



**World Learning/ -Ethiopia**



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

**USAID/Ethiopia**

## Target Analysis Report II

USAID/Ethiopia

Basic Education Strategic Objective II:

Community-Government Partnership Program

Cooperative Agreement 663-A-00-02-00320-00

<p>World Learning Ethiopia</p> <p>P.O. Box 16981 Addis Ababa, Ethiopia (251-1) 628940</p>	<p>World Learning for International Development</p> <p>1015 15th St. N.W. Washington, D.C. 2005 (202) 408-5420 <a href="mailto:education@worldlearning.org">education@worldlearning.org</a></p>
---	---

October 2005

## Table of Contents

I. Background.....	2
II. Implementation.....	3
III. Analysis of Target Attainment.....	7
IV. Summary of the Target Analysis Report.....	11

## Background

USAID/Ethiopia's second-generation basic education strategic objective (BESO II) is that: *quality and equity in primary education is enhanced*. In the implementation of this Strategic Objective, the specified intermediate result (IR) that USAID has contracted to World Learning/Ethiopia is that a community - government partnership in education is strengthened. This IR focuses on community-based capacity building efforts to improve access, quality and gender equity in primary education.

World Learning Ethiopia's BESO II Community-Government Partnership Program (CGPP) is collaborating with the Government of Ethiopia to help achieve the aims of the Education Sector Development Program (ESDP) by enhancing the community - government partnership in primary education. The program is specifically targeted at increasing the capacity of local communities such as Kebele Education and Training Boards (KETB), and Parent - Teacher Associations (PTA) to assume new roles and to participate more effectively in the management of primary education at the local level. The underlying assumption of this IR is that by increasing parental involvement in schools, more children will attend school, leading to increased enrollments and decreased dropouts at the primary school level. In association with this is the expectation that increasing parental involvement and community support with the schools will have a particularly positive impact on girls' participation.

BESO II CGPP is being implemented by World Learning Ethiopia in the Amhara, SNNPR and Benishangul – Gumuz Regions. Working to date in a total of 121 woredas selected by the respective Regional State Education Bureaus and 1800 schools selected by the respective Woreda Education Offices in these regions, WLE is involved in supporting the partnership with the goals of reducing female dropout rates in grades 1 – 4, increasing the participation of community members and strengthening PTAs and KETBs so that they can actively enhance quality and equity in the learning environment.

Major activities of the WLE BESO II CGPP are to:

- Strengthen PTAs and KETBs local level capacities;
- Stimulate community outreach in support of education;
- Promoting gender equity, including campaigns against abduction, early marriage and female circumcision, and the value of education for girls through Girls' Advisory Committees;
- Promote alternative educational practices for children in educationally disadvantaged circumstances through the establishment of Non-Formal Education Centers and use of paraprofessional teachers, flexible time tables, where appropriate; and
- Strengthen the capacity of Woreda Education Offices (WEOs) and other educational bodies to work closely with schools and local communities.

WLE has completed the third project implementation year. This report presents or analyzes the impact of the project on those schools that have been assisted by BESO II CGPP program for at least one year.

## I. Implementation

In accordance with the Cooperative Agreement with USAID, WLE has integrated all the 1800 schools into CGPP: 1118 schools from Amhara, 107 schools from Benishangul-Gumuz, and 575 from SNNP Regions. That means, its coverage and support has reached 100% of its projected target. Engaging the targeted 1800 schools has been accomplished in 5 intakes/batches/ for Benishangul Gumuz and SNNPR, and in 6 intakes/batches/ for Amhara Region (See Table 1 below).

**Table 1**  
**Project to Date, Number of Schools Engaged in the Project by Implementation Year and Cohort (1 July 2002 – 30 June 2005)**

Region	Imp. Year -I 2002 - 2003 (1995 E.C)		Imp. Year-II 2003 - 2004 (1996E.C)		Imp. Year-III 2004 - 2005 (1997E.C)		Total No. of schools
	No. of 1st Cohort Schools	No. of 2nd Cohort Schools	No. of 3rd Cohort Schools	No. of 4th Cohort Schools	No. of 5th Cohort Schools	No. of 6th Cohort Schools	In All Cohorts
Amhara	100	100	200	152	320	246	1,118
SNNP	70	73	144	28	260	-	575
B. - Gumuz	20	20	12	20	35	-	107
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>615</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>1,800</b>

## INDICATORS

In the Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) of BESO II CGPP a set of indicators and result framework levels were developed to measure the impact of the project. The assumption is that this set of indicators would address the extent to which the *Community Government Partnership is strengthened and hence Quality and Equity in primary education system enhanced* as a result of our intervention.

The four main indicators of CGPP under the three Intermediate Result Level IRL are:

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

2. **IR Indicator 3.2a: percent of educational issues raised by PTAs, KETBs and GACs annually to the community and/or the local government of which 2 are related to quality and equity issues;**
3. **IR Indicator 3.2b: percent of educational issues raised by PTAs that are responded to by local government and/or communities;**
4. **IR Indicator 3.3: percent of PTAs that have taken actions of which 50% are related to equity and quality.**

According to the PMP of BESO II CGPP, the schools to be considered for the analysis are those schools that have participated in the program for at least one year. Thus, Cohort 1-4 of the CGPP schools have been included in the analysis. This includes the “graduated” schools, Cohort 1 and 2, and Cohort 3 and 4 that are currently participating in the program.

#### **IR Indicator 3.1: Dropout Rate for Grades 1-4**

The model used to calculate and analyze the dropout rate is a reconstructed cohort model. This model is also used to calculate and analyze weighted average dropouts for grade 1-4. It is also used to compare the benchmark and the target set by CGPP partners and endorsed by USAID for the FY2003-2004 with the attained dropout rate in WLE CGPP schools. As aforementioned, the model was applied to assess the impact of the program on the schools in the first four cohorts. A cohort in this context is group of students/schools that were integrated into CGPP at the same time. Hence the number of schools with grades 1-4 included are 72, 315, and 552 WLE CGPP schools in Benishangul Gumuz, SNNPR, and Amhara regions respectively that have participated in the program for at least one year (See Table 2). These are CGPP Cohort 1 - 4 schools.

The method used to compile the number of dropouts is similar to the Ministry of Education’s approach. As is well known, the weakness of this methodological approach is that it does not consider the number of students transferred to other schools. The other methodological problem is that it is only possible to estimate the number of dropouts for a previous year; therefore the dropout rate is calculated for the 1996. E.C. academic year and is therefore not current.

#### **IR Indicator 3.2a: Educational Issues Raised by PTAs, KETBs and GACs**

As part of implementation strategy, all WLE CGPP schools have been raising educational issues and discussing these with local government and the communities. The various issues expected as central points are related to school improvement activities that directly or indirectly influence the equity and quality of education in the schools. The raising and discussion of such issues was promoted by SDAs and ZCs in their capacity building efforts with PTAs and KETBs. As part of CGPP, each school has been provided with a PTA/KETB logbook in which minutes of meetings were (and are) recorded. It is from these records that the data given below

were transferred to the Main Office through the M&E SDA-3 forms. The SDA-3 form is now a quarterly institutional issues monitoring form that captures how

**Table 2**  
**Project to Date, CGPP Schools Entry and Exit Date by Cohort**  
**(1 July 2002 – 30 June 2005)**

Cohort	Number of Schools	Period	
		Entry Month & Year	Exit Month & Year
1	190	August-Dec. 2002	Dec. 2004
2	193	May 2003	Dec. 2005
3	356	Aug/Dec.2003; Feb.2004	Aug/Dec.2005; Feb. 2006
4	200	May 2004	May 2006
5	615	Dec. 2004	Sep. 2006
6	246	Feb. 2005	Dec. 2006
<b>Total</b>	<b>1800</b>		

many issues were raised in meetings of PTAs, KETBs and GACs: how many pertained to education, and the percentage of PTAs that raised issues that address the quality and equity (from the menu of qualifying issues developed at the USAID M&E workshop in August 2002). Although the focal point in the analysis is the PTAs, issues raised and discussed by KETBs and GACs are also included in the analysis because these institutions also contributed to the overall activities of the PTAs.

In reality, whatever issue is raised and discussed by the PTAs, KETBs and GACs it is related to education in general and addresses the improvement of quality and/or equity either directly or indirectly. Moreover, observation shows that the impact of issues may differ from place to place. In most cases the factors are interrelated to the extent that sometimes it is difficult to identify which issue falls under to which category.

The data collected from the schools with at least one year of program support shows that a total of 9,710 issues were raised and discussed in the 939 WLE CGPP (one to four cohorts) schools in the three regions. This indicates that communities are more motivated to discuss matters related to education of their children, and more importantly they have started to record what they discussed as school problems, approach the local government and/or community to identify solutions. The analysis thus shows that the 939 (first four cohorts) WLE CGPP schools raised and discussed educational issues and almost all the schools raised educational issues of which two issues were related to improving equity and quality. This improvement is ascribed to the efforts made by the SDAs and ZCs by conducting a series of capacity building interventions to KETBs, PTAs, GACs and schools.

### **IR Indicator 3.2b: Educational Issues Responded to by Local Government and/or Communities**

Regarding the responsiveness and support of local government, Woreda officials play key roles including follow up of school plan implementation, issuing directives, taking actions to solve problems beyond the capacity of the PTAs and KETBs, advocacy for education (and especially the education of girls), and providing technical and material assistance to schools from time to time. The responses of the local government are complicated by several factors such as high turnover of personnel, and inadequately trained personnel, inadequate finance and materials. Notwithstanding these problems, the data shows that government responded positively as far as WLE CGPP school intervention is concerned in a great many instances. They collaborated in providing building materials to schools, transportation to SDAs and ZCs, and in mobilizing communities for school improvement activities. From a total of 9,710 issues raised with the local government and/or the community, the local government and/or community addressed 5,785 PTA/KETB issues in 1997 E.C.

Local government support has great significance for the project implementation, WEOs paid basic salaries of SDAs while World Learning Ethiopia paid salary top-ups. In addition, government officials also participated in facilitation of training events during Woreda and in-school Orientation Workshops, and SDA training. They also have trained PTAs, KETBs and other school personnel and the community. Local government also supported project activities by providing office space for SDAs and ZCs. High government officials opened training sessions and workshops conducted by WLE BESO II CGPP at regional and zonal levels. Exchange of information/data between the project and local capacity building and education offices at all levels are continued. Finally, there are numerous instances of government assistance and follow-up to end rape, abduction and early marriages.

### **Indicator 3.3: Actions Taken by PTAs**

With technical support by WLE's field staff, PTAs and KETBs, CGPP schools have undertaken a range of activities that are directly or indirectly contributing to equity and quality in education. These actions include:

- Checking and controlling dropout and absenteeism in the school;
- Collecting and recording data on the school and students;
- Conducting monitoring and follow-up activities;
- Controlling and evaluating school procurement and contract procedures;
- Creating the means through which construction materials can be supplied;
- Designing strategies to mobilize untapped community resources in terms of labor, material, money and ideas;

- Developing internal income generation activities for the school;
- Employing community teachers as the need arises;
- Evaluating the performance of students and teachers;
- Facilitation of conditions to secure community contributions;
- Follow-up implementation of strategic plans;
- Mobilizing the community build residences for teachers;
- Monitoring and follow-up student discipline and teachers' professional code of ethics;
- Participation in community workshops to mobilize the community to demonstrate its commitments for school improvement activities;
- Preparing plans by identifying and prioritizing school problems and upon appraisal, evaluate the school improvement plans;
- Promoting community participation in various ways;
- Promotion of girls' education;
- Rewarding students (especially females) for outstanding academic achievement;
- Supporting efforts to end early marriage, abduction and rape of girls;
- Strengthening the link between the community and the school by inviting community and local government officials to the school;
- Taking steps to meet SIA criteria;

## II. Analysis of Target Attainment

***IR Indicator 3.1: % of CGPP Schools in focus regions that have a Weighted Dropout Rate for Grades 1-4 below the regional average (from a benchmark of the average for last three years).***

To analyze the indicator, as mentioned above, we must calculate the flow rate. Flow rates show the different ways in which pupils move through an educational system or leave the system altogether. The model used to demonstrate the flow of pupils through an educational system is a reconstructed cohort model. To apply this method we need enrollment data for two consecutive years by grade and sex, repeaters, and re-admitted data by grade and sex for the later year.

Therefore to calculate and analyze the dropout rate, the weighted average dropout rate for grades 1-4 we used a reconstructed cohort model. The formula that we used is described below.

**Definitions:**

**Promotion Rate (PR):** -The rate at which students pass from one grade to the next higher grade. This is obtained by comparing students enrolled in grade g+1, year y+1 with students in grade g year y.

$$P.R_y^g = \frac{Er_{y+1}^{g+1} - Rpt_{y+1}^{g+1} - Rad_{y+1}^{g+1}}{Er_y^g}$$

**Repetition Rate (RR):** -Is the rate at which pupils repeat a certain grade. And it is calculated as,

$$R.R_y^g = \frac{R_{y+1}^g}{E_y^g}$$

**Dropouts:** -Dropouts are students who have left the system in the academic year under consideration. And the dropout rate is the rate at which pupils leave the system. This is calculated as the residual of the two other rates (i.e. 1-Promotion Rate-Repetition Rate). This is based on the assumption that a student has only three possible routes: to be promoted to the next grade, to repeat a grade or to drop out. In this assumption the sum of the three rates in a particular year has to be 1. This assumption is being used because data on dropouts cannot easily be obtained from schools.

$$D.R = 1 - P.R - R.R$$

Where in the equations; Er =Enrolment,  
Rpt =Repetition,  
Rad =Readmitted  
P.R=Promotion Rate,  
R.R=Repetition Rate,  
D.R=Dropout Rate,  
y=Year, g=Grade.

The above formulae were used to calculate the dropout rate and hence the weighted average dropout rate for each cohort 1-4 CGPP schools, and then tallied the number of schools with dropout rates below and above the Bench-Mark (B.M) (see Table 3).

**Table 3:Percent of Batch/Cohort 1-4 CGPP schools in focus regions that have a weighted average drop out rates for grades 1-4 below the regional average (from a benchmark of the average for the last three years).**

Region	Benchmark (B.M) *	No. of Batch 1-4 CGPP Schools	No. of CGPP Schools whose Weighted Average Dropout Rate is less than the regional B.M	Target	
				Planned**	Actual***
Amhara	0.26	552	319	7.5%	57.79%
B. - Gumuz	0.13	72	7	7.5%	9.72%
SNNPR	0.27	315	104	7.5%	33.02%

\* The Regional weighted average dropout rate for grades 1-4

**\*\* Target planned for FY 2003/04 (1996 E.C.) is 7.5% i.e. 7.5% of schools with dropout rate less than the regional benchmark**

**\*\*\* Actual Target attained: Percentage of CGPP Schools with weighted average dropout rate less than the benchmark**

***IR Indicator 3.2a: % of PTAs that have raised at least 5 education issues to local government of which 2 are related to (the current menu of) quality and equity***

**Methods used to analyze this indicator:**

- Issues raised by PTAs to local government counted,
- Those PTAs, who raised 5 educational issues to local government of which two were related to quality and equity issues, considered in analyzing the target (see Table 4),
- The count of each region compared against the planned target value for 2004/05 (1997 E.C.), i.e. 20%.

**Table 4: % of PTAs that have raised at least 5 education issues to local government of which 2 are related to (the current menu of) quality and equity**

Region	No. Of Batch 1-4 CGPP Schools	No. of PTAs of Batch 1-4 CGPP Schools that Raised at least 5 educational issues of which 2 Are Equity Quality Issues	Target	
			Planned (%)	Actual (%)
Amhara	552	443	20%	80.25%
SNNPR	315	231	20%	73.33%
Benishangul Gumuz	72	71	20%	98.61%

***IR Indicator 3.2b: % of education issues raised by PTAs and that were responded to by local government and/or communities.***

**Methods used to analyze this indicator:**

- Considering IR Indicator 3.2a above, issues raised by PTAs to local government and/or communities counted, and
- Those issues responded by local government and/or communities considered in analyzing the target attainment

**The following illustration will demonstrate the steps used to calculate the indicator.**

**Demonstration:**

<b>School Name</b>	<b>No. Of Issues raised by PTAs</b>	<b>No. Of issues responded by local government</b>
<b>School-1</b>	<b>I<sub>1</sub>-No.Of Issues</b>	<b>R<sub>1</sub>-No.Of issues responded</b>
<b>School-2</b>	<b>I<sub>2</sub>-No.Of Issues</b>	<b>R<sub>2</sub>-No.Of issues responded</b>
<b>School-3</b>	<b>I<sub>3</sub>-No.Of Issues</b>	<b>R<sub>3</sub>-No.Of issues responded</b>
<b>&gt;&gt;</b>	<b>&gt;&gt;</b>	<b>&gt;&gt;</b>
<b>School-n</b>	<b>I<sub>n</sub> No. Of Issues</b>	<b>R<sub>n</sub>- No. Of issues responded</b>
<b>Total</b>	$\sum_{i=1}^n I_i$	$\sum_{i=1}^n R_i$

Therefore, % of educational issues raised by PTAs and that were responded

$$\text{to by local government and/or communities} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n R_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n I_i} * 100$$

For indicator 3.2b, the count of each region compared against the planned target value for 2004/05 (1997 E.C.), i.e. 20%.

**Table-3: Percent of education issues raised by PTAs that were responded to by local Government**

Region	No. Of Batch 1-4 CGPP Schools	Total No. Of Issues Raised by the PTAs/KETBs	Total No. Of Issues responded to by local Government	% Of Educational Issues raised by PTA and responded to by local Government	
				Planned	Actual
Amhara	552	5,889	3517	20%	59.72%
SNNPR	315	2743	1637	20%	59.68%
B. - Gumuz	72	1078	631	20%	58.53%

*IR Indicator 3.3: % of PTAs that have taken actions of which 50% are related to equity and quality.*

**Method of Analysis:**

- First those PTAs that have taken actions were considered;
- Then out of their actions, those PTAs who have taken actions of which 50% are related to equity and quality in education were tallied and used for the target analysis;

- The count of each region was compared with the planned target value for 2004/05 (1997 E.C.), i.e. 15%.

**Table 4: Percent of PTAs that have taken actions of which 50% are related to education quality and equity**

Region	No. of Batch 1-4 CGPP Schools	No. of PTAs that have Taken actions of which 50% are related to Equity and Quality Issues	% of PTAs taken actions of which 50% are related to Equity Quality Issues	
			Planned	Actual
Amhara	552	436	15%	78.99%
SNNPR	315	141	15%	44.76%
Benishangul Gumuz	72	68	15%	94.44%

### III. Summary of the Target Analysis Report

The assessment of the project performance against the set targets indicates that the program is showing significant tangible progress in the efforts to improve equity and quality in primary schools under the BESO II CGPP program.

Considering all the four indicators, all the three regions have successfully attained the set targets. The percentage of schools with an average dropout rate below the regional benchmark are greater than the set target, Amhara Region with the highest (57.79%) and Benishangul Gumuz region (9.72%) with relatively lower but above the target performance. With regard to the other indicators: Indicator 3.2a, the minimum was 73.33% (SNNPR); Indicator 3.2b, the minimum is 58.53% ( B. – Gumuz Region); and Indicator 3.3, the minimum is 44.76% (SNNPR).

Therefore, for all indicators the performance is greater than the set targets. In most cases the data shows that the target attainment is far more than the target, an encouraging situation that witnesses the awareness of the community, the support of the local government and the positive progress and impact of BESO II CGPP.

Interestingly, these results have been at a time of high turnover of government personnel. They suggest that with greater stability in the educational system, a stronger partnership in support of quality and equity in education between communities and government is possible.

Another variable that may impact on future accomplishments in reaching these targets is that a number of other government agencies have taken to requiring greater community support (financial and otherwise) for non-educational activities. It will be important to determine if such additional adaptation of the CGPP model at the community level by other agencies will impact on community performance in these indicators.