting analysis of training:

*We were trained for 3 or 4 days and told to send both boys and girls to school. The knowledge of the training and our way of life do not match. Our knowledge of the importance of education is so low, but we have a good knowledge of our culture.*

Yet, the value of education has clearly been internalized at some level. Referring to the researcher taking notes, one member of the community stated the following:

*If you are educated, you can feed yourself just by writing! Educated people can support their elderly, they can take care of themselves and others. They can go to America and fly by plane! We are dreaming to see our children reach that level of education. We hope that education can liberate us too.*

Combating traditional cultural practices harmful to girls is a more monumental challenge. When the women told us about the practice of “absuma” (a male member of the mother’s family has the right to marry a girl child without her consent), they are criticized by the men. The cultural perspective on educated girls is: “If she is educated, she will leave him.” Another member of the committee said:

*We don’t even think of leaving this kind of system and we didn’t get any training on why we should leave this. Yet, those who are living closer to town are sending their girls to school.*

#### **ABEC Facilitators**

Two young men<sup>11</sup> have a three-year contract to serve as facilitators in this ABEC. Housing is provided for the facilitators by the community. The facilitators teach 60 students a level 1 curriculum in both Amharic and Afari. The students’ ages range from 7 to teen-age. Classes begin at 7:00 am and end at noon due to the heat and family requirements for child labor.

The facilitators reported receiving several trainings from the implementing NGO: student-centered teaching, gender, how to mobilize the community and how to bring the community to school. Although reports cite that facilitators receive “teaching resources” from the NGO, there were meager resources present - just a few handmade teaching tools constructed by the facilitators and a Eurocentric poster depicting a culturally inappropriate “Family.” The facilitators are provided with teaching materials in addition to one primary level textbook that they use to prepare lessons. Both facilitators are eager to learn more and to have more resources available. They describe their interactions with the implementing NGO as people checking attendance. The SDC does not consider supporting the facilitators as part of his job description. However, the Save COP informed the evaluators that the role of the SDC in relation to the ABECs is being addressed within the new integrated strategy being rolled out this year.

The team questioned the woreda about the provisions of teaching materials and training to ABE facilitators. According to the woreda, these materials are the responsibility of the REB and they are not yet available to distribute to the ABECs. Other respondents noted that the government is eager to roll out these ABECs but is doing so without adequate training and teaching resources.

---

<sup>11</sup> Save documents describe these facilitators as one male and one female.

## **OROMIYA**

To meet the capacity-building goals of CGPP, SCOPE has developed training manuals on:

- The New Education and Training Policy (its implementation strategy to understand how to address the acute problem of access, quality, equity and relevance of the education system)
- Record keeping and financial management
- Preparation of action plans
- Communication skills to build effective relationship with all key school stakeholders
- Decentralization (especially decision-making authority)
- The role of community in the education system
- Roles and responsibilities of PTAs and KETBs

TOTs are held for three days to equip woreda participants with the necessary skills to serve as future trainers to KETBs, PTAs, School Directors, and GACs/GEACs. SDCs assist in this training. The cascaded training is given for one day. According to respondents, notebooks and pens were supplied but no handouts.

In most schools visited, KETB and PTA members and School Directors were newly assigned and had not received any CGPP training. Training materials were not available in the schools as they had been taken by the previous Chairs and School Directors.

When we asked PTA and KETB members about the topics in which they were trained, most could not recall. We also asked them if they had received any training material and they said they had not. They said that they had requested the training materials but they never received them. The members of the committees were also asked whether the training given was sufficient and if they require additional training. Their response was that it was not sufficient and they require additional training on financial management, record keeping, and community mobilization. They also requested that the training be given to other community organizations involved in educational development activities.

## **GEAC**

GEAC representatives interviewed in the four schools in Oromiya had similar training from the SCOPE project. In three of the schools, teachers on the GEAC reported that they received gender training although they did not know who provided the training. (It is unclear if it was SCOPE or AED BESO II gender training.) All GEACs requested additional training from SCOPE, including support and materials, to be more effective as trainers in their own communities. The comments below from one school were similar to those heard in the others:

*There are other groups in the village that we can include in a training. The elders and religious leaders really need training. ... We want to know more about female role models. I am interested in seeing female judges!*

In one school, GEAC members stated that the female SDC has given them training on how to counsel girls, on quality education and problems of girls and how to solve their problems. The teacher has received materials on how to organize the GEAC. Although they “admire her (the SDC’s) capacity,” they are quite specific in their statement about training needs:

*We want training on gender issues but it should not be in training of trainers. We want the original trainers and it will take long days. We want training on the disadvantage of early marriage. We also want an advisory book on gender for our committee.*

### **4.3 Mechanisms of Community Participation and Support**

What the capacity building and training inputs discussed in the previous section are designed to do is to create community ownership of the schools and the implementation of school improvement projects. Each IP mobilizes the school and the community through formal and informal training to identify school problems, prioritize them and then determine relevant solutions. Each school develops an action/strategic plan, and then mobilizes its resources to supplement the amount provided to the school through the SIA. Community contributions can be in cash, in labor, and in materials. SIA grant amounts vary with implementing agency as do the number of grants awarded.

In this section we discuss the school-based processes that have resulted in the many improvements in quality and equity observed during the course of the research. We present the specific school plans, objectives achieved, and amounts contributed for the schools in which data collection took place. We also discuss the type of support received, especially by the KETBs/PTAs and the cooperative relationships between the GAC/GEAC and KETBs/PTAs in solving the particular problems of girls in each region.

#### **4.3.1 SNNPR**

##### **SIA Grant Process**

In SNNPR communities are very involved in fundraising activities, in creating strategic plans for school improvement, and in monitoring progress toward reaching the objectives entailed in each of the three SIA phases. WL provides three SIAs in the following order: 1) 2,500 birr; 2) 3,500 birr; 3) 6,000 birr. The first and second grants are non-competitive but have specific criteria to fulfill; the third grant is offered competitively to those who have received the first and second grants. Approximately 67% of all schools in each woreda receive the third grant. Competition is against other schools in the same woreda. Each school must submit a strategic plan for the use of the grant. This plan, along with the school's sustainability plan, is forwarded to the WEO where a ranking exercise takes place. The names of the top-ranked 2/3 of all schools are passed along to the Regional Director and REB representatives, who then determine if there are any anomalies. If there are, the woreda might be asked to reconsider a certain school's ranking. If there are not, then the school and woreda names are passed along to WL head office for administrative purposes and the disbursement of the award.

When the grant has been spent and the objectives of the plan reached, the KETB/PTA call a general assembly of the community to view the progress made. Throughout the implementation of each project, community members come to the school compound to observe progress, also making suggestions along the way. At the general assembly, community members are also consulted about the next improvements they would like to make. In this way, the community helps in identifying problems, passes on the plan developed by the KETB/PTA, and oversees any progress made. Table 5.8 sets forth the items in the plans for the first two SIA grants that were achieved in the five schools visited in SNNPR.

**Table 5.8: School Improvement Plans Made and Achieved - Five Schools in SNNPR**

<i>School</i>	<i>Plans Made and Achieved</i>
<i>Abela Lida</i>	<p><i>Plan 1</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fence the school compound</li> <li>• Make a school signboard</li> <li>• Finish already started construction of 2 classrooms</li> <li>• Repair 30 desks</li> </ul> <p><i>Plan 2</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct 4 blackboards</li> <li>• Build a library</li> </ul>
<i>Muracho Gucho</i>	<p><i>Plan 1</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct 6 latrines for students</li> <li>• Construct 2 latrines for teachers</li> <li>• Construct 30 desks</li> <li>• Repair 30 other desks</li> <li>• Purchase sports articles</li> <li>• Clear and level the sports field</li> </ul> <p><i>Plan 2</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct 4 blackboards</li> <li>• Construct front fence</li> <li>• Purchase teaching aids</li> <li>• Conduct maintenance work on 2 classrooms and 3 teachers' shelters</li> </ul>
<i>Debub Mesenqela</i>	<p><i>Plan 1</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renovate 2 classrooms</li> <li>• Construct 4 latrines</li> <li>• Construct 60 desks</li> <li>• Construct 5 blackboards</li> </ul> <p><i>Plan 2</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct latrines for female students</li> <li>• Equip the Pedagogical Center</li> <li>• Make a school signboard</li> </ul>
<i>Balesito</i>	<p><i>Plan 1</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct 41 desks</li> <li>• Construct 4 latrines</li> <li>• Construct 1 blackboard</li> </ul> <p><i>Plan 2</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct 250m fence around the school</li> <li>• Conduct maintenance on 4 classrooms, an office, and staff room</li> <li>• Construct 20 desks</li> <li>• Establish a Pedagogical Center</li> </ul>
<i>Dagara</i>	<p><i>Plan 1</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct 2 classrooms</li> <li>• Construct 1 office</li> <li>• Construct 60 desks</li> </ul> <p><i>Plan 2</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct 8 latrines</li> <li>• Equip the Pedagogical Center</li> </ul>

**SIA Grants and Community Contributions**

Communities in SNNPR have provided significant contributions to improving school quality. For the five schools visited in SNNPR, the following funds/labor/materials were raised (excluding the SIA grant amounts):

**Table 5.9: Community Contributions to School Improvement  
Five SNNPR Data Collection Schools**

<b>School</b>	<b>Phase 1 (birr)</b>	<b>Phase 2 (birr)</b>	<b>Phase 3 (birr)</b>	<b>Total (birr)</b>
<b>Abela Lida</b>	16,100.00	11,570.00	23,557.00	51,227.00
<b>Muracho Gucho</b>	5,807.50	7,900.00	8,397.00	22,104.50
<b>Debub Mesenqela</b>	18,079.80	4,360.00	4,972.00	27,411.80
<b>Balesito</b>	2,545.00	5,582.00	10,900.00	19,027.00
<b>Dagara</b>	56,819.00	5693.00	3757.00	66,269.00

From these figures, it can be seen that the SIA grants for the five schools visited have leveraged considerable extra funds, as high as 4:1 of community fundraising to SIA grant. Schools are not only able to mobilize community contributions; they are also able to obtain grant funds from other governmental and non-governmental agencies.

It should be noted that WL does not require a minimum contribution. All contributions are voluntary and based on an individual's capability.

A particular problem in SNNPR in raising funds after the first SIA grant was the poor coffee harvest. As the community is largely made up of farmers that grow coffee as a cash crop, when there is a normal harvest, community members are able to contribute cash and other in-kind items. When the harvest is poor, community members not only are missing the income from the coffee, they must also work in different areas to generate an income. The problem of income is compounded when family size is taken into account. Many families are polygamous in the school communities we visited. With many children, families must pass on ever-smaller parcels of land to their sons as an inheritance. When the possibility exists to generate an income in other ways, children are often taken from school to earn.

**Roles, Responsibilities and Actions of KETBs and PTAs**

We learned that although KETBs and PTAs were to identify a number of problems they wanted to solve, the most pressing for many was the construction of new classrooms. In SNNPR, the REB had passed a regulation stating that all schools will require students to be present all day (instead of attending in shifts). This created severe overcrowding problems at each grade level and put pressure on the KETBs and PTAs to construct even more classrooms. It also put pressure on the woreda to provide more teachers. We also learned that a woreda priority was the construction of new classrooms.

Schools in the SNNPR that were once grades 1-6 were downgraded to grades 1-4. Parents and community members were very unhappy about this change, and most members of the KETB and PTA wanted to upgrade their school to grades 1-8 so that children could remain in the community for all primary grades. Hence, the school and community are continuing to add classrooms after the SIA grants are finished so that the school can offer grades 1-8.

In all schools visited, the KETB and PTA work together, holding weekly/bi-weekly/monthly meetings together, although their official roles and responsibilities remained separate. That the community chose both the KETB and the PTA helps to make them accountable to the community. The only exception to this statement is the KETB Chair, who is also the kebele

Chair, and is appointed by the woreda. That the KETB chair is appointed and subject to transfer or other decision by the woreda has resulted in a very unstable headship of the KETB. In all cases, the School Director serves as the KETB Secretary. The heavy workload of the KETB chair has translated many times into his non-attendance at meetings, which holds up decision making.

When the KETB/PTA confront issues they cannot resolve themselves, they take the issue to the woreda (IR 3.2a). Among the top issues raised to the woreda and the woreda responses (IR 3.2b) in SNNPR are as follows:

**Table 5.10: Sample of Issues Raised with the Woreda and Woreda Responses, SNNPR**

Issues Raised with the Woreda by PTA/KETB	Response of Woreda
Community non-acceptance of PTA/KETB-designed action plans	Woreda consults with community to determine the issues and helps to resolve until the action plan is accepted
Increasing farm activities at school to generate income	Solved by PTA/KETB
Construction and maintenance of classrooms and fences	Woreda donates some materials
Hiring a school guard	Woreda allocates a position
Upgrade the school level	Woreda upgrades

In SNNPR woreda responses to requests made by PTAs/KETBs have not been readily forthcoming. Also, the data collection on these IRs has not been adequate; more training of SDAs on how to collect these data is required.

**Roles, Responsibilities and Actions of GACs**

GACs are normally composed of 7 members: two teachers, two mothers, two students (1 boy and 1 girl), and a community member (may be a religious leader). In all the schools we visited, the membership of the GAC varied; in some cases there were as many as 15 members.

The GAC generally meets twice per month, or more often if needed. The GAC encourages all girl students to come to them with their problems to be resolved. In our research, we had the GAC members identify and rank order the top 10 issues facing girls in their schools. We then asked them to tell us what the GAC did about the problems and what the results were. In general, the problems fall into three categories: problems of poverty, gender-specific problems, and issues of school quality. Table 5.11 sets forth the results of this data collection exercise for all five schools visited in SNNPR:

**Table 5.11: Girls' Problems and Solutions Developed by GAC, SNNPR**

Girls' Problems	GAC Solution	Results
<b>Poverty</b>		
No Clothing	Provision of clothing through GAC income generating activities	Increased girls' enrollment

Must Generate Income	GAC convinces parents to send children to work only on market days	Decreased dropouts
Demand for Girls' Labor	GAC convinces parents to send their daughters to school and work after	Increased girls' enrollment
Orphan Girls	Supported by GAC with clothes, food, and school supplies	Decreased dropouts
<b>Gender-Specific</b>		
Early Marriage	Convincing parents to let girls continue in school; education of community on harmful health effects of early marriage	Increased girls' enrollment
Abduction (grades 4, 7 and 8)	KETB and PTA brought in to address the community on the illegality of abduction; parents addressed on the immorality of abduction	Increased girls' enrollment
Rape	Boys and girls are given instruction on the illegality of rape and how to interact with and respect each other	
Menstruation	Education of girls on normal bodily functions; construction of separate latrines for girls and boys; lessons to parents on assisting their daughters	More girls come to school during their monthly periods
Female Genital Cutting/ Mutilation	Education on illegality of operation and difficulty in bearing children	Prosecution of women performing these operations; decline in practice
Vulnerability of Girls to HIV/AIDS	Education of community on spread of HIV/AIDS; discouragement of sex before marriage; encouragement to be tested; health center professionals give lessons	
Low Self-Esteem/Not Valued as Boys	GAC gives lessons on equity	
Illiteracy of Mothers	GAC visits mothers to tell them of the long-term payoff possible when girls are sent to school	
Low Girls' Enrollment	Lessons on time management, not to be discouraged when facing problems; lessons to parents on equity	Increased girls' enrollment
Low Examination Results for Girls	Girls given tutorial classes by male and female teachers; make more textbooks available to girls	Increases in test results
Absence of Female Teachers as Role Models	Request sent to woreda for female teachers	
<b>School Quality</b>		
Separate Toilets for Girls and Boys	Prioritized for SIA grants	Increased girls' enrollment

Of particular interest in gathering these data was one under-performing school that had no female teachers, and more than half of the teachers were new this year. In that school, the male teachers on the GAC identified only school quality and structural issues affecting girls. They did not identify any gender-specific issues the GAC needed to resolve. At this particular school, girls started school at an older age and many were already married. None of this was mentioned by the GAC.

Female members of the GAC serve as role models to girl students in that the teachers, especially, explain through their own experiences how they became professional women. Teachers point out the women who are in senior government posts, many of whom had humble, rural beginnings, just as these girls. Some mothers on GACs are community opinion leaders, and one

has won the regional council election. There was a general consensus among mother-members that regardless of what their educational attainment has been, they cannot miss the opportunity of sending their daughters to school.

We learned that the GAC members do not receive any formal training on how to identify and resolve girls' problems. The training they receive as a group is informal and is provided by the SDA at school visits (who serves as a role model to members of the GAC). The SDA looks over the GAC's annual plan, makes suggestions on how to improve it, and collects data on the types of issues addressed by the GAC. The GAC is one of the most compelling organizations developed through CGPP in decreasing girls' dropout rates and increasing girls' enrollment. We believe that with additional, formal training, the work of the GAC could be even more productive. Moreover, in some cases, the linkages between the GAC and the KETB/PTA are somewhat tenuous. The GAC members sometimes feel they are operating on their own, even though they can easily access the PTA/KETB for assistance.

#### 4.3.2 Amhara

*Most families in Amhara rely on rainfed cereal agriculture (t'eff, barley, maize, sorghum, millet) for both their income and subsistence. When we went to communities in Amhara, fewer PTA and KETB members were present because the rains had come early and farmers were busy planting. At one school, we were informed that the government was providing bags of fertilizer and so only a few teachers remained on the school compound. One school was located on a peninsula in Lake Tana where the climate and soils allowed for the growing of coffee. The School Director told us that when the coffee crop is good, school enrollment is up, and when it declines children must be taken out of school (at least seasonally) to engage in income generating activities. In another community, people own a significant number of cattle and so sell milk and butter to generate income.*

The area also suffers seasonally from malaria infestation. Also, because the main road to Addis Ababa cuts through the woredas we visited, the incidence of HIV/AIDS infection is high.

Some very rural communities were difficult to mobilize for two reasons: 1) school ownership by the community was a very new idea; and 2) farmers believed they had to contribute cash, which many did not have. At the COWs, however, community members learned that even they, poor as they are, can contribute something toward the education of their children. In this region, it was very clear that community interest grew with the completion of the plan implemented for each SIA grant.

In Amhara, school-communities devised and achieved the following plans for the first two SIA grants:

**Table 5.12: School Improvement Plans Made and Achieved - Five Schools in Amhara**

School	Plans Made and Achieved
Zegie	Plan 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repair water pipe</li> <li>• Refurbish and organize library</li> <li>• Repair floors of two classrooms</li> </ul> Plan 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct 4 classrooms</li> <li>• Prepare two sports fields</li> <li>• Obtain teaching aids for grades 1-4</li> <li>• Beautify school compound with flowers and naming of trees</li> </ul>
Andassa	Plan 1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct 2 latrines</li> <li>• Fence the school compound</li> </ul> Plan 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct two classrooms</li> <li>• Construct 30 benches</li> <li>• Prepare sports fields</li> <li>• Reward better-performing females</li> </ul>
Ayelew Mekonnen	Plan 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purchase 210 desks</li> <li>• Purchase 210 benches</li> </ul> Plan 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purchase 3 blackboards</li> <li>• Construct tutorial hall</li> <li>• Purchase 10 chairs for teachers</li> </ul>
Ziguda	Plan 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct 5 classrooms</li> </ul> Plan 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct 2 classrooms</li> <li>• Construct a library</li> <li>• Construct an office</li> <li>• Construct a store room</li> <li>• Construct a Pedagogical Center</li> </ul>
Kulkwalmeda	Plan 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repair walls of 3 classrooms</li> <li>• Repair floors of 11 classrooms</li> <li>• Construction of store rooms with iron sheets</li> </ul> Plan 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct 1 classroom</li> <li>• Purchase 9 blackboards</li> <li>• Finish construction of 8 latrines</li> <li>• Purchase 20 combined desks</li> </ul>

#### SIA Grants and Community Contributions

Table 5.13 sets forth the amounts raised by communities for the SIA grant activity:

**Table 5.13: Community Contributions to School Improvement  
Five Schools in Amhara**

School	Total (birr)
<b>Zegie</b>	17,300.00
<b>Andassa</b>	17,259.45
<b>Ayelew Mekonnen</b>	18,945.40
<b>Ziguda</b>	74,712.50
<b>Kulkwalmeda</b>	46,813.10

#### Roles, Responsibilities and Actions of KETBs and PTAs

KETB/PTA roles and responsibilities include: financial management, community mobilization, planning, fulfilling SIA grant criteria, obtaining funding from other sources, and sustainability. The KETB/PTA members identify school-based problems, prioritize them, develop action plans

on how to solve them, and take the plan to the community for approval. With the funds provided by the SIA and the amounts raised by the community, actions plans are implemented.

Some of the problems identified by the PTA/KETB could be resolved by the community, but not all. For instance, the community cannot purchase textbooks; they must come from the woreda. The Amhara Development Association has been a partial problem solver in this region, providing funds and in-kind support for the construction of buildings. Among the issues brought to the woreda and the ways in which the woreda addressed the issues are as follows:

**Table 5.14: Sample of Issues Raised with the Woreda and Woreda Responses, Amhara**

Issues Raised with the Woreda by PTA/KETB	Response of Woreda
Farmers residing on the school compound	Farmers chased away
Destruction of latrines	Latrines reconstructed
Drinking water	Piped water brought in
Funding obtained to build a high school; permission sought	Woreda denied; a high school had already been built in an adjacent woreda

**Roles, Responsibilities and Actions of GACs**

The number of members on the GAC generally exceeds 7. In one community both an Orthodox priest and a Muslim Imam are members. The GAC generally meets twice a month, and more often if needed. The members often go out to visit parents and other community members to build awareness on why girls should go to school. The GAC did not receive any formal training (although some chairs attended the KETB/PTA training provided by the woreda or by WL) in how to identify and solve gender-related problems. Despite this lack of input, the GACs in Amhara identified, prioritized, and solved many problems with the result of increasing girls enrollment or decreasing girls’ dropout rates. The problems the GAC identified and resolved fall into three categories: Poverty, Gender-Specific Issues, and School Quality Issues.

**Table 5.15: Girls' Problems and Solutions Developed by GAC, Amhara**

<b>Girls' Problems</b>	<b>GAC Solution</b>	<b>Results</b>
<b>Poverty</b>		
Unable to Afford School Expenses	GAC opens small retail shop to generate income to provide supplies to girls; money collected from community, teachers and students to support needy girls; mobilized funds from HIV/AIDS Secretariat	Girls provided supplies and clothing; 145 girls able to stay in school
Orphans	GAC identified sources of child adoption; support solicited from kebele "edirs"	4 orphans sent to Italy and France
<b>Gender-Specific</b>		
Early Marriage	GAC provides awareness training to girls and parents on the dangers of early marriage; some training provided by religious leaders; levy of 500 birr on parents and elders who arrange such marriages; girls advised to report on intended arrangements for early marriage	20 early marriage contracts nullified in joint action with KETB, PTA and Woreda justice
Personal Hygiene Practices	GAC provides training to girls on various related topics	Improved hygiene practice
No Housing for Girls Living a Long Distance from school (fear of rape)	GAC helps to find rental housing for girls; opened an ABE (satellite school) in nearby kebele	More girls protected from harmful actions on the way to school
Lack of Community Awareness on the Value of Girls' Education	GAC undertakes community awareness raising campaigns (held in churches and mosques)	More parents are sending their girls to school
Need for Girls' Labor at Home	Consultations with parents to send their daughters to school; organized tutorial classes	Girls able to stay in school and have more study time
Lack of Self-Confidence and Self-Esteem	GAC organized monthly girls' discussion groups; facilitated girls' involvement in school leadership and class monitoring	Improved self-confidence among girls
Girls' Dependency	GAC arranges for skills training to enhance self-employment and income; support obtained from YMCA	No results reported
<b>School Quality</b>		
No Latrines	Separate latrines constructed for girls and boys	Increased enrollment
No Drinking Water	School children advised to bring water in plastic bottles from home	Children must take care of their own drinking needs

The GACs with which we spoke in Amhara work in cooperation with the KETBs/PTAs. Abduction and early marriage are endemic to the region, often requiring woreda legal assistance to nullify any contracts made. Early marriages are often viewed as an income generating activity of the family because a "beautiful" girl can command a price of 2,000 birr.

Teachers on the GAC serve as role models to girl students. They show the girls how to dress, how to be healthy, and the rewards that come from staying in school. Mothers serve as community educators, citing the consequences of not having attended school in their own lives. One Muslim mother talked about how hard it was for her to stay in school due to the beliefs about girls in her religion. She persevered and now she wants her daughters to attend high school, although there is none in her community. Teachers also play a role in educating boys about the traditional division of labor, positing that boys should take on some of the responsibilities of girls so that girls are also free to go to school.

In one community among the Awi people, we were told that it was a cultural shame for girls to be seen in the company of boys. Cultural beliefs dictate that there be a separation lest girls' reputations are ruined. In school, teachers must address this issue and encourage boys and girls to work together. By doing so, the old beliefs and practices are being challenged, but this is one factor that prevents girls from being enrolled in school.

### 4.3.3 Tigray

#### SIA Grants Process

TDA offers two grants to all 400 schools under BESO II. The first grant is for 5,800 birr and the second is for 10,000 birr; all schools receive both grants. SDAs work with PTAs and School Directors to develop SIPs which are then submitted to the Woreda Technical Working Group. (The SDA is a member and secretary of this body.) The woreda can approve or reject and can also give comments. The SIP is next sent to the regional office where it is again reviewed for "concurrence with the objectives of BESO." All of the SIPs are then summarized by regional professional staff and then they are submitted to the regional steering committee. This committee has the right to deny a grant, but they have never disapproved an SIP. The regional staff noted, however, that often in the first round, SIPs are returned for revision.

#### SIA Grants and Community Contributions

A comment about CGPP that was commonly expressed during discussions with PTAs and KETBs can be summarized in the following quote: "CGPP gives us a little and we provide so much more." Typically, communities support school improvement programs through contributions in the form of labor, materials and cash. The monetary value of labor and materials is determined on local market prices.

All schools stated that they felt that they should receive more resources from the project, although the School Director in one school also stated that even without BESO resources, the community was motivated enough to make the repairs to school furniture. (This school appears to also be a BESO I school.)

The view of the community getting little and giving a lot is of particular concern because of the size of TDA grants (total of 15,800 birr to all schools under BESO II) and the fact that three of the schools visited also received grants from BESO I. The efficacy of TDAs strategy and interventions needs to be investigated further.

Table 5.16 shows BESO II Phase 2 grant breakdowns from the four CGPP schools visited. Considering the four schools together under BESO II, the contribution of communities to total school improvement cost constitutes a third (34%) of CGPP's contribution. In some communities the contribution is greater than one-half of the SIA.

**Table 5.16: TDA/BESO 2<sup>nd</sup> phase Grant Receiving Schools (11/2004 – 10/2005)**

Contributions to school improvement		School improvement investment outlay in:				Total
		Enderta woreda		Houzen woreda		
Source	Type	Mikael Kelti school	Lahma School	Debrehiwot school	Endasebela School	
Com'unity	Labor	-	600	200	100	900
	Materials	-	-	-	-	-

	Cash	2,500	1,000	2,500	3,000	9,000
	Sub-total	2,500	1,600	2,700	3,100	9,900
<b>School</b>	Labor	-	150	200	100	450
	Materials	-	-	-	-	-
	Cash	300	400	500	2,000	3,200
	Sub-total	300	550	700	2,100	3,650
<b>Gov't &amp; others</b>	Materials	9,100	-	-	-	9,100
	Sub-total	9,100	-	-	-	9,100
<b>CGPP</b>	SIA	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	40,000
	Sub-total	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	40,000
	Total	21,900	12,150	13,400	15,200	62,650

Mikael Kelti's School Director, who is a member of both the PTA and GAC, reported that the school has received government funds to support three new classrooms.

#### ***Requests to the Woreda and Woreda Responses***

A PTA in Hawzen addressed the issue of contract teachers, a common phenomenon in the schools we visited. They made a case to the woreda that due to the shift to self-contained classrooms, they need qualified teachers. Their request has not yet been acted upon. In this region, as in others, there is high turnover of teachers and School Directors due to "the lack of amenities."

The School Director of one Enderta school noted that the community, suffering from drought for at least 3 years, is benefiting from government and other programs including resources to construct additional classrooms and "food for work."

#### **Roles, Responsibilities and Actions of PTAs/KETBs**

The challenge in mobilizing PTAs/KETBs is illustrated in a quote from a new School Director who took over a school last year that probably also had BESO I support:

*Given the difficulties in this community for a long time, it had a dependency syndrome. It was obvious that the school management had to take the lead. Even the PTA was not different from the general community even though they had gone through training.*

This school is staffed entirely by contract teachers, excluding the School Director. All of these teachers are new this year. CGPP has provided resources for latrines (which were locked for the entire visit because the person with the keys was not on campus), a science kit (badly kept with few materials), and desks. PTA members said that they do their best to forward suggestions on how to reduce dropouts, to provide support on teaching and learning problems, and how to stop absenteeism. The latter issue is a key achievement as the PTA feels they have succeeded by undertaking a campaign in the community. They note, however, that they are very poor and have many constraints on what they can do with the school.

Another school, which may also have received BESO I support, stated that they had been highly successful in mobilizing the community to contribute and that BESO was a "good partner" that helped to create a "bridge" between the school and community. Still, they were concerned with what they identified as "decreasing grant amounts" from BESO. Their School Director stated

that “at the very least, the PTA will be sustained [if BESO ends] because of the experience and skills acquired in planning, scheduling and management.”

In another school, parents questioned the educational policy decision to move from double shifts to all-day school. They cited the need for children’s labor in a very poor community. This issue was debated in the PTA and the final consensus was that the advantages of all-day school outweighed the disadvantages.

A school in Hawzen is attempting to pressure the woreda into providing them with qualified teachers. They considered staging a demonstration at the woreda to protest transfers but, when told that the transfers were connected to teacher promotion, they abandoned this idea. Another member of this PTA stated that they are well on their way to closing the gap between male and female enrollment.

#### **Roles, Responsibilities and Actions of GACs**

The contributions made by WAT from its membership on the GAC to its membership on the Woreda Technical Working Group to the training and support it provides for addressing gender inequality, harmful traditional practices, and the promotion of girls education cannot be overstated. WAT’s membership structure – from the village to the region – has meant that activities at the level of the GAC are connected to higher institutional levels. For example, in a woreda group interview, the WAT member of the Woreda Technical Working Group stated that GAC issues are now woreda issues:

*This TA working group looks into problems related to early marriage and loss of opportunities, girls’ household responsibilities that keep them away from school. We review, identify, define scope, and seek solutions. Decision-making areas have included the problem of abduction. We follow up at the courts. A number of abductors have been sentenced. ... We promote women’s participation all along the line ... and participate on the Girls Education Committees.*

Even when these actions are initiated at the school level, the presence of WAT at all levels provides broader institutional support for gender and education actions. Indeed, the WAT representative noted that CGPP “provided a platform for the association [WAT] to institutionalize their activities through through GACs and the woreda technical working groups.” This is certainly an example of community participation and support. What is left to determine, however, is how WAT’s significant responsibility for gender technical support is planned, monitored, and held accountable since they have no contractual relationship to the implementing partner.

As noted before, GACs in Tigray are organized and active, and receive training from WAT. They are engaged in awareness campaigns, tutorials, income generation and other activities to promote girls’ education. Early marriage, parents’ demand for the labor of their daughters, low self-esteem, and poor academic achievement are all problems identified by the GACs. Unlike other regions, however, they did not see rape and abductions as such serious problems today, although they were endemic in the past.

When asked if there were any changes in the behaviors of boys or male teachers since the GAC was instituted, one teacher responded that in the past, girls would only confide in female

teachers. Since male teachers have been sensitized and trained, the girls now feel comfortable talking with them. Additionally, as we watched boys and girls in a spirited football game, we noted a shift towards boys and girls playing together.

Table 5.18 presents the problems identified by GACs, how they addressed the problems, and how they define the results.

**Table 5.18: Girls' Problems and Solutions Developed by GAC, Tigray**

<b>Girls' Problems</b>	<b>GAC Solution</b>	<b>Results</b>
Poverty	Income-generation projects (embroidery, etc.)  WAT training/technical package on energy and labor saving	Girls have resources for school materials and all girls have new income-generating skills More time for girls that could encourage them to go to school
Demand for Girls' Labor (water, fuelwood)	Village awareness campaign	Increased girls' enrollment
Cultural priority for boys	Messages on gender equity included in all awareness campaigns  Girls clubs organize dramas and other events  Recognizing girls who assert their right to education	Increases in girls' enrollment   Girls on GAC
Early Marriage leading to drop out	Take opportunities in community gatherings to spread information. Awareness-raising campaign on the harmful effects of early marriage  Established a teacher / student Child Rights Committee to assure that girls understand their rights.  Teachers write poems and have monthly drama sessions at school.	Parents of 4 girls convinced to delay marriage and allow girls to continue education  Increased girls' enrollment
Low academic performance of girls leading to drop out	Tutorials established Prizes given to high-performing girls Encourage parents to support daughters education	Improved academic performance.
Absence of Female Role Models	Teachers and girls on GAC take on this role with female students	Increase in girls' self esteem

In one Hawzen school, the GAC addressed problems in girls' education that went beyond their current scope of influence. They noted that girls drop out at increasing rates as they get older and/or get into the higher grades. They are well aware that girls are less likely than boys to go to upper primary and highly unlikely to go to secondary school. In addition to the barriers and problems cited in the chart, they noted that the distance to these schools was a significant barrier for girls.

#### 4.3.4 Afar

This section includes findings from two primary schools in Afar. An analysis of the findings from the ABEC is in a separate section.

#### SIA Grants

Due to a miscommunication, we were unable to review the content of School Improvement Plans for the schools visited. In the two primary schools in Afar, we learned in community interviews that the emphasis was on the need for new and renovated classrooms, although additional needs were identified and included in the SIA (supplying schools with sports materials, fencing and erosion protection around school). Other critical needs (creating a water supply at the school, building a residence for teachers, providing resources for the activities of the GEAC) have not been included or achieved through the grants process in the schools visited.

In one school, the PTA had many new members due to a problem of embezzlement of woreda funds by a former School Director.<sup>12</sup> They were proud that they had constructed four new classrooms in the last year. They stated that they had received two grants for construction, although they had no information on the specifics of the plan or community contributions.

In the other school, members of the PTA had specific knowledge of their cash contributions and accomplishments (9 classrooms in three years), and were also highly demanding of SCOPE about finding out why they had not received another grant, or why their plan to develop a water supply/reservoir at the school was rejected by the project.

*In the plan, they had a reservoir for school...BUT this was rejected by school development agent and it was returned to the community. He told us that this plan is not accepted by the project office.*

We were informed by the Save COP that the plan was rejected because of the cost of the pump requested, and that other schools did address water issues in their plans, such as construction of a holding tank. Perhaps in the case of this particular school, as in other schools across IPs and regions, SDAs do not all have the capacity to engage the PTAs in a participatory planning process that would result in addressing water issues in a way that is doable and within project guidelines and resources.

It was interesting to observe this PTA, made up of Afari men and women who spoke with equal frequency with us during the group interview. They believed that although they are a very poor and uneducated community, they had accomplished more than other BESO schools. “Truly speaking,” said one man, “we have accomplished a lot for this woreda.” The PTA also explained that they believed that it was critical for them to add grades (beyond grade 4) to continue to support the enrollment and retention of girls, noting that girls cannot attend schools a great distance from their homes due to safety and cultural constraints.

*We are told (by the SDC) that the school has failed, but the justification is not convincing. They are telling us we are doing good, that we are using money wisely, and better than other schools. Finally, they have told us that we have failed. We asked for the criteria why we have failed. We asked for criteria... they didn't tell us... we can't learn unless they tell us.*

---

<sup>12</sup> We were informed by the SAVE COP that Save conducted an investigation of this embezzlement charge and found that the funds involved were not CGPP.

*We don't know our mistakes. And we can't learn. We have the motive! We will continue working, but because he said that we have failed and didn't tell us why, we cannot improve.*

Despite the rejection of their water reservoir plan, this PTA has developed an alternative, although less satisfactory strategy: parents were solicited to provide a barrel and each child must bring two liters of water from the river to school daily for drinking and cooking, although they recognize that the water is not potable.

The PTA's sense of accomplishment and demands for explanations by the project attest to their high level of engagement. No other PTA exhibited these characteristics in the three regions visited by the researcher.

### **SIA Grants and Community Contributions**

To supplement the grants provided by Save (Phase 1: 3000 birr; Phase 2, 3500 birr), the community raised 1000 birr for the first phase and 2125 birr in the second phase (in addition to in-kind labor) at Hasoba School. Data were not available for Amibara school.

**Table 5.17: Community Contributions, Two Schools, Afar**

<b>School</b>	<b>Phase 1 (birr)</b>	<b>%Target</b>	<b>Phase 2 (birr)</b>	<b>%Target</b>	<b>Total (birr)</b>
<b>Amibara #2</b>	580.00	58%	19,059.80	95.3%	19,639.80
<b>Hasoba</b>	1,000.00	100%	1,150.00	115%	2,150.00

Note: Eleven Afar schools received Phase 3 funding. Afar schools do not have value calculated for contributions of labor and local materials.

### **Roles, Responsibilities and Actions of PTAs/KETBs**<sup>13</sup>

Both PTAs in Afar had one member from the kebele, although they were not identified as KETB. Both PTAs also met at least monthly, and more often when a problem or issue arose that required their attention. Both PTAs had written minutes, usually kept by the teacher on the PTA, although one school noted that a community member had begun to take the minutes. The SDC provided guidance and supervision of their planning process and, in one case, was seen as not providing necessary information (i.e., feedback on why they were unsuccessful in obtaining the third SIA). The process for identifying issues and plans was, perhaps, overly influenced by the SDC: in one school, for example, a plan to have some resources used for GEAC activities was rejected by the SDC. That school also felt that the SDC was not as understanding about the challenges they faced in times of clan conflict and violence. However, on the positive side, these are high expectations and reflect some level of community empowerment.

Both PTAs in Afar discussed their responsibilities to encourage enrollment and retention, especially of girls, and to work in their communities to promote education of all children. Specifically, the PTAs discussed how they follow up on children who have had long absences by meeting with their families to encourage their continued education.

One of the PTAs not only encourages parents to keep children in school, but also works with the School Director in following up on migrating families. The School Director provides letters of

<sup>13</sup> In both schools in Afar, the Kebele chair participated in the interviews.

transfer and the PTA attempts to assure that the children are actually enrolled in the receiving schools.

In one of the PTAs, there was a seamlessness between PTA and GEAC commitments:

*We have learned about problems of female students, how we can bring females to school, and how to identify problems of the school. ... The population in this area is illiterate and they do not know the importance of education. They don't know the important of educating daughters. There is a household pressure due to culture, so we have to go to the community and convince them. We say that you may receive a letter from your relative and you will have to ask others to read it... If you send your daughter to school, she can read it to you. We want to attract females to come to school.*

#### **Requests to the Woreda and Woreda Responses**

In one of the schools, the PTA wrote a letter to the woreda to have the School Director removed for embezzlement and because “he was not able to motivate the community.” The action was successful, but the community is disappointed that when the former Director was transferred, teachers were also transferred. Still, the PTA has high expectations: “BESO support has helped us to manage the school. As a result, we demand from the woreda.” Another change initiated by this PTA was not made directly to the woreda but has implications for government policy on the membership of the PTA. They stated that the first PTA was made up of highlanders, not Afari, and they reorganized in order to have more Afari members to reflect the culture and experience of the community.

In the other school, PTA members stated: “We present any problem we think to the WEO.” They have identified and presented the following: shortage of teachers, water, electricity, textbooks, upgrade (more grades), and problems of health and transportation. Since the WEO is relatively new, they also talked about going to the zone in past years. The only response from government has been inaction on their request for replacement teachers for those who have been transferred. They also believe that they will have a large increase in enrollment next year and are frustrated by the woreda response.

#### **Roles, Responsibilities and Actions of GEACs**

The GEACs in both schools have actively addressed socio-cultural barriers to girls’ education and have implemented programs to support very poor girls. Both perceive the GEAC as a significantly different entity than the former structure of girls’ clubs, although a girls’ club is part of the GEAC strategy. In most schools visited by the team, the GEAC has provided a formal and valid social space to address the very difficult barriers, deeply rooted in culture and tradition, that keep girls out of school and force them to leave school prematurely.

Although both of the GEACs talked about abduction and early marriage, in the second school, the issues were presented in very stark terms. A teacher stated that change in this Afari community is just starting, and that problems faced by girls and women are very serious and difficult to overcome.

The GEAC consists of 2 mothers, 2 teachers, and 4 female students age 12 and 13. They talked about the cultural practice in Afar of “absuma” where any girls can be forced to marry a male

relative of her mother's, "even if she is 15 years old and he is 70 and he wants her for his 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> wife."

Abduction and early marriage were cited as frequent occurrences, with a teacher adding that quite often "a very young girl, age 10, 12, 15, is given to an old man." They described abduction as follows: "Without her knowledge or consent, a girl is forced by a man to be his wife. After taking her, he will pay or give something to the parents if she is not willing to be his wife. She has no other choice because after losing her virginity no one is going to marry her." In response to this situation, said the girls on the GEAC, they know of several girls who have committed suicide by taking poison they are able to get from the nearest town.

It was highly unusual for such desperation to be shared so readily, especially by the young students, and they clearly had the self-respect and presence to communicate these very serious issues. All four girls perceived themselves as role models for other girls, although one stated that they tell girls "to be better than us." The girls stated that it is very important that they have female teachers and a female School Director.

*Because they (the School Director and female teachers) are here, girls are coming to school . . . Because the Director supports girls. She does very good things for girls. . . Because we are not afraid of anything. Because we can talk to them (the teachers), we can discuss anything with them. If there is a male teacher, we will be afraid of talking with him.*

The GEAC has used lessons from a teacher training provided by the World Food Program to develop incentives for girls' enrollment and retention: they provide cooking oil to girls with good attendance records. In addition, they have a highly developed drama program with a variety of scripts/scenarios and costumes. Many of the girls participate in these community-awareness dramas and they also write poetry. (In other schools, the poetry was written by teachers.) The GEAC members noted that they wanted resources for costumes and for sharing their dramas. They also thought it would be a good idea to have the dramas videotaped so they could be shared more widely. They did not request resources for GEAC programs through the SIA "because of a bad experience" with the SDC.

Table 5.19 presents the accomplishment of GEAC activities:

**Table 5.19: Girls' Problems and Solutions Developed by GEAC, Afar**

<b>Girls' Problems</b>	<b>GEAC Solutions</b>	<b>Results</b>
Fathers prevent daughters from attending school. They see it as "wasted" on girls. Low cultural value placed on girls and women.	Members do monthly presentations and dramas at community meetings. Girls play important role in "sector" meetings, of 50 families, to raise awareness. Teachers and Director meet with entire school body to raise boys' respect for girls.	Perceived increase in girls' enrollment. Girls on GEAC believe in their own and other girls' intrinsic value. State that female SD and teachers are critical to their development.
Belief that girls who go to school will become "out of control" (sexually active).	Meet with religious and clan leaders to promote girls' education.	Perceived increase in girls' enrollment. No girls in 2001 and 50 girls today. Boys and girls sit together, play together, dance together.
Belief that if a girl is educated,	Use cultural leaders to validate girls'	Perceived increase in girls'

she will not want be a good mother	education.	enrollment
Lack of self esteem, knowledge of female biology, embarrassment	Girls' club representatives refer girls to teachers on GEAC for counseling. Girls write poems and share.	Girls have access to support mechanisms in school environment
FGM and other harmful traditional practices	Training provided to religious and clan leaders on dangers of FGM and links to HIV/AIDs in community meetings. Sector meetings with trainings on FGM, HIV/AIDs and related issues	Religious and clan leaders agree to support GEAC in this educational campaign. Perceived modest increase in community acceptance of message. Clan leaders say that stopping FGM will create "two men in one house."
Distance from home to school (safety concerns)	Established school police to protect girls	Protection provided close to schools
Abduction and (forced) early marriage	Reported to school and GEAC. Complaints made to authorities. GEAC supports girl in court sessions. Demonstrations in market.	No definitive successes
Family reliance on the domestic labor of girl child	Conducted household census and have list of girls who should come to school. Plan to offer incentives next year.	
Poverty	Donations by members of girls clubs and others to provide learning resources to very poor girls. Provide oil to female student monthly, a maximum of 4 liters for two students for those girls who come regularly.	Some girls provided with pens, notebooks, etc. Perceived increase in girls' enrollment and retention

### ABEC

The Kel'at ABEC Management Committee, all male, stated that they had been elected in a community meeting. Prior to SCOPE, they had asked the woreda for a primary school. About 1.5 years ago, the CARE ZC came to the community and asked them to establish the committee. They stated that the project "brought materials" and that they constructed the school, a one-room corrugated structure that is not fully enclosed, and a residence for the facilitators. They also stated that they "mobilize the community to send their children to school," and, if there are absences, they "go to the house and try to get the absent children."

Future plans include clearing bush and planting trees. But their most important issue is one raised in the context of the SCOPE project. Three months ago, the U.S. Ambassador visited the school and presented "papers" that allowed the school to apply for the Ambassador's fund. The community is convinced that this was a promise from the Ambassador to build a school and their efforts have been concentrated to this end. For example, the committee chairperson made at least one trip to Addis to meet with EMRDA about the grant. He said he also went to the woreda for support (the woreda did not confirm this). Management problems most likely contributed to this misunderstanding. However, the Committee is actively seeking improvements in education despite their semi-pastoralist way of life.

### **4.3.5 Oromiya**

#### **SIA Grants**

Save offers three SIA grants given over a period of 3 years (or one per year). In the first year all CGPP schools are entitled to receive 3,000 birr. In the second year, 80% of those who received the first grant are awarded an SIA of 3,500 birr (after being engaged in a competitive process). In the third year, 35% of those who had received the second grant can receive the third – again through a competitive process - of 3,500 birr. A review of the progress of schools receiving grants in the first process might demonstrate their progress, and 5% of these schools might also be a part of the third phase competition.

#### **SIA Grant Process**

The first step for the transfer of funds to the PTAs is to open a bank account and identify cosigners who will have the authority to withdraw funds from the account that have been deposited by the IP or by the community. The second step is for the PTA, School Director and teachers to prepare an action plan that will detail the contribution of the community in terms of labor, cash and material. Then the SDCs and the WEO review the proposal as per the project guidelines. If the plan meets the SDC and WEO approval, it is sent to the ZC and then the Regional Coordinator for approval. The proposal is then sent to the head office, reviewed, and sent to the Finance Department for final review. If all guidelines have been followed, it is sent to the COP for signature; then funds are disbursed to the schools.

When applying for an SIA from Save, PTAs need to identify community contributions. A suggested minimum of 33.33 % contribution (of the SIA amount, in cash, kind or labor) from the community is requested.

#### **Roles, Responsibilities and Actions of KETBs/PTAs**

KETBs/PTAs have developed a process for problem identification in their communities:

- PTAs, with the cooperation of the school community (teachers, students, GACs, community members), list all the problems of the school
- The listed problems are prioritized
- The PTAs shares the prioritized list with the KETBs for discussion
- When agreement between the PTA and KETB is reached, the community will be invited for a meeting to discuss the prioritized problems
- After exhaustive discussions, the community determines how much to contribute in terms of material, labor and cash within a specific time frame

The KETBs/PTAs are very concerned about expanding their schools to reach grade 8 from grade 6 so that children do not have to travel great distances to complete their primary education. One school used the SIA and community funds to add classrooms for grade 7, and their future plans include construction of other classrooms to accommodate grade 8. Although the SIA grant is an incentive, it is not adequate to cover the cost of finishing the classrooms and furnishing them with blackboards, chairs, desks, etc.

KETBs/PTAs in Oromiya have successfully completed the following activities with their SIA grants and community contributions:

- Additional classroom construction

- Fencing of school compound
- Construction of separate toilet for boys and girls
- Library construction and equip with of reference book
- Establishment of pedagogical center and equip with the necessary materials
- Maintenance of classrooms, desks, chairs, blackboards
- Additional supply of desks, chairs and blackboards
- Make school signboards

#### **Roles and Responsibilities of GEACs**

The GEACs in Oromiya have provided counseling and support to girls, held discussions with parents to advise against early marriage and generated income from school activities to provide resources so girls can continue their education. The GEACs advise parents to keep girls in school, advise girls in their studies, and provide training on FGM and HIV/AIDs. They have also actively addressed other harmful cultural attitudes and practices, even where the most commonly mentioned problems for girls were abduction, the practice of “irrecha,” and early marriage. One GEAC also credits SCOPE for shifting programs for girls from an ineffective girls’ club to a proactive committee.

Income-generating projects have been established with initial capital from the teachers and small contributions from students. Students buy and sell peanuts and tea and make knit handicrafts. The profits are used to buy school supplies for very poor girls. A female student (now 15 and on the GEAC) was a victim of abduction, and when she was eventually able to get away from her husband, the GEAC bought her a goat and supported her return to school.

One school had a classroom converted to an office for the member teachers to create a private and safe space for girls. When a girl finds out her parents are considering a forced, early marriage, she comes to the teachers and the GEAC initiates a discussion between both sets of parents and they are advised to keep both children in school until age 18.

One GEAC reported that it had “saved” three girls who were abducted and assisted them to return to school. Another claims it has rescued ten girls from “irrecha,” seven this year alone. A teacher in this school keeps written records on their efforts. They primarily advise parents but, in some cases, take cases to the police. The cultural practice of “irrecha” was described as follows:

*If a man wants to have a female (age 12 or 13) to be married to his family, he comes with a horse and a kind of plant leaf and they (other male family members) bring the very big leaves and stand nearby the house. This means that the man’s need has to be fulfilled. If the parents don’t give him the girl, the parents feel that the girl will die after some days, so she has to go. In some cases, if the girl doesn’t go, they threaten to kill her.*

A male student told us of his personal transformation: previously, he accepted the practice of abduction. Now, when he hears a boy or man talk about it, he advises them not to do so. “If a student practices abduction, the school will punish him and report him to the police.”

Unfortunately, reporting to the police or taking a case to court is not always successful. One GEAC reported that when a case gets to court, the parents often pressure the girl to lie about her age and she complies out of fear.

One committee reported that it has conducted a census of girls to follow up on their enrollment. They state that there are many more girls enrolled in school but that the community still does not fully understand that boys and girls are equally important in the family.

Table 5.20 sets forth the problems raised, solutions implemented, and the results achieved of the GEACs in four schools in Oromiya:

**Table 5.20: Girls' Problems and Solutions Developed by GEAC, Oromiya**

<b>Girls' Problem</b>	<b>GEAC Solution</b>	<b>Results</b>
Parents say you may begin educating a girl but it won't result in anything, it is not worth it. If a female completes grade 5 or 6, they think it is enough.	Provide tutorials to girls  Awareness-raising with parents and other community members  Follow-up of girls who drop out, late comers, and those held back from schooling by early marriage, abduction, etc	Perceived increase in girls' enrollment and decrease in girls' dropout
Dependency of a woman on her husband (little choice in parenting decisions.)	Awareness-raising with parents	No direct result
Belief that if a female is sent to school, she will "misbehave"	Awareness-raising with parents	Perceived increase in girls' enrollment and decrease in girls' dropout
Irrecha, abduction, (forced) early marriage	Counseling girls and families and, when necessary, reporting to police	Saved 10 girls from irrecha  Perceived decrease in these practices
Early marriage (below age of 18 many couple married at 12 or 13) (Boys are above 18)	Counseling girls and families	Girls report to GEAC when parents might be considering early marriage  Perceived decrease in these practices
Lack of self-esteem, knowledge of female biology, embarrassment	Counseling girls through GEAC	Girls have girl-friendly school resources and safe place
Family reliance on the domestic labor of girl child	Income generation projects to purchase school supplies (tea club, knitting, selling peanuts, collecting donations from teachers and girls)	Perceived increase in girls' enrollment and decrease in girls' dropout
Poverty	Income-generating projects to purchase school supplies (tea club, knitting, selling peanuts, collecting donations from teachers and girls)	Perceived increase in girls' enrollment and decrease in girls' dropouts

## **5. PROJECT MANAGEMENT/TURNOVER OF KEY PERSONNAL**

We begin this section with a brief description of the management issues of USAID and in the operation of the TWG. We then consider the two fundamental aspects of managing the CGPP: 1) Implementing Partners, and 2) GoE participation. We consider the head office management and capacity of IPs first. We then consider the capacity and activities of the Regional offices of the project, including the activities of ZCs and the SDAs as a bridge between IPS and the GoE. At this juncture, we divide our findings by region. Within the regional discussions, we then discuss the findings on REBs and Woredas as project management entities.

### **5.1 Turnover and Changes in USAID**

During the course of the implementation of BESO-II, USAID rewrote its strategic plan to reflect the new food security and community resiliency objectives. This meant that IPs may have to take on added responsibilities to conform to the new priorities, but this must be done with appropriate budgetary adjustments.

WL reported having had four CTOs over the course of CGPP implementation. This meant, according to the COP, that WL did not receive the full support such relationships entail in carrying out project responsibilities (until the CTO was fully oriented to the project). When the new CTO was learning, the COP had to consult with the BES Chief for support.

The BESO team at USAID has been of assistance to IPs in the following ways (according to IP COPs):

- Making visits to schools and identifying capacity building and transport needs of SDAs (this is the “best contribution” made by USAID said one COP)
- Creating the Collaboration Group among all BESO II partners
- Being sympathetic to the issue of constrained resources in the face of increased project requirements
- Enjoying a good working relationship with the BES Chief
- Receiving excellent advice on data collection and data management
- Making professional recommendations on the M&E systems

COPs stated that improvement in oversight and management are required. Specific examples cited:

- Failure to notify IPs and REBs about RFAs/RFPs focused on KETB and PTA training, an area where IPs have considerable expertise and many training manuals
- Greater coordination and integration among BESO partners in the sharing of plans and materials (at no additional cost to CGPP IPs)
- Greater advocacy for CGPP with all stakeholders, making CGPP a priority (over the teaching and learning activities performed by AED under BESO II)
- Balancing the demands placed on IPs for additional work (e.g., in health) in light of the changes in strategy
- Greater care exercised by CTOs in communicating with IPs (interaction should not be with staff but only with the COP so as to avoid confusion)

When asked what the ideal relationship IPs could have with CTOs, they said they expect:

- An open relationship, one that encourages rather than always points out weaknesses

- Sharing in problem solving
- Smoothing of “bumps” with the MoE
- Going into the field to observe and make helpful (rather than critical) suggestions
- Developing a win-win attitude because USAID and the IPs are together trying to create positive change
- Communicating openly with a good give-and-take
- Providing technical support where needed
- Monitoring of the project with good feedback on strengths and weaknesses
- Participation in annual planning workshops and being prepared to make helpful suggestions

COPs also have expectations of USAID as a whole:

- Leveraging pressure on the MoE for policy reform, especially regarding turnover
- Providing appropriate resources when additional deliverables are required (under the new strategy)
- Integrating project management functions more so that all of the BESO II IPs can learn from each other
- Developing greater transparency in the USAID BESO team (including conducting organizational development exercises, such as the performance of an internal SWOT, self-assessments, development of learning circles, and the like)

COPs stated that they would like to see more synergy among all the IPs of BESO II, and that the fairly recent decision of USAID to hold monthly meetings with the Collaborative Group (all IPs) is a welcome step in this direction.

## **5.2 Technical Working Group**

The TWG operational modalities and membership list are found in Appendix C. In this section we present comments made by IP COPs on the usefulness of the TWG.

COPs made the following suggestions to improve on the usefulness of the TWG. COPs appreciate meeting with all other IPs in a forum that potentially could produce greater collaboration. Toward that end, they suggest:

- Developing a rule that the same person should represent their respective organizations at each quarterly meeting
- Coming prepared (i.e., having read the quarterly reports in advance)
- Pressuring the MoE to distribute reports on time
- Making questions after presentations more substantive (instead of adversarial, even from USAID)
- Allowing more room to discuss MoE policies that affect the implementation of CGPP, e.g., decentralization, educational for all, abolishing the shift system, and “rationalizing” the schools to be either grades 1-4 or 1-8.
- Conducting some exercises in forward thinking on MoE policy changes and how to accomplish these in light of CGPP goals
- Creating a consultative process to redesign formats for meetings, presentations and reports to allow for a shift of focus from reporting routine events to addressing areas of

project significance and policy issues, and to allow for a comparative analysis of IP results

What COPs would appreciate is a TWG that is more supportive of IP efforts, that is forward thinking, that identifies what is of significance in IP activities, and that advocates for the principles and practices of CGPP with the MoE. COPs would welcome substantive comments and feedback on their work, as well as the opportunity for discussion. IPs want to feel more like partners in a supportive relationship.

## **5.3 World Learning**

### ***5.3.1 Head Office Staffing***

The head office of WL is led by a Chief of Party/Project Director, who is an expatriate (the rest of the staff is Ethiopian). Under him is the Deputy Director – Programs, with two people reporting to him: the Training Director and the M&E Specialist (to whom the Database Manager reports). Also under the COP is the Deputy Director – Finance and Administration. Reporting to her is the Finance and Administration Manager (who has an Administrative Assistant). Reporting to the Manager is the Cashier/Receptionist, a Finance & Administration Officer, a Senior Accountant, an Accountant, Drivers, Office Assistant and Guards. The total number of staff of the head office is at least 16 (depending on the number of drivers and guards).

In senior staff interviews, we learned that staff is stretched, with one backstopping the other across departments. There is also a shortage of staff in data entry, which has resulted in the inability to analyze data in a timely manner. This shortage of staff is the result of an insufficient project budget and/or the design of the PMP with related data collection and entry problems. For work to be done in a timely manner, funds must be made available to increase technical staff, particularly in the data entry area.

There has been very little turnover at the head office. Only one employee was asked to leave and the WL COP indicated that the office has been running more efficiently since.

## **5.3.2 Regional Operations - SNNPR**

### ***5.3.2.1 Regional Office Structure and Staffing***

At the Regional level, WL includes the following staff members: Regional Director, Training & Programs Officer, M&E Assistant, Finance & Admin person, Accountant, Secretary, Office Assistant, 3 guards, and 2 drivers, for a total of 12 employees working out of the Regional Office. Each of the senior staff has a dotted line relationship with their counterpart in the head office. The Regional Office also supports five ZCs, two of which are female (many ZCs have been SDAs or have had similar positions under BESO I). To cover the 575 schools, there are 40 SDAs, of which 8 are female (for an average coverage per SDA of 14 schools).

### ***5.3.2.2 Zone Coordinator Roles and Responsibilities***

ZCs are the links between the SDAs and the Regional Office. Each ZC in SNNPR is responsible for an average of eight SDAs (although the number varies per zone in accordance with the geographic location of schools and woredas). ZCs hold monthly meetings with their SDAs in which informal training is provided and information is passed along from the Regional and head office. The ZC monitors the work of the SDAs, conducts site visits at schools, helps SDAs solve

more difficult problems, accepts and goes over all the data collected by SDAs in their quarterly and annual data collection exercises, prepares monthly work plans, and attends monthly regional meetings. ZCs are also generally present, with the SDAs, at all KETB/PTA training given by the woreda. ZCs receive the same training as SDAs although their work is slightly different and involves supervision. Most ZCs, along with SDAs, are former teachers or school directors who may or may not have had supervisory experience.

Female ZCs may have an additional task to perform over their male counterparts. One ZC in SNNPR was abducted as a young woman. Because she managed to extricate herself from her situation some years later, she was able to return to school and go on to be a teacher and then a Director. She is often asked to share her abduction experience with GACs and other community members to demonstrate that one does not have to resign oneself to a certain kind of life because of earlier misfortunes. She serves as a role model when sharing her experiences.

### **5.3.2.3 SDA Roles and Responsibilities**

When an SDA is hired, s/he participates in a 9-day training in which the following topics are covered: Self-Learning/Facilitation Skills, the Status of Primary Education in Ethiopia, SDAs as Change Agents, Impact of Decentralization on Education Quality and Its Role to Enhance Community Participation, School Leadership, Roles and Responsibilities of BESO II CGPP Collaborators, Improving Girls' Education, Project Planning, Community Mobilization Strategies, M&E, School Resource Management, Characteristics of Effective Schools, Educational Quality, Sustainability, PoPCI, Strategies to Incorporate HIV/AIDS into CGPP School Activities, and an Orientation for Field Exercise. Each topic is presented using adult education methodologies, with a number of tasks to be performed. After 6 days of classroom learning, there is a practicum for two days in the field. On the final day, participants give a fieldwork report as well as an evaluation of the training.

We found this one-off training to be exceptionally well organized in skill building and information sharing. In keeping with best adult education training practice, however, we find that 1) the one-off training provided does not allow for the “digestion” of information, and that 2) the informal training the ZC provide in their monthly meetings may not be sufficient to motivate and encourage SDAs to perform their work more efficiently and effectively.<sup>14</sup>

When employed, SDAs are normally given responsibility for 4 (cohort 1) schools. After 6 months, another 4 are added (cohort 2), after another 6 months, another 4 (cohort 3). After these 18 months, at least Phase I and II of the SIA should have been disbursed, and many schools might be working on Phase III. The project design projected that, for WL, the graduation of many Phase I, II and III schools would have taken place after two years, making room for the addition of new schools/cohorts. When we conducted the research, we found that graduation had indeed taken place, but that 1) cohort 4 was double the size of the previous 3 cohorts, 2) cohort 5 was triple the size of the first three cohorts, and 3) SDAs were still required to conduct follow-up activities every quarter with the graduated schools. Hence, with an average of 14 schools to cover, between 4 and 8 might have graduated, but between 6 and 10 will be working on the plans for their SIA grants, thus requiring greater input and more visits. Given that woredas were

---

<sup>14</sup> In the critique of an earlier draft of this report, the WL COP said that the provision of more formal training to SDAs is limited by the budget.

initially told to “start at the center and move out,” woredas are now choosing schools farther distant.

Female SDAs, like their ZCs, have the additional responsibility of sharing their own personal stories of how they came to their professional positions. In demand in schools and communities, female SDAs who have escaped harmful traditional practices and gone forward in their education are asked by GACs, especially, to explain the professional pathways that brought them to where they are, as most have been raised in the local environment and overcame constraints.

The workload of the SDAs is extremely heavy. In addition to their regular “rounds” of school visits (some of which take place after a 30 km. walk) to monitor and respond to questions from the KETBs, PTAs, School Directors, GACs, and the community, SDAs are required to collect quarterly data. They also lead the ZCs on site visits, develop their monthly/weekly work plans and share them with the woreda, and are responsible directly to the woreda for about 5% of their time. At the woreda, when they are in their offices, SDAs try to share with Supervisors what they are doing in CGPP so that Supervisors might also share what they have learned with non-CGPP schools. Woreda officials believe that SDAs are very overworked. At one woreda, we were told that an SDA had been serving 33 schools until another SDA was hired.

Because of the very high turnover of KETB and PTA Chairs and School Directors, and because the woredas do not provide additional training to schools that have received the initial KETB/PTA training, the orientation of new personnel falls to the SDA. Without a “rolling” training program, new school and KETB personnel receive an orientation from the SDA – a very condensed version of a two- or three-day workshop. Moreover, many transferred staff take all documents on CGPP with them, leaving replacements with no files on CGPP activities. We believe this condensed training is not sufficient for replacement personnel to understand the complexities of the project and that this part of the SDA’s job description should be dropped in favor of more formal training given.

As a woreda employee, one SDAs reported that he receives the monthly salary of 940 birr. WL tops up his (and other SDAs’) salary with an additional 340 birr, and 300 birr for transportation.<sup>15</sup> Since they are no longer teachers or directors, they are not eligible for any raises from the woreda (although no raises have been given for the past three years), so their salary levels are stagnant.

Despite all of the hardships, SDA turnover has not been very high. We are not aware of how many SDAs have left their posts in SNNPR since the beginning of the project.

### **5.3.2.3 Government Management/Oversight of CGPP**

While BESO-II sought to obtain buy-in from the regional, zone and woreda levels of educational administration, the design of the IPs was based in what WAS before the decentralization and devolution of responsibilities from the REB and zone to the woreda. We are not aware of any major adaptations that IPs made to accommodate this devolution.

---

<sup>15</sup> The COP indicated that top-ups are increased regularly on the basis of merit.

#### **5.3.2.3.1 REB**

In SNNPR we learned that there is no one person appointed to oversee CGPP as this is one of many projects the REB is managing. We were told that there is a severe manpower shortage that prevents them from designating certain people or departments to undertake the exclusive management of this project. Hence, people who know about CGPP may be found in Project Planning and Implementation Services, Education Programs & HR Development, in supervisory services, and at the Deputy Head level.

We also learned that the REB is largely a policy unit whose former responsibilities have been devolved down to the woreda. The REB relates to the woreda on several levels: in two conferences held annually, in the conduct of mid-term and annual reviews, and in the submission and review of woreda reports to the REB. The REB relates to CGPP through their attendance at quarterly TWG meetings.

For the woreda to be effective in their new jobs, the REB provides capacity building on how to manage, supervise, how to implement various educational activities, and how the community can become involved in school management.

We were also informed that the former zone structure is still operational, although it serves primarily a budgeting function for salaries, allocation of educational materials, block grant administration, and the hiring of teachers. The zones also compile reports from the woredas as well as statistics on teachers. Further changes in accordance with decentralization may produce a restructuring that will do away with the zones.

#### **5.3.2.3.2 Woreda**

One WEO head was unable to provide very much commentary on CGPP as he always refers matters relating to the project to the Supervisor, who had received the TOT, who provides KETB/PTA training, and who monitors both CGPP and non-CGPP schools. Supervisors are responsible for between 10 and 15 schools that include both CGPP and non-CGPP schools. Once the supervisor arrived, the WEO was reminded that he also sits on the committee to rank school applicants for the 3<sup>rd</sup> SIA grant.

Supervisors have jobs similar to SDAs. They must visit schools, monitor their performance, provide formal and informal training, interpret policies for schools, collect data for the MoE, etc. The woreda suffers from a similar staff shortage as CGPP, and this has created greater cooperation between SDAs and Supervisors in sharing information, rides, and community mobilization skills.

Individuals who have received the WOW and the TOT vary from woreda to woreda. In one woreda, Supervisors were selected for the training; in another, it was the Training Expert. Because there was no consistency in identifying who would go for the training, and then give the training, we cannot make any particular comment as to the strengths and weaknesses of the choice of person to send. Moreover, in some woredas the people with whom we spoke had little knowledge of CGPP because they had not attended any training (possibly due to their recent transfer).

In general, for the REBs and woreda officials interviewed, we find the commitment to CGPP inconsistent at the REB level, and incomplete at the woreda level. If the project principles are to be sustainable, more individuals at both the REB and woreda level should be trained in CGPP principles and practices.

### **5.3.3 Regional Operations - Amhara**

At the Regional level, WL staffing is similar to that in SNNPR. However, due to the number of schools covered in Amhara (1,118), there are 6 Zone Coordinators and 72 SDAs, of which 10 are female (for an average coverage per SDA of almost 16 schools). Each ZC manages between 6 and 13 SDAs depending on the geographic distribution of woredas and schools. There are 58 woredas in Amhara. Of the 1,118 schools, 200 have graduated requiring quarterly visits, leaving 918 schools to be covered intensively (one visit per week, where possible) by 72 SDAs.

Because of the data collection and entry requirements of the M&E System, the Amhara office is behind. They have had to hire contractors to enter and clean the data before submitting it to the head office for analysis.

Earlier this year, the Training & Program Officer was hard pressed to perform all his duties because so many cohort 4 and 5 schools were joining CGPP. The Regional Director said it would have been good to have two T&P Officers so that each could serve 3 zones. He said they made it with what they had, but we have no way of verifying whether the complete training package was offered at all necessary levels.

#### **5.3.3.1 Zone Coordinator Roles and Responsibilities**

See the discussion on ZC activities for SNNPR.

#### **5.3.3.2 SDA Roles and Responsibilities**

The basic salary of an SDA in Amhara is 728 birr per month, with 250 birr as a top up from WL, and 300 birr for a transportation allowance. The comments made about SDAs in SNNPR are applicable here in Amhara. The COP reported that although two female SDAs returned to teaching after their schools completed tenure in the program, they still come to monthly SDA meetings.

### **5.3.3.3 Government Management of CGPP**

#### **5.3.3.3.1 REB**

The Educational Programs Department (EPD) has oversight over CGPP at this level in Amhara. Specific people in this department have been assigned to work on the project, and the principles and practices of CGPP have been integrated into daily work schedules. Individuals with responsibility in the EPD have periodic site visits to schools and note the differences between CGPP and non-CGPP schools. Because the REB considers the project so important, we were told that the REB is always represented at TWG meetings (the exception was the one held in June). Commitment to CGPP has been consistent as the key people supporting the project have been constant, unlike other REBs.

When asked about the weaknesses of CGPP, the Deputy expressed his concern over the “part time” woreda employees, the SDAs. He believes the very new directive concerning Supervisors

at woreda level working in clusters will negate the necessity for SDAs. He believes the “top-up” and allowances SDAs receive should be used for different purposes. Under the new system, one Supervisor will cover between 3 and 5 schools, making their work more manageable and allowing them to spend more time at each school. He reported that 700 Supervisors have already received training, and they are planning to add 300 more this summer. We believe it would be useful for sustainability purposes for CGPP to look into the job descriptions and training given to new Supervisors to see if there is any overlap between CGPP and Supervisor training so that the Supervisors might be better equipped to address different aspects of CGPP in their clusters.

#### **5.3.3.3.2 Woredas**

At each of the three woredas visited, we learned that CGPP activities are managed by a designated individual. At the woreda, Supervisors are organized to manage seven clusters of schools, some of which are CGPP and some not. Supervisors, because they can see the improvements in CGPP schools, try to share what they have learned with non-CGPP schools. In one woreda, as the number of CGPP schools grew, another SDA had to be seconded. The woreda officials believe that the SDA workload is too heavy and that more SDAs should be seconded. To alleviate some of the problems SDAs face, the woreda provides transport to schools when possible. The biggest achievement of CGPP according to woreda officials is community ownership of the schools as evidence in the community’s mobilization and support.

### **5.4 Tigray Development Association - Tigray**

#### **5.4.1 Structure and Staffing**

The CGPP project is located within the TDA headquarters in the regional capital of Mekele. CGPP was described as “only one of the many projects executed by TDA.” The project office has at least 8 positions including 7 professional staff who manage the project as a team. This means that they all are involved in all areas of the home office’s interventions: participation in woreda level training, supervising SDAs, reviewing SIPs, conducting annual supervisory visits to schools, and conducting more frequent supervisory visits to SDAs. All of the professional staff have their own job descriptions but backstop each other when needed.

The Project Director also informed the team that BESO II operates in 5 zones in Tigray: South, East, Central North, and Northwest. Twenty SDAs cover this large territory without any transportation provided by the project. This means that they generally cannot visit schools more frequently than once a month, although, as noted earlier in this report, the Hawzen SDA made more frequent visits. The Project Director told the team that during contract negotiations, USAID had required them to increase the number of schools served from 300 to 400 and decrease the number of SDAs from 40 to 30. (We did not check this assertion with USAID.) TDA currently has only 20 SDAs.

TDA does not have zonal coordinators, which means that there is no intermediary support for SDAs between the field and the head office. When queried about this management decision, the Project Director stated that the reason for not having zonal coordinators was that the government has abolished the zonal structure. However, other implementers have zonal coordinators and this position seems central to providing real support to SDAs. The Project Director also stated that TDA previously had two experts assigned to 10 woredas each, but these positions no longer exist or are no longer filled.

The regional office professional staff include the Project Director, Field Coordinator, Monitoring and Evaluation Head, Finance Head, Statistician, and 2 Education Officer. (Only one education expert is currently on staff.) TDA has no Training or Capacity-Building Specialist, although training responsibilities were described as part of the Field Coordinator's responsibilities and all members of the team participate in delivering basic training topics. TDA has one Education Officer (formerly there were two) who has been with the project one year. He stated that his job description was "to support the SDAs" and that his primary function was to "summarize the School Improvement Plans" and assist other regional staff in management of SDAs. When asked if he would describe his job as "education" or "management," he said management, and also stated that he needed additional training in order to contribute to the project. The Education Officer has assisted in the delivery of general training topics but has not developed any specific technical training related to education or gender and education. In addition, all inquiries about gender content and strategies were deferred to WAT and there appears to be no institutional learning about gender and education based on the dearth of materials and inability of professional staff to describe content. (This also holds true for community organizing and action planning.)

The technical capacity problem at the regional project office is aggravated by high staff turnover. For example, at the time of the evaluation, two expert positions were vacant because the computer specialist/statistician and education specialist had resigned. (This may have contributed to why we were unable to obtain printouts from their database on various topics.)

Another troublesome management issue, related to the general deficit of technical capacity filtering down to the field level, is that the responsibility of a significant component of BESO II (Cooperative Agreement Outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3.1, 1.3.2) is being devolved to a non-contractual partner. We make this assumption based on our interviews with TDA and WAT, although we did not have access to TDAs Cooperative Agreement and we were not informed about WAT's role by USAID.<sup>16</sup>

#### **5.4.2. Oversight and Coordination**

A Regional Steering Committee (RSC) comprised of representatives from governmental bureaus of Capacity Building Coordination, Education, Finance and Economic Development, the Women's Association of Tigray (WAT), AED/BESO II, and TDA/BESO II, approves annual plans and provides overall guidance and directions for project implementation. However, it should be noted that the Vice Director of WAT has stated that TDA is not as forthcoming with project information as it would like. There are also technical working groups at the woreda level that have similar functions as those of the RSC. They are composed of representatives from the woreda offices of Capacity Building Coordination, Education, Finance and Economic Development, the Women's Association of Tigray, and Youth and Farmers Associations. The SDA is also a member and secretary.

At community/school level, the Tabia/Kebele Education and Training Board (T/KETB) is responsible for mobilizing local resources and overseeing the implementation of school improvement plans. The T/KETB is composed of Tabia Capacity Building Head (Chair), School Director (Secretary), and representatives from the teachers' association, and tabia/kebele-level

---

<sup>16</sup> USAID did inform us that Save had subcontractors.

farmers association, women's association and youth association. However, in our visits to schools, we had, at best, one representative of the Kebele and they were not necessarily from the KETB.

### **5.4.3 Field Staff**

CGPP's field-level staff consists of 20 SDAs who are full-time employees of the project. They are paid between 1100 and 1550 birr per month, and receive 191 birr for transport. Most of the SDAs are former teachers or School Directors. SDAs are based in woreda education offices and travel long distances to schools, often on foot, almost on a daily basis. Each SDA provides project services to 20 schools. The Project Director told the team that the regional CGPP staff is responsible for providing backstopping and technical support to the SDAs. However, from our follow-up interview with one of the education experts, it appears that the regional project team serves only a supervisory and information-processing function rather than addressing the specific training needs of SDAs as facilitators in the thinking and practice of grassroots education development.

TDA's design – hiring SDAs as project employees rather than the secondment of woreda employees with project top-up – is very different from the other IPs' design. This has implications for the sustainability of the project. From the perspective of the SDAs, the design and management of this aspect of the project is not working well: SDAs stated that they do not feel that they get adequate support from the regional office, communities do not feel that they get adequate visits or training from the SDAs, and the Project Director informed us of a very high turnover rate among SDAs.

A human resources management deficiency identified during the research process occurred when we inquired from the professional staff about the reasons for staff resignations in the home office and among the SDAs. They responded that they do not do any exit interviews and do not know why people resign.

## **5.5 Save the Children -US**

### **5.5.1 Structure and Staffing**

The evaluation team met with the Save COP and other staff in the context of a group interview at the Save head office. Meetings were conducted for several hours over three days. The COP presented an organizational chart of the Save SCOPE project that included:

- Regional Coordinator at headquarters who functions as a project manager across all regions and supervises Zonal Coordinators
- Zonal Coordinators who are in the regions (with the exception of one of the Oromiya ZCs, who is in Addis) and who are responsible for supervising SDCs
- SDCs who are responsible for the core implementation of SCOPE and for collecting all field level M&E data
- Deputy Chief of Party who supervises M&E and links project management to technical specialists in Addis (this is a new position)
- Education Advisor (60%)
- Girls Education Specialist
- Training Coordinator

- Capacity-Building Coordinator and Assistant (CARE staff in Save office and programmatically managed by COP)

The COP, who is the third in the life of the project, began with SCOPE in Winter 2004 and noted her good fortune in inheriting a well-functioning staff. (During the second day, the interactions between Save and CARE staff communicated a seamless and high-functioning team.) We do not know the reasons for turnover at the COP level but note that the new COP is making significant efforts to increase training and support to SDCs and to manage the ABECs more effectively.

A core team of specialists in the head office is responsible for designing the technical components of the project: it is composed of the Education, Training, Capacity Building, Girls' Education specialists and the Non- formal Education (NFE) program coordinator. In addition the NFE Coordinator oversees the management of the program and the sub-grants for Non-formal Education.

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Unit is composed of the M&E officer and two data encoders. This team is responsible for all monitoring and evaluation activities within SCOPE.

The Finance Unit of the project is in the head office and is composed of the Accountant and Grants' Accountant. In CARE Ethiopia financial matters are handled in the sub-offices including the head office for central financial matters.

The COP is responsible for the overall direction and management of the project. She has reported to the evaluation team that BESO II is one of many programs implemented within the Save office which has a large administrative and financial support infrastructure, including offices supporting the project in certain zones. The initial decision to include CARE as a subcontractor was based on getting on-the-ground coverage where Save did not already have a presence.

## **5.5.2 Zonal Operations – Afar**

### **5.5.2.1 Zonal and Regional Coordinators**

Structurally, the RC coordinates all logistics of the project and supervises the ZCs. Save has zonal, not regional offices, and some of the ZCs may have assistants because of location and distances. Each of the 12 ZCs is responsible for approximately 90 schools. With the Assistant Regional Coordinator, RCs are responsible for all field operations. They monitor the work of ZCs on monthly and quarterly bases and provide professional support to ZCs.

ZCs are responsible for the overall management of the project's field based activities and they supervise the SDCs. ZCs provide professional support to SDCs. They collect reports from SDCs and manage all monitoring and evaluation activities in their designated zone. ZCs oversee SIA activities and oversee training at the zonal and school level. They communicate with the Zonal Education Desk and WCBO on education matters, prepare monthly and quarterly reports and submit them to the Regional Coordinator, and participate in the quarterly ZC meeting.

ZCs working for CARE are supervised by their respective Area Coordinators. The Regional Coordinator and Capacity Building Coordinator provides inputs for their APA and guidance regarding implementation to have harmonization in implementation.

#### **5.5.2.2 SDCs**

As woreda employees, Save's SDCs receive a monthly salary top-up of 420 birr with a 260 birr transportation allowance.

SDCs receive a one-day orientation, nine days of formal training, and additional informal training and support in a variety of areas, including: proposal writing, program planning, program management, communications, gender, government education policy including policy on decentralization, and HIV/AIDs. The SDCs are key elements in a cascading training strategy: they are provided with training guides, handbooks and other materials and deliver training to the PTAs.

Because the SDC is a woreda employee and will continue to be so after SCOPE, the SDC is a woreda-level beneficiary of the project. The extent of institutional capacity developed for the woreda through the SDC depends on several factors:

First is the quality and scheduling of training and support in implementing a variety of concepts, approaches and methodologies that are new Ethiopian educational structures (e.g., community mobilization, participatory methods and problem-solving approaches, creating girl-friendly schools, effective communication strategies). Save has produced excellent training materials as demonstrated through the six training volumes shared with the team. The problem for SDCs is that the training has not been frequent enough to achieve reinforced adult learning required for the adoption of new and counter-cultural approaches and methods. The frequency, duration and scheduling of SDC training is also impacted by the problem of turnover, experienced quite frequently in CARE Awash and impacting the ZC's ability to support continuous learning on the part of the SDC.

Second, the potential for training and other capacity-building activities to have institutional impact requires government commitment to organizational development. In at least three regions (Afar, Oromiya, Tigray) the transfer of woreda and school officials (school directors and teachers) was a major external factor affecting the project. In Afar, there was a similar problem with CARE staff (SDCs and ZCs). We also observed significant turnover of PTA members, which impacts the ability of the SDC to train and support the PTA as a community-based educational institution.

In February and March 2005, Save implemented a comprehensive training program for SDCs in response to the finding of an SDC needs assessment. The training included units on Facilitators Toolkit, Action Planning, Report Writing Skills, Practical Activities for Girls' Clubs, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Community Mobilization. These topics address training gaps identified through field interviews in all of Save's regions. Despite the expertise of the implementing partner and the quality of their training materials, SDCs both request and require additional training to improve their capacity to fully function in a cascade training model. The expectation that SDCs can become skilled deliverers of new and culturally challenging content and

participatory methods without significantly more capacity building is unrealistic. Save's new training materials and approach, if implemented regularly, may partially address this gap. It remains for the GoE to address the other.

SDCs are accountable to the ZCs and are the main link between the project and the schools. SDCs work with the ZCs to set schedules, meet with communities, provide professional support to PTAs and school personnel, conduct training of PTA's and woreda officials, deliver school improvement incentive awards, prepare monthly plans and reports and submit them to the WEO and ZCs.

### **5.5.2.3 Gender**

We noted that Save has a gender specialist on staff, a female COP and Deputy COP, and, according to the COP, some relative success in hiring female SDCs. To have female SDCs, SOPE made a deliberate effort to go into the schools and to identify female teachers for these positions. "Hopefully, when we leave," said the COP, "these women will stay in the woreda."

### **5.5.2.4 Save's Management Relationship with Subcontractors**

As a subcontractor to Save, CARE is the implementing organization for BESO II SCOPE (CGPP) in four regions including Afar. In the case of Afar, there is concern that CARE has been disengaged (e.g., the closing of the CARE office in Awash for a period of time, no transport assistance by CARE to the SDC in the past, ZC turnover and time lapse in replacing him, report by SCOPE staff of little support from CARE zone office, and problems in the organizational flow of information). According to the Save COP, CARE Awash serves as the administrative entity and Save Addis must provide programmatic supervision. This management relationship has been strengthened recently, but it appears that Save was not fully aware of problems and other issues in Afar in the past.

In addition to CARE, SCOPE has subcontracted the implementation of ABECs to various Ethiopian NGOs. The COP reported that there have been implementer problems and that one implementer was removed for non-performance and one backed out of the contract before implementation.

In the case of Afar, the evaluation team visited two primary schools and one ABEC managed by EMRDA. In both instances (CARE and EMRDA), there are problems in the flow of information. There are also problems in the communication and feedback loops from the community through the SDC and up through the management hierarchy. There does not appear to be an adequate structure to assure that there is clear and continuous communication and feedback, especially in assuring that SDCs are providing appropriate information to communities and to other levels of project management. Two examples from a primary school and the Kel'at ABE center illustrate the challenges:

An Afari primary school is dissatisfied with the SDC for a variety of reasons including not informing them of the reasons why they were not selected for a grant. They also stated as a "weakness" of the project that they do not see the ZC or people from the head office, presumably concerning the problems with the SDC. Issues of transparency in the grant decision process and

the ability of the PTA to communicate with higher levels of authority are central to effective management and have not been adequately addressed in Afar.

In the ABEC, we encountered a high community expectation that the U.S. Ambassador's visit would result in a grant to build a primary school. This assumption was reinforced by the same SDC. When asked if he had communicated the "promise" from the Ambassador to his supervisors, he noted that "it was an EMRDA matter" and that he is "not responsible for the ABEC." The two issues here are a lack of information flowing through the project and an assumption that a sub-contractor is the only responsible entity. The fact that Save's head office was not aware of this is evidence of a management problem.

The Save COP stated that she recognizes the problems with implementation in Afar and has taken measures to improve communication. Since the Awash program is phasing out, she does not anticipate drastic management changes. The COP also stated that CARE does not have similar problems as an implementing partner in other regions. While visiting the Save head office, the team interviewed a CARE ZC from Oromiya who gave a completely different impression than the Awash CARE office. He is highly informed and technically capable and was able to state specific accomplishments from a variety of schools.

#### **5.5.2.5 ABECs – Structure and Management**

There is great interest in government to establish ABECs and to implement an ABE curriculum among pastoralists. SCOPE is undertaking these activities among pastoralists in Afar, an "emerging region."

ABECs provide primary education for children over 8 years old. SCOPE's strategy, implemented by CARE, is to meet with the woreda to identify a location, then put out an RFA for local NGOs to manage the ABECs and to implement the ABE curriculum. It is important for these to be local institutions. SCOPE initially had nine partners but one contract was cancelled due to performance problems (false reports and non-allowable costs) and another partner backed out before the program began when it realized it did not have sufficient capacity for implementation.

There have been structural problems in how the ABE program has been implemented. Two examples are in the areas of capacity building and monitoring, areas where the COP told us that improvements are being made this year. ABECs are supervised by the woreda, receive pedagogical support from the government and SDCs, and training from the local NGOs. The program coordinator of the contracted NGO attends update meetings at Save and is trained by Save. SCOPE now has a well-developed monitoring system for the ABECs. Criteria are developed in collaboration and the SDC, who monitors the ABEC. The woreda ABE person also goes out, so the system is multi-layered.

The facilitators (teachers) in ABECs are local people with at least primary education who are hired by the woreda and managed by the NGOs. They are trained by the NGOs and the government, but Save has found that additional training is needed. As of this year, all of the ABEC facilitators are also trained by SCOPE in topics such as communication, gender, and other relevant topics.

### **5.5.2.6 Government Roles & Responsibilities**

Since we did not consult with the REB or the woreda in Afar, we have nothing to report in this sub-section.

## **5.5.3 Regional Operations - Oromiya**

### **5.5.3.1 Zone Manager Roles & Responsibilities**

The Zone Manager for Oromiya (unavailable to us in his office in Addis) was not interviewed, and so we have nothing to report on the management and structure of the zone office for Oromiya.

### **5.5.3.2 SDA Roles & Responsibilities**

The SDCs work closely with WEOs, PTAs, KETBs, GACs, and manage up to 14 schools. SDCs engage in a long list of activities: 1) with PTAs: monitor PTAs activities, foster the growth of relationships among PTA members, explain the role and responsibilities of each committee, explain the SCOPE program, train and mentor PTAs, facilitate PTA financial management of SIAs, assist PTAs in developing proposals, and attend PTA meetings; 2) with communities: mobilize communities, listen to the community concerns and problems, participate in resource mobilization, gather appropriate data from the community and schools, and sensitize school communities regarding challenges and the importance of girls education; 3) with GEACs: build relationships among members, inform GEAC members of their roles and responsibilities, and enhance the capacity of GEAC's to facilitate the creation of a child/girl friendly school environment.

### **5.5.3.3 Governmental Roles & Responsibilities**

#### **5.5.3.3.1 REB**

We met with Dereje Asfaw Jetu, Deputy Head, Capacity Building. The region has 6646 primary schools grades 1-4 and 1-8. Ato Dereje is the 6<sup>th</sup> education head since the project started. He stated that there is no SCOPE training at the regional level; it is mostly at the woreda level, bringing 2-3 woredas together to do training. There is collaboration between SCOPE and the region: SCOPE reviews regional policy and develops the program in consultation with the region. The REB reviews SCOPE's plan for the region as well as quarterly implementation reports. He believes that SCOPE is contributing to quality as well as enhancing the participation of the community.

Ato Dereje also noted that the REB is assisting in capacity building for SCOPE and, technically, in the production of textbooks, which indirectly assists the project as all woredas use the same curriculum. He cites AED BESO for assistance to the REB with training and support materials and BESO SCOPE for its significant contribution to linking the community with the educational system.

The REB has a member of staff responsible for liaison with all USAID projects. He attends meetings and reports to the Deputy. There is no specific mention of this role in his job description because no CGPP activities are carried out at the regional level.

The Deputy credited SCOPE for changing policy on PTA guidelines regarding their ability to manage finances, stating:

*The KETB is not active as such, rather it is the PTA in our case. It is the mandate of the KETB to manage all activities in education in their kebele. The chairperson of KETB is the chairman of whole kebele and has so many responsibilities, it is impossible to focus on education. We empower the PTA, and we revised the manual and guidelines because of the issues raised by SCOPE.*

Ato Dereje provided an analysis of the strong and weak points of decentralization:

*In order to make decisions effective and to have the community participate, we have to address problems in the management of teachers: transfer of teachers from one woreda to another. The salary of teachers was decentralized to the woredas and some woredas are not willing to accept teachers with many years of experience because their salary is high. Another difficulty is the equity problem: resources are not equally distributed, some localities cannot even feed themselves. For example, if you consider the western part of Oromiya, they have resources and they can achieve in 2-3 years. When you come to south Oromiya, they are very poor and are affected by drought. They don't have resources to support education so gross enrollment is 65%. Previously, when resources were assigned from center, we can make it equitable. Also, there is a shortage of human capacity. Most of our woreda offices are under capacity now. There are not enough educated, experienced people at the woreda level. We have 220 woredas and turnover is very high. This happens in part because the salary scale of government is less when you compare it to NGOs and the private sector. When you look at facilities at woreda level, many have no electricity, phone, and water.*

Ato Dereje stated: “The role that this project has played [in mobilizing communities] is really remarkable.” Consequently, the REB has decided to scale up this project by adopting the “principle of SCOPE” for each school. They intend to let each school prepare a project plan and the government will assign 10% of budget for the implementation of that project. The community will cover 90% of the project costs. He stated: “We have at least one project in every school in Oromiya.” In most cases, the project is construction because class size is very large in this region. The funding mechanism is that the regional government assigns a block grant to the woreda and the woreda assigns 10% to each school. Through this mechanism, 98 million birr have been generated from the community.

He also noted that the policy change from a shift system to a full day will depend on the PTAs strengthened by the project to mobilize the community to make this change. (We found PTAs resistant to this change in Oromiya and elsewhere due to the demands for child labor.) Ato Dereje noted that the ABECs, scheduled to be built in every kebele, will provide educational opportunities to children who cannot attend all day.

When asked about the overlap of BESO II/AED and BESO II/SCOPE, he said that there is an intention to “distribute the resources equally” but that there is also a USAID interest in implementing both in one school to achieve significant change. He observed that where they have worked together, significant changes can be observed.

The Deputy identified as a project weakness the fact that they were only able to implement in 1300 schools while there are over 6000 in the region. He cited the project constraints of drought,

the capacity of the community, the awareness of the community on the importance of education, and the problem of not sending daughters to school.

When queried about sustainability, Ato Dereje said:

*I think that it is the responsibility of the Woreda Education Office to take over and to scale it up. We have tried our best to be frank, we have benefited a lot. They have shown us the way how to mobilize the community. We have applied and been successful. Our area of attention is now quality. For the last 10-13 years, it was access. The Gross Enrollment Rate is 92.2%. Very high! But when you consider the net intake rate, there is a problem there. Our area of attention is to bring quality and that means resources. When you look at the school facility, it is amazing that children are sitting on the floor. In terms of class size, there are schools with 120+ in one classroom (the government standard is 1/50 primary and 1/40 for secondary).*

#### **5.5.3.3.2 Woreda and SDCs**

At Woreda level, nobody is assigned to follow-up and give the required attention to the project. Five percent of the SDC's time is allocated to WEO tasks to make the SDC eligible for salary increments, promotion and other related benefits. The WEO also evaluates the performance the SDC.

## **6. EXTERNAL FACTORS**

### **6.1 Cross-Regional Similarities**

The team identified many external factors that are influencing the implementation of CGPP. Of greatest concern in all Regions is the high rate of transfer of KETB Chairs, School Directors, and others. Although we were quoted the policy that School Directors had to be in one place for at least two years, we found significant evidence in all regions that this policy is not being implemented thus allowing School Director transfers after just a few months. One school had had five Directors since the commencement of the project, and when we interviewed at the school, the Deputy Director was in charge. One REB had six directors since the project started, and many of the PTAs we interviewed had relatively new members, people who had not received any CGPP training.

There is increasing pressure being brought to bear on communities to take on projects advanced by other government agencies. Communities are being asked to construct health posts, agricultural training centers, roads, and the like. In some instances, communities have no choice but to comply because the woreda or kebele tells them they must contribute. Although the kebele is designated as the coordinator of many of these projects, it would appear that the communication with each ministry or government agency is not coordinated to protect the community from exploitation. This may be due to the very heavy workload of the kebele chair, who is also the KETB Chair and who must respond to woreda demands.

The policy of REBs to either downgrade schools (from grades 1-6 to grades 1-4 only) or to disallow schools teaching in two shifts will increase the dropout rates, especially of girls, because parents require their children's labor, especially from girls, and because they do not want their daughters walking farther distances to school thus making them more vulnerable. The

community response to these policy changes is to demand more, not less grades, in their schools, and to question government policy.

If parents withdraw children or refuse to send children to all-day schools, this rationalization of education policy may have an unintended consequence of contributing to the “worst forms of child labor” (WFCL, ILO definition) in that children who are prevented from going to school because of family labor requirements are considered as engaged in WFCL. In very poor communities, families live on the margins and cope through traditional social and cultural practices. Even when children go to school, they also provide family labor for part of the day, including petty trading (boys and girls), livestock tending (boys), water fetching and child care (girls). Girls, especially, are needed at home for part of the day to work in the household. Because of these changes in policy, many schools are feverishly working toward building more classrooms to either upgrade the schools to grades 1-8 or to accommodate all the classes needed to maintain the teacher: student ratio set by the government.

The distances children must walk to schools make them vulnerable along the way and takes up a significant portion of the day. Although the REBs and woredas have policies of building ABECs in underserved areas, accessibility remains a problem.

Most rural schools do not have drinking water. Children who must stay in school for several hours without water or food are more likely to drop out because they are unable to perform. Construction of wells or water harvesting was beyond the scope and budget of CGPP and the communities.

Many socio-cultural practices have impeded the progress of CGPP: e.g., clan wars among pastoral people. Those harmful to girls – abduction, early marriage, FGM, and other practices serve as barriers to girls attending or staying in school.

On the positive side, CGPP has mobilized both religious and legal institutions in support of girls’ education. Many religious leaders are members of the PTAs/KETBs, and legal institutions respond to issues raised about early marriage and abduction by PTAs/KETBs/GACs/GEACs. Many early marriage contracts have been nullified by the courts and legal institutions have spoken out on the illegality of abduction.

## **6.2 SNNPR**

We learned that in this region (although it may be applicable elsewhere), the political appointment of the KETB chair has given rise to many disputes thus reducing this person’s effectiveness. The region has also experienced significant changes in the PTA chairs, although a reason could not be discerned. The recent elections interfered with community mobilization and fundraising. Government support to CGPP schools favored those involved in school/classroom construction.

## **6.3 Amhara**

The team came to Amhara in a season when malaria was raging and farming activities were at a peak (farmers were planting as the rains came early). Seasonality affects the timing of community mobilization and fundraising with more success possible after harvest time. In this

region there is a lot of school construction, so Directors and teachers have options for transfer. In this region, there is also a high incidence of only one KETB for 4 schools that are both CGPP and non-CGPP.

## **6.2 Tigray**

Regional external problems include:

- Recurrent drought/economic distress – little time to participate, no resources to contribute
- Out-migration for income (especially due to drought); boys, especially, migrate
- Frequent restructuring of civil service – staff turnover at all levels and reassignments
  - Chair of regional woreda technical working group
  - Transfer of School Directors and teachers
  - KETB leadership
- Transfer policy for School Directors – practice not in keeping with policy

## **6.4 Afar**

### **6.4.1 Regional Conditions**

Afar is described as an “emerging region” and it does not have the level of infrastructural and organizational development of other regions. For example, PTAs did not exist in Afar prior to SCOPE. According to the COP: “In Afar, Kebeles didn’t have KETBs until quite recently, so we are working to formalize authority of PTAs as we have in other regions.” The project had to organize them in every community.

Afar is changing its administrative structures, also creating additional stresses on the project. Respondents in the communities reported that zonal authorities were not at all responsive to them, and in the beginning of the project, the zone handled all education matters. The Amibara WEO was established only this year.

The dominant ethnic group is the semi-nomadic pastoralist Afari. The distances from home to school are great, the climate is harsh – extremely hot – and their lack of access to potable water were named as a primary problem in every community. The people are extremely resource poor, often move with their animals for part of the year, and have traditional social and cultural practices (clan identity and conflict, FGM, child marriage, abduction, “absuma”) that pose significant barriers to educating children, especially girls.

The challenge to educating girls within the Afari culture has been well-documented by the GEACs elsewhere in this report. An additional barrier mentioned by the Save COP and evident in one school has to do with the clash of cultures between Afari people and people from the highlands moving into the regions to work on commercial farms. This has provided additional challenges to the Save/CARE implementation. For example, with movement of highlanders into state farms or into formally pastoralist areas, the pastoralists feel the school is no longer for them and there are a lot of dropouts.

### 6.4.2 Conditions Affecting ABECs

In the ABECs visited, there were no curriculum materials and no mechanisms for linkage to primary schools (children do not meet formal examination requirements).

### 6.4.3 Turnover

Throughout SCOPE, the turnover of government officials and staff (REB, WEO, School Directors and Teachers) has had a serious impact on the design and cost of training. In addition to dramatic changes in personnel, there has been a lack of follow-through by WEO staff in conducting trainings, frequent shifting of school directors and teachers during the life of the project, and the tendency of these government employees to take knowledge and materials with them, leaving little in the community or woreda. This has contributed to the need for constant retraining to accommodate changes in personnel beyond the project's control. Although by far not as extreme as other cases observed in the process of collecting data in other regions, the following list of changes in the Afar schools visited illustrates this point. The first school has good performance on weighted drop out average and is a cluster school. The second school has low performance on weighted drop out but relatively high performance on the enrollment of girls and an empowered PTA.

#### Aminbara #2

School Director	new this academic year
One year or less at school	7 including SD
Greater than one year at school	4
Total number of teachers	11 teachers including SD (3 female)
PTA – members new since 2004 due to embezzlement of woreda (non-CGPP) funds and intention to include Afari members	

#### Hasoba Primary School

School Director	female, 9 years at school
One year or less at school	2
Greater than one year at school	3 including SD
Total number of teachers	5 including SD (4 female, 1 male)
PTA – most have 3 years on PTA	

### 6.5 Oromiya

Particular external issues of concern in Oromiya include:

- Early marriage and abduction
- Demand for child labor
- Sickness due to malaria
- Drought
- Engagement of school children in income generating activities
- Poor parental attitude towards education
- Poverty
- Distance from the schools particularly for the second level of primary education
- Action taken by the government in reducing the level of education (from the second cycle of primary education to the first cycle only)
- Seasonal migration of children as day laborers especially during drought

## **7. PROJECT RELATION TO MISSION PLANS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY RESILIENCY**

CGPP has laid the foundation for communities to undertake self-help projects, to own what they do, and to reduce reliance on government provisioning. That communities are being asked to take on more and more responsibilities, however, has stretched their resources. This may result in a backlash not only in undertaking local construction projects, but also in the maintenance and ownership of schools. It will depend on the value that the community places on the particular project, as well as family resources, and on the degree of coercion GoE places on communities.

That school communities have learned how they can assert their ownership of the school is in their personal interest to provide education to their children. That this behavior can be extended to issues of food security and community resiliency might be a stretch. CGPP provided on-going technical assistance to communities, whereas other projects do not provide the same support. The extension services of the Ministry of Agriculture may not have similar patterns of organizational support and information sharing as the CGPP and so changing farmer behavior concerning the crops they grow and the methods they use for growing may not be offered in a consistent manner so as to change behaviors over the long term.

We believe that the way forward in establishing community resiliency builds upon a solid foundation of community mobilization, awareness of the critical issues, community decisions on how to solve problems through action planning, and community implementation of their plans. This process requires oversight. For CGPP, the PTA and KETB provided motivation, mobilization, and oversight. It is unclear for community resiliency how PTAs and KETBs might be transformed into Community Based Organizations (CBOs) that would spearhead the growth of resiliency in other sectors.

## **VI. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

### **8. INTRODUCTION**

In this section we summarize the main findings presented in Section V.

### **9. DIFFERENCES IN PROJECT DESIGN**

#### **2.1 Link to BESO I**

Both WL and TDA participated in BESO I. TDA selected BESO I schools for BESO II. This was done, according to USAID, in contradiction of USAID guidelines. This presents a contractual issue for USAID regarding TDA's performance and an internal management issue for USAID related to due diligence. In addition, it has compromised the evaluation team's ability to attribute any change to BESO II in schools that have received BESO I funding. We do not know the extent of overlap between BESO I and BESO II schools. In the final or supplemental research, we would expect to see significant differences in schools that have received over seven years of support.

#### **2.2 Grant Size and Competitive Process**

Both WL and Save offer three SIAs, while TDA offers two. Both Save and WL have similar maximum financial resources available to each school (Save:10,000 birr, World Learning:12,000 birr ), while TDA provides 15,800 birr to each of its 400 schools. When one considers the competitive processes in Save and WL, the difference in comparison to TDA's grants is even higher, and many more TDA PTAs may have received many thousands more under BESO I. We question the disparity of funds available to PTAs across regions and IPs.

WL and TDA offer two SIAs on a non-competitive basis, but Save offers only one. WL offers the third SIA on a competitive basis within the woreda, while Save offers the second and third on a competitive basis. We believe Save should drop the competitive process for the second SIA for two reasons: 1) the process is cumbersome; and 2) participating PTAs have not had sufficient time to develop capacity by the time the second SIA is offered. We also understand from the Save and WL COPs that USAID's resource constraints shaped the total amount available to SIAs and that a change in design would require additional resources. We also believe that TDA should not be funding BESO I schools and that an impact study of their performance under these circumstances should be done.

#### **2.3 Graduation**

WL graduates its schools after two years, Save after three, and TDA not at all. Graduation at WL means that the SDA visits only quarterly. We believe a modified version of graduation should be employed by WL that will bring the SDA to the school every two months so as to maintain a good relationship between the project and the schools and to continue to provide support to the schools as they implement their sustainability plans.

#### **2.3 Zone Coordination**

Both WL and Save employ ZCs as intermediaries between the Regional or head office to manage the work of SDAs; TDA does not. We believe that, since the workload of SDAs is higher in Tigray (each SDA in Tigray is responsible for 20 schools, whereas with WL and Save they are

responsible for between 12 and 16), TDA should hire ZCs to support and manage the SDAs and to provide a more focused conduit for information flow.

#### **2.4 Sustainability Aspects**

WL and Save provide workshops on sustainability to woreda officials, KETBs/PTAs, and others in preparation for writing the proposal for the third SIA. Save has negotiated sustainability commitments from three REBs to date. The TDA Project Director stated that TDA has conducted sustainability workshops to 199 participants. We were not given the opportunity to review the content of the training materials when in Makelle so we cannot comment on their contents. Because of the BESO I/BESO II confusion, we believe that USAID should undertake a thorough review of TDA's sustainability accomplishments for both BESO I and BESO II.

SDAs are employees of the woredas under the WL and Save plans, whereas under the TDA plan, SDAs are employees of TDA/the project. We believe TDA must devise its own sustainability plan for the future utilization of SDAs in the woredas so that the expertise and experience of SDAs is not lost. We recognize that TDA assumes that sustainability is integrated into the woreda technical working groups, but the potential for SDAs, who have grassroots experience in CGPP, should also be addressed.

#### **2.5 Gender Resources**

Save has a Gender and Education expert on staff who devises gender training materials for training. TDA uses WAT to provide gender training to school-based organizations, including the GAC. WL relies upon the sharing of personal expertise of its ZCs and SDAs to provide gender-sensitive insights into local decision making. We believe gender training, taking into account the specific needs of GACs, should be provided to GACs so that they can be more effective. WL should endeavor to access gender resources and implement them more directly and deliberately. We also recommend that TDA more thoroughly integrate the gender component into their own organizational capacity and suggest that USAID examine the contractual implications of TDAs current arrangement with WAT.

#### **2.6 M&E Systems and Information Flow (Transparency)**

Each IP has developed a PMP and collects data at least on a quarterly and an annual basis. However, due to burdensome data collection processes, difficulties in encoding, and limited data entry clerks, information on all indicators and sub-indicators is not easily accessible. We believe the data collection systems should be simplified to reflect the IRs and the Sub-IRs only, thus relieving some of the data collection stress of the SDAs and reducing the data entry burden of each organization.

#### **2.7 PTA/KETB Financial Management of Resources**

WL and TDA allow for either the PTA or KETB to manage resources; Save has ascribed this responsibility to PTAs. We believe either will work, as long as all the responsible individuals have had appropriate training in financial management. We note from project quarterly reports that there is much to be done in assuring that financial management capacity is sufficient, despite PTA enthusiasm in schools we have visited.

## **10. MEETING TARGETS**

Targets for the IRs vary significantly from organization to organization. We cannot explain the variance.

As information on targets is collected annually, the team had the results from only the first year, compared to the baseline. We were unable to discern a trend, although all organizations met their goals on most IRs. The exception was found in the response of woredas to issues raised by the community (IRT 3.2b). Since information for this year was not yet available, we cannot document a trend or speculate on the woreda-response shortfall.

School level information indicates that 1) enrollments are increasing, 2) dropouts are decreasing, 3) more girls are enrolling and staying in school longer, 4) communities are exercising ownership of the schools, 5) PTAs/KETBs are linking communities to schools and are taking over the management of schools, 6) PTAs/KETBs and communities are working together to identify and solve school problems, 7) GACs are addressing the needs of girls, and 8) the school-community relationship has, overall, been strengthened.

## **4. IMPACT ON BENEFICIARIES – MEETING PERCEIVED NEEDS**

### **4.1 Capacity Building and Training**

In general, IPs are to be commended on the system of capacity building and training they have devised in addressing the needs of REBs, Woredas, Schools (including KETBs, PTAs, and GACs), Communities, Regional Project staff, ZCs and SDAs. Save has shared their processes in training communities for ABEC management and in training facilitators (although this is subcontracted). The team was provided training materials (both formal and informal) from IPs and was shown timetables, agendas and reports on different training provided. Positive results were discussed by the team with participants at each training level. We believe that the content and approaches presented in the WL and Save training manuals and resources are excellent. TDA has provided no manuals or other resources of similar content and quality, even after the Project Director questioned our conclusions during the Stakeholders' Meeting. We believe that these manuals and resources must be developed and implemented in Tigray.

Even when the manuals are available, the continuous changing of personnel, especially at the woreda, KETB and School Director levels, has created significant gaps in training. This must be addressed in a formal "refresher" or "retraining" effort by the IPs in each region. We have been told by IPs that they do not have resources to meet this need fully. We believe that training and capacity building for decision making and social change are as important a project strategy and the provision of SIAs, and that that USAID and IPs need to address these gaps quickly and thoroughly.

We also recognize that there is a gap in WL (and possibly Save) in materials for specific formal training of GACs. Although Save has conceptual materials appropriate for training SDCs, we did not see evidence of manuals and resources appropriate at the community level.

The only gender resources identified for TDA are 1) a paper on gender prepared by WAT and 2) a paper on the roles and responsibilities of the GAC, leading us to the conclusions that a similar gap may exist for TDA.

Finally, across all IPs, there is a lack of materials at the school/community level. Across all regions, member of PTAs, teachers, and GACs requested additional training and training resources suitable to a community context. We also believe that these materials should be developed, distributed, modeled, and supported by the IPs.

#### **4.2 Mechanisms of Community Participation and Support**

SIA grants have been the prime motivator for KETBs/PTAs and communities to begin addressing school problems through the identification of problems, prioritizing them, developing action plans to solve the problems, and raising funds to supplement the SIA grants. The amounts communities have raised in the schools studied range between one-third to four times the SIA grants (this may include grants received from other agencies obtained with the proposal writing skills imparted by IPs in training). Where PTAs/KETBs identified problems they could not resolve, they brought them to the attention of the woredas. In some cases, the woreda was able to help them; in others not. This may be due partially to the woredas not having the full capacity to address grassroots demand.

GACs have addressed a broad range of gender-specific issues. Some work in close relationship to KETBs/PTAs and others not. We believe the work of the GACs can be made more effective through specific training, as noted above, and further support from the SDAs and SDCs.

From a “sample” of one ABEC, the team learned that the GoE is rolling out the construction and staffing of ABECs very quickly, often without sufficient materials. That was also true in the case of the ABEC implemented by an NGO subcontractor. The Save COP has informed us that the NGO contractor had an agreement to use government materials but that the government has not yet distributed these materials. In addition, the SDC has not provided sufficient support or reporting on the ABEC to other levels of the SCOPE project, reflecting management and implementation problems for Save with CARE Awash. We have been informed by the Save COP that the SDC’s initial job description did not include supervision and follow-up of ABECs, and that Save is addressing this gap through a new strategy that makes ZCs and SDCs responsible for ABECs.

### **5. PROJECT MANAGEMENT/TURNOVER OF KEY PERSONNEL**

#### **5.1 USAID**

Turnover of USAID CTOs for WL created a gap in relationship, which has since been reconstructed. Changes in USAID’s strategic plan may have caused a “hiccup” in project implementation, and this might be more serious if appropriate resources are not provided to take on additional responsibilities.

#### **5.2 TWG**

The TWG’s function is to coordinate and assess BESO II activities. CGPP COPs indicated that the oversight and management of the TWG can be improved by doing the following:

- Developing a rule that the same person should represent their respective organizations at each quarterly meeting
- Coming prepared (i.e., having read the quarterly reports in advance)
- Pressuring the MoE to distribute reports on time

- Making questions after presentations more substantive (instead of adversarial, even from USAID)
- Allowing more room to discuss MoE policies that affect the implementation of CGPP, e.g., decentralization, educational for all, abolishing the shift system, and “rationalizing” the schools to be either grades 1-4 or 1-8.
- Conducting some exercises in forward thinking on MoE policy changes and how to accomplish these in light of CGPP goals
- Creating a consultative process to redesign formats for meetings, presentations and reports to allow for a shift of focus from reporting routine events to addressing areas of project significance and policy issues, and to allow for a comparative analysis of IP results

### **5.3 IP Staffing**

Each head office has a COP/Project Director, and a variety of staff depending on the organization’s operational modalities. For WL, there is a Deputy Director for Programs and a Deputy Director for Finance. The M&E and Training Directors (and their managers and staff) report to the Deputy Director for Programs; the Accountant and Finance staff report to the Deputy Director for Finance. Each of the Directors has a regional counterpart with whom they interact often. For Save, there is a Deputy who supervises M&E, a Regional Coordinator who functions as project manager across all regions, an Education Advisor, a Girl’s Education Specialist, a Capacity Building Coordinator and a Training Coordinator. TDA has a Project Director, Field Coordinator, M&E Head, Statistician and 2 Education Experts in the head office. Each IP has regional and zonal variations that, again, suit their operational modalities. WL has both RCs and ZCs, while Save has ZCs; TDA has neither. All IPs employ SDAs. SDAs all receive different salaries in accordance with Regional/woreda pay scales.

We believe the contractual relationships that Save has with CARE and other NGOs (to implement the ABEC portion of their operations) makes for a more complicated staffing structure. It is not clear the effect this has on operations. TDA does not employ ZCs, which leaves SDAs without critical support and backup in the field.

SDAs are extremely overworked. They must participate in the trainings provided at school level, conduct follow-up visits and monitor school-community-based activities, provide informal training to school-based organizations, collect data quarterly and annually, and perform functions for the woreda. All of these are accomplished with very limited access to transport. We believe that the SDA workload needs to be revised and more SDAs hired to ensure monthly (if not more frequent) visitation to participating schools. Additional resources will be needed to accomplish this.

#### **5.4 Government Management of CGPP**

The commitment of REBs varies by region. In some, CGPP is “just another project;” in others Directors and Deputy Directors have designated specific departments for oversight and have developed plans for the continuation of CGPP principles and practices after the project ends.

At the woreda or implementation level, commitment also varies among the woredas visited. Owing to changes in personnel and the discontinuous training received, not all decision makers at this level are able to address the sustainability issues of the project. In some cases, we learned that the CGPP training is conducted by Supervisors, in other by Training Officers, and in still others by more senior people. It appears that when the invitation was issued to the woreda for participants, in some instances selection was based not on who would provide the workshops and do the follow-up but on who might benefit from participation (per diem). This meant sometimes that inappropriate people were chosen. Consequently, the level of woreda commitment varies.

Woredas we visited do not have a sustainability plan for the continued employment of SDAs. However, Save has reported that the Somali Region has created sustainability plans at the woreda level that have been approved by the REB, and that similar results are soon expected for Afar and Oromiya. While those who really understood the CGPP principles and practices want to capitalize on the experience and expertise of the SDAs, perhaps in creating a “Community Mobilization Department,” others thought that the SDAs might just go back to being Directors or teachers.

We believe commitment at the REB and woreda levels needs to be strengthened by 1) providing supplemental training to all key decision makers, or 2) arranging for a “best practice,” “lessons learned,” or sustainability conference to be held with all key REB and woreda levels, with each participant responsible for presenting a brief (15-minute) paper on their activities or jointly sponsoring workshops on how each REB/woreda can participate in the extension of CGPP after the project ends. (The Save COP has informed us that Save has done something similar in Somali and it is in process in Afar and Oromiya.) This will require extra financial resources.

#### **6. EXTERNAL FACTORS**

CGPP implementation has been influenced by a number of factors that, in general, have had negative consequences:

- High rate of turnover at the school-community level of KETB Chairs, PTA Chairs, School Directors and Teachers and inconsistencies between policy and practice in the transfer for School Directors
- Increasing pressure of other government agencies for community members to contribute to the construction of roads, health posts, housing for government officials, agricultural stations, and the like.
- The policies of REBs and woredas to: 1) downgrade schools from grades 1-6 to 1-4 in their rationalizations process; 2) disallow more than one shift at a schools; and 3) slow approval and staffing of schools that have feverishly constructed other classrooms to upgrade the school to grades 1-8.
- The lack of drinking water at schools and the failure of the GoE to provide wells or water harvesting equipment.

- The recent elections drew many people away from their focus on the school to local politics
- The seasonal agricultural calendar and malaria
- Poverty and the out-migration of children to generate an income
- Changing governmental administrative structures owing to the uneven response to the edict of decentralization
- Cultural attitudes and practices that are extremely harmful to girls and serious barriers to girls education.

## **7. CONCLUSION**

Each of these findings is represented in either the Sections on Lessons Learned or Recommendations to guide the way forward in the second half of the CGPP. We turn to Lessons Learned first.

## **VII. LESSONS LEARNED**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

In this section we identify areas where lessons have been learned over the course of project implementation. We categorize the lessons learned using the same structure as we have for the Findings Section: Project Design Variations; Meeting Targets, Impact on Beneficiaries (capacity building and training, and community participation and support), Project Management, and External Factors. We add a final category of “Other” to capture any other lessons learned not yet covered.

We are mindful, as a research team, that the lessons learned presented in this section are applicable to the institutions and individuals interviewed. We make the same claim, however, that due to the rigor of the data collection in each location, the lessons learned are suggestive of practices in the larger project.

### **2. PROJECT DESIGN VARIATIONS**

- Schools in Tigray that were involved in BESO I have received up to 27,000 birr from the combined projects, whereas those only in BESO II have received approximately 12,000 birr (if they received all 3 SIAs). The practice of providing additional funds to BESO I schools through BESO II should demonstrate significantly greater results.
- 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, PTAs make similar statements.
- ZCs serve a vital function in supervising, coordinating, and supporting the work of SDAs, and in providing them ongoing informal training. However, they have little management and human resources expertise and little or no training in these areas.
- 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 REB 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.
- Although GACs have acted on issues raised by girls at schools and to address overall gender inequalities, they have done so with little or no specific training and field-level resources. In Tigray, they are supported by WAT, a membership organizations with a presence at all levels of society. This has added benefits for GACs, but, as with other partners, they do not have resources, such as manuals, appropriate for community level training by GAC members.
- While SDAs have gained considerable skills and expertise, it is not clear how they will be used by the woredas in the future; in Tigray SDAs are employed by the CGPP which means a plan for their future employment at the woredas must be developed.
- M&E systems created by WL and Save are elegant and accessible, if the data collection and entry is undertaken in a timely manner. TDA is able to retrieve quantitative data such as frequencies and percentages and to report on the content of SIAs, but appears to

have less information and understanding about impact. Both WL and Save collect data on the sub-IR indicators, but internal studies show that the data collected, encoding, and entering are not without problems. WLs database was originally constructed to reflect monthly data collection. WL learned – due to transportation and workload issues of SDAs – that data could only be collected on a quarterly basis.

- Remoteness of SDAs from regional supervision and technical support has posed a setback to their work efficiency, effectiveness and morale in Tigray.
- The SIA system does not provide for communities to progressively move toward higher levels of self-reliance and sustainability in Tigray.
- In setting performance targets, it is important that differences in local capacities and capabilities are taken into consideration.
- Employment status of SDAs (fixed term contract) with the woredas has posed serious concern about sustainability. Woredas are unclear about how SDAs will be utilized in the future.

### **3. MEETING TARGETS**

- All three IPs went beyond most of their targets in terms of IR 3.1-IR 3.4, except for IR 3.2b, Responses of Woredas to Issues Raised. With the increasing empowerment of communities, and the increasing demands they are placing on woredas, woredas may not be prepared to respond appropriately.
- Although significant changes were reported between the baseline and the first year of implementation, insufficient evidence is available to document a trend. Moreover, data collected does not include school-level transfers. Although repeaters and others are reported through the mechanism of data collection on sub-IR indicators, it is not fully accessible but should be made so.
- WL and Save reported on changing targets for each year of implementation assuming that growth will be experienced annually. If sufficient training and follow-up visitation is not conducted, this growth trajectory may not be realized.
- School communities have been mobilized to contribute cash and in-kind to the improvement of their schools. The ratio has reached as high as 1:4 for SIA: community contributions in the research areas. (“You provided a spoonful, and we provided a shovelfull.”)
- Many of the sub-Intermediate Results provide a more rounded indication of how the project is doing. A review of these, along with the current IRs, should yield more realistic monitoring tools for project success.

### **4. IMPACT ON BENEFICIARIES**

#### **4.1 Capacity Building and Training**

- REBs do not receive any formal training on CGPP; this may lead to failures in sustainability at this level.
- Selected woreda officials have received training through a TOT mechanism in which they are equipped to provide training to PTAs/KETBs, but they do not provide any handouts to trainees, which leaves them devoid of any written record of the training (aside from personal notes). In some areas, woreda participation in training of school-level participants has fallen below expectations, sometimes due to turnover of woreda staff.

- Formal training has produced results in the management of school finances by the PTA/KETB, in the keeping of records, in planning, in community mobilization, in fundraising, and in implementing projects. However, the learning is “spotty” in places due to inconsistencies in attendance at training.
- The high mobility of KETB Chairs, PTA Chairs, School Directors and Teachers has created gaps in learning and ability to fully implement CGPP as replacements do not receive the same formal training as their predecessors.
- Training provision at more frequent intervals through well-designed learner-centered training manuals is a necessary condition for SDAs and CBOs to improve their problem-solving knowledge and skills and, most important, to overcome the tradition of hierarchy in decision processes.
- Materials from WOW, SOW, COW and PTA/KETB training is not readily available at Woreda or school levels so there is nothing to refer to when there are personnel changes or someone needs to refresh their recollection.

#### **4.2 Community Participation and Support**

- PTAs/KETBs play an instrumental role in bottom-up planning and implementation of school improvement initiatives; they are linking communities to schools.
- PTAs/KETBs 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 for participatory decision-making and more consistent follow-up.
- Communities are being challenged by all the demands for construction of roads, health centers, etc. CGPP mobilizes communities to support schools with cash and in-kind contributions. Currently, communities prioritize education in part because of a new sense of ownership. With all the competing demands being placed on communities, it is not clear how long communities will see schools as a priority for their attention.
- Turnover of KETB Chairs, PTA Chairs, School Directors, woreda and REB officials, and others has impacted the implementation of the project in every region. Unless more frequent, widespread and “refresher” training is provided for replacements and REB and woreda staff, the sustainability of the program is under question.
- GACs are addressing the specific needs of girls at school by identifying their problems, finding appropriate solutions, and reaching out to the community to adopt changes in attitudes and behaviors. GAC effectiveness could be improved with formal training and contextually appropriate field materials on how to address particular gender issues.
- Communities have found it desirable to improve schools, enroll more girls, provide greater support to girls to remain in school, and to reconsider some of the harmful traditional practices that girls face. Their effectiveness could be improved with more intensive support from the SDA during all phases of project implementation and after graduation.

#### **5. PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

- USAID management of CGPP could be strengthened by improving relationships between the CTOs and the IPs.
- TWG usefulness to IPs could be strengthened by opening up discussions wider on policy issues and by advocating for changes in the MoE.

- A critical minimum professional staff at the regional level, both in terms of number and mix, has a major bearing on the successful implementation of the program
- Effective implementation of CGPP is a function of its organizational ability to retain its staff
- The M&E plans of WL and Save require a significant amount of data collection. A more streamlined data collection, encoding and entry system might allow M&E departments to generate data in a more timely manner.
- ZCs have both HR and management responsibilities, yet they perform their tasks without specific training in these areas.
- SDAs are so overburdened with their regular work and the need for data collection that the time they spend at schools providing technical assistance presents a challenge. Without appropriate transport to reach schools greater distances from the woreda, SDAs must walk as many as 30 kms. to visit a school. Once at a school, they must meet with all organizational units and determine how best to support them. A review of SDA workloads should yield an accurate picture of the number of visits to schools are possible in a month's times.
- SDAs are provided a lengthy training at the outset of the program, selected training on M&E and data collection, and informal training in monthly meetings with ZCs. This training requires continual updating so that SDAs can be more effective in their jobs.
- SDAs come from organizational cultures and social traditions that are hierarchical in decision processes. In many cases, they are more directive than facilitative in their interactions with PTAs/KETBs and GACs. SDA training must deliberately work to overcome these barriers and provide SDAs with personal and professional opportunities for change.
- IP budgets are inadequate to accomplish all the work needed to address sustainability, especially on the government level, and to provide "retraining" or "refresher" training and improved training materials to current and replacement staff at all levels.
- The flow of information is from bottom-up in terms of data collection and reporting. SDAs are not provided with comparative school level data that they can use in reporting back to schools. Once these reports have been generated, they should be distributed through the Regional Offices and ZCs to each SDA for reporting back to schools. In some cases, the lack of a feedback loop to communities about the grants process is also a barrier to their continued learning and improvement. WL is working to improve this by developing a "Community Report Card," but we believe that data should also be shared at school level.
- ABECs are being quickly implemented to reach underserved communities. This haste, however, has created shortfalls in the provision of appropriate materials.

## **6. EXTERNAL FACTORS (including Government Policy)**

- REB 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. Government must also address the real danger that

without sufficient alternatives, these changes may reduce the enrollments of girls and very poor children in the short run and increase WFCL in Ethiopia.

- The initial thrust in school sustainability plans is to extend their schools, build more classrooms to accommodate the ending of shifts, staff them, and obtain textbooks. When these goals have been achieved, it is not clear what the community and school organizations will do next.
- Diseases such as malaria and HIV/AIDS have reduced the number of children attending schools, especially HIV/AIDS orphans. GACs are raising money through the establishment of small shops and other income generating activities to provide clothing and school supplies for those who do not have them. The number of children who fall into this category is rising. Information on grants available from other NGOs is shared, but inconsistently, by SDAs. PTAs, KETBs, and GACs should be made aware of other grant and income generating opportunities and should be provided with any grant writing support needed to access extra funding.
- Each community occupies a microenvironment that contributes to the determination of the type of income generating activities and farming conducted. CGPP fund raising activities might produce greater contributions when timed to coincide with the sale of cash crops.
- When cash crops such as coffee are grown in a community, school enrollments increase and the dropout rates for girls goes down. When the coffee crop declines, absenteeism and dropouts increase as children are expected to participate in income generating activities. In non-cash crop communities, demands for children's labor and income are a constant barrier to education.

## **7. OTHER (INCLUDING STRUCTURAL ISSUES)**

- Although IPs meet regularly, there seems little exchange of information on best practice and ways in which greater impact can be obtained.
- There has been insufficient linking between quality and access as envisioned in the entire BESO II endeavor. When there is overlap in CGPP and AED BESO in a particular school, there is a multiplication of impact. Although USAID and IPs have recently increased collaboration and overlap, we want to stress the importance of doing so to achieve maximum benefits for schools and communities.
- MoE annual data collection on schools, and IP data collection exercises fail to take transfers into account, thus distorting the dropout rate.

## VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

### 1. INTRODUCTION

In this section we present the many recommendations that emerge from our findings and lessons learned. As with these two sections, recommendations are made in the following categories: Project Design Variations, Meeting Targets, Impact on Beneficiaries (including Capacity Building and Training, and Community Participation and Support), Project Management, External Factors, and “Other” to include any recommendations that do not fit under the other categories. We provide a brief rationale before making each recommendation.

As with the previous sections, we stress that the recommendations are directly applicable to the institutions and individuals consulted, and suggestive to the rest of the project (a determination as to whether a specific recommendation is appropriate to a particular context must be made).

### 2. PROJECT DESIGN VARIATIONS

**2.1 Rationale:** It appears that USAID was not fully cognizant of TDA’s practice of providing BESO II SIAs to BESO I schools.

**Recommendation:** USAID should review carefully its management and oversight practices of TDA.

**2.2 Rationale:** TDA provided recipients of BESO I inputs SIA grants under BESO II, resulting in significantly more funds and support for some schools.

**Recommendation:** A separate impact assessment needs to be undertaken in Tigray to determine whether increased inputs have meant increased improvements in school quality and equity and in the community’s capacity for decision making and school management.

**2.3 Rationale:** Save provides SIAs to school, Phases II and III of which are competitive. This is burdensome for all participants and creates ambiguity on the part of the applicant.

**Recommendation:** Resources should be made available so that Save can drop the competitive process for Phase II but leave it for the final Phase III, adjusting criteria for grant making appropriately.

**2.4 Rationale:** Because not all interested parties have received training (due to high turnover rates), schools require greater support from SDAs.

**Recommendation:** Schools should not be graduated after two years, but after three years - one year after completion of Phase III or when the school demonstrates its ability to generate its own action plans and funding. This will put an extra burden on SDAs, necessitating the hiring of more SDAs to cover fewer schools.

**2.5 Rationale:** ZCs serve a vital human resources and management function without specific training on leadership, management, and human resources. TDA should provide closer and more substantive support to SDAs through the hiring and training of ZCs.

**Recommendation:** Formal leadership/management/HR training should be provided to ZCs and all other relevant staff who have management functions. IP budgets should be increased to account for this additional training. Moreover, TDA might benefit from a restructuring to add ZCs as SDAs in Tigray have responsibility for 20 schools each.

**2.6 Rationale:** Variability in government commitment threatens sustainability.

**Recommendation:** 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. To do this, formal training needs to be provided for those in REBs and woredas who have not had it. IP budgets should be increased to account for this additional training.

**2.7 Rationale:** M&E systems are very complicated, though elegant, and there are significant problems with data collecting, encoding, and entering.

**Recommendation:** IPs should simplify their data collection processes and instruments and then provide appropriate training to SDAs/SDCs if they are to be the data collectors.

### **3. MEETING TARGETS**

**3.1 Rationale:** Project performance varies from region to region, and locale to locale.

**Recommendation:** Performance indicators should be adjusted to accommodate this variability.

**3.2 Rationale:** Woreda responses to issues raised by schools are either not readily forthcoming or cannot be addressed.

**Recommendation:** Reconsider this as an appropriate results indicator given that woredas are being overwhelmed by community-school demands. Alternatively, determine if there is a way CGPP can help woredas be more responsive.

**3.3 Rationale:** Sub-IR indicators tell more about a school's progress than some of the IRs.

**Recommendation:** M&E systems should track and report on all the Sub-IR indicators as well as the IR indicators.

### **4. IMPACT ON BENEFICIARIES**

#### **4.1 Capacity Building and Training**

**4.1.1 Rationale:** A tremendous turnover rate among School Directors, teachers, KETB chairs and others has created a gap in CGPP knowledge and expertise among new employees. Some PTA and KETB members have forgotten some of what they know and felt somewhat at a loss to identify what they know about the project.

**Recommendation:** 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.

**4.1.2 Rationale:** Insufficient materials are provided to workshop participants at all levels.

**Recommendation:** Handouts on all topics covered in every training should be provided to participants, along with a binder, and they should be directed to make these available to others who have not received training. Costs should be covered through an increased budget allocation from USAID.

**4.1.3 Rationale:** 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. They have not received any specific training on how to do this, nor do they have field level resources to assist them in these efforts. Not all GACs even had printed guidelines as to how they should do their work.

**Recommendation:** IPs should design and implement a two-day training program for GACs specifically designed to teach them how to counsel girls and address problems and barriers to girls education. The approach and content of this training should be participatory and practical, rather than didactic and theoretical. It should provide learning opportunities through GACs' sharing their experiences and GAC members participation in designing strategies and resources for use at the community level. We advise all IPs to distribute these field- based gender training materials and to 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.

**4.1.4 Rationale:** Woreda officials vary in their knowledge of CGPP and their understanding of their responsibilities to the project. At times the WEO Head cannot explain what his supervisors or training experts are doing. Also, the Woreda Council – a major decision-making body – is not fully aware of the extent of CGPP activities.

**Recommendation:** Project orientation training should be provided to Woreda Council members as well as to WEO heads who are not involved in the day-to-day implementation of the project (as Supervisors are as they travel to project and non-project schools). They should be given a manual describing the project and the role of the Woreda in the project during implementation and when the project is finished. Extra budgetary allocations should be made to USAID to cover this expense.

**4.1.5 Rationale:** REBs vary in their understanding of CGPP and their commitment to its success. In one case, CGPP is considered one of many projects; in another, it is seen as integral in implementing REB/MOE policy. Also, there is significant turnover in personnel at the REB level and new personnel need to be aware of CGPP and the impact it is having on schools and communities.

**Recommendation:** The IPs should provide a formal orientation session for REBS and establish a regular, periodic meeting (e.g., monthly) with the REBs to update them on progress and keep CGPP uppermost in their minds.

## **4.2 Community Participation and Support**

**4.2.1 Rationale:** Community resources are being stretched to cover all manner of construction for other ministries. The kebele is the coordination unit for these activities, and the kebele chair/KEBT chair is overextended.

**Recommendation:** Determine how the project can remain in the forefront of kebele administrators and act on whatever is learned.

## **5. PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

**5.1 Rationale:** The TWG as the body providing oversight to all of BESO II can be more supportive and responsive to IPs.

**Recommendation:** The TWG should encourage IPs to raise points on and discuss policy issues. Once discussed, the TWG should advocate for any changes recommended with the MoE in support of BESO II.

**5.2 Rationale:** SDAs must cover large territories and go where no other means of transportation are available.

**Recommendation:** IPs should purchase motorcycles for use by SDAs and then turn them over for use at the Woreda when the project has been completed. USAID should provide the funding to do this.

**5.3 Rationale:** SDAs collect data from schools on their dropout rates, girls' enrollment, etc. While this information is shared with the community by the school, the SDA never receives the comparative analysis generated by the M&E system in the headquarters of the implementing partners. Without any documents, SDAs cannot go to schools and provide comparative information.

**Recommendation:** Once data has been analyzed, a print-out should be provided to each SDA and ZC to share the comparative progress of each of their schools. This document can also be shared with Woreda supervisors who address both project and non-project schools. This would close the feedback loop and give schools a comparative perspective. As WL finishes its design of the "Community Report Card," it should be shared with other IPs.

**5.4 Rationale:** It is important to bridge the gap between the regional and woreda levels of understanding of CGPP.

**Recommendation:** The regional IP office should organize a regional conference in which regional and woreda staff are required to present workshop-type papers on the progress of CGPP in their region/woreda.

**5.5 Rationale:** IPs all function best when they have the full contingent of professional staff.

**Recommendation:** IPs need to ensure that vacant staff positions are filled in a timely manner (i.e., a Deputy Director for Training, Statistician, and Educational Expert in Tigray) so as not to disrupt project implementation.

**5.6 Rationale:** IP budgets are inadequate to take refresher or retraining course into account, to purchase motorcycles for SDAs, and to offer non-competitive SIA grants to schools for the second phase (Save).

**Recommendation:** USAID should obtain budget increase estimates from IPs to cover all of these additional costs and the amounts should be granted.

**5.7 Rationale:** SDA training is limited and needs to be expanded to reflect best practice in adult education methodologies.

**Recommendation:** SDA training should begin with a two-week process that includes field experience, and then be updated at least quarterly with formal training on specific topics to build their capacity for excellence. Materials should include manuals, facilitation guides, and include participatory and adult-learning content.

## 6. EXTERNAL FACTORS

**6.1 Rationale:** Government practices don't match policies in terms of transfer of School Directors in that many do not stay in their posts the requisite number of years. KETB Chairs are politically shuffled and reduce the effectiveness of the KETB contribution to school quality and equity.

**Recommendation:** An agreement must be reached with GoE to enforce its policies regarding transfers to that CGPP personnel is consistent and can contribute to sustainability. The TWG can be instrumental in achieving this.

**6.2 Rationale:** Government agencies are making unrealistic demands on communities for their contributions, which may jeopardize the sustainability of CGPP activities on behalf of schools.

**Recommendation:** The TWG should determine how best to approach other GoE agencies to reduce the amount of competition with CGPP activities for community contributions.

## 7. OTHER

**7.1 Rationale:** IPs are not sharing sufficiently to adopt each other's best practices.

**Recommendation:** Each IP must be transparent in what they are doing and the lessons they are learning. These lessons must be shared with each other (e.g., contributions from all IPs should be made to the WL "Lessons Learned" book now in process.)

**7.2 Rationale:** The linkage among all the BESO II IPS is very loose, especially between AED and the other IPS. AED schools have a minimal overlap with CGPP schools.

**Recommendation:** All IPs should try to overlap their efforts more so that schools as centers of excellence for teaching and learning as well as community mobilization can be developed.

**7.3 Rationale:** IP data collection strategies on dropouts do not take transfers into account.

**Recommendation:** IPs should develop a formula on how to calculate transfers, or their data collection instruments should require that schools keep count of the number of transfer letters they write.

## IX. BIBLIOGRAPHY

### **Save the Children US Documents**

Capacity Building Department. December 2004. *BESO II/SCOPE Project: Cohort I and II SD's Capacity Building Need Assessment Study*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Lishan, Saba, Ashley Aakesson and Asnakew Assefa. March 2005. *Preliminary Formative Research Plan for Strengthening Gender Equity*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

M&E Unit. July 2005. *Feedback on Project Activities Progress*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Oromia Education and Capacity Building Bureau. 1997 *E.C. Educational Performance Indicators of 1997 (E.C. (2004/5))*. Addis Ababa: Oromia Education and Capacity Building Bureau.

Save the Children. 2002. *BESO II/SCOPE: Five-Year Plan Community – Government Partnership Program in Afar, July 2002-Jun2 2007*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. 2002. *BESO II/SCOPE: Five-Year Plan Community – Government Partnership Program in Oromiya, July 2002-June 2007*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. November 2003. *BESO II/SCOPE: Knowledge, Attitude and Practice (KAP) Survey Report*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. June 2003. *BESO II/SCOPE: Performance Monitoring Plan, Volume II (Monitoring Tools)*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. July 2004. *BESO II/SCOPE: Conceptual Ideas on Capacity Building*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. December 2004. *Beso II/SCOPE: Gender Responsive Participatory Techniques of Action Research and Grants Proposal Preparation (Volume IV Draft)*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. December 2004. *BESO II/SCOPE: Performance Monitoring Plan, Volume I (M&E Framework)*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. June 2002. *BESO II/SCOPE: Quarterly Report February-June 2002*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. June 2002. *BESO II/SCOPE: Quarterly Report April – June 2002*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. December 2002. *BESO II/SCOPE: Quarterly Report October-December 2002*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. March 2003. *BESO II/SCOPE: Quarterly Report January-March 2003*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. June 2003. *BESO II/SCOPE: Quarterly Report May-June 2003*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. September 2003. *BESO II/SCOPE: Quarterly Report July-September 2003*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. December 2003. *BESO II/SCOPE: Quarterly Report October-December 2003*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. December 2003. *BESO II/SCOPE: Training Modules, First Phase, Volume II (First Draft)*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. May 2004. *BESO II/SCOPE: Quarterly Report January-April 2004*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. June 2004. *BESO II/SCOPE: Quarterly Report April-June 2004*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. September 2004. *BESO II/SCOPE: Quarterly Report July-September 2004*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. December 2004. *BESO II/SCOPE: Quarterly Report October-December 2004*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. April 2004. *Proceedings of the BESO II/SCOPE Second Phase First Cycle Training*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. March 2005. *BESO II/SCOPE: Quarterly Report 01 January – 31 March 2005*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. February 2005. *BESO II/SCOPE: Training Manual on Identified Capacity Building Competencies for SDCs*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. March 2005. *Report for BESO II T W G Meeting For the Period October, 2002 –March, 2003*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. February 2005. *BESO II/SCOPE: Field Handbook, A Guide for Zonal Coordinators and School Development Coordinators*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. (undated). *BESO II/ SCOPE Project First and Second Cohort SDCs Training Workshop Proceedings*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. (undated). *Proceeding of the BESO II/SCOPE Project Fiscal Year 2004 First Phase First Cycle Training*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. (undated). *Strengthening Communities through Partnerships in Education – SCOPE: Final Technical Application*. Save the Children.

Save the Children. (undated). *Strengthening Linkage of SCOPE's ABE Implementation Activities with the Overall BESOII/SCOPE Project Implementation Programs*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

Save the Children. (undated). *Tentative Check list for Follow up of ABE implementation Project (Draft)*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children.

### **Tigray Development Association Documents**

TDA. 2004. *TDA Newsletter*, Vol. II, No. 3, April.

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program. 2002. *Annual plan: July 2002 – June 2003*. Mekelle, TDA

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program. 2002. *Five Year Plan: July 2002 – June 2007*. Mekelle: TDA.

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program. 2002. *Summarized Group Activities Presented at the SDA Experience Sharing Workshop Conducted in December 2002*. Mekelle: TDA (in Tigrigna)

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program. 2002. *Three Months' Progress Report: (July – September 2002)*. Mekelle: TDA

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program. 2002. *Three Months' Progress Report: (October-December 2002)*. Mekelle: TDA

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program. 2002. *TOR For SDA's Professional Training*. Mekelle: TDA, Field Coordination Unit.

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program. 2003. *Annual Plan 2003-04*. Mekelle: TDA

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program. 2003. *Quarterly Progress Report: (January – March 2003)*. Mekelle: TDA

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program. 2003. *TDA/BESO CGPP Development Agents Training Schedule*. Mekelle: TDA

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program. 2003. *Performance Monitoring Plan: 2003 – 2007 (Draft)*. Mekelle: TDA.

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program. 2004. *Annual Report: July 2003 – June 2004*. Mekelle: TDA

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program. 2004. *Annual Plan: July 2004 – June 2005*. Mekelle: TDA

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program. 2004. *CDA Final and CGPP Annual Accomplishment Reports*. Mekelle: TDA

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program. 2004. *Girls Advisory Committee (GAC)*. Mekelle: TDA (in Tigrigna). (contents of document not known)

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program. 2005. *Girls Advisory Committee (GAC)*. Mekelle: TDA (in Tigrigna) (contents of document not known)

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program. 2005. *List of Round 1 CGPP Schools that have a weighted average dropout rate for Grades 1 – 4 below the regional average*. Mekelle: TDA, M&E Unit. (database printout)

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program. 2005. *Supervision Report On Selected Second Cohort Project Schools, Annex I*. Mekelle: TDA

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program. 2005. *Third Quarter Report: (October – December 2004)*. Mekelle: TDA

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program. 2005. *Third Quarter Progress Report: (January – March 2005)*. Mekelle: TDA

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program (undated). *School Action Plan Preparation*. Mekelle, TDA (in Tigrigna) (contents of document not known)

TDA/BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program (undated). *TDA/BESO II 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase First Cohort Grant Receiving Schools. Implementation Period: November 2004 – October 2005*. Mekelle: TDA

TDA & USAID Ethiopia. (undated). *BESO Project Statistical Bulletin*. Mekelle: TDA (this is a report on BESO I results).

WAT. 2004. *Concept Paper on the current and Future Development Programs and Activities of the Women's Association of Tigray*. Mekelle: WAT.

WAT. (n.d.) *Women's Association of Tigray*. Special Issue, No. 4. Mekelle: TDA

## **World Learning Documents**

- Gero, Tahir. 2005. *BESO II CGPP. Training & Capacity Building: Challenges and Proposed Solutions*. Addis Ababa: World Learning.
- Gurevich, Robert. 2004. *Decentralization in Education: Some Implications at the Local Level (Draft)*. Paper presented to the Regional and Local Development Studies Seminar, Addis Ababa University. Addis Ababa: World Learning.
- Gurevich, Robert and Feleke Desta Beyene. 2005. *Sustainable Community Support for Education: Untapped Opportunities in Ethiopia*. Paper presented to the World Learning Global Conference 2005 on “Local Communities Leading Global Change: Knowledge Building for Sustainable Action, Washington, DC. Addis Ababa: World Learning.
- Swift-Morgan, Jennifer. 2004. *Community Participation: So What? What Does “Community Participation” Really Mean, and How Might it Affect School-Based Learning? Insights from Southern Ethiopia. (Draft)*. Paper presented at the annual conferences of CIES, Salt Lake City. Addis Ababa: World Learning.
- Thom, Hillary. 2005. *Girls’ Education and HIV/AIDS in Primary Schools of Southern Ethiopia*. Addis Ababa: World Learning.
- World Learning Ethiopia. 2002. *Annual Implementation Plan. BESO II Community-Government Partnership Program. Amhara Region. July 2002-June 2003*. Addis Ababa: World Learning Ethiopia.
- World Learning Ethiopia. 2002. *BESO-II Community Government Partnership Program Consolidated Annual Report January 1 – September 30, 2002*. Addis Ababa: World Learning.
- World Learning Ethiopia. 2002. *Five-Year Implementation Plan. Beso II Community-Government Partnership Program. Amhara Region. July 2002-June 2007*. Addis Ababa: World Learning Ethiopia.
- World Learning Ethiopia. 2002. *Five-Year Implementation Plan. Beso II Community-Government Partnership Program. Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples’ Region. July 2002-June 2007*. Addis Ababa: World Learning Ethiopia.
- World Learning Ethiopia. 2002. *Performance Monitoring Plan. Beso II Community Government Partnership Program*. Addis Ababa: World Learning Ethiopia, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit.
- World Learning Ethiopia. 2003. *BESO II Community-Government Partnership Program. Woreda & School Orientation Workshop. A Guide for Facilitators*. Addis Ababa: World Learning, Training Unit.
- World Learning Ethiopia. 2003. *BESO-II Community-Government Partnership Program Quarterly Report for the Period April 1 – June 30, 2003 and Consolidated Annual Report for the*

*Period July 8, 2002 – July 7, 2003 (Ethiopian Fiscal Year 1995).* Addis Ababa: World Learning Ethiopia.

World Learning Ethiopia. 2003. *BESO II Community Government Partnership Program. First Cohort Schools Baseline Report.* Addis Ababa: World Learning.

World Learning Ethiopia. 2004. *Annual Implementation Plan. BESO II Community-Government Partnership Program. Amhara Region. July 2004-June 2005.* Addis Ababa: World Learning Ethiopia.

World Learning Ethiopia. 2004. *Annual Implementation Plan. BESO II Community-Government Partnership Program. SNNP Region. July 2004-June 2005.* Addis Ababa: World Learning Ethiopia.

World Learning Ethiopia. 2004. *Annual Report – Basic Education Strategic Objective 2: Community-Government Partnership Program.* Addis Ababa: World Learning Ethiopia.

World Learning Ethiopia. 2004. *Annual School Profile Data Updating Instrument (rev.ed.).* Addis Ababa: World Learning Ethiopia, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit.

World Learning Ethiopia. 2004. *USAID BESO II Complementary Drought Assistance Program. Closeout Report.* Addis Ababa: World Learning.

World Learning Ethiopia. 2004. *Gathering Instruments (rev.ed.).* World Learning Ethiopia: Monitoring and Evaluation Unit.

World Learning Ethiopia. 2004. *BESO-II Community-Government Partnership Program. School Development Agent (SDA) Training: A Guide for Facilitators.* Addis Ababa: World Learning.

World Learning Ethiopia. 2005. *Quarterly Report (January – March 2005). Basic Education Strategic Objective II. Community-Government Partnership Program.* Addis Ababa: World Learning Ethiopia.

#### **USAID Documents**

USAID Ethiopia. 2000. *Integrated Strategic Plan FY 2001-2006.* Addis Ababa: USAID.

USAID Ethiopia. 2001. *BESO-II SOAG Annex 1, 8/13/2001.* Addis Ababa: USAID, pp. 15-17 only.

USAID Ethiopia. 2003. *Basic Education Strategic Objective 663-0009. Performance Monitoring Plan FY 2002-2007.* Addis Ababa: USAID.

USAID Ethiopia. 2004. *Foundation Established for Reducing Famine Vulnerability, Hunger, and Poverty. Integrated Strategic Plan: FY 2004 to FY 2008.* Addis Ababa: USAID.

**Other Relevant References**

Ethiopia. Ministry of Education. 2002. *Guideline for Organization of Educational Management, Community participation and Educational Finance (Draft Translation)*. Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.

TWG/USAID. 2005. *Minutes for TWG Meeting. Venue – Pinna Hotel, Awassa. February 25-27, 2005*. Addis Ababa: TWG/USAID.

TWG/USAID. N.d. “Terms of Reference for the BESO Technical Working Group (TWG).” Addis Ababa: TWG/USAID (single sheet, source unknown).

## APPENDIX A

### USAID/ETHIOPIA STATEMENT OF WORK FOR EVALUATION OF BESO II COMMUNITY- GOVERNMENT PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION

#### I. TITLE

Comprehensive mid-term evaluation of the Community Government Partnership Program (CGPP)/Basic Education Strategic Objective II (BESO II)

#### II. OBJECTIVE

The objective of this Task Order is to provide a team to conduct a comprehensive mid-term evaluation of the Community Government Partnership Program (CGPP)/Basic Education Strategic Objective II (BESO II). The team will assess CGPP management and implementation progress and CGPP's overall results to date. The CGPP is being implemented by Save the Children-US (SCF/US) CA 663-A-00-02-00331-00, Tigray Development Association (TDA) CA 663-A-00-02-00321-00, and World Learning Inc (WLI) CA 663-A-00-02-00320-00. Results of this evaluation will assist USAID/Ethiopia and the Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (GFDRE) in:

- Assessing the effectiveness of the CGPP implementing partners in their respective CGPP targeted regions,
- Assessing the effectiveness of project management and its impact on the implementation of the program,
- Measuring the CGPP's impact on communities and local education government agencies to date,
- Understanding key external factors that influence project implementation,
- Identifying and analyzing implementation issues,
- Assessing the impact of changes in key personnel (such as Chief of Party, Deputy Chief of Party, and Deputy Director for Programs) of implementing partners on project activities,
- Identifying lessons learned and making recommendations for improvement for the remaining life of the project.

The findings and recommendations of the evaluation will inform USAID/Ethiopia and the Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (GFDRE) deliberations in determining future strategies for the Basic Education Strategic Objective (BESO II) to enhance quality and equity in education. It will also inform the CGPP partners in their efforts to maximize project effectiveness.

### III. BACKGROUND

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), SCF/US, TDA, and WLI. The Community School Grants/Activity Program (CSGP/CSAP) was one component of BESO I and was implemented in the 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 project 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 Boards (KETBs) 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 BESO II, there are different contractors and grantees. The principal ones are Academy for Educational Development (AED), SCF/US, TDA, and WLI. The contractor, Academy for Educational Development, 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. The three grantees, SCF/US, TDA, and WLI, are implementing BESO II/CGPP. In BESO II, USAID has expanded its support from two regions to eight regions for the CSGP/CSAP, now called the Community Government Partnership Program (CGPP) in 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.

Save the Children-US (SCF/US) 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. Working with 3,700 project schools, communities and government partners to strengthen local capacities at school, community and decentralized government levels, CGPP allocations among the implementing partners are broken down as follows: TDA -- 400 schools, SCF/US -- 1500 schools and WLI --1800 schools. In addition, the BESO II/CGPP program supports flexible education for children in disadvantaged circumstances.

The broader CGPP implementation strategy seeks to improve quality and equity in project primary schools through increased community participation and support of the school's educational program. It is being accomplished through newly established PTAs, KETBs, and increased participation at the school level by parents, community

members and other external government and community 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 and budgeting). Such support is the responsibility of another BESO II implementing partner not covered under this evaluation. Furthermore, although the USAID approved project design of the CGPP implementing partners is generally similar in approach, important differences in implementation details exist among the partners.

The 5-year three Cooperative Agreements (CAs), as listed in the first page, were signed with the three CGPP implementing partners in February 2002. This evaluation will cover the activities undertaken since the beginning of the CGPP.

#### **IV. STATEMENT OF WORK**

The team shall conduct a comprehensive mid term-evaluation of BESO II/CGPP.

The evaluation shall: (a) examine the results and effectiveness of the CGPP in relation to the objectives of the Cooperative Agreements (CAs) and to the USAID/BESO II Results Framework; (b) evaluate performance against the goals delineated in the CA plans and in annual work plans; (c) examine the effectiveness of the three CGPP implementing partners/staff (d) identify and analyze implementation issues, including innovations, challenges, implementation barriers and their causes; (e) identify lessons learned for improving the project design; (f) assess important external variables beyond the control of the implementing partners that impact on project implementation; (g) gauge Ministry of Education (MOE), Regional Education Bureaus (REBs)/Woreda Education Officers' involvement and assessment of the progress of the project; and (h) make recommendations for improving project design and/or implementation for the remaining period of project implementation.

Specifically, the Team shall address the following issues:

- A. **Project Results and Input:** The evaluation will examine the project's overall results to-date, including:
  - i. A systematic review of established targets at all levels under the established TDA, SCF/US and WLI BESO II/CGPP Objectives in the CAs and Implementation Plans. If performance has exceeded or fallen short of targets, the reasons - positive or negative- shall be identified.
  - ii. The impact of the CGPP on the targeted beneficiaries. For individual project activities, the evaluation shall answer questions such as: Are the activities achieving their intended results? Has the planning and execution of the project incorporated strategies for sustainability from the beginning? How effective have the interventions been? Why have these been accomplished or not accomplished?

iii. Examine the variations in project design among the partners and assess their relative strengths and limitations.

iv. Identify the external (non-CGPP) project specific implementation factors that influence positively or negatively project implementation and progress.

**Specifics:**

***Capacity Building and Training:***

- What are the critical variables that impact on CGPP training and capacity building activities?
- How adequate is the training and capacity building support provided to the School Development Agents/Coordinators (SDAs/SDCs) to ensure that they can effectively execute their responsibilities in providing training and capacity building for members of PTAs, KETBs and communities?
- How systematic, sequential and logical is the training for SDAs/SDCs and Zone Coordinators? Is it responsive to the challenges faced by SDAs/SDCs and Zone Coordinators?
- How effective is the design and training provided to PTAs, KETBs and Girls' Advisory Committees (GACs)?
- To what extent are PTAs and KETBs gaining the necessary skills and knowledge to manage their schools through the training provided by SDAs/SDCs? What factors account for this?
- To what extent do GACs have the necessary skills, support and knowledge to improve the school-community climate for female students? What are the project and non-project factors that impact on this?
- How effective are the capacity-building and training activities for woreda-level officials involved in the education sector? Do the woreda officials feel that the capacity-building and training activities are relevant to their needs or project goals? If not, why not?
- How appropriate and sufficient are the training and capacity building strategies to transfer the relevant skills and knowledge? What can be done to improve them?
- Are there any other implementation issues in relation to the training and capacity building components of TDA, SCF/US and WLI's activities that need to be addressed? If so, how should they be addressed or have they been addressed by them?

***Community Participation and Support***

- What evidence exists to show that communities support their schools in a manner consistent with project design and objectives?
- Do PTAs/KETBs and communities feel a sense of ownership of their school? What evidence exists to support this?
- What evidence exists to identify improvements in quality and equity in education at the school level resulting from CGPP interventions?

- Do socio-cultural, economic, ethnic or regional factors impact on community support for education under CGPP? If so, how?
- What is the level of PTA/KETB and community interaction with the Woreda Education Office in matters affecting quality and equity in education? What are the factors impacting on such interaction?
- Does the planning and execution of the CGPP in education incorporate strategies for sustainability at the school and community levels, the woreda and regional level and the national level? If not, what are the impediments?
- What progress is being made in implementing alternative basic education programs under CGPP?
- What are the strengths and challenges in implementing alternative basic education under CGPP?
- What is the impact of gender inequity on CGPP performance (especially inequities in the participation of women) and turnover of community members closely involved in the implementation of CGPP including PTA and KETB members?
- To what extent does it appear that issues affecting women and girls are being addressed under CGPP?
- What indications are there, if any, that activities being implemented through CGPP are being used by communities or government education actors? Why or why not?

**B. Project Management:** The evaluation team will examine the effectiveness of the management of the implementing partners in achieving CGPP priorities. The evaluation should address at minimum, the following questions and issues:

- Have implementing partners' management organizations and use of their resources (human, financial, material and time) tackled project priorities in a timely and efficient manner? If not, why?
- Are there clear and appropriate delineations of responsibilities of each staff member at all levels at the central office and the regional offices?
- What is the quality of support given by administrative and finance units to project implementation and program staff?
- What has been the impact of seconding SDAs/SDCs by Woreda Education Offices on project management?
- How effective have implementing partners' management been in building team capacity and ability to work towards a common objective?
- How well are implementing partners' monitoring activities in terms of the tracking inputs, ensuring that supporting processes are put into place in a timely fashion, as well as the quality of resulting outputs and changes? Examine each at the different levels, namely headquarters, field offices, and at school and community levels.
- What has been the impact of changes in USAID Cognizant Technical Officers on Project Management?

- What recommendations would the evaluation team make to USAID and the partners to improve project management?

**Turnover in Key Personnel.** There has been turnover in several key personnel positions within a relatively short time among the individual implementing partners. What impact have these had on project implementation and continuity? Were there performance problems with regard to these staff members? How were these problems addressed? Did implementing partners take appropriate management steps to address these problems? Were USAID regulations regarding key personnel appropriately adhered to? How might USAID help implementing partners address critical management issues?

### **C. Analysis of External Factors Affecting CGPP Implementation:**

Recognizing that external variables often impact on implementation, the evaluation team will examine the following issues:

- Impact of local, regional and national government policies on project implementation. These include (a) new policies regarding decentralization in the administration of education; (b) local government personnel practices in education including the impact of provision of teachers and headmasters, and turnover of regional, woreda education and school officials; (c) Woreda Education Office support for teaching/learning activities including provision of textbooks, teaching materials and other pedagogical support on project implementation; (d) seconding of School Development Agents by Woreda Education Offices; (e) changes in local government policies affecting local education including elimination of the “shift” system; (f) impact of “Education for All” programs that promote access on educational quality and equity.
- Additional responsibilities assigned to CGPP partners by USAID including the Complementary Drought Assistance program and the Kokeb Kebele program integrating Health and Education under SO 14.
- Role and impact of the Technical Working Group in CGPP administration and support.
- Level and scope of collaboration among all BESO II partners affecting support for CGPP schools including provision of in-service training, cluster teaching/learning and pedagogical materials, and other BESO II resources to CGPP participating schools.
- Level of funding provided by USAID relative to the project goals and the impact on project implementation.
- Changes in USAID Mission strategies and priorities since project design and inception.
- Impact of other USAID inputs, directions, policies and procedures on project implementation.
- Regional and Woreda Education Office willingness, capacity and readiness to scale up and sustain CGPP efforts.

D. **Relationship to Mission Plans:** Based on implementing partners' project documentation and the Mission's Integrated Strategic Plan, the evaluation report shall define in summary the relationship between the activity BESO II/CGPP and USAID's BESO II Results Framework. It is recognized that USAID/Ethiopia's Mission strategies and priorities have undergone important changes since CGPP design and implementation began. The report shall also assess how the BESO II Results Framework has been supported by the implementing partners BESO II/CGPP project in light of the original strategies and priorities and current priorities and strategies. The evaluation will also examine the CGPP implementing partners' contributions to supporting social resiliency in Ethiopia and how it might be implemented to further strengthen social resiliency.

E. **Beneficiary Assessment.** The Team will assess the degree to which the CGPP in education has responded to perceived needs of its beneficiaries: students, teachers, PTAs, education managers, government partners at the school, kebele, woreda, regional and national levels. Which CGPP activities are considered to be most important by beneficiaries? Which ones least? Why? What actions or evidence exists to support these findings? Do woreda education and regional officials feel a sense of ownership of the CGPP? If so, what actions are they taking to promote scaling up of program activities to non-CGPP schools and/or to promote sustainability in CGPP schools upon completion of their active participation in the project program cycle?

F. **Design Recommendations:** the Team will analyze the mid-term evaluation findings, and expected results, the reasonableness of the targets in relation to the implementation time-frame, the implementing partners' organizational structure, implementation environment, etc., and will make recommendations for changes in the present project designs, implementation plans and USAID support.

## EVALUATION METHODS

Both quantitative and qualitative methods will be required to collect data from a number of sources, including field visits, implementing partners, MOE, REBs and WEOs officials, PTAs, KETBs, schools etc. Techniques/instruments to be used to capture data may include structured questionnaires, direct project activity observations, interviews and other rapid appraisal methods. To the extent feasible, interviews (either in person or via telephone) will be conducted with appropriate Home Office staff of U.S. implementing partners. Once in the field, the Team is expected to interview MOE, REBs, SDAs/SDCs, Woreda Education Officers, PTAs, school directors, teachers, students, implementing partners' staff in Addis Ababa as well as in regional offices. The BESO II Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) will be a key source of information.

The Team will use a combination of purposive and random sampling methods based on a sampling framework that includes factors affecting the nature and implementation of the CGPP.

## ***PERFORMANCE PERIOD***

The evaluation fieldwork and preparation of the final report shall be carried out over a 36 day period. The evaluation team will be authorized a ten-day workdays in the field. Team members will be authorized three workdays prior to start of fieldwork for document reviews and team meetings. Ideally, the period of performance will begin on May 16, 2005 and conclude on June 20, 2005.

## **REPORT & DELIVERABLES SCHEDULE**

The evaluation team will receive direction and assistance from the USAID/Ethiopia Basic Education Services Office (BES Office) Chief, who will be the primary point of contact for the team; the Deputy BES Office Chief; the Cognizant Technical Officers, and other members of the BES Office. All substantive reports and documents related to program implementation will be supplied to the evaluation team prior to their entry in country. These will include USAID/Ethiopia Country Strategy Plan for the period 1996-2001; USAID/Ethiopia's Country Strategic Framework; the implementing partners' Project Implementation Plan; the BESO II Annual Performance Report, quarterly reports, BESO II PMP and other pertinent documents.

### WEEK 1

At the beginning of the first week, the team shall provide USAID/Ethiopia with a work plan that identifies key work elements, evaluation methodology including evaluation sample areas, and provide a schedule that demonstrates how the work will be accomplished within the period of performance. USAID will review the plan with the Team within two days of receipt. USAID will officially approve the work plan once the Mission's feedback has been incorporated into the work plan.

### WEEK 2 and 3: Field work

At the end of the third week, the Team shall provide to USAID an annotated outline of their preliminary findings and brief USAID on the progress of the evaluation.

### WEEK 4

At the beginning of the fourth week, the Team shall brief USAID on the progress of the evaluation.

By the end of the fourth week, the Team shall provide to USAID and its partners a first draft of the evaluation report for review and comment. The report should not exceed 50 pages. The first draft shall follow the general format as follows:

- (i) Executive Summary
- (ii) Purpose of Evaluation
- (iii) Background
- (iv) Methodology
- (v) Body of the report
- (vi) Summary of findings
- (vii) Lessons Learned

(viii) Recommendations

Within three days of receipt of the draft report, CGPP implementing Partners shall provide written responses or additional information to the team if they so desire.

WEEK 5

At the middle of the fifth week, the Team will have a meeting with the USAID BESO II Team to discuss the findings and the draft report. A one-day workshop will be held during the work week involving MOE, REBs, USAID, other stakeholders deemed necessary and the consultants to discuss findings, experiences, lessons learned and recommendations.

At the end of the fifth week, the Evaluation Team shall incorporate written and oral comments into the final evaluation report that will include all of the findings and recommendations. Eight (8) copies shall be submitted to USAID/Ethiopia. In addition, the team will submit to USAID/Ethiopia the final evaluation report on formatted 3.5 inch diskette or CD-ROM, Microsoft Word document.

***RELATIONSHIPS & RESPONSIBILITIES***

The Team will work under the technical direction of the BESO Office Chief. This evaluation shall be participatory and collaborative in nature, encouraging and relying on host country personnel.

**THE TEAM**

Illustrative education and experience requirements for each member of the team are detailed as follows:

1. **Education Specialist: Team Leader**  
Advanced degree in education with ten years experience in the developing world, Ethiopia or Africa in particular. Understanding of quality, equity and gender issues in basic education is essential. Excellent written and oral communication skills. Must have successful previous experience in leading evaluation teams.
2. **Evaluation Specialist**  
Experience in conducting participatory evaluations, including facilitating group meetings and using rapid appraisal methods. Previous participation on education evaluation teams. Familiarity with basic education issues, knowledge of qualitative and quantitative research methodologies and knowledge of USAID programs, regulations and procedures.

**3. Local Education Specialist**

*An advanced degree in education. Experience in evaluating the performance of USAID-funded education projects in Ethiopia or African countries preferred. Fluent in local languages for possible translation, and other evaluation requirements. Good writing and communication skills in English.*

**4. Local Education Planning and Management Specialist**

Experience in managing community-based program interventions, especially in the primary education sector. Understanding of Ethiopia's education sector, and planning and management education issues in Ethiopia. Knowledge of MOE, REBs and woredas. Fluent in local languages for possible translation and other evaluation requirements. Good writing and communication skills in English.

**SPECIAL PROVISIONS**

- A. **Duty Post:** The duty post for this Task Order is Ethiopia.
- B. **Language Requirements:** Members of the evaluation team are required to have excellent oral and writing proficiency in English. All reports are to be submitted in English.
- C. **Access to Classified Information:** The team will not have access to classified information.
- D. **Logistical Support:** The team will provide all logistical support within the country. To the extent feasible, implementing partners are authorized to make project vehicles available to evaluation team members on a reimbursable basis.

**APPENDIX B  
INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED**

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>PERSON/PEOPLE</b>	<b>PURPOSE</b>
June 7	USAID	Ato Tesfaye Kelemwork, Deputy Chief, BESO	Orientation, contract review
June 8	1) USAID 2) World Learning	1)Ato Aberra Makonnen, Chief, BESO; Ato Assefa Berhane, CTO, BESO, World Learning and Save the Children, US; Ato Befekadu Gebre Tsadik, CTO, BESO, Tigre Development Assocation; Ms. Karen Freeman, Deputy Director. 2)Bob Gurevich, Chief of Party, and Ato Felleke, Deputy Director, Programs	1) Orientation; appointments; partial SOW review 2) Information gathering on WL implementation activities
June 9	1) Ministry of Education 2) Save the Children US 3) World Learning	1) Wzo. Fantanesh Tilahoun, Head, Planning, and Head of Technical Working Group 2) Barbara Greenwood, Chief of Party, Save; Felekech Bahir, Deputy COP; Mekonnen Angassa, Zonal Coordinator 3) Bob Gurevich, COP; Feleka Desta, Deputy Director, Programs; Dawit Megeessa, Database Manager; Adenech Kebede, Deputy Director, Finance and Administration; Tahir Gero, Training Director; Edesta Wolde-Mariam, M&E Specialist	1) Obtain letters of introduction to Regional Education Bureau; orientation on MOE view of CGPP 2) Information gathering on Save implementation activities 3) Information gathering on WL implementation activities; select woredas and schools for research in SNPP; select woredas for research in Amhara
June 10	Save the Children US	Barbara Greenwood, COP, Save; Felekech Bahir, Deputy COP; Kassay Yimar, Capacity Building Coordinator; Training Coordinator	Information gathering on Save implementation activities; select woredas and schools for research in Afar and Southwest Shewa
June 13	Team 1 (Nancy and Kassaw) – SNNPP REB	1) Hassan Abdu Beshir, Educational Programs & Human Resources Development Department	Data collection on project at REB level

	Team 2 (Virginia and Alemayehu) - Tigray Development Association	Head; Tonja Toma, Planning & Project Division Head  2) Ato Tesfazghi Abera, TDA Executive Director; Ato Tadella, Project Director; Ato TsehayeFekadu, M&E Unit Head; Ato Tsegaye Hadera, Field Coordinator; Ato Salim Mohamed, Finance Unit Head; Ato Tsegaye Gtensae, Education Expert	
June 14	Team 1 – Abela Lida School, Shebedina Woreda; Muracho Gucho School, Shebedina Woreda; Shebadina Woreda – Training Expert.  Team 2 – Enderta Woreda	1) At Ablea Lida School: Girls’ Advisory Committee – 2 teachers, 3 students, 2 mothers; School Director – Ato Belai Petros, Deputy Director – Ato Tamene Yemore; PTA/KETB members – KETB chair and member, PTA chair, 1 teacher, and 1 community member (5). Amelework Alemayhue – Zone Coordinator for World Learning. At Muracho Gucho School: PTA/KETB members – KETB chair and 1 member; PTA – 3 teachers and 1 member; GAC – 2 male teachers and 2 mothers; School Director; SDA for this school - Shebadino Woreda, Assemaro Adato.  2) Ato Hagazi, WEO Head, Ato Zeferu, SDA; Ms. Awetash, Woreda WAT	Data gathering through PRA exercises, focus group and individual interviews
June 15	Team 1 – Debub Mesenqela School; Dalle Woreda; WL SDA	1) At Debub Mesenqela School – School Director, Ato Aschalu Belai; GAC – two teachers, 1 mother, and 1 student; PTA/KETB – KETB Chair, Cashier, and 3 members; PTA - 2 teachers and 3 members; representative of the Teacher’s Association; School Director. SDA for this	Data gathering through PRA exercises, focus group and individual interviews

	<p>Team 2 – Mikael Kelti School; Lahma School</p>	<p>school – Yohanis At Dalle Woreda, Mesfin Machuka, Woreda Education Office Head; Bedassa Deshira, Supervisor</p> <p>2) Ato Molla Chekole, KETB Chair; Ato Mehari Beyene, Village Elder; Ato Libanos Tadelle, PTA member; Ms. Genet Ayalew, PTA member; Ato Teodros Woldu, KETB Secretary &amp; GAC member; Ato Hilgizew Eshetu, PTA and GAC member; Ms Ageritu Kebede, GAC member. Ato Hailemariam Mezgebe, PTA &amp; GAC member; Ms. Berhan Negussie, GAC member; Ms Membere Berhe, GAC member; Ms Minaseb Abraha, GAC member; Ato Lule Gebreselasie, PTA member; Ato Abraha Tsegay, PTA member; Ato Zinabu Abera, PTA member</p>	
June 16	<p>Team 1 - Balesita School, Aletawondo Woreda; Aletawondo Woreda; WL SDA</p> <p>Team 2 – Houzen Woreda; SDA Houzen; Debre Hiwet School; Endatsebela School</p>	<p>1) At Balesita School: PTA/KETB – PTA Chair, 1 female and 1 male community member; KETB – KETB chair, 1 teacher member, School Director; GAC – 2 female teachers, 1 student; School Director; SDA for this school – Kassaye Fisseha.</p> <p>Ato Alem Girma, Woreda Education Supervisor; Ato G.medhin G. Selassie, Woreda Farmers Association; Ms. Hiwot Gebru, Woreda WAT; Ato Yemane G.Egziabher, Woreda Youth Association; Ms. Azeb Aregay, SDA PTA -5 members (2F) – 1 Director, 2 teachers, 2</p>	Data gathering through PRA exercises, focus group and individual interviews

		community members; GAC - 2 teachers (m) (chair), 2C (1F), 1 student (F) PTA - 3 females (2 teachers); GAC members (1 chair of KETB), 1 student female member	
June 17	Team 1 - Dagara School, Dale Woreda  Team 2 – WAT	PTA/KETB members, GAC members and School Director  Vice Director, Aster Amare	PRA exercises, focus group and individual interviews
June 18	Team 1 - World Learning Regional Office - SNNPR; TWG meeting  Team 2- Capacity Building Coordination Head	Berhanu Manallew, Regional Director; observe TDA presentation at TWG in Nazareth (Adamo)  Ato Abadi Zemo	Individual interview; observation
June 20	Team 1 (Nancy and Alemahehu) - Travel to Bahir Dar; 1) REB – Amhara; 2) WL Zone Coordinator, West Gojjam  Team 2 (Virginia and Kassaw) – 1) Oromiya Regional Education Bureau; 2) Travel to Awash; 3) CARE Office, Awash.	1) Fanta Mojas Bikonegn, Deputy Head, REB; Tekele Gebre Kedan, Head, Education Programs Department. 2) Mekwannet Athacho, ZC  CARE Awash: Nigussie Mengistu, Area Finance Head, Asanmew Getu, Area Administrative Head, Sharew Gultu Zonal Coordinator, SCOPE	Group interview at REB; individual ZC interview  CARE Awash: Group interview
June 21	Team 1 – 1) Zegie School; 2) Andassa School; 3) SDA, West Gojjam	1) PTA Chair and 4 members; KETB Chair and 5 members (overlap in membership); Mengistu Bizuneh, Deputy Director (Acting Director); GAC – 2 teachers (1 M and 1 F), 2 students, 1 Orthodox priest, 2 community members (female) 2) KETB Chair and 1 member; PTA chair and 3 members, 2 teachers; School Director; GAC – 2 female teachers and 1	Group and individual interviews; GAC PRA exercise

	<p>Team 2 – 1) Amibara Woreda Education Office, Afar Region; 2) Amibara #2 Primary School; 3) Kel’at ABEC</p>	<p>mother 3) Aynealem Tafere, SDA</p> <p>1) WEO: Mesfin Endris, Education Department Head; Bidar Ali, Capacity Building Office Head; Girma Femissa, Education Support Department Head; 2) Amibara #2: School Director, Ibrahim Ali; PTA: Seid Debus, Chair, Banchiayehu Belete, Member and Teacher (woman), Mohamed Yimev, Member and Teacher, Blachew Glwolde, School Unit Leader (double shift); GEAC: Salam Ashebir, Chair (woman teacher); other members present: 1 male student, 1 female student, 1 mother, 1 male elder; 3) Kel’at ABEC: Group meeting with 12-15 male members of Center Management Committee, additional male community members/leaders, two community women, older male, two male facilitators, and student translator. Also present for part of the meeting: Care zonal coordinator and SDC (translator), Assefa Berhane, USAID and Felekech Bahirn, Save for translation</p>	<p>1) WEO: Group interview; 2) Amibara #2: PTA Group Interview, GEAC PRA Tool and Group Interview, SD Individual Interview; 3) Kelat: Group Meeting. Interview with facilitators.</p>
June 22	<p>Team 1 – 1) Ayelew Mekonen School; 2) Achefer Woreda; 3) SDA Achefer</p>	<p>1) Walla Worku, School Director; KETB/PTA overlap, 4 present, 1 teacher; GAC – 2 teachers, 2 mothers, 1 female student 2) Yaynealem Tafere, Formal Education Program Desk Head; Worku Ferede, Primary School Head 3) Abekellish Minalleh, SDA</p>	<p>1) Individual, group interviews and PRA tool at school; 2) group interview at woreda; 3) individual interview with SDA</p>

	Team 2 – 1) Hasoba Primary School; 2) Woreda Education Office (SDC)	1) Hasoba: SD: Senait Telezgi, GEAC: Ethiopia Asfaw and Ainalem Alebachew (teachers), Amkelech Seid (mother), Mindi Bere, Hasna Humed, Hareguwa Teferra, Habtamnesh Assefa (students) PTA: Mohamed Ali, Ali Hassen (Chairperson), Aisha Hummad , Nuritu Duke (f) Ibrahim Abdella, Student, Translator. Also present Feleketch Bahirn, Save, and Assefa Berhane, USAID, for translation; 2) WEO: Tsegaye G. Kidan, SDC	1) Hasoba: PTA with SD Group Interview; GEAC with SD, PRA tool and group interview; 2) SDC: Individual interview
June 23	Team 1 – 1) Ziguda School; 2) Dangla Woreda; 3) SDA Dangla Woreda  Team 2 – 1) SDAs; 2) Buta Bedaso School; 3) Doni School	1) PTA Chair, 1 member, 2 teachers; KETB chair, 1 member; School Director (female); GAC – Chair, 3 members (2 female, 1 male), 1 student (female) 2) Dangla Woreda – Leul Makone, Head WEO, Tesfahun Workineh, Inspector, Tesfaye Simene, Formal Education Desk Head 3) Kassahun Amare, SDA  1) SDAs- Mustofa Kedie, Bayush Hailu 2) Mesetu Shume PTA accountant; Denkishe Bedada, GAC member; Mame Sisay, GAC secretary; Abonesh Bekure, GAC Chair; Asselefech Dessalegne, Chair person of Women’s committee; Gezahegn Tedesse School Director; Tura Gurmu, PTA member; Ayane Chequala, PTA member; Geda Boset, PTA member; Million Jabessa GAC member	1) Group and individual interviews at schools, woredas, and with SDA.  2) Group and individual interviews at schools and with SDA

		3) Fikirte Tsegaye, GAC member; Gosa Birtukan, School Director; Asefash Cheneke, PTA secretary; Fantahun Dersi, PTA member; Shewaye Hailu, PTA member; Etalemahu Abebe, GAC member; Tadelu, GAC member; Debele, PTA Chair; Kiltu, PTA member; Fantahun Derso, PTA member; Demeke Nigussie, PTA treasurer; Girma Bejaga, PTA member; Nigussie Kurfa, PTA auditor; Dinku Jima, KETB Chair	
June 24	<p>Team 1 – 1) Kulkwalmeda School; 2) SDA Bahir Dar Special Zone; 3) Regional WL Office; 4) Bahir Dar Zuria Woreda</p> <p>Team 2 – 1) Dengore Neyu School; 2) Tedecha School</p>	<p>1) PTA Chair, 1 member, 1 teacher; KETB 1 member; School Director; GAC – 3 teachers;</p> <p>2) Ayalnesh Biresaw, SDA</p> <p>3) Tadella Zewdie, Regional Director</p> <p>4) Habtamu Ubalem, WEO Head</p> <p>1) Genet Hailu, GAC member; Zewdinsh Hailu, GAC Chair; Dema Geda, GAC member; Tola Feyissa, GAC member; Assefa Gudeta, GAC member; Ayu Gobena, GAC member; Jambo Regassa, PTA member; Bosse Leta, PTA member; Jima Lore, PTA member; Digo Buni, PTA member</p> <p>2) Dadi Asfaw, PTA Chair; Debebe Gobena, PTA member; Bekele Babsso, PTA member; Kasim Geba, KETB member; Aleminesh Dadi, GAC chairman; Like Borena, GAC member</p>	<p>1) Group and individual interviews at schools, at the woreda, with the SDA, and at the Regional WL office.</p> <p>2) Group and individual interviews at schools.</p>
June 27	World Learning (Nancy)	Robert Gurevich, COP; Felleke, Deputy Director, Programs; Dawit – Database; Desta – M&E; Tahir –	Obtain clarification on different points and documents for final report

		Training	
June 28	Save the Children – US (Ginny)	COP and Senior Management Team	Conduct follow-up interviews and request print-outs from database
June 30	USAID		Provide briefing to Basic Education Team
July 6	MoE; USAID	BES Team from USAID; SO 14 head from USAID; COPs of WL, Save, and TDA; other staff members from IPs; 4 Juarez team members	Provide briefing to Wzo Fantanesh, head of TWG and Planning at MoE; provide briefing to Mission Director; provide workshop to stakeholders

## **APPENDIX C**

### **TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The Technical Working Group (TWG) is an oversight group established under BESO-I and continued under BESO-II to assist in the coordination of project activities, to provide inputs and approvals to different implementing partner plans, and to make recommendations to enhance the effectiveness of the project. The TWG provides “a broad-based forum for consultation and input as the program progresses, to assure that USAID maintains its core values of customer service and participation throughout the life-of-plan.”<sup>17</sup> This appendix sets out the membership, tasks and responsibilities, and related information on the TWG.

#### **MEMBERSHIP/MEETINGS**

The TWG meets quarterly after each implementing partner submits its quarterly report. The TWG works on a consensus basis and is composed of the following members:

- MOE, Head, Education Sector Development Program and Planning Department, Chair
- USAID Chief, Basic Education Services
- USAID Deputy Office Director, Office of Basic Education Services
- USAID Project Management Specialist, Save the Children US and World Learning
- USAID Project Management Specialist, Tigray Development Association
- Chief of Party – Academy for Educational Development
- Chief of Party – World Learning
- Chief of Party – Save the Children US
- Chief of Party- Tigray Development Association
- Chief of Party – PACT (TEACH program for Alternative Basic Education Center enhancement);
- Department Head, Educational Mass Media
- Manager, National Organization for Examinations
- Head, State Education Boards for all States of implementation
- Head, Tigray Regional State Education Bureau
- Head, Amhara Regional State Education Bureau
- Head, Oromiya Regional State Education Bureau
- Head, SNNPR Regional State Education Bureau
- Head, Afar Regional State Education Bureau
- Head, Harari Regional State Education Bureau
- Head, Benishangul-Gumuz Regional State Education Bureau
- Head, Gambella Regional State Education Bureau
- Head, Somali Regional State Education Bureau
- Head, Addis Ababa City Education Bureau
- Head, Dire Dawa Education Office
- Head, Planning and Policy Analysis Panel
- Expert, Project Preparation and Follow-UP
- Department Head and Two Panel Heads, Ministry of Finance
- Director, Institute for Curriculum Development and Research
- Department Head, General Education
- Department Head, Women’s Affairs

---

<sup>17</sup> USAID. 2001. *BESO-II SOAG, Annex 1*. Addis Ababa: USAID, p. 16

### **TASKS AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

According to a document entitled “Terms of Reference for the BESO Technical Working Group (TWG)” provided to us by USAID, the following are the Tasks and Responsibilities of the TWG:

1. Evaluate whether plans, implementation and results are in line with the spirit and intent of BESO and in particular of conditionalities, covenants and other reforms, and come up when necessary with innovative ideas and suggestions for better approaches.
2. Monitor the implementation progress of the project and ensure that it is in line with the national policy, priorities and BESO objectives.
3. Recommend further analysis/studies (e.g., baseline data) required in fulfillment of its monitoring and evaluation duties.
4. Ensure that the preparation of yearly plans of action is done in consultation with and the involvement of all concerned parties.
5. Evaluate the implementation progress of BESO project and advise and recommend on policies/financial issues, priorities or procedures related to the implementation of the BESO project.
6. Obtain assistance of other offices and staff as appropriate in carrying out its responsibilities.
7. Meet, as required, and discuss with relevant stakeholders to ascertain their position, feelings and opinions on BESO project and its impacts.
8. Through its chairperson and secretary, may attend the meetings of the USAID Basic Education Strategic Objective Core Team.

An additional responsibility the TWG identified and implemented is to visit CGPP schools to observe progress.

### **EFFECTIVENESS**

The TWG tracks each organization’s plans, activities, monitoring activities, assessment findings, budgets, financial reports, and the like. It also ensures that each organization disseminates findings and results of research and assessments with other implementing partners. The TWG also inquires into the late implementation of plans. It suggests changes in reporting formats (both quantitative and qualitative information), EMIS systems, reporting in terms of planned against achieved activities and outcomes, human resources issues and challenges, sustainability, procurement, and all manner of management issues to assist implementing partners in delivering their programs efficiently and effectively.

According to the BESO-II SOAG, Annex I, of 8/13/2001, the TWG also has the mandate to reduce support to an Implementing Partner for not meeting the criteria for participation:

*Should a region that has been receiving BESO-II assistance not be able to meet the criteria in a given year, BESO-II assistance to that region will be significantly reduced and transferred to support more productive investments.*

**APPENDIX D**  
**ORGANIZATION OF EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT,  
COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND EDUCATIONAL FINANCE**

**Excerpted from: Ethiopia. Ministry of Education. 2002. *Guideline for Organization of Educational Management, Community Participation and Educational Finance (draft translation)*. Addis Ababa: MOE.**

The following are relevant excerpts on the roles and responsibilities of various educational bodies involved in the CGPP. These excerpts are included in an appendix as a base line to compare/contrast actual practices identified in the findings of the evaluation team.

NOTE: Since the development and dissemination of these guidelines, the Zonal Education Offices have been dissolved, with the REB devolving powers and responsibilities to the Woreda Education Offices.

**DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE:**

**Regional (State) Education Bureau – REB/SEB**

- Develop and effect, based on the Education Policy, the curriculum for primary education
- Provide technical, professional, material and capacity building support to zones and woredas
- Ensure that the education provided in the region complies with the standard set at national level
- Coordinate and mobilize government, non-government and civic organizations for the successful execution of educational objectives
- Collaborating with representatives of Zonal or Woreda Education Offices, deploy the teachers assigned to the region to each Woreda
- Devise and implement strategies to build the capacity of community members represented to administer schools and facilitate conditions whereby they could exchange experiences

**Woreda Education Office – WEO**

- Establish and administer primary, secondary as well as technical and vocational schools
- On the basis of the Region's educational plan, draw short, medium and long term plans for the Woreda and ensure implementation
- Ensure that the education given in the Woreda complies with the standards set at national/regional levels
- Devise and implement mechanisms helpful to expand education, particularly primary education, all over the Woreda
- Ensure equitable distribution of education in areas that were previously deprived of access to educational opportunities
- In the case of new schools to be constructed by the government, issue requirements and decide with the Kebele where the schools are going to be built

- Strengthen educational supervision at Woreda and school level to make sure that quality of education is maintained
- In order to enable the community involved in Education and Training Boards as well as in Parent-Teacher Associations (PTA), support the establishment of educational committees at Kebele and school level, and follow up on their operation
- Organize symposia and seminars that discuss educational problems at the Woreda level and on ways of enhancing the community in educational activities
- Facilitate conditions whereby Kebele and PTA committees in the Woreda come together and share their experience among each other
- Give awards to civic associations, organizations, educational professionals, individuals and schools, which have made an outstanding contribution to the sector; announce their exemplary performance through the mass media and other available means
- Appoint primary school teachers
- Make sure that the teachers assigned to the Woreda are fairly deployed in the various schools
- Encourage a healthy competition sentiment among the community in various Kebeles to prop up their involvement in educational activities
- Devise and implement appropriate strategies that enable the community to extend labour and financial contributions, and support the government's efforts in the construction of schools and provision of educational materials.
- In consultation with the Woreda Education and Training Board, pass decisions on teachers' disciplinary misdemeanours and follow up the implementation of the decisions.

**Woreda Education and Training Management Board (accountable to Woreda Council)  
(meets quarterly)**

Membership: Chairman – Representative of the Woreda Capacity Building Office; Member and Secretary – Woreda Education Office Head; Member – Representatives of KETB (up to 5 kebeles of which 2 are PTA members, one male and one female); Member – Representative of Teachers', Women and Youth Associations

- Scrutinize and approve plans presented to it to enhance the Woreda educational activities
- Devise mechanisms that would help formal and non-formal educational programs to contribute their share in the efforts deployed to nurture the culture of equality, justice and democracy and produce capable citizens
- Facilitate conditions for the implementation of research studies that would seek various income sources for the expansion of educational activities in the Woreda
- When the community requests the opening of schools in their localities, it gives decision, taking into account the participation required of the community
- When the community requests the construction of a new school, it investigates the existing conditions in light of available information from the Woreda education office and presents its findings to the Woreda Council for approval
- Draw requirements concerning the Kebeles where new schools would be built with the budget allocated by the government, and control its implementation
- Encourage and support investors to open new schools in the Woreda
- Make sure that the educational activities in the Woreda are supported by the necessary budget, manpower and other relevant inputs

- Provide the necessary support to ensure that the curriculum is prepared in tune with the objective reality of the Woreda
- Approve every year's academic calendar in accordance with the region's academic calendar and the objective reality of the Woreda
- Scrutinize and approve the recommendation presented by the KETB against those directors who failed to discharge their duties and responsibilities; take severe disciplinary measures particularly against those directors who abuse their power and mistreat female teachers
- Render decision on pleas lodged against decisions passed by the KETB in opposition to those teachers and staff members who failed to discharge their duties. It can approve, reverse or amend the decisions.
- Facilitate conditions whereby development associations in the area could join hands with the KETB in the construction, renovation, expansion and furnishing of schools
- Promote healthy educational competition among schools and give awards to schools with an outstanding performance at the end of every academic year
- Promote a spirit of healthy competition among KETB and PTAs in coordinating the community to participate in the educational activities; give incentives to those with a better performance
- Prepare viable plan useful to combat the scourge of HIV/AIDS, and ensure its implementation
- Facilitate conditions whereby KEDT and school committee members could acquire capacity building training
- Make sure that the decisions passed by the Woreda Education and Training Management Board are implemented by the WEO
- Formulate and effect internal regulations in a bid to effectively undertake the aforementioned tasks.

**Kebele Education and Training Board (KETB) (accountable to Kebele Council) (meets every two months)**

**Members: Chairman – Representative of the Kebele Administration; Member and Secretary – Director of the School; Members – 3 parent representatives of the PTA; Member – Representative of Womens' and Youth Associations; Member – Representative of the Teachers' Associations in the Kebele**

- Approve the annual plan and budget of schools; follow up the implementation
- Cooperate with other concerned bodies for the expansion of formal and non-formal education
- Devise and effect mechanisms whereby schools could boost their internal incomes
- Conduct awareness raising activities to sensitize the community about the need to send their school-age children to schools and not to drop out
- Strengthen co-curricular activities so that they could complement the teaching-learning process
- Make sure that the property of the school is properly handled and utilized for educational purposes

- Supervise and control that the director, teachers and the support staff of the school work together for the prevalence of a smooth teaching-learning process
- Plan, coordinate and effect mechanisms whereby the local community could extend financial and material contributions for the construction and expansion of schools and other relevant activities.
- Coordinating the local community, study ways and strive to address the problems of teachers (such as housing) so that they would love their profession and serve in the area for several years
- Give the decision on the complaints of a director against those teachers who failed to discharge their duties and responsibilities properly
- When a director, who failed to discharge his/her duty properly, could not be corrected from his/her mistakes, it gives a recommendation for decision to the Woreda Education and Training Management Board. But if the offences are simple, decisions would be given by the KETB
- Give decisions on teachers' career appraisal when it is presented to it by the school director
- Examine and endorse the school's quarterly performance report
- Recruit teachers and other staff members according to the demand of the school
- Receive schools that have been built by the initiative of the local people, and make them ready for service
- Mobilize the local community to extend financial, material, labour, etc., contributions to build the capacity of the schools and enhance the educational activities in their locality
- Encourage the schools' efforts exerted to increase their internal income
- When new school are decided to be built in the area by the government, draw requirements that make a certain place eligible to host the construction of the schools
- Coordinate the local community and other bodies' efforts in the fight against the HIV/AIDS pandemic
- Carry out other relevant activities beneficial for the consolidation of the educational activities in the area.

Parent-Teacher Associations (PTA) (meets monthly)

Members: Chairman – a parent elected by the PTA; Member – Two teachers elected by the PTA (one of the candidates would be a woman); Member – Representative of Parents (up to 4)

- Equip students with good ethical values
- Ensure that teachers properly executive their teaching responsibility
- Advise and correct those teachers who failed to discharge their duties properly; refer to the director those teachers who could not be corrected through advice along with a punishment proposal
- Present disciplinary breaches that had not been given decision by the schools to the KETB
- Ensure that teachers are teaching in accordance with the interest, demand and rights of their students
- Make sure that the programs of the school are properly implemented according to the schedule; provide the necessary support to the implementation of the programs

- Advise and reprimand students with disciplinary problems, punish those students who could not desist from their wrongdoing, and submit a dismissal proposal to the director. Follow up the implementation of the decision
- Together with the school's management and the KEDB, strive to involve the community in the efforts geared to boost the internal income of the school
- Parents' representatives in the PTA conduct teachers' performance evaluation
- In consultation with the director, give incentives to teachers and other staff members with an exemplary performance
- Call parents to meetings, seek lasting solutions to the problems affecting parent-teacher relationships in collaboration with the director, parents and KETB
- Prepare their relevant plan of action, and submit to the school's director and follow up its implementation
- Encourage students not to disrupt their education and seek solution along with parents to students who had already quitted classes
- Give comments while the school's annual plan of action and their execution strategies as well as other internal directives are formulated
- Draw plan, get them approved by the parent-teacher conference at the beginning of the academic year, and present the performance report in the middle and at the end of the year

#### **School Director (accountable to WEO)**

- Prepares annual plan of action with the necessary implementation budget that involves the PTA and the school community, and present the plan to the KETB and the WEO. Makes sure that the plan is materialized upon approval
- Ensures that every department and teacher prepares a lesson plan based on the school's plan as well as the national, regional and Woreda educational objectives
- Discloses the job description of teachers and other staff members; prepares short training and experience sharing programs that enable teachers to be acquainted with latest innovations, inventions and new teaching methodologies
- Creates a favorable teaching-learning environment that nurtures students' physical, psychological and emotional potential as well as initiates them to be disciplined and hard working
- Organizes the parent-teacher, curriculum, administrative, training as well as consultative committees, clubs, etc.
- Assigns home-room teachers and unit leaders when it is necessary
- Organizes various co-curricular programs and clubs to complement class education, enhance students' talent and creative ability, promote students' self-reliant sentiment and help them spend their spare time in constructive and productive activities
- Coordinates co-curricular programs along with the PTA to help students be fruitful in the educational activities in and outside of the classroom
- Ensures that the educational activity is carried out in accordance with the human and democratic principles enshrined in the constitution
- Gives guidance and instructions for the implementation of the federal, regional and Woreda educational policies, regulations and directives

- Participates as a leader or advisor in the various committees established in the school as per the situation; facilitates a supervision system that enables teachers with better dedication and skills to give professional support to their colleagues
- Makes sure that students have access to educational and professional guidance services
- Encourages students to clean and beautify classrooms and the school's compound making it attractive for a teaching-learning process
- Ensures that the educational activity satisfies the demand of the local people and enriches the youth potential and natural tendency; encourages community participation
- Examines and passes decisions on the recommendations presented to him/her by the PTA on various issues, and informs the outcomes of the decisions to the concerned bodies
- Mobilizes the local community, governmental and non-governmental organizations, entrepreneurs and renowned personalities to extend the necessary support to the school
- When teachers, staff members or students leave the school, he/she examines their record and gives them a recommendation letter accordingly. On the other hand, the director ascertains that teachers, staff members or students transferred from other schools do have the same recommendation letter
- Ensures that students' test and examinations are properly conducted, results are recorded, filed and handed over to the concerned bodies
- Avoid educational wastage by devising mechanisms whereby students transferred and complete one educational level or program without disrupting classes
- Closely follows that the records of students and other staff members are properly recorded; the school's property are utilized appropriately and ensures that text books and laboratory services are made available to students
- Supervises that teachers and staff members carry out their respective duties and responsibilities, takes disciplinary measures against those teachers and staff members who do not discharge their responsibilities appropriately
- Based on the recommendation presented to him/her by the PTA, the director passes decisions against those teachers and staff members who particularly:
  - Pursue partisan politics or promote the objectives and agenda of any political party and influence students
  - Violate the human and democratic rights of students who forward justifiable criticism or challenging questions, or do not give appropriate answers to students' questions
  - Physically punish students or get them punished in the same way
  - Promote religious teachings in the school.

### **Community**

- Educational finance
- Undertaking school-centered studies
- Maintaining quality of education
- Formulation of primary schools curriculum and preparation of textbooks
- Raising enrolment of female students
- Strengthening relations between the community and schools
- Supporting teachers and addressing their problems
- Offering practical training to technical and vocational students

## **APPENDIX E DATA GATHERING TOOLS**

### **INFORMATION GATHERING QUESTIONS – IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS: WORLD LEARNING, SAVE THE CHILDREN, TIGRAY DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION**

#### **Persons to Interview**

- **Chief of Party**
- **Deputy Director for Programs**
- **Deputy Director for Finance**
- **M&E Director**
- **Training Director**
- **Database Manager**

#### **Questions Posed of Relevant Individuals**

- 1) What is the structure of your organization? How many employees do you have? Where are they? How does the structure of the organization help you achieve project goals?
- 2) What is the entire incentive award process? What feedback do you have on how the awards have been used?
- 3) What sort of follow-up do you do with schools that have graduated?
- 4) How do you hire SDAs? What kind of turnover do you have in employing SDAs? Why? How do you train SDAs? What are their jobs? How do you provide follow-up and support to SDAs?
- 5) How do you identify possibilities to develop alternative education? Where are these? Describe what you do.
- 6) How do you undertake capacity building? What populations are targeted? What curriculum do you use? What delivery approach do you use? Who trains in which area? What kind of training evaluation do you perform? What evidence do you have that the training is contributing to project goals?
- 7) How do you mobilize the broader community to support the school? How do you organize their training?
- 8) How are the contributions that government makes calculated? What is the source?
- 9) How do Girls' Advisory Committees work? How are the committees formed? What do they do?
- 10) How would you characterize the knowledge and support of the wereda for CGPP? Of the Region?
- 11) What type of training does the REB, zonal and wereda capacity building office provide? To whom?
- 12) How is your M&E system structured? How does it work? What are your data collection instruments? How is your database organized (observe this)?

- 13) Describe the implementation process that your organization uses, i.e., timely flow of resources, planning process, implementation of activities and constraints. Please describe the process by which programs and finance work together.
- 14) Please describe any HR difficulties you have experienced and what you did about it? What were the results?
- 15) Are there any overriding problems in implementing CGPP? What are they? What solutions would you suggest should be implemented?
- 16) Please describe any collaboration or coordination of your organization with the other implementers of IR3. Please give examples.
- 17) Please describe the relationship you have with BESO (IR 1, 2, and 4) implemented by AED. Please include specific activities as well as constraints to collaboration.
- 18) Do you collaborate or coordinate your project with any other donor programs? If so, which ones? For what purpose?
- 19) Tell us about your Performance Monitoring System, how to collect data, the architecture of your database, and the generation of reports.
- 20) Perform a SWOCA – strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, constraints, and achievements from your point of view.

**QUESTIONS/AREAS TO COVER  
IN FIELD DATA COLLECTION  
REBs, Woredas, KETBs/PTAs, School Directors, GACs  
Regional Project Offices, Zone Coordinators, and SDAs**

**The following data collection instruments have been designed to elicit information on:**

- **Project Results and Inputs**
- **Capacity Building and Training**
- **Community Participation and Support**
- **Project Management**
- **Turnover in Key Personnel (both in government and in implementing partners)**
- **External Factors Affecting CGPP implementation**
- **Community Empowerment**

**Each tool has been specifically designed to elicit relevant responses from each stakeholder group as described below. Where information was provided before the question was posed, the teams went on to the next question.**

**REGIONAL EDUCATION BUREAU – Head, Deputy, Department of Educational Programs, those responsible for CGPP (to be asked in a small group format)**

- 1) What priority is the CGPP at the regional level? Who has oversight of the CGPP? How much time has been allocated per participant to the work? Has participation in CGPP been included in any job descriptions?
- 2) What kind of policies have you put in place since CGPP began that have affected the project or that relate to community empowerment?
- 3) How have policy reforms (decentralization) affected you?
- 4) Describe the relationship you have with the woreda? With the KETB? With the schools? How do you communicate/share information with the woreda? The KETB? The schools?
- 5) Describe the reporting system from the region, to the zone, to the woreda, to the school. Who is responsible for what?
- 6) How do you monitor the CGPP activities?
- 7) What is the teacher/principal transfer policy? How have transfers affected the implementation of CGPP?
- 8) Describe the structure of the REB. What kind of personnel turnover have you experienced over the course of the project?
- 9) What sort of training have you received from CGPP? How has this training changed the way you perform your work?
- 10) In the new decentralization move, you have transferred many responsibilities to communities, especially concerning primary education. What is your responsibility in strengthening communities to fulfill their mandate? Do you think the CGPP helped in that?
- 11) How will the REB institutionalize some of the CGPP initiatives?
- 12) Perform a SWOCA – strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, constraints, achievements
- 13) What should be done to make the CGPP sustainable after USAID support ends?
- 14) Is there anything else we should know about the REB in terms of the implementation of the CGPP.

**WEREDA EDUCATION OFFICE - Head, Deputy, Department of Educational Programs, those responsible for CGPP (to be asked in a small group format)**

- 1) What priority is the CGPP at the woreda level? Has oversight of the program been delegated to anyone (beside the SDAs/SDCs)? How much time has been allocated per participant to the work? Has participation in CGPP been included in any job descriptions? What were your roles in planning, implementation and monitoring of the CGPP? Has that role been enough or should it be expanded? How?
- 2) What kind of policies have you put in place since CGPP began that have affected the project?
- 3) How have policy reforms (decentralization) affected you?
- 4) Describe the relationship you have with the REB? With the KETB/PTA? With the schools? How do you communicate/share information with the REB? The KETB/PTA? The schools?
- 5) Describe the reporting system from the region, to the zone, to the woreda, to the school. Who is responsible for what?
- 6) What do you do with the data that is collected from schools on the CGPP indicators, especially on school drop-out rates?
- 7) What is the teacher/principal transfer policy? How have transfers affected the implementation of CGPP?
- 8) Describe the structure of the woreda. What kind of personnel turnover have you experienced over the course of the project?
- 9) How do SDAs and woreda responsibilities mesh? What percent of SDA time is allocated to the project? What percentage of time is allocated to woreda business?
- 10) What types of training have you received from the CGPP? How has this training changed the way you perform your work?
- 11) How does the woreda provide oversight to the establishment, development, supervision and maintenance of ABEs?
- 12) Perform a SWOCA – strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, constraints, achievements
- 13) Is there anything else we should know about the woreda in terms of the implementation of the CGPP.

**SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM (School Director, Deputy, Lead Teachers) (to be implemented as a focus group)**

- 1) Tell us a bit about this school and community. What is the main source of income for adults? To which ethnic group do they belong? What religion are they? What are the main issues of the community? How many pupils are in this school? How many teachers? What is the drop-out rate for girls? For boys? What do you think is the main reason for drop-outs?
- 2) How did your job change as a result of the creation of PTAs? The creation of KETBs? The MOE decentralization policies? What are you now responsible for? How does that differ from the past?
- 3) Describe the communications you have the PTA, the KETB, the Woreda, and the REB? What information is exchanged? What do you receive? What do they receive? What do you give? What do they give?
- 4) What training/capacity building did you receive under CGPP to help you adapt to the changes that are occurring? What were the topics? What skills did you develop? What difference did this training make in the way you perform your work? Tell us the specifics of what is different.
- 5) What changes have occurred in your school as a result of PTA activities? How are any new buildings maintained? How will these changes be made sustainable?

- 6) What kind of support is the SDA providing to your school? How often does the SDA come for a visit? What does the SDA do when s/he is here?
- 7) Perform a SWOCA – strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, constraints, achievements – of the project at the school level.
- 8) Is there anything else we should know about the school that has not yet been covered?

**GIRLS’ ADVISORY COMMITTEES (to be implemented as a Participatory Assessment Process)**

The GAC will perform a group activity designed to obtain information on: 1) key issues facing girls in school, 2) what the GAC has done to alleviate these issues, and 3) what the results were of these actions. Sheets of paper are provided to the GAC members. They are asked to brainstorm the 10 most pressing problems girls are facing to remain in school. Members are then asked to rank order these problems in terms of their importance. Members are then asked how they (and the PTA and others) have addressed the issues. Finally, they are asked what the outcome of their activities on behalf of girls has been. As each section of the chart is debriefed, many probing questions were posed to obtain detail on each point.

The chart will look like the following:

**GIRLS’ ADVISORY COMMITTEE ASSESSMENT**

Pressing Problems Girls Face in Remaining in School	GAC Actions to Resolve	Results of Actions Taken

Additional questions posed of the GAC:

- 1) How does the GAC operate? How do you decide which issues to address and when?
- 2) What training did you receive to help you understand the problems girls in school face? Who provided that training? What did it include? What follow-up support do you receive from the SDAs?
- 3) What changes have you noticed in male teachers in terms of the way they treat girls in their classes?
- 4) How do you serve as a role model for girls?

**KETBs/PTAs**

Since these bodies general met together, they were asked first to generate a list of all the changes that they had identified to improve school quality and equity ensuring that each person provided at least once response. We then went on to pose the following questions:

- 1) How did you come to participate in the PTA? The KETB?
- 2) How does the PTA and KETB function (operational modalities)?
- 3) How do you identify community education issues/problems?
- 4) How has your participation in the PTA/KETB prepared you to take on larger issues affecting the community?

- 5) How are you supported by the SDA? How often does s/he come to visit? What does s/he do when visiting the school?
- 6) Perform a SWOCA – strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, constraints, and achievements – as it relates to CGPP.
- 7) Is there anything else about PTAs you would like to tell us that we didn't ask you about?

**IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS AT REGIONAL, ZONAL AND SDA LEVELS (to be asked either in an individual or small group format)**

**Regional Office**

- 1) What is the job of the regional office? What is your staffing? How are responsibilities allocated? How is staff managed and evaluated? What is the reporting structure? What experience do you have with staff turnover at the regional level? Do you conduct exit interviews with staff who leave? What is the main reason for the turnover?
- 3) What are the key external issues that have affected project implementation to date?
- 4) Describe the ways in which you communicate with the woreda? The REB? What information is exchanged?
- 5) What kind of support do you get from the REB? Woreda Education Office? HQ? What kind of support do you provide the REB? Woreda?
- 6) What is your role in providing training and/or technical assistance to the REBs? The woredas? The KETBs/PTAs? School Directors? GACs? The community? How do you deliver the training? Who delivers the training? What is the curriculum? How is the training followed up? By whom?
- 7) What changes have you observed in schools since the project began in terms of: School management? Enrollment rates? Girls' participation? Drop-out rates? What explains these changes?
- 8) How do you monitor what the zonal office is doing? How do you monitor what SDAs are doing? What sort of capacity building do you provide to the staff? How do you follow-up on these activities?
- 9) What has been done to create sustainability among the KETBs/PTAs? Describe the process used to build sustainability.
- 10) Perform a SWOCA – strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, constraints, achievements
- 11) Is there anything else we should know about regional operations in terms of the implementation of the CGPP?

**Zonal Office**

- 1) What is the job of the zonal office? What is the reporting structure?
- 2) How have the changes in personnel at the school, woreda and REB affected the implementation of the project?
- 3) What are the key external issues that have affected project implementation to date?
- 4) Describe the ways in which you communicate with the woreda? The REB? The KETBPTA? What information is exchanged?
- 5) What kind of support do you get from the REB? Woreda Education Office? Regional Project Office? HQ?
- 6) What sort of training and/or technical assistance do you provide to the REBs? The woredas? The KETBs/PTAs? School Director? GACs? The community? How do you deliver the

training? Who delivers the training? What is the curriculum? How is the training followed up? By whom?

7) What changes have you observed in schools since the project began in terms of: School management? Enrollment rates? Girls' participation? Drop-out rates? What explains these changes?

8) How do you support the work of the SDAs? What sort of feedback do you provide them on the work they are doing? How often? How do you increase their capacity to do better?

9) What are the steps you have taken to ensure empowerment and sustainability of KETBs/PTAs in their ability to lead and manage the school? What is the visible outcome of these efforts?

10) Perform a SWOCA – strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, constraints, achievements.

11) Is there anything else we should know about zonal operations in terms of the implementation of the CGPP?

### ***SDA***

1) What is the job of the SDA? How do you do your job? What are the challenges you face in doing your job?

2) What are the key external issues that have affected project implementation to date?

3) Describe the ways in which you communicate with the woreda? The REB? The KETB/PTA? School Director? GACs? The community? What information is exchanged?

4) How have the changes in personnel at the school, woreda and REB affected the implementation of the project?

5) What kind of support do you get from the REB? Woreda Education Office? The regional project office? The zonal project office? HQ?

6) What are the key motivations for community members to participate in the KETB/PTA? How has this changed over the course of implementation? What is the KETB/PTA able to do now that it was not able to do before CGPP?

7) How do you help the Girls' Advisory Committees do their jobs? What are the main issues that prevent girls from attending school? How has this changed over the course of the project?

8) What sort of training and/or technical assistance do you provide to the REBs? The woredas? The KETBs/PTAs? School Directors? GACs? The community? How do you deliver the training? Who delivers the training? What is the curriculum? How is the training followed up? By whom?

9) What changes have you observed in schools since the project began in terms of: School management? Enrollment rates? Girls' participation? Dropout rates? What explains these changes?

10) What are the steps you have taken to ensure empowerment and sustainability of KETBs/PTAs in their ability to lead and manage the school? What is the visible outcome of these efforts?

11) Perform a SWOCA – strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, constraints, achievements.

12) Is there anything else we should know about SDA operations in terms of the implementation of the CGPP?

