

J O I N T

Department of Work-Oriented Adult Education

and

U.S. Agency for International Development

SUMMARY EVALUATION

of

Pilot Project in Non-Formal Education

October, 1975

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

U.S. Department of State

Joint Department of Work-Oriented Adult Education and U.S. Agency for International Development Summary Evaluation of Pilot Project in Non-Formal Education

October 1975

14 pages

AID Contract Number:

AID Project Number: 663-55-130-167

Source: ARC ET 370.0963 M884

The Work Oriented Adult Education Program is a three-year project to design, develop, test and evaluate an organization and system for delivering relevant learning to rural adults and out-of-school youth. The careful planning process used is considered a very good format but more attention should have been given to continuity of participants, open access to background documents and a clearer definition of responsibilities of all parties involved in the planning process. The project plan needs some revision, but the failure to accomplish more during the implementation phase is not attributed to design problems. During the six months' implementation, serious management, leadership and administrative problems were already inhibiting the project. Recommendations include: (1) some form of project to develop the delivery system for relevant, work-oriented training for the rural masses should be continued; (2) the project should be redesigned; (3) the approach of the project should be changed from its experimental mold to one of delivery system design, development and evaluation; and (4) fundamental decisions should be reviewed to provide the redesigners with clear guidelines on such topics as urban vs. rural, youth vs. adults, agrarian vs. crafts-training, and individual vs. communal programs.

Table of Contents

Pilot Non-Formal Education Project

Summary Evaluation Report

	<u>Page</u>
I. <u>Introduction</u> to Joint Evaluation Process	1
II. <u>Project Description Summary.</u>	2
III. Evaluation of <u>Planning Process</u>	3
IV. Evaluation of the <u>Plan.</u>	5
V. Evaluation of <u>Implementation.</u>	8
VI. Summary Evaluative Comments	12
VII. Summary <u>Recommendations .</u>	13
VIII. <u>References.</u>	14

I. Introduction to Joint Evaluation Process

June, 1975 marked the end of the first year of the Non-Formal Education (NFE) pilot project, and USAID was getting ready to undertake a Project Appraisal Report (PAR) exercise when the Ministry of Education expressed a renewed interest in reactivating the pilot project which had been at a standstill for about six months. In July, the USAID staff met with the new and former staff of the Work Oriented Adult Education Department (WOAED) to determine the status of the project. USAID explained that they would soon be undertaking an evaluation of the project, and recommendations on future USAID assistance to this project would be jointly determined by the outcome of the evaluation. The WOAED staff was invited to participate in the evaluation exercise and it was agreed to undertake a joint evaluation. Nine evaluation sessions were held in August and September (Minutes of the individual sessions are available). The evaluation was done against the PROP presentation and project "proposal." Each part of the Logical Framework matrix was taken up in detail. This detailed approach was used to achieve a thorough evaluation, as well as to orient the new staff members to the work done to date on the project. In addition, this approach was deemed important to provide an informed basis for deciding the future of the project. What follows in this report is a summary of the evaluation findings. If it is agreed to continue the project and engage in replanning it, the detailed minutes of the evaluation should be consulted.

The following people took part in the evaluation process:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1) Ato Mergia Gobena (MinEd) | 6) Ato Assefa Abera (MinEd) |
| 2) Ato Yirga Gebre (MinEd) | 7) Ato Yilma Bekele (MinEd) |
| 3) Ato Leake Abbay (MinEd) | 8) Mr. Ted Morse (USAID) |
| 4) Ato Matheos Gessesse (MinEd) | 9) Woiz. Melke Tadesse (USAID) |
| 5) Ato Sertsu T. Haimanot (MinEd) | |

All sessions were marked by an openness, frankness and willingness to look critically at past efforts that made the evaluation an honest self-appraisal.

II. Project Description Summary

The Work-Oriented Adult Education Program is a three-year project to design, develop, test and evaluate an organization and system for delivering relevant learning to rural adults and out-of-school youth (both male and female). The organizational sub-systems to be developed include those related to identifying village development training needs, local trainer capabilities, actual training of learners, alternative methodologies and materials, administrative, financial and evaluation sub-systems and coordinating mechanisms. The types of learning to be delivered thru these organizational sub-systems include (1) technical skills training (individual training in rural vocational, agriculture, home and village development skills); (2) minimum formation education (functional literacy and numeracy, standard weights and measurements, civics and etc.); and (3) attitude formation (concepts of change and development), with the aim of increasing the productivity, income and standard of living of the rural masses, who comprise about 90% of Ethiopia's population.

The actual learning is to be carried out in close collaboration with other ministries who have launched development programs in rural Ethiopia. With this in mind, the six pilot areas were selected to allow work-oriented adult education to be integrated with other development activities. The ultimate goal is to develop tested mechanisms for delivering rural-relevant learning which can be considered for use on a national scale.

Based on joint MinEd/USAID planning, a Project Agreement for US\$106,000 was signed on June 30, 1974 to finance this program during the first year. Using these funds, an inter-ministerial exploratory workshop in February, 1974 and a planning workshop in May, 1974 were held. Field visits were made in April-May 1974 for site selection purposes and to discuss some of the concepts developed in the exploratory workshop. Short-term observational training in the U.S. for the project managers was provided in conjunction with a Michigan State University international conference on NFE in April, 1974. Awraja-level training for the local staff was carried out in September-October, 1974. Also, three U.S. consultants have visited Ethiopia to assist with plan formulation, instructional technology and evaluation design; with their assistance the WOAEP staff have produced procedural and training manuals for curriculum, training and evaluation sub-systems. Baseline surveys were being conducted and preparations for Woreda-level training were well underway until February 1975 when full-time WOAEP staff attention was given to implementing the recent changes in Ethiopia. The project is now being jointly evaluated to see what was accomplished, and to provide an informed basis for deciding to continue, redesign or cancel the project.

(For detailed description of the project, see references.)

III. Evaluation of the Planning Process

A section on the planning process is included in this evaluation because replanning of the project is anticipated and the re-planners should have the benefit of a "process evaluation."

The Ministry Planning Division drew up the initial paper for this project and submitted it through the Planning Commission Office for USAID assistance. The paper was based on ideas exhaustively aired in the Education Sector Review; it presented a very workable approach to project development. Following discussions with the Assistant Minister for Primary and Adult Education, detailed plans were worked out for an Exploratory Workshop, which was held in February, 1974. Because of the very good pre-workshop preparations (including drafting discussion papers), the full representation (over 90 people) from all interested agencies, and a very open exchange of ideas, the Exploratory Workshop is considered the important initial step in the project planning process. The complete and comprehensive program concepts developed in the Workshop were put into a summary report that has proved basic to planning and useful for historical reasons; it has remained as a necessary reference for the frequently changing staff working on the project. However, this report, like many others, was not freely available to the staff, causing orientation and commitment problems mentioned later.

The second step in the planning process was for three teams to visit the six awraja sites identified in the Exploratory Workshop to discuss the program concepts with district field staff. As a process this "field input" step is highly recommended. However, several factors gave varying results: three days was considered inadequate time to accomplish both tasks of data acquisition and concept verification; the varying stages of inter-agency organization at the awraja level made explanation and understanding of the "integrated approach" difficult; the three teams were not well oriented before they left and responded differently to local questions. Despite these problems, the teams were able to ascertain local interest and capabilities; on this basis the pilot sites were selected and they proved to be good comparative selections. A consolidated report of field visit findings was prepared. It served as a background paper, along with several others prepared by Ministry, USAID and consulting personnel, for the Planning Workshop held in May, 1974. In addition, prior to the Workshop, the Ethiopian and American project managers attended an international conference on Non-Formal Education. This provided useful international comparative experience to the May Planning Workshop, along with the international consultants who also participated.

The May "Planning Workshop" had, by design, fewer participants (35). They were divided into three Working Groups, assigned topics to develop, and were given periodic plenary sessions and group leader sessions to coordinate their work. A retreat setting allowed undivided attention. The major problem encountered was the representation by individuals who did not

attend or have the information from the Exploratory Workshop or Field Visits. Also, as will be explained later, not enough of the "operators" who would later be required to implement the project attended the Workshop. Participants ranged from an illiterate farmer to the Minister of Education. The format of the Workshop is considered excellent.

Unfortunately, the very useful Working Group papers were not circulated after the workshop. And because the "Proposal" which emerged on the basis of these papers was a summary, much important planning detail was hidden. When this lack of detail later became a problem, USAID's Education Assistant put together several binders with all the working papers and they were made available to the operating staff. The "Proposal" document was consolidated by an American consultant and reviewed by the Ministry and USAID project managers. It was then presented to the Minister who approved it. Finally, the "Proposal" was used by USAID to draft the approval document (PROP) to AID/Washington, and the Project Agreement which was signed June 30, 1974 between the two governments. The virtual non-involvement in the final project approval process by other sections of the Ministry of Education or by other ministries introduced an unnecessary constraint that was never overcome.

As should have been anticipated in such a vertically-oriented government structure, and despite attempts to involve them in all but the last step in the planning process, the role of participating ministries in this project needed more definition. And because the planned inter-ministerial coordinating committee did not evolve until very late, attempts at integration were less successful.

Inasmuch as the project was basically an activity to design and test an NFE delivery system, weekly planning and replanning sessions were scheduled. Provision was made for extensive and diverse technical assistance. However, the revolution, reorganization, personnel changes, feeling of self-reliance and a period of indecision brought these joint meetings to a halt half-way through the first implementation year. Therefore, the process for continued monitoring of plan implementation and replanning broke down with stifling results.

The above comments purposely highlight the shortcomings in the planning process to benefit the replanners. In summary though, the evaluators believe the process used was very good and produced a very implementable plan.

IV. Evaluation of the Plan

As noted in the Summary Project Description the project is to design, develop, test and evaluate an organization and system for delivering relevant learning to rural people. The importance of social services for the rural society is of a higher priority today than before the revolution, which is moving to base its legitimacy on this principle of improvements for the rural masses. Work-oriented education is likewise given a higher priority by the new government which is going ahead with a nationwide program in this field. And because a new Department of Work-Oriented Adult Education has been recently established, the need and receptivity for program and systems design is greater today than when the project was originally planned. It is the belief of the evaluators that the project is still very useful, relevant, necessary and desirable and may even have been ahead of its time before.

The project "proposal" produced by the above process was considered to be a very workable plan. While the plan had weaknesses, the failure to accomplish more is not attributed to design problems. Given the context of academic education's overproduction of secondary school graduates, and the fact that less than 10% of the rural school age population is participating in academic education, the basic concept of work-oriented education in the plan is very sound. The three major streams (technical/skills training, basic education and attitude formation) in the plan seem very applicable. The plan's primary beneficiaries, the rural masses, are consistent with Ministry of Education and USAID priorities. The three year time frame for design and evaluation seems right; even though the revolution temporarily slowed work down, the new government's policies should add new momentum to the project. Given the Ministry of Education's work-oriented education assignment in the governmental reorganization, the plan's institutional focus is correct. The strategy and approach of the plan are considered good and even necessary. The plan's estimate of resources was accurate for the level of activity carried out, even though these were underutilized. The output targets, both design and training are appropriate. The logical linkages from Goal, Purpose, Outputs, Inputs is identifiable, if they had been managed properly. Were it not for the necessary revolutionary changes and Ministry of Education leadership difficulties, the planning could have resulted in a successful project. However, at the risk of appearing negative about the plan, its shortcomings will be highlighted.

The plan probably suffered from having too much, and too little detail. In some instances the plan went so far in discussing the NFE delivery system that some staff thought the design work was done and tried to move immediately into implementation. This resulted in a belated focus on the real intent of the project, which is organization and sub-system design for a work-oriented adult education program. On the other hand, sometimes the staff

were looking for an already developed detailed implementation plan and found themselves a drift without this or strong leadership. On the whole, the planned purpose of designing the delivery system was not fully appreciated by the staff until part way through the implementation year. Also, given the staff and leadership context, the plan design of "learning by doing" was confusing. Some staff members recognized that the plan neither concentrated solely on designing the delivery system nor solely on running operational programs (as they had been doing with the functional literacy project) and were not at ease with this dual approach. There is no doubt that the project would have gone further with more detailed guidance, either from MDE management or more detailed plans for them to follow.

Another weakness in the plan was the lack of specificity regarding what "non-formal or work-oriented" education was to be in the Ethiopian context, and what the Ministry of Education's functional literacy system's role was to be in the project. This was complicated by a changing Ethiopian context and by the Assistant Minister's attempt to broaden the literacy section into a broader adult education section. It was further complicated by the very broad definition in the plan of what NFE was to be: the plan drafters saw NFE as any training deemed useful for individuals or rural development. However, that tended to overlap with the training functions of every other rural development agency and did not clearly define the Ministry of Education's role in rural training or work-oriented education. In the absence of the planned Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee or implementation of the Awraja Decentralization scheme, there was no mechanism for resolving this definitional issue which was to have been solved through integration of training and technical efforts.

By using the functional literacy staff for project design and implementation, the MDE managers introduced another constraint which was inherent in the plan design: inadequate attention was given to defining the differences between the literacy and work-oriented approaches. Around the world this issue is still being debated (while villagers needs are neglected). During the replanning stage it is essential that these two approaches be resolved or no further resources should be expended. In addition to this program approach definition, organizational responsibilities for WOALP and WOAEP must be made clearer.

The project plan basically called for implementation within an integrated scenario. Functional (agriculture, health, public works, community development) programs with which WOAEP can integrate are few (see chart) and concentrated. The plan design should be reviewed in terms of

equity: will the Awraja and Woreda implementators choose to primarily focus WOAEP training as a reinforcement to other functional programs, thus giving more services to the few people (along the roads) who already benefit from government services? Or should WOAEP work in remote areas, but suffer inflexibility without technical backstop services and inputs to allow their training to be put into practice? (1) Integrated; (2) supportable, and (3) remote scenerios are suggested to (a) reinforce or build-on the work of the technical agents or (b) help prepare the remoter people and areas for the technical agents. (See charts). A minor design problem, now resolved to include both, was to plan for agrarian or craftsmen training.

A collateral design issue which requires additional attention is WOAEP "core content" vs. WOAEP as a "delivery system." Again the plan drafters have opted for both and both may be possible. Recognizing that the village level workers (unspecified in the plan) probably will need some training "curricula and materials" support, these have been drafted (drawing heavily on functional literacy materials/outlines) and packaged as "core content". There is a strength to this approach, which limits the training to a few known and priority "core" areas. The danger is that it will be inflexibly unresponsive to villagers needs. At the other extreme, building a "delivery system" which can flexibly respond to peasant needs runs the risk of not being practical. That is it may be impossible to assign local level staff qualified enough to translate broad, technical villager needs into operational training; or allocation of operational funds that can be used locally to buy the responsive services and inputs may not be legal.

Related to the above is the decision on field staff. Several options are outlined in the planning papers, but to date the Ministry has not opted for any one or combination of schemes for field organization, staff and implementation. This decision is in turn related to a decision regarding the functions of the WOAEP Central Department. The plan basically designed the Central Department as a resource and support unit; but implementation has tended to broaden this to policy formulation and actual program operations in the field. Both of these issues should be addressed in the replanning phase to allow sub-systems design to proceed.

V. Evaluation of Implementation

- A. The momentum of the exploratory and planning workshops carried over after the June 30, 1974 signing of the Project Agreement. Weekly steering committee meetings were chaired by the Assistant Minister and assignments given to the WOALP staff. Working committees were established on (1) Training, (2) Evaluation, (3) Materials, and (4) Content (agriculture, coops, home economics, skills training, literacy, etc.)

A training manual was drafted, reviewed, revised and redrafted. It was used as the primary vehicle for awraja level training held at the six centers by three training teams in October, 1974. These training sessions included participants from all the district level offices and some from the province and sub-district. It covered the concepts and operational steps to be taken to implement the project. This training was designed to prepare the awraja staff to train the woreda or village participants; however, the sub-training scheme was interrupted by the political changes in the country. The training manual was considered adequate for the work done to date but it should be reviewed against any replanning; it should also be put into the context of a comprehensive training sub-system, which is not yet completely designed.

An evaluation manual was also produced. It envisioned three types of evaluation: total project effectiveness; baseline surveys of village/participant conditions, and evaluation of the individual training activities. Questionnaires were drafted and tested in the case of the baseline surveys. During the awraja level training, training for a district evaluator was given, but it was considered too short for the work to be done. Baseline surveys were actually completed in three of the six awrajas, and training was designed on the basis of the survey in two of these awrajas. No participant level training in the work-oriented format was actually conducted before the program work stopped. Again the evaluation manual is considered adequate for the work done to date, but it needs to become part of a total evaluation sub-system. This sub-system design work was well underway in late 1974, but stopped short of decisions.

The training and evaluation sub-sectors probably went further in systems design than any others. They also went further in implementation than the other sub-sectors. This is attributed to the initiative of the personnel working in these sectors.

A curriculum manual was also drafted. It treated subjects of literacy, numeracy, civics, agriculture, coops, home economics, health, public works, and vocational or cottage industry skills. The "curriculum" was not tested in actual villager level training. The question of

"core content" vs. designing a flexible system to deliver relevant training is treated above. A great deal of work has gone into the "curriculum" and this was beneficial when the WDAF staff was asked to work with the Development Through Cooperation Campaign. It will also be valuable as reference material for other agencies engaged in practical adult training.

Partly in preparation for the curriculum manual, partly to familiarize the staff with what existed and to establish the planned Materials Reference Center, relevant training materials were collected. While several hundred pieces of useful material in the "core" areas identified above were collected, it is believed that only a small fraction of the existing materials have been collected to date.

This is partly due to limited time, spatial problems and leadership, but also due to a reluctance by other agencies to freely exchange their materials. This behavior must be overcome thru policies, coordination and supervision. Only recently have the materials collected been organized for easy access. It is believed that the establishment and operation of the Materials Reference Center is still an important function for WDAED and should be pursued regardless of other program decisions.

As can be seen from the above highlights, a great deal of work has been accomplished. The extensive planning and implementation papers have been collected for ready reference and must be consulted by others engaging in villager level adult education/training.

- B. While discussions on Non-Formal Education can be traced back five years (see references) planning actually started in early 1974, implementation began in July 1974 and was interrupted in late 1974 after only six months of actual work. The hiatus between January and July, 1975 is attributed to the Ethiopian revolution. The structural changes being brought about by the revolution are creating an environment very favorable to work-oriented education: the values of the new system provide a firm foundation for work-oriented education. But the change of government, anticipated new policies, extensive reorganization of the Ministry, assignment and reassignment of new staff, delay of the Fourth Five-Year Plan and detail of staff to work with the Development Through Cooperation Campaign Headquarters all combined to bring the project to a halt for six months. Noting the magnitude and pace of changes introduced by the new government, it is amazing that the delay in implementation was only six months, and as noted above, the work will be in a stronger position as a direct result of these changes.

- C. No delay in implementation is attributed by the evaluators to the availability of proper inputs; however, the management of these inputs is seen as second only to political events as major cause for not achieving the planned results.

The Ethiopian government provided all the fiscal, physical and human resources required by the project in a timely manner up to the end of 1974. Likewise the consultant, training, and monetary inputs planned from the U.S. and other donors were available as scheduled. The consultants particularly made useful contributions to planning, systems development and evaluation. They continued "on-call" even after project implementation ceased. Extensive and helpful comments on the quality, timeliness and quantity of inputs are contained in the evaluation minutes. But inasmuch as they themselves were not considered as constraints, the inputs are not treated in detail here.

- D. The overwhelming conclusion of the evaluation group regarding inhibiting factors over which some control can be exercised is management and leadership. Time after time in our joint evaluation discussions, specific examples of problems created by inadequate management, comparatively weak administration and non-constant leadership were given. Some of the examples are related here to add weight to what the evaluators considered the most significant problem in the project.

The WOALP staff felt that responsibility for the WOAEP was never clearly delegated, in writing, to them and therefore they were never clear about their continuing involvement. There was a definite feeling that all decisions were being taken at the central ministry and the staff had no latitude for initiative or problem solving at even a minor level. At times they willingly responded to oral instructions from the Assistant Minister, but they perceived these as disjointed orders on specific assignments. Therefore, there was neither a delegated responsibility for continuous work nor a commitment by the staff to take initiative to solve day-to-day problems. At other times there appeared to be a communications gap between the project manager (Assistant Minister) and WOALP staff. Basic planning documents were not known to the staff; the staff complained that they did not know what was expected of them; they tended to see the WOAEP as additional to their WOALP jobs, which they had done for five years; despite repeated oral discussions on these points they had an expressed need for written job descriptions, written orders on how to relate WOAEP and WOALP work. At times there was open resistance to project leadership at the same time this was being highly desired. Although orally outlined several times, lines of authority remained cloudy or unaccepted. The administrative and financial sub-systems received virtually no attention, which is not surprising when the

staff claimed not to know even the amount of funds allocated for their work or how to get access to it. Despite weekly steering committee meetings, the staff felt they were not involved enough in the earlier planning to relate their present assignments.

Some of this management problem can be explained in terms of the dynamics of the time: this was a project being implemented on the verbal instructions of the Minister because the foundational Fourth Five-Year Plan had been delayed; it was being implemented on the good faith and commitment of the Project Manager when the change of ministers, anticipated reorganization and new policies did not allow institutionalization. Some of it had traces of anti-authority which existed in Ethiopia at that time; other incidents can be traced to traditional administrative behavior. These same factors led to a lack of intra-ministry coordination. Other MOE departments that should have been helping the WOALP staff with WOAEP were uninformed, uninvolved and at times resistant of an effort to push ahead with a new activity when everyone else was trying to keep a low profile. But this did deprive the project of essential reinforcement.

Similarly, inter-ministerial coordination was not realized until very late and then only on a sporadic, ad-hoc basis. Many of the same factors inhibiting project and intra-ministry management restricted inter-ministerial coordination. This was complicated by the aborted start of the Awraja decentralization scheme which was to provide the local administrative framework of integrating NFE into rural development. There were repeated references to the lack of authority to do what was being planned, and no faith that the program would be implemented just because it was good for the rural people.

This summary could belabor this point, but suffice it to say that the management, leadership and administration constraints must be clearly resolved before any meaningful work will go on as a responsible process.

VI. Summary Evaluative Conclusions

1. The careful planning process used is considered a very good format; however, more attention should have been given to continuity of participants, open access to background documents and a clearer definition of responsibilities of all parties involved in the planning process.
2. The project plan needs some revision, but the failure to accomplish more during the implementation phase is not attributed to design problems.
3. A great deal of very good work was accomplished in a short six months under difficult times.
4. The cessation of the project after six months (for six months) is attributed to the dynamic conditions created by the revolution.
5. However, during the six months of implementation, serious management, leadership and administrative problems were already inhibiting the project.
6. Important intra- and inter-ministerial coordination was planned but not fully implemented because of the political changes and management problems.

VII. Summary Recommendations

1. Some form of project to develop the delivery system for relevant, work-oriented training for the rural masses should be continued.
2. The project should be redesigned taking into account the comments of the evaluation group and the new government's policies and organization.
3. The approach of the project should be changed from its experimental mold to one of delivery system design, development and evaluation.
4. Fundamental decisions should be reviewed to provide the redesigners with clear guidelines on such topics as:
 - a) the role of the Ministry of Education in work-oriented training for rural people,
 - b) the targets of the project-operations or delivery system design or both,
 - c) urban vs. rural; youth vs. adults; agrarian vs. crafts training; individual vs. communal programs; etc.
5. In redesign, reconsider the basis for selecting six experimental areas; decide if a flexible mechanism is to be built which can respond to local interests, or if a nationwide single model is to be built.
6. Involve in the replanning those who will be involved in implementation, or provide full orientation where planning involvement is not possible. Continuous, joint plan monitoring and replanning sessions should be held.
7. Carefully study the management problems of the first six months and during the replanning, pay special attention to drafting a management section for plan implementation. Call on Institute of Public Administration or Addis Ababa University Faculty of Public Administration to study the management problems and provide management training if needed.

VIII. References

1. Paper on the "Recent Background and Evolution of NFE in Ethiopia,"
July, 1974, T.D. Morse, USAID/Ethiopia.
2. "Index of Documents on NFE," July, 1974, USAID/Ethiopia
 - A. List of Non-Formal Education Workshop I Documents
(February 18-21, 1974)
 - B. Reports of Field Visits made between Workshops I and II
(March - April, 1974)
 - C. List of Non-Formal Education Workshop II Papers
(May 22-24, 1974)
 - D. Workshop II--Working Group Reports
(May, 1974)
3. Binder of Project Documents, USAID/Ethiopia
4. "Index of Working Papers Developed by the WOAEP Steering Committee
and Working Groups, between July and December, 1974."