

PDAF-930

82452

**NAMIBIA  
BASIC EDUCATION  
REFORM PROGRAM**

**Second Annual Review**

Prepared by:

**Creative Associates International, Inc.  
5301 Wisconsin Avenue N.W.  
suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20015**

Prepared for:

**Advancing Basic Education and Literacy (ABEL) Project  
Contract No. DPE-5832-Z-00-9032-00  
United States Agency for International Development  
Office of Education**

31 March 1993

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>PREFACE</b> .....	iii
<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
A. The Role of USAID in Basic Education Reform .....	2
B. The Second Annual Review of the Basic Education Reform Program .....	3
C. The Scope of the Final Report .....	4
<b>II. MANAGING THE REFORM OF BASIC EDUCATION</b> .....	6
A. Building the Management Capacity of the Education System .....	6
1. Accomplishments .....	6
2. Issues, Concerns, Constraints and Opportunities .....	8
3. Priority Actions .....	13
B. Establishing and Monitoring Performance .....	14
Standards for the Education System	
1. Accomplishments .....	14
2. Issues, Concerns, Constraints and Opportunities .....	15
▲ Equity and Access .....	17
▲ Efficiency .....	22
▲ Quality and Student Proficiency .....	25
3. Priority Actions .....	33
<b>III. DELIVERING THE REFORM OF BASIC EDUCATION</b> .....	36
A. Reforming the Curriculum .....	36
1. Accomplishments .....	36
2. Issues, Concerns, Constraints and Opportunities .....	38
3. Priority Actions .....	43
B. Developing Human Resources .....	44
1. Accomplishments .....	44
2. Issues, Concerns, Constraints and Opportunities .....	48
▲ Training School Principals .....	48
▲ Resource Center Network .....	50

▲ Preparation of Teachers for the New Curriculum . . . . .	51
▲ Teacher Support Network . . . . .	52
▲ Preservice Teacher Education . . . . .	52
3. Priority Actions . . . . .	53
<b>IV. RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .</b>	<b>55</b>
A. A Summary of Feedback to the MEC . . . . .	55
1. Managing the Reform of Basic Education . . . . .	55
2. Establishing and Monitoring Performance . . . . .	55
Standards for the Education System	
3. Reforming the Curriculum . . . . .	57
4. Developing Human Resources . . . . .	58
B. Suggestions for USAID Assistance . . . . .	59
C. Recommendations for Realignment of the . . . . .	60
USAID Program	
1. Resource Sufficiency . . . . .	60
2. Budgetary Flexibility . . . . .	60
3. Reform Timeline . . . . .	61
4. Capacity for Reform . . . . .	61
5. Disjuncture in Priorities . . . . .	61
6. USAID-MEC Collaboration . . . . .	61

**APPENDICES**

- A. List of Documents Reviewed
- B. List of Interviews, Schools Visited
- C. Team Schedule
- D. TCC Agenda, Discussion Guide,  
List of Attendees at 16 February Meeting
- E. Debriefing Agendas
- F. Testing and Assessment Workshop Minutes

## **PREFACE**

The Basic Education Reform Program Review Team would like to acknowledge the numerous individuals who in a variety of ways made the review process productive, efficient and enjoyable at the same time. Sue Grant Lewis coordinated the review for the Ministry of Education and Culture (MEC) and we wish to thank her and the MEC officers and staff who contributed to our assigned task by providing documents, offering advice and criticism and participating actively in the professional dialogue that was part of this review. The Technical Coordinating Committee was generous with the time and expertise of its members and was a valuable partner along the way. Additionally, throughout the Government and in nongovernmental educational institutions we found and we wish to thank those who were of assistance.

On field visits we were greatly guided by Mr. Dolf van Jaarsveld and by Gert Fourie and regional and school personnel throughout the country who gave us their time and support to ensure that we had a broad view of education in Namibia.

Within USAID we would like to acknowledge and thank Barbara Belding, Victor Levine, Emmy Malithano and Brigitte Henke who were active participants in advising on and supporting our efforts.

Our team was fielded by the staff of the ABEL project (Advancing Basic Education and Literacy, contract number DPE-5832-Z-00), and we are most appreciative of the support from A.I.D.'s R&D/Education Office and from Creative Associates International, Inc., the implementation subcontractor.

Throughout this review, we have been made aware of the complex and demanding task undertaken by USAID in assisting the Government of the Republic of Namibia in the reform process. We would like to recognize and applaud the dedication and skills of Richard Shortlidge, USAID Representative who encouraged us to be thorough and candid in our work.

Lastly, we would like to acknowledge with respect and gratitude the leadership provided to Namibia's Basic Education Reform Program by the Honorable Nahas Angula, Minister of Education and Culture. He encouraged and ensured the cooperation of educators around the country in our review process. We hope that he will be both encouraged and challenged by our observations and conclusions.

On behalf of the Review Team, this document is submitted to provoke discussion and to encourage action.

B. Bryant, J. Cobbe, K.P. Dzvimbo, J. Jansen, A. Riddell,  
C.W. Snyder

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

In Namibia basic education is defined as ten years of general comprehensive education which is compulsory and provided free of charge on a universal basis. The reform of basic education aims to ensure that by the year 2000, the majority of Namibian citizens will have acquired the basic skills of reading, writing and numeracy and will have knowledge of socio-cultural processes and natural phenomenon. The goals for basic education reform and development are:

- ▶ Equitable access to schooling;
- ▶ Operational efficiency of education;
- ▶ Effective pedagogy;
- ▶ Democracy.

In order to achieve these goals the Ministry of Education and Culture (MEC) has developed an Action Plan for 1992-1997 and related documents that serve as initial guides to the implementation of the reform. The Action Plan addresses:

- ▶ Planning and management;
- ▶ Educational Management Information System (EMIS);
- ▶ Physical facilities;
- ▶ Curriculum reform;
- ▶ Materials production and distribution;
- ▶ Teacher education and support;
- ▶ National Institute for Educational Development (NIED);
- ▶ Adult and Nonformal Education.

Each component of the Action Plan contains objectives and indicators for tracking progress. Overall integration of the planning, implementation and monitoring of the basic education reform resides with the Ministry's Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC).

The timeline for the reform specifies four stages for implementation. The period 1990-1993 has been a time of policy development, negotiation, program definition and organization. The result of the first three years of reform is the installation of an infrastructure through which specific reforms can be delivered. The period 1993-1996 will be a time for design, development and piloting of the basic education curriculum and syllabi within the guidance established by the language reform policy making English the medium of instruction. The MEC at the same time

will research, develop and test access and educational measures. The years 1997-2003 will be the time of full implementation of the complete reform program for grades 1-7. The first cohort of learners will complete their seven years of primary education in 2003 and the full ten year program will be ready for implementation. Finally, by the year 2006 a complete basic education cycle will be in operation and the progression from grade 7 to grade 8 will be expected to be 80%.

#### **A. The Role of USAID in Basic Education Reform**

The Program Grant Agreement (ProAg) for Basic Education Reform Sector Assistance Program was signed 22 March 1991 to assist the grantee "to establish an effective, efficient, and sustainable basic education system in Namibia accessible to all children." The USAID support to basic education reform in Namibia is provided through untied budgetary assistance. Payments, eventually to total \$35 million, are disbursed in annual tranches upon satisfactory completion of conditions precedent (CP) to disbursement.

Because USAID support to education in Namibia is in the form of non-project assistance (NPA), A.I.D. guidance indicates that USAID and the host government must have in place systems for 1) reaching agreement on specific performance steps, 2) recording agreement on satisfaction of conditions precedent, 3) managing and accounting for funds and 4) assessing program impact. The ProAg stresses the role of USAID in monitoring the progress of the Government of Namibia (GRN) in achieving program objectives and places importance on program and impact indicators in particular.

One component of USAID's monitoring and assessment system is an annual external evaluation of the progress of the basic education reform program. According to the ProAg, the purpose of the external evaluation is to assess and verify progress of the program, assist the MEC in its own monitoring and assessment process, and assist USAID in determining further assistance and disbursements. The report of the evaluation team, as indicated in the ProAg, would be the basis for an annual workshop to review basic education reform. The review is intended to take place in cooperation with the Technical Coordinating Committee of the MEC.

The ProAg (Section 7.3) further describes activities that may be included as components of the evaluation. They are 1) establishment of baseline data and indicators for the program, 2) evaluation of progress towards attainment of the objectives of the program, 3) identification and evaluation of problem areas or constraints which may inhibit such attainment, 4) assessment of how such information may be used to help overcome such problems and 5) evaluation, to the extent possible, of the overall development impact of the program.

The first annual evaluation of the basic education reform program was conducted in February 1992. That evaluation focused almost exclusively on conditions precedent to disbursement and in the judgment of the evaluation team, some of the critical conditions had not been fully met. An extension of sixty days was recommended in order to allow the MEC to complete the CPs. After sixty days, the deadline was extended again to December 1992 and relations between the MEC and USAID became increasingly strained during this time.

The second annual review was intended to minimize the conflictful nature of the earlier process while assisting both USAID and the MEC in assessing progress. The second annual review is described below.

**B. The Second Annual Review of the Basic Education Reform Program**

The second annual review of the basic education reform program in Namibia was conducted 1-27 February 1993 and included background document review during the month of January. The Terms of Reference (TOR) for the review, dated 25 November 1992, requested Creative Associates International, Inc. (CAII) "to provide an independent professional review of the program and to work collaboratively with the Ministry of Education and Culture (MEC) to apply new information and insights to the next steps of implementation." CAII was requested to employ two strategies in the review. First, through individual interviews and small meetings, review team members would provide a critical review of basic education reform and stimulate professional discussion and debate leading to recommended action steps for the future. Second, using a series of small, well-focused workshops constituting the most substantive and extensive part of the review process, the team would exchange ideas and action recommendations with Ministry personnel. This open exchange of ideas was intended to focus on efficiency, quality and equity and access and was not tied to decisions regarding funding.

The Terms of Reference were modified in a memorandum to the review team leader from the USAID officer for human and natural resources dated 5 February 1993. The modification requested the review team to:

- ▶ Work closely with the MEC to review the existing plan for program indicators as described in the MEC's document 4.2.1.(a) and to recommend strategies and specific activities for strengthening the system of indicators, their quantitative measurement and comparative processes;
- ▶ Review the Ministry's plans for an EMIS as described in the Ministry's document 4.2.1.(b), make recommendations for strengthening the system and determine the adequacy of the existing EMIS to measure the set of indicators identified above;
- ▶ Analyze the adequacy of resources available to the reform during the coming year and determine how the Ministry plans to finance the Action Plan;
- ▶ Identify critical constraints in carrying out the reform that might be alleviated by USAID through projectized activities utilizing any additional resources.

The review team was assembled in response to the Terms of Reference and was composed as follows:

- ▶ Brenda L. Bryant, Management and Evaluation Specialist (Team Leader);
- ▶ James Cobbe, Economist and Efficiency of Education Specialist;
- ▶ K. Peter Dzvimbo, Teacher Education Specialist;

- ▶ Jonathan D. Jansen, Curriculum Development Specialist;
- ▶ Abby Riddell, Statistician and Specialist in Equity and Access ;
- ▶ C. Wesley Snyder, Testing and Assessment Specialist focusing on Quality.

The review was conducted in five parts, each designed to carry out one or more of the aims stated in the Terms of Reference. First, team members reviewed documents that had been submitted by the MEC to USAID in fulfillment of tranche 2 and 3 conditionalities. Three team members met to discuss the documents on 19 January; the document review continued throughout the remaining weeks. Second, team members conducted interviews with key Ministry representatives and others in Windhoek, 1-5 February. Third, during the week of 8 February the review team divided into three pairs and visited educational institutions in five of the country's six education regions including Katima, Khorixas, Ondangwa, Rundu and Windhoek. Fourth, the team conducted a series of workshops with MEC personnel during the week of 15 February. Workshops covered these topics: testing and assessment; Educational Management Information System (EMIS); cost, revenue and sustainability; reform program indicators; and curriculum and its relationship to teacher education and testing. A workshop with the TCC on 16 February consisted of four subgroups on planning and management of the reform, information systems, curriculum and the delivery of instruction, and educational personnel development and teacher education. Fifth, the week of 22 February included documentation and reporting of the results of the review. The Appendices include lists of documents reviewed, interviewees and sites visited. The complete schedule for the team is also appended.

This review was conducted while the MEC was engaged in the final stages of a rationalization and reorganization expected to have some direct impact on the reform of basic education and on the capacity of the MEC to carry out its plans. Potentially compromised further by severe resource constraints, the reform is being implemented and reviewed in a highly volatile environment.

### C. The Scope of the Final Report

The purpose of the final report is to summarize the findings of the review team and to make recommendations to USAID regarding priorities for action in the implementation of Namibia's basic education reform. Following the introduction provided in Chapter I, Chapter II addresses policy, planning and management of basic education reform. This chapter discusses the EMIS and provides an indepth analysis of indicators and measurement of equity and access, cost and efficiency, and quality and learner proficiency. It is titled, "Managing the Reform of Basic Education." Chapter III, "Delivering the Reform of Basic Education," concentrates on the design, development and delivery of instruction with special attention given to curriculum reform, the provision of textbooks and materials, physical facilities and the development of Namibia's human resources in the education sector, especially teacher education. Chapter IV is derived from the preceding analyses and offers general recommendations to USAID regarding future support to the reform.

In compiling this report the review team has made every effort to be comprehensive and responsive to a range of directives. In so doing, the team necessarily has chosen to concentrate on some topics at the expense of others. The report serves these purposes: to review progress towards attainment of the objectives of the program; to identify constraints to attainment of the objectives; to assist the MEC in its own monitoring and assessment process; and to assist USAID in determining further assistance and disbursements. Additionally, the team has focused on most elements of the MEC's Action Plan, but has given minimal attention to adult and nonformal education. Importance has been placed on the EMIS, on indicators and measurement of progress and on resources available to finance the reform. The intention of the review team is to assist both the MEC and USAID in taking important next steps in reforming basic education in Namibia.

## **II. MANAGING THE REFORM OF BASIC EDUCATION**

Directing and controlling the reform of basic education in Namibia is the responsibility of the Ministry of Education and Culture. Given that the early stages of the reform process have concentrated on overall policy guidance and organization structuring, the MEC's Action Plan for 1992-1997 focuses on building the capacity of the Ministry to manage, finance and implement the reform; and on further defining the aims of the reform through the establishment of standards and indicators of progress and through developing systems for obtaining and managing information to inform and guide the change process.

### **A. Building the Management Capacity of the Education System**

The capacity of the MEC in the broadest terms refers to the systems and processes as well as the human resources needed to manage and implement basic education. In its Action Plan the Ministry emphasizes the need to strengthen planning and management capacities and lists the following priorities: community-level participation and community mobilization for reform implementation; consultative frameworks to build consensus in education; budgeting and financial management; coordination of policy analysis and planning; integration of planning functions at the local, regional and national levels; administrative and management support systems; regional capacity; and personnel development.

The review team considered the management capacity of the MEC in general throughout the assessment. Following is an analysis of the accomplishments, constraints and issues and priority actions related to the Ministry's capacity to respond to the demands of the reform.

#### **1. Accomplishments**

During 1992 the MEC concentrated its efforts on action planning, on studying costs associated with the reform, on reorganizing the education system, on continuing to unify the system and develop consensus for its mission and on installing administrative operations at the regional level. Specific accomplishments include:

- ▶ Widespread awareness of the basic education reform program at all levels, including headquarters, regional offices, and schools;
- ▶ Awareness of and pride in the unification of the education system;
- ▶ A start with respect to decentralization to regional offices and outreach to remote communities along with an expansion of the inspectorate and the corps of subject advisors;
- ▶ Improved access to schools and increased community support for the promotion of school attendance in many areas;
- ▶ Widespread access to and participation in various decision-making processes (field visits indicated that this was a common conclusion at least with respect to

inspectors, subject advisors, and heads; the basic curriculum framework development process also involved many groups from outside the MEC structure -- churches, parents, NGOs -- in an extensive consultative process);

- ▶ The start of a planning process that links costing and program goals (i.e., the cost study);
- ▶ Progress on the rationalization and restructuring of the entire Ministry, which is intended to improve efficiency and planning, and increase decentralization to the regions (the relevant document was not yet public while the team was in Namibia, being with the Public Service Commission, but it was widely reported that the PSC would accept the major recommendations);
- ▶ Progress in capacity building within the MEC via courses, training, and other processes aimed at increasing planning and management capabilities;
- ▶ The preparation of the framework and action plan contributing to team-building within the MEC by requiring collaborative processes across directorates and divisions;
- ▶ The establishment of an aid coordination office, thereby providing linkages between external donors and both planning and operational sections of the MEC (while this function is operational, the ability to link external funds with provision for recurrent costs on the completion of externally-funded activities is not yet a priority).

Additionally, the MEC produced a report titled "Basic Education Reform in Namibia - Costs, Resources and Sustainability: Projections for 1993-2002." This document represents a very useful start in understanding what it will cost to maintain the education system that is being planned for Namibia. It is a modular, largely spreadsheet-based, projection model that uses all available information to produce projections of expenditure levels on a variety of assumptions about the trajectory of the education system over the time period. However, in order to make the projections, some very heroic assumptions about certain elements of cost, and about allocations over levels, were necessary because of the lack of real data on actual expenditures. Nevertheless, it is a useful development because it provides a relatively simple methodology and templates that can be used to produce projections of resource needs as information availability and understanding of the system improves.

This is a fairly substantial list, and the MEC does seem to have achieved much, given that it is only three years since independence and eleven different authorities had to be welded into a single Ministry. There still remains a considerable distance to go before the MEC is operating in a fully satisfactory fashion.

## 2. Issues, Concerns, Constraints and Opportunities

Despite the relatively optimistic conclusions of the projection exercises reported above, there are real causes for concern about costs and sustainability, as well as about the equity and rationality of current resource allocation decisions. Judgments about cost levels and sustainability are inherently subjective, and are also extremely sensitive to policy decisions not yet made (e.g., about real salary levels) which are inherently unknowable. Nevertheless, there are grounds for suspecting that the system as it currently exists involves a level of cost that is probably not sustainable in the long run. Two items are worth noting.

First, available information suggests that the average primary school teacher employment cost in late 1992 was slightly more than six times average GDP per capita in Namibia. This is around double the average for lower-middle-income countries in the early to middle eighties, and nearly triple the average for upper-middle-income countries in the same period, as reported in Lockheed and Verspoor (1991:368-371; see endnote 1). Countries that had ratios of this level, such as Zimbabwe in 1984 (6.6), Zambia in 1982 (6.1), and Cote d'Ivoire in 1979 (7.8), have seen the ratio fall as a result of erosion of relative real teacher salaries, because the cost of the system was unsustainable as universal primary education was approached.

Second, available information on guideline budget allocations for MEC for 1993-94, on contractual commitments for personnel costs, catering, subsidies, etc., strongly suggest that operational costs next year will be under extremely strong pressure even if the freeze on hiring is continued and the MEC is successful in its negotiations with the Ministry of Finance for assistance to meet personnel cost commitments and contractual requirements for catering. Current projections suggest that even if MEC gets all it calculates it needs to meet personnel commitments, operational costs (which include travel, books, materials, and supplies such as electricity, diesel fuel, and telephones) could be cut by more than half.

Under current procedures and structures, the budgetary and expenditure control systems of the MEC are highly unsatisfactory. There is no link between the Planning Directorate and the Financial Administration Directorate, which has the responsibility for developing the budget. There are no reliable links between the MEC and either the Ministry of Finance, NPC, or other operational ministries (such as Works, Water Affairs) that plan actions highly relevant to population movements and the location of schools. Guideline amounts for the next financial year are received late, and have not in the past been adhered to by the Ministry of Finance. There is some evidence that Finance intends that in future years guideline amounts will be provided earlier and will be firm, but MEC personnel remain skeptical throughout the system.

The current budgeting procedure appears to be to take the personnel in post, and calculate their employment cost; and then add to this other contractual and quasi-fixed commitments, such as the Culture section of the Ministry, transfers to private schools (set to rise from R11.7 million in 1992-93 to R14.2 million in 1993-94), and the catering contract for hostels (residential dormitories) which has an inflation-escalation clause as well as being based on a per capita sum for each learner each day. The resultant total is then compared to the guideline amount received from the Ministry of Finance, and the residual regarded as the initial amount available for "operating costs" including transport, books, materials and supplies and additional personnel. In theory, in the past the residual has been allocated to regions on the basis of regions' budget

requests based on their perceptions of need. For 1993 the picture is grim. First, the initial residual is minus R33 million odd, i.e., the guideline amount is insufficient to meet continuing personnel costs, the catering contract, and other quasi-fixed commitments, alone. Second, the Minister has directed that when the "operating cost" total is finally derived, it is to be allocated to regions on the basis of a fixed, derived, per learner amount, ignoring differences in the grade-mix or cost levels by region. Third, officials refused to speculate on how the budget would be handled if the guideline amount was not increased, on the grounds that the guideline amount would be increased by R100 million and that therefore the cut in operating costs would only be on the order of 12%.

In a workshop for MEC officials, the review team suggested that budget stringency offered an opportunity for reallocation and greater equity if procedures were turned on their head. It was suggested that personnel costs should be treated as the residual, the MEC could calculate how many teachers it could afford (starting with qualified teachers, who are established), and then translate that into a nationwide learner-teacher ratio, and then tell overstuffed schools how many volunteers they had to produce for transfer, while giving unqualified teachers notice of probable termination. If the excess teachers from overstuffed schools refused to transfer, they could be deemed to have resigned, and that would then free money to keep the unqualified teachers in the understaffed regions. This suggestion produced a howl of protest. Lack of housing in underserved areas was cited as the reason. The housing issue is worthy of a short digression.

Teachers are civil servants once permanently appointed and are therefore entitled to the same housing benefits as other civil servants of equivalent rank. This amounts to three options. There is a subsidized housing loan scheme, whereby government guarantees a loan from a Building Society for house purchase or construction, and heavily subsidizes repayment. This scheme is very generous, but Building Societies can only legally make loans where they can secure a legally-binding mortgage, i.e., in proclaimed towns. North of the Red Line, towns are still in the process of being proclaimed, and in communal rural areas south of the line, secure title is also not possible. Second, there is a rent-subsidy scheme also available, but this is only of value where rents are substantial and leases can be signed. Third, where government housing is available, teachers can apply for it (and then are charged 5% of salary as rent; in one Otjinene school teachers objected because four of them were sharing a house, and each being charged 5% of salary as rent).

These housing schemes are in principle quite sensible, but in practice very damaging to the educational system. They are inequitable because only those teachers in towns south of the Red Line can take advantage of the loan scheme (eventually, it will also be possible in proclaimed towns in the North). They are a serious constraint on the supply of teachers to the North, to rural areas generally, and also on the mobility of teachers. They produce understandable but expensive pressure on MEC to provide housing, at least at secondary schools, in rural areas and the North, and the MEC is in fact still planning to do so at new schools in these locations. In rural areas, it is reportedly difficult for teachers who are not of local origin to secure either housing or a plot on which to build a house, placing a serious further constraint on the supply of teachers to primary schools in such areas.

A full solution to this problem will no doubt have to await a complete resolution of the land tenure question. However, it would seem that the MEC has not been as aggressive in seeking

a solution as it could have been. There would not appear to be any insurmountable obstacle to the MEC seeking to obtain long leaseholds to land suitable for housing adjacent to the schools it controls in rural areas and the North, and then subletting on long leasehold plots to teachers for houses. It similarly would not be difficult to make minor adjustments to the regulations covering Building Societies to permit and in fact require them to offer mortgages on houses built on such subleasehold plots, even if they do not have the full services of plots in a proclaimed township. Recognizing the constraints on legal draftsmanship in the GRN at present, this would appear such a serious constraint on improving equity and efficiency in the education system (and, no doubt, on staff deployment in other operational ministries that might be allies of the MEC in a push for such changes), that it would seem to be wise for the MEC to be willing to invest some political capital in pushing for such changes. It would add to the personnel costs of the MEC, because more teachers would qualify for housing loan subsidies, but it would enormously relax the constraints on staff mobility and deployment, and on the improvement of equity in the system.

There are a number of changes envisaged for the near future under the planned restructuring of the MEC. First, the Planning Directorate is expected to get a financial planning unit and a financial advisor, although at this point its duties and staffing are unknown. Second, Financial Administration is due to get an internal audit unit, something it clearly needs in terms of recent fraud and corruption (e.g., salary payments to "ghost" teachers). Third, a Committee on Budget and Expenditure or equivalent is to be revived, although its composition and powers are still unknown. Currently, there is nobody in the MEC who monitors actual expenditure levels and commitments during the financial year, which can produce unpleasant surprises like that of the current financial year, when a total freeze was required because late in the year it was discovered that there was serious overspending. Even the new body will not be very effective until the financial systems are in better shape so that with a relatively short time lag it is possible to know expenditure and encumbrances by school and object, something which is currently totally impossible and delays in Government Stores mean that this is not wholly possible even if MEC does get its systems up to scratch (see endnote 2).

However, the fact that the immediate short term future looks rather bleak for the MEC is, in fact, a strong reason to strengthen the planning and management capacity of the Ministry and an incentive to do so. The team found broad agreement with this view within the TCC and MEC. The following opportunities for change in the 1993-96 period were agreed to during the TCC meeting on 16 February:

- ▶ Improvement of linkages between finance and planning, both internally within the MEC and externally between MEC and the Ministry of Finance and NPC;
- ▶ Improved information systems in finance, personnel, and physical facilities and materials, with a view eventually to being able to provide on-line school-level information on expenditures and outstanding orders;
- ▶ Improved mechanisms for resource allocation;
- ▶ Improved dissemination and use of data for making policy decisions and for refining policies;

- ▶ Refining the system for distributing books and materials;
- ▶ Additional management training for headquarters and regional personnel; strengthening school-level management;
- ▶ Further implementation of decentralization to the regional offices, including specification of central-regional linkages, commonality of purpose, integration of tasks, exchange of data, and the like;
- ▶ Review of policy on community mobilization in support of schools and hostels, with a view to possibly reducing government's share of the burden of capital and recurrent costs of the system;
- ▶ After passage of the new Education Act, review of the structures under which school Boards and Committees operate;
- ▶ After implementation of the MEC restructuring and rationalization plan, review of formal communication structures within the MEC with a view to improving coordination and cohesion.

The willingness of middle management in the MEC to agree that these sorts of actions needed to be taken over the next few years was very gratifying to the team. However, it was stressed that the ability of the MEC to actually implement many, perhaps any, such initiatives in the short term is severely constrained by the financial stringency facing the MEC and serious shortages of suitable personnel, equipment, and funds to obtain software, training, and the installation of new systems. Management within the MEC can begin planning such initiatives, but in the short term it is extremely unlikely that the Ministry will be in a position to implement much without external assistance. This may be an important opening for new USAID activities with the potential for high impact.

Perhaps more worrying was the view expressed by many officers that they were unsure whether top management in the MEC was committed to such planning and management reform. Certainly, management is a severe problem in the MEC. The view was expressed that there are in fact three ministries, the old ministry of the colonial period, the ministry of the expatriate advisors, and the new ministry of Namibians. Communication between the three is weak at best, and so is coordination and cooperation, and maybe unity of purpose. To some extent this is an inevitable consequence of the current stage of Namibia's transition, but it is not clear that the MEC is yet dealing with it in a way that is optimal from a long-term point of view. Many individuals in powerful positions operate in comparative total darkness, and other units feel leaderless and directionless and without the ability to influence events. As yet, there appears to have been very little in the way of deliberate attempts at team building and cohesion building within the Ministry, despite the widely-held view that the strategy in the Ministry has been to go slow in order to build consensus. It is to be hoped that the restructuring plan will to some extent answer these problems, but it should be emphasized that they are severe, and in an overstretched organization are clearly detrimental to performance. Top management in the MEC could usefully be encouraged to put greater priority on internal, cross-directorate communication

and linkages, and on team building and the fostering of cohesiveness within the Ministry as a whole.

Five other issues/opportunities that arose partly during the workshops conducted in the MEC by the review team are possible high priority opportunities for action in the next several years. First, and perhaps the most important although also the most difficult politically, is the hostel issue. The total cost of hostels is estimated for the coming year at over R150 million (about R80 million for the catering contract, the rest for personnel costs, supplies, and maintenance). Total cost recovery is estimated at about R3.5 million from fees. This means that hostel residents are subsidized to the tune of nearly 98% of cost. The catering contract may exceed the nutritional minimum and many hostels are overstaffed. The team was told of a hostel of 450 learners with 85 staff. The level of expenditure on hostels warrants a detailed investigation of hostel operations, costs, and policies. Current policies actually reduced the fees at many Class C (mostly former White Administration schools) hostels, so that even learners from high income families are now receiving very substantial subsidies. The level of subsidy at many Class A hostels is such that the fee is much less than the out-of-pocket cost of feeding the learner at home, providing a powerful incentive for school attendance and retention, but also for repetition, and it is doubtful whether the GRN can afford it in the long run. Obviously, there are strong political reasons why hostels must be retained and substantial subsidies must be provided for those that need them in order to attend school. Nevertheless, there is equally obviously substantial scope for cost reduction and for increased cost recovery, and the first step is probably a detailed study of hostel operations and costs.

Second, there is the question of the treatment of DANFE (Adult and Nonformal Education) in the budget process, and the relatively weak development as yet of alternative routes to educational qualifications to the formal school system route. Current procedures for budget development put DANFE, with "operating costs," at the bottom of the heap to share out the residual left after personnel costs and other contractual and quasi-fixed commitments have been covered. The result is that DANFE is underfunded and has to rely on external funds to develop its ideas for the extension of out-of-school routes to formal qualifications. This is almost certainly counterproductive when schools, especially secondary schools, are heavily overcrowded with overage learners who may have already repeated several times (and often are occupying expensive and overcrowded hostel space). On the face of it, especially with a view to long run sustainability, it would seem desirable to strengthen DANFE and protect it better in the budget process (e.g., by earmarking for it a fixed percentage of the guideline amount off the top, rather than a residual off the bottom), and encourage DANFE to use its increased funds to develop and expand alternative routes to formal educational qualifications for young adults who are no longer in school. Undoubtedly, many teachers would welcome the opportunity to work for DANFE on a part-time, remunerated, basis in night or weekend schools.

Third, a number of officers suggested the formation of a unit within the MEC to do special studies on particular aspects of the operation of the school system, to seek out gross inefficiencies and inequities, and draw them to the attention of the relevant responsible officers. It is not clear where such a unit could reside organizationally in the restructured MEC, or what its staffing or authority might be, but it seems like an idea worth investigating further. It seemed very common for individuals to be able to cite anecdotal evidence of really outrageous particular inefficiencies or inequities, but with the feeling that nobody had the time, the

authority, or the professional competence to do anything systematic about them. The idea of a special studies unit, with broad investigative powers and its own, protected, budget, reporting direct to top management (the PS or the Minister himself), might be one that could substantially ease the transition through which the MEC is going, if it was appropriately staffed.

Fourth, it will be a considerable time before good expenditure data on a school basis are available, and also before good data on parent and community contributions are available on a widespread basis. In the interim, it might well be useful to perform some school-based cost studies, at perhaps half a dozen or so schools, to clearly document the range of per learner cost and of parent and community contributions. This could perhaps be a first activity by a special studies unit if it were to be established.

Fifth, it became clear in the course of the workshops and other meetings, that the vast majority of staff in the MEC headquarters did not have a strategy for estimating the recurrent cost implications of the changes they were responsible for planning and attempting to implement. This is a dangerous situation, which could easily lead the reform into great difficulties. Staff seemed receptive to the idea that when they were planning innovations such as curriculum reform, they needed to consider the recurrent cost implications of what they were proposing, but they did not know how to go about doing it. As a matter of urgency, the MEC should consider how to go about giving training to all MEC staff, including advisors, on how to incorporate consideration of recurrent cost implications into their innovation and reform proposals. Presumably, eventually the Planning Directorate and its new Financial Planning unit will have responsibility for coordinating the recurrent cost implications of reform and growth proposals, so it would seem logical to also give this unit the responsibility for enlightening staff in other units of the MEC on how to make estimates of recurrent cost implications of their ideas.

### 3. Priority Actions

Given the constraints and opportunities that have already been noted and analyzed, it is apparent that immediate next steps should be taken with a view to building on what already exists and recognizing the financial and human resource constraints in the system. Priority attention should be given to:

- ▶ Completing the planning for financial, personnel, and physical information systems and beginning implementation;
- ▶ Establishing mechanisms for coordinating the information systems and for integrating resource allocation and the information systems;
- ▶ Strengthening the capacity of the regional offices.

It is highly desirable that immediate actions build incrementally on existing documents and policies, e.g., by refinement and greater specificity in parts of the Framework and Action Plan. The MEC should, therefore, elaborate sections 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 1.1.5, 1.1.6, 1.1.7, and 1.2 of the Action Plan, identifying those items within those sections on which action will be initiated during 1993 and 1994, and provide for each item so identified an implementation timetable with, where possible, quantified targets for achievements in calendar years 1993 and 1994. Particular

emphasis should be placed on section 1.1.7 concerning regions, including quantified targets for staffing and training of regional offices.

## **B. Establishing and Monitoring Performance Standards for the Education System**

Two critical aspects of the planning and management of the basic education reform are the definition of the education system's performance standards and the effective monitoring of those standards by means of an educational management information system. The MEC's Action Plan calls for the setting of performance standards related to access and equity, quality and efficiency. The Plan singles out an important role for the Educational Management Information System (EMIS) currently handled largely by the Information, Statistics and Data Division (ISDD) of the Ministry and refers to the Ministry's need for an applied research capability presumably falling under the National Institute for Educational Development (NIED). The linkage between ISDD and NIED is not clear nor is their relationship with testing and assessment worked out at this time.

The review team devoted substantial attention to the review of performance standards or indicators and the related acquisition and use of information. The analysis of that review follows.

### **I. Accomplishments**

A fully operational education management information system has the capacity to capture, integrate, analyze and report a wide range of information that is important to policy makers, planners, and managers and to the general public that finances education and reaps the results of the system's performance. The MEC is on the way to developing a comprehensive information system, but is in the early stages of the process. Concerted effort during the past year has produced remarkable results. They include:

- ▶ Initial exploration of indicators for monitoring the reform of basic education;
- ▶ Collection and reporting of the 15th School-Day Statistics and Annual Education Census;
- ▶ Implementation of school mapping;
- ▶ Completion of the baseline learner assessment;
- ▶ Staff training offered by Cambridge in developing, setting, marking and grading the IGCSE; training will be put to use for grade 10 examinations;
- ▶ Research undertaken that contributes to creating an applied research capability in NIED (i.e., five primary school case studies and an English language teaching survey of 16 schools);

- ▶ Initial discussions with the Ministry of Finance concerning the consistency of their proposed "universal" macro information system and the MEC's information system;
- ▶ Investigation of the requirements of a personnel information system in preparation for a forthcoming consultancy;
- ▶ Initiation of the development of a micro financial information system to track expenses per budget line;
- ▶ Completion of the ISDD costing study;
- ▶ Production of a plan to collect information on school facilities;
- ▶ Piloting of the 15th School-Day data collection in two regions, Rundu and Khorixas, leading to lessons learned for further regionalization;
- ▶ Increase in the dissemination and use of ISDD data during 1992 with several notable outreach efforts;
- ▶ Training of three staff members in educational planning and policy analysis at the Harvard Institute for International Development summer workshop.

ISDD has made impressive progress in terms of data collection, processing, and especially, integrating educational data with geographic and demographic information and other information in a GIS. The ability to call up school data, or any given geographic collectivity of school data, and correlate them with census data is impressive and potentially extremely useful. This is a great achievement.

ISDD also has many other achievements to its credit and has produced an internal ISDD workplan for 1993, in which a large number of tasks are identified, costed in terms of professional personnel-days, and prioritized. It is impressive. However, it suffers from a few difficulties. First, the prioritization is not, perhaps, ideal, in that it tends to concentrate heavily on analysis of data already available and extension of data on institutions to those not yet fully covered, such as DANFE, the University, hostels, physical facilities, and teacher education. Little emphasis is given to the issue of personnel, financial, and expenditure data, which everyone agreed in the relevant workshop should be of high priority. Second, the identified work for 1993 would require a minimum of 10 to 12 professional staff, whereas in fact ISDD currently has three professional staff, and the opinion of MEC officials was that even if exemption from the hiring freeze could be obtained, it was unlikely that more than a very few potential Namibian professional staff were available for recruitment.

## 2. Issues, Concerns, Constraints and Opportunities

Performance indicators for monitoring basic education reform are addressed in the document submitted 24 December 1992 titled "Program Indicators for Monitoring Basic Education Reform," produced in satisfaction of tranche 3 Condition 4.2.1 (a). This document is the

outcome of considerable discussion within the Ministry, particularly by staff of ISDD and others directly involved with the reform program. The team discussed issues concerning indicators with many staff of the Ministry, and in general was very impressed with the level of professional knowledge displayed and the sensitivity to both the theoretical and measurement difficulties associated with indicators.

Although the relevant document shows a commendable awareness of the difficulties, both theoretical and practical, in devising an appropriate system of indicators for monitoring what an educational system is trying to achieve, it errs on the cautious side in what it actually proposes to do. This, perhaps, reflects an overly perfectionist approach to the indicator issue. An ideal system of indicators is never attainable, because it is not possible in practice to ever measure educational value added with any confidence or reliability. All indicator systems are therefore imperfect, approximate, and to the purist, crude, and this is unavoidable. However, the fact that an indicator is neither conceptually ideal nor 100% accurate does not mean it is not useful; everything depends on the purpose for which the indicator is to be used. To give a trivial example, if the criterion of acceptability were 100% accuracy, a totally inoperative analogue clock is enormously more acceptable than one that loses one second a day (which will only be 100% accurate once every 11<sup>8</sup> years, as opposed to twice a day for the wholly broken one); however, we all know which clock we would rather have for most practical purposes.

In the workshop on indicators conducted by the review team, some other reasons for caution on the commitment to specific indicators did emerge, or can be inferred from the discussion. Some officers of the MEC clearly worried about potential distortions of behavior induced by an inappropriate choice of indicator. In effect, they are concerned about the possibility of an Averbch-Johnson effect, namely that if an indicator is chosen, much effort may be diverted into ensuring good performance in terms of the indicator, and if the indicator is not fully appropriate this may be counterproductive in terms of the true objectives of the reform. A related, if not identical, concern is that specific quantitative goals may be imposed on the MEC by donors, specifically USAID, if the MEC commits to a particular indicator. A third reason for apparent foot-dragging on commitment to specific indicators appears to be simply a feeling on the part of MEC staff that this is a requirement imposed from outside, and given staff constraints and the urgency of other tasks, MEC staff should choose their own priorities and not jump to meet the desires of outside agencies. There seems to be an unnecessary disjuncture between documents and indicators which are produced specifically for USAID and documents and indicators which could be seen to be more useful broadly for the Ministry's own purposes. Currently, the ISDD is collecting data which will be extremely helpful both for the Ministry's own purposes as well as for USAID's tracking of the basic education reform. There remains considerable reluctance to commit to additional indicators beyond those mentioned in the document cited above.

However, there does seem to be some agreement among the staff that there is a need to set standards and to gauge the progress of the reform. There appeared to be general acceptance that information existed that could be presented in the form of a general overview of the education system and how it was changing. There are many statistics which could help to provide a broad, descriptive overview of the progress made since Independence, but which are not being used adequately for this purpose. None of the documents examined, including the "Annual Review" of 1992, provides a comprehensive snapshot that places Namibia's educational reform in

perspective. A first draft of a statistical yearbook has been put together, but as was explained to the team, due to other work pressures, has not been given a high priority.

There is a hollow ring to pointing out any shortcomings regarding the production of more statistics than are already being produced. Staff shortages in the ISDD limit the production of the array of information identified as high priority, no less other outputs. There is no lack of vision in terms of what could and should be produced. The action framework and the highly detailed 1993 year plan is evidence of what the ISDD envisages.

At the end of the day, the purpose of an EMIS is to produce data in such a way as to facilitate management, planning and policy formulation. Educational census data is the front end of the system; indicators based on census data point in the direction of further, targeted research necessary to explain anomalies incapable of being answered by routine data collection exercises. An EMIS should serve the head office in these capacities, but it should also serve the regions, as well as the wider public, indeed, the consumers of education. There is more that is capable of being measured from available statistics than is being quantified and disseminated at present. A less conservative use of the data at hand would facilitate a broad, descriptive overview of the educational system, what is being requested of the Ministry by USAID, but which should also serve the Ministry's and the wider public's needs regarding information dissemination about the changes at hand.

Indicators and monitoring systems are needed to track the progress of the goals of the reform. They are indicators and measures of equity and access, efficiency of operations and quality including learner proficiency. Each of these standards for the system is analyzed below.

#### ▲ **Equity and Access**

Equity of access, the term used in the MEC document, brings together two indicators. It is understood and accepted that the notion of access should not mean access to a school of any standard; rather, it should mean access to schools of certain, basic quality standards. Nonetheless, the MEC at present separates out access from equity in the indicators proposed, and equity gets shortchanged, in terms of any reporting before 1994. The longer term goal is appreciated, but it is necessary to have some "feel" for the disparities in standards of schools across the region, and more imperfect measures may be appropriate in the short term.

The different access indicators to be reported (beginning with 1993) make sense, approaching more finely honed measures of net, as opposed to gross enrollment, as data become available, and reporting enrollment numbers having a baseline of 1989 or 1990 in the short term. Plans are also in hand to define basic quality standards with the notion of reporting in 1994 access, presumably, to schools of these minimum standards.

In the meantime there are other data which could be used to describe disparities in the educational system as rougher indicators of equity. What follows is an enumeration of data which could be used in describing disparities in the educational system. All of these data can be obtained from the 15th School-Day Statistics Form or the AEC. (Age-cohort figures presume that the national census data are available.)

## **Facilities**

- ▶ Number of schools per learner per age cohort by region;
- ▶ Number of outdoor spaces per learner per age cohort by region;
- ▶ Cubicles per learner;
- ▶ % platoons; number of platoons by level by region;
- ▶ % double sessions; number of double sessions by level and by region;
- ▶ Learners per classroom per region by age cohort;
- ▶ Learners per laboratory per region by age cohort;
- ▶ Learners per library per region by age cohort;
- ▶ % without offices per region;
- ▶ % without lavatories per region;
- ▶ % schools with water, electricity, telephone at school per region;
- ▶ Houses per teacher per region;
- ▶ Single accommodation per teacher per region;
- ▶ Houses/single accommodation per teacher per school per region.

## **Repetition**

- ▶ % failure by grade by level by gender by region;
- ▶ % 2 repetition types by gender by region.

## **Teachers**

- ▶ Ordinary teaching staff per learner per region;
- ▶ Additional teaching staff per learner per region;
- ▶ Non-teaching (unfortunately only non-hostel) staff per learner per region;
- ▶ % with professional qualifications per learner per age cohort per region;
- ▶ % in four band qualifications per learner per age cohort per region;

- ▶ Years teaching experience by region;
- ▶ Number in four salary bands by region;
- ▶ % in four salary bands by region;
- ▶ % in four salary bands by subject by region;
- ▶ Number by academic qualifications by region;
- ▶ % by academic qualifications by region.

### **Classes**

- ▶ Learners per class per region;
- ▶ % in schools with class size band of x to x.

### **Learners**

- ▶ Average age by gender by region ;
- ▶ % overage by some definition by grade by level by gender by region (by circuit).

### **Instructional Materials**

- ▶ Number of texts per learner per subject per region;
- ▶ % sharing texts per region.

Most of the above measures could be utilized in one form or another. The year 1988 could be used as the baseline for the learner and teacher numbers and categories. Other measures are more problematic, with respect to comparable data from earlier years; for instance, measures of repetition, pass/fail, class group sizes, double-sessioning, platooning, multigrade classes, school facilities including teachers' housing, and instructional materials. More recent baselines would have to be used, and in some cases, there would need to be better definitions of what is being measured ( e.g., with respect to instructional materials). It was suggested that a flow chart illustrating the different transition rates as they have changed would be useful. In addition, enrollments by subject by school by region would be a further measure in the direction of addressing equity concerns. It was suggested that further data concerning adult and non-formal education enrollments which are collected outside the ISDD should also be considered for inclusion. Numbers of hostels - information not collected within the ISDD but within other parts of the MEC - were a final addition to the list. It could not be said that in discussions with MEC officials any consensus was reached on a final product. Rather, the suggestions above represent a first attempt at the descriptive measures that might be included in a statistical yearbook.

The MEC has been considering different potential indicators of basic quality standards, in order to infuse some meaning into the term equity of access, as noted above. The determination of basic quality standards for Namibian schools is likely to necessitate many compromises along the way, however. On the one hand, there are the rough and ready measures of inputs which can be used to describe changes in the system, as enumerated above, but as the MEC document states:

To include inputs that are not known to be related to outcomes would be meaningless (p.3).

These are very strong words, implying very high ideals. It is important to question whether the process of linking inputs definitively to learner outcomes can match such high ideals. The document goes on to state that "Now that the MEC has the learner proficiency baseline data for primary level, analysis of school factors helping to explain variation in learner performance will start..." Stepping back from this plan, how can it be carried out, and what can result from such an exercise? There are several options.

The first option considers bivariate relationships: Test for significant relationships between average class scores with inputs at the class or school level, given that only one class per grade per school was selected. Some of the inputs that can be tested in relation to these scores are: class size; teacher's professional qualifications; teacher's academic qualifications; teacher's years of teaching experience; teacher's age; teacher's gender; teacher's home language; average age of learners in class; proportion of learners speaking particular languages; whether the class is a multigrade class; proportion of repeaters in class (only in schools in which there is only one class per grade, however); numbers of texts per learner in English or math (only in schools in which there is only one class per grade, however); double-sessioning at school; platooning at school; public vs. private school; school size; school type; index of school facilities; proportion repeating at school; learner/teacher ratio at school; proportion of teachers with particular professional qualifications; proportion of teachers with particular academic qualifications; proportion of female teachers; principal's professional qualifications; principal's academic qualifications; principal's years teaching experience; principal's gender; numbers of houses/single accommodation per teacher; and, whether there is water, electricity, or telephone at or near the school.

The second option considers multivariate relationships: Regress class level proficiency on sets of some of the above factors until the maximum variance in proficiency has been explained.

It is not possible to account for confounding effects in bivariate relationships. This means that before one starts, one is out on a limb. Who is to say that the presence of a significant relationship between, say class size and proficiency is still present when other conditions prevail, such as the teacher's having good professional qualifications? So is one going to determine significant linkages of inputs with learning on the basis of such a methodology?

In regression analysis, by simultaneously controlling for the effects of different variables, one is able to approach a more complex model. However, the research design for testing relationships between school or class level inputs and proficiency levels is inherently weak. Although learner level data have been captured, they will have to be analyzed in aggregate form

because one is unable to control for other learner level factors which would confound the measurement of the proficiency level achieved. There is no measurement of socio-economic background, so its confounding influence cannot be separated from the proficiency measure. An SES measure is particularly important in the absence of any earlier measurement of achievement (understood to be impossible, as, indeed, the rationale for producing these assessment tests is the creation of a baseline measure!) Further, having to deal at the class/school level constrains the goal of the exercise. For instance, a question one would want to ask is, "Does class size affect a learner's proficiency?" But all one could infer would be the effect on the average class proficiency level. This is unsatisfactory. Apparently, it was intended also to include socio-economic data about the school's region as a means of controlling for variations outside the school influencing proficiency. Previous efforts to control for SES in aggregate in many different settings have been vilified in the literature, on methodological grounds. To reiterate, one cannot make inferences at the level of the learner on the basis of aggregate statistics.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to use the baseline assessment - at this stage - as a backdoor route to a school effectiveness study, essentially what one is getting at in trying to establish linkages between "quality" inputs and proficiency in English or math. What can be done? There are two options. The first option necessitates a divorce from the purism of the linkages one would like to establish between basic quality inputs and proficiency (or achievement, in the longer run, or, indeed, whatever outcome one wanted to measure - retention has also been suggested). Through a series of discussions of the data points noted in the first section of this document, agreement will have to be reached as to what package of measurements should form an indicator of progress in achieving a certain standard, and hence measuring equity of access, i.e., to quality institutions.

The difficulty is that ideally one would want to measure process changes, e.g., changed teachers' practices, in addition simply to increases or changes in the provision of physical inputs such as more textbooks. The more meaningful indicators are more problematic. No fussing with the lists of possible measures above is going to solve this dilemma. If one accepts that trained teachers and textbooks are likely to be the most significant physical inputs to the system and those which necessitate the most change, then monitoring changes in their provision will probably be the best compromise. If one wants to measure inservice training to upgrade teachers, different data from that currently being collected will have to be gathered. If one wants to monitor which types of textbooks are reaching the classroom, then similarly, further data collection will be required. It is unfortunate that most hopes were placed on deriving "significant" relationships from further analysis of studies such as the baseline assessment or the correlation of physical inputs with retention rates; neither approach provides the answer.

One choice, the minimalist approach, would be to modify the data captured on teachers' qualifications to include inservice training contact time or completion of upgrading and monitor this. In addition, it would be worthwhile to continue to monitor the number of textbooks per subject per learner. One might like to go the next step to monitor the number of textbooks per subject per grade per learner, but trying to finesse more detailed statistics on textbooks in routine data collection is inadvisable. Finally, some measure of the upgrading of principals' skills, e.g., contact time in inservice training, would round off the monitoring of the most significant levers to change, if not the changes themselves within the classroom.

Another choice is to carry out a school effectiveness study designed for the purpose not only of establishing linkages between inputs and proficiency, achievement, or retention, but also relationships between the processes and social organizations within schools and the wider community which mediate these more physical 'input' linkages. This tack would provide better information (but still not perfect!) on the interrelationships between physical inputs, processes, social organization of the class as well as school, and so help in determining the most significant variables to monitor for basic quality standards related to more **meaningful** inputs. It is likely, however, that **routine** monitoring of quantitative inputs, even if these are shown to be **linked** to outcomes, will still have to fall back on data captured as suggested in the first option. The only alternative, and this would be longer term, would be to try to quantify systematic, qualitative reporting by school inspectors. There is no doubt that this would be more informative, but it is likely to be much too ambitious in the short run. If the school effectiveness route is to be followed, further discussion will have to take place concerning the use of the new proficiency tests (see quality, below), or others, or the use of different outcome measures, such as retention. Ideally it would be possible to build on these baseline measures and test the same set of learners and collect other learner, class and school data of interest. Of course, producing a full-fledged school effectiveness study would have ramifications considerably beyond the identification of basic quality standards!

The longitudinal study being carried out in twenty schools will be a significant contribution to the process of determining basic quality standards and should indicate directions, even if it cannot be definitive, either for the purpose of the creation of such standards or for measuring school effectiveness. Although analysis of the variance between schools/classes is constrained by the small number of schools/classes sampled per grade, the richness of the longitudinal data, tracking individual learners over several years, should be used to monitor progress in these schools toward achieving basic quality standards. This may sound a bit chicken and egg-ish, but the idea is that the first wave of analyses should inform later analyses, building from raw, untested hypotheses regarding appropriate minimum standards to more refined ones. This will involve, necessarily, a gamut of variables to be collected in the first instance, to ensure that the net is spread wide at the outset.

#### ▲ **Efficiency**

The motivation for developing efficiency indicators is assumed to be twofold. First, they are a management tool, that permit monitoring, to at least some degree, of the efficiency with which the resources of government, and of learners, parents, and communities, committed to the education system are being used. Second, they are an accountability tool, that permits monitoring of the stewardship of resources by those given responsibility for them.

Currently, the 15th School-Day survey and the AEC provide ISDD with information on learners, teachers, and minimal information on school physical facilities by school, which can then be aggregated in various ways. This is good. However, this is achieved by specific data collection procedures controlled and maintained by ISDD. Administrative procedures with respect to finance, personnel, physical distribution of inputs such as books and materials, and physical facilities are not such that these can be meaningfully associated with individual schools or school levels. The educational system in Namibia, and the size of the MEC operation itself, are sufficiently small that it should be feasible to devise ways to permit integration of data from

these four administrative functions with the educational data on learners and teachers per se by school. Doing this will neither be easy nor a short-term task, but it should become a long-term objective of the MEC, because a truly useful EMIS system is not likely without it (just as a rational resource allocation system is not likely to be feasible without it).

Achieving this objective will require not only technical expertise and changes in how the MEC does business, notably in the personnel, finance, and physical distribution divisions (including in regional offices), but also very considerable organizational, political, and administrative skills. It would be presumptive at this stage to try to outline how this objective should be approached in detail. As discussed earlier in the Chapter, administrative and procedural changes, particularly with respect to how information is recorded, stored, transmitted, and aggregated, are necessary. The obvious key issue is that in reviewing these matters, and designing new systems, the interests of EMIS must be taken into account, so that such information is available to the EMIS system in a form appropriate to EMIS needs. One obvious requirement will, eventually, be computerization of regional finance offices and personnel functions, as well as physical distribution of books, materials, etc. It was extremely disturbing to learn that some directorates of the MEC are already beginning to place computers in regional offices, but without any form of coordination or overall plan. This is not only likely to result in duplication and unnecessary levels of cost, but could also produce incompatibilities in systems that will lead to great difficulties in producing suitable data for the EMIS. There does in theory exist an office in the PM's office to coordinate computerization, but most divisions go to great lengths to avoid the official procedures, because of the delays they introduce. It might be highly desirable for top management in the MEC to introduce its own coordinating and approval mechanism for introduction of computers and systems, so long as the procedures adopted were designed to be rapid and were staffed with appropriate personnel.

Turning to specific features of the Ministry's plan for establishing and measuring efficiency indicators, cycle costs are rejected because of the lack of reliable cost data. This is, currently, wholly justifiable, in that it is a correct statement that the Ministry does not as yet have systems in place that would permit reliable estimation of costs by grade, level, region, or school. Cycle costs are therefore not a sensible indicator to try to estimate at present, although as noted elsewhere it would be desirable for the Ministry to begin work on the development of financial, personnel, and physical information systems that would permit the generation of usable cost estimates. It is also desirable, and participants in workshops agreed with this, to start to develop data on contributions toward the cost of education by parents and communities, both through school fund fees and through contributions in kind and specific fund-raising activities. In the TCC sub-committee, it was noted that after the new Education Act is passed, it may be possible to promulgate new regulations on school boards and committees, and school funds, that may facilitate reporting of such data as well as providing a firmer and more specific legal basis for school boards and committees, particularly with respect to their mode of election, powers, and responsibilities.

In the MFC document, cycle time and repetition are rejected as efficiency indicators for a variety of reasons, some of which amount in effect to a perfectionist view of the reason for which indicators are desired. Of course repetition is largely a policy determined number, also influenced by factors totally outside the control of the Ministry. Of course, such indicators, if interpreted in an isolated and purist manner, implicitly assume no change in educational value

added per grade completed. This is not the point; they remain crude indicators of the efficiency of the system. They should neither be reported nor interpreted in isolation; they need to be accompanied and qualified by indicators of quality, which are unlikely to be perfect either, and by text discussing the reasons the Ministry believes the numbers are changing in the way they are.

It is not clear why the Ministry prefers completion rate to cycle time. The use of completion rate to the exclusion of other indicators implicitly assumes that the education delivered to those learners who do not complete the course was of no value, which seems a more radical and inappropriate assumption than those that lead the Ministry to reject other indicators.

The greatest current concern with the position of the Ministry as reflected in this document is that it does not reflect any coherent strategy with respect to efficiency indicators, nor does it appear to recognize the legitimate accountability argument for urgency in producing some simple, crude indicators immediately. It would be desirable for the Ministry to overcome its reluctance to commit to any specific numbers, and adopt immediately a limited set of crude, simple indicators for which data are already available, at the same time adopting a workplan to expand and refine the set of indicators that will, in the long term, provide a better method for monitoring the efficiency of the system.

In the short run, the data available now, from the 15th School-Day questionnaire and the AEC, would permit the calculation of the following crude indicators related to efficiency:

- ▶ **Learner/teacher ratios.** This should be reported as a national average, by region, and possibly by circuit. It would be desirable to also report maximum and minimum values by school, and to report the percentage of children in schools where the value of the ratio lies within some target range (such as 30 to 35), and the percentages in schools where the ratio is above and below that range, although these are as much equity indicators as efficiency ones.
- ▶ **Implicit cycle time and completion rates.** The data collected can be used to derive apparent transition rates from one school year to the next (proportion promoted, repeating, or leaving). If we assume migration cancels out nationally, and there are no dropouts, it is then possible to calculate, on the assumption that the transition rates remain unchanged and an arbitrary assumption concerning multiple repetition, average years of schooling per graduate ('cycle time,' I presume); on-time graduation rate; and eventual graduation rate. These are synthetic, artificial, and crude indicators, that shift in response to policy changes (e.g., on repetition and promotion), but they are nevertheless useful indicators that are relatively easy to understand. With rather more heroic assumptions on migration, they can be calculated on a regional basis or even for individual schools, although it is doubtful whether this is worthwhile except as an equity indicator. However calculated, they need to be reported along with quality indicators if the latter are changing, because of the danger, otherwise, of misinterpretation.

- ▶ Percentage of learners more than x years overage by grade and region and, perhaps, also by circuit. The AEC data permit derivation of this indicator, in fact by school; what value x should take should be subject to discussion. Three years might be a reasonable starting point.
- ▶ Gross enrollment and (budgeted) expenditure per learner-year, by region. This is available and is a crude indicator but nevertheless an indicator. When information systems are improved, it could be improved by reporting actual expenditure per learner-year, and extending the disaggregation by level.
- ▶ Gross completion. This can also be reported by level, and eventually also expenditure per completer by level. It is not clear quite what is proposed as "completion rate" by MEC. Number of completers divided by enrollment in the level could be a useful indicator, but is of course subject to the same problems with respect to repetition etc. as other indicators.

#### ▲ **Quality and Learner Proficiency**

Namibia's commitment to reform makes it clear that changes will continue to be rapid, constrained only by resource limitations and the increasingly heavy burden on administrative agencies. Both internal and external pressures will mount to justify and accredit the expansionary and methodological accomplishments. Information about the "quality" of these efforts will grow in importance.

One of the main indicators of quality for education systems is information about the achievements and attainments of learners resulting from their participation in formal schooling. This is not easy information to accumulate. In most cases, the information takes the form of classroom tests and national examinations. The fields of testing and examinations in Namibia are relatively new concerns for many segments of the Ministry. In earlier days, responsibility for exams was delegated to external authorities and little attention was given to the development of internal capability for either classroom or national assessments.

There is a long-term need for development of an assessment system and the preliminary review of current paths and initiatives in basic education that will contribute to that development. There is currently only one national examination for basic education; this is the new Junior Secondary Certificate Examination (JSCE), administered at grade 10. In 1992, four schools sat the exam, and in 1993 it is the intention to administer the exam nationally, thus replacing an older junior certificate exam set externally. Because of changes in the grade 12 (standard 10) examination; (i.e., by subscribing to the International General Senior Certificate of Education of the Cambridge syndicate), about 200 teachers were trained in test development, marking, and grading of marks by Cambridge. This is the pool of limited expertise currently available for the localization of the junior secondary examination. The JSCE is administered by the Directorate of Examinations. This body is primarily concerned with the administration and processing of exams and is not a center of testing expertise. With the possible exception of the University of Namibia's education faculty, there is no real expertise available to help plan or provide

evaluative and technical assistance on the development of an assessment system within Namibia's basic education program.

Two sets of factors influence the implementation of learner proficiency assessment. They are organizational constraints and technical considerations. Each is discussed below.

Organizational constraints on assessment are several and can be explained. The urgency for change and the implementation of the new educational vision have provided the impetus to vast reformation of the structural elements of educational administration and the expansion of access to schooling. New schools, teachers, learners, and curriculum generate many inconsistencies between form (what is planned and hoped for in the new vision) and reality (what is actually happening and accomplished). Gaps between the ideals of the modern vision of education and educational practice are characteristic of modern education everywhere. With the rapid changes in Namibia, organized as they have been around the most sweeping modern notions of "learner-centered" education, such inconsistencies are probably very substantial. Elsewhere, these inconsistencies are tamed by organizational entities that attend to these alignments, such that teachers are better trained, learners are convinced of the benefits of education and better prepared for those outcomes, and the curriculum is operationalized through multiple instructional strategies to enliven its paper conceptualizations. This is not yet the case in Namibia. The organizational forms are not in place yet. The central Ministry is reorganizing, the teacher education institutions are being recast and reconstituted, schools and the teacher cadre are growing beyond the materials and curriculum supply, and most new and old learners are not well prepared for the new language and curricular requirements. Thus, there is no organizational response-capability to assessment and evaluative information.

This is not an unusual situation in the development context. The infrastructural requirements to "do" something are not always the same as the requirements to "assess and evaluate" something. The rush to meet the greater needs of the polity will necessarily outstrip the attention to the quality of that effort. And it frequently seems that it is more difficult to develop a useful and accurate information architecture than to develop politically sensitive initiatives and actions. The real problem, as clearly understood by the leadership of Namibia's education program, is to keep the ideals alive through processes that move toward goals, and not to formalize definitions and rely on formal specifications and evaluations too quickly. At the remotest schools, education officials speak in terms of "learners" (reference to learner-centered) and understand the reform agenda. The social marketing agenda of the reform has been a clear success. There are no doubt substantial deficiencies in the system, but whatever relative inadequacies could be identified, the organization is not well endowed to deal with particular problems of quality. In this case, progress will result more from a focus on goals and process rather than an emphasis on standards and rationalistic notions of accountability.

These conditions do not preclude the usefulness of and necessity for assessment and evaluative information. They do, however, place the needs in perspective. External agencies, as well as developing internal entities (e.g., NIED), will press for assessment data to get some handle on quality concerns. There are many legitimate problems that can only be addressed with good information about learner proficiency. With limited resources, as soon as political needs are addressed, there will be the need to weigh the benefits of quality versus expansion. The MEC must accommodate these informational needs both to ensure continuing external support and

effective internal development, even if recognizing the limitations of current information and the long road to infrastructural development of the information architecture. Within this context, the following comments will attend to realistic possibilities in the provision of learner proficiency information and deemphasize critical, idealistic recommendations.

In addition to organizational factors, there is a host of technical considerations related to testing. Although the attainment of some proficiency alone is not sufficient to proclaim the success of an instructional program, it is an important ingredient and information about learner proficiency is essential to the evaluation and management of the reform program. Education is a complex area where problems and opportunities are interrelated and interconnected, and the goals and technologies are only weakly linked. Adding to the ambiguities, the assessment of proficiencies is problematic. There must always be texture and context to interpret even the best attempts at measurement. Good assessments provide the bases for good management and development.

Namibia has the rudiments of an assessment system. The accomplishments are more of form than substance, but the pieces can be put together to provide useful information for the ongoing reform effort. The following comments relate specifically to the extant context.

First, implementation of the instructional program accompanying the reform is emergent rather than spontaneous and immediate. Different schools adopt different levels of any new initiative and the quality of implementation varies dramatically (e.g., one official estimated that about 50% of the reform was actually in place in one region). The language policy is new and different syllabi (old and new) are operational. To recognize these existent variations, the new tests in English, math, and Oshindonga spanned both old and new instructional intentions. Validity is general rather than specifically curricular; that is, the tests cover the skills to be developed but are not tied to any specific curriculum/test blueprints. Accordingly, it would be difficult to interpret changes in scores, which is essential for the use of the tests as baselines. If possible, the tests should be "unpacked" to establish multiple baselines so that differences from year to year can be reasonably attributed to specific developments. Programmatic attributions are always problematic; multiple baselines provide some fabric and texture to the interpretations. A counter argument might be that any "change" would be fine and specific attributions are unnecessary. The problem is that unless the assessments are fine-tuned, they will be overrun by errors and insensitive to changes. Gross scores can mask more targeted changes. The difficulty for multiple measures is that they may not have been well developed because they had no referent attachments to curricular specificities.

Second, the tests of English, math, and Oshindonga were developed as individual differences tests. Interpretations of change are difficult in any case with such tests. What does it mean if there is a "statistically significant" change? What is it a change of? How do you know if it is important or related to programmatic influences? Problems of change measurement are complex. The problems arise in the first case from the ambiguity of quantitative assumptions in the measurement of educational constructs. The major problem for Namibia, however, is that there is little expertise in any of the aspects of measurement. It would be tough enough to develop good "representational" measures with professional assistance -- witness the complexities inherent in national assessment programs around the world and the international IEA comparative research programs, and they do not have to contend with the additional complexities of change. One recommendation would be to identify those features of the program that can be clearly

specified in test blueprint terms (as argued below this will not include many important outcomes), and develop precise, mastery-based tests to provide a national assessment of the success of the curriculum (many tests could be "borrowed" and revised from other sources for this purpose). A report card or profile of accomplishments would provide formative evaluative/diagnostic information for the management of the reform implementation.

Third, learner proficiencies in the core subjects of education are only a part of the educational initiative in Namibia (and elsewhere). Many aspects of education are not as easily specified as the skill components. When we move to cognitive development, the complexities of valid measurement increase. This is particularly true at the lower levels, where language difficulties are greatest and cognitive processes are emerging. If we did not need to be concerned about resources, the approaches might include extended ("portfolio") measures and individual assessments where processes can be investigated as well as solutions assessed. This is such an important aspect of education. Perhaps with the emphasis on expansion, the assessment program could focus on the features outlined in the second point, above, and could begin to develop these more difficult areas in the future (again, examples can be collected from other systems). At the moment, it may be fair to say that education is being provided to as many people as possible but the quality of that agency will be diverse across the nation as undertrained teachers attempt to provide some minimal or at least basic program to these new learners. In fact, it should be noted that the prediction on many of these measures would be that the scores would go down as the system expands (rote memory items might be exceptions). If and when marginal teachers and learners enter the system; tests should reflect the inevitable developmental problems. It would be a major achievement for the Namibian education system to remain at some stable level of learner proficiency while the expansion and reform are underway.

Fourth, even more difficult to measure are the myriad of aesthetic, moral, and social concerns of education. Few of these concerns can be assessed by single occasion, unitary construct measures. In this area, it may be feasible to develop "scenario" lists which describe the kinds of experiences that would be necessary to develop these more complex arrays of behaviors, attitudes, perceptions, and cognition. By checking the conditions for development, we shall know if appropriate activities are included in the instructional program.

Fifth, learner proficiencies are difficult to influence. As already indicated, the most likely reflection of change would be those features of education that are most easily specified -- those that lend themselves to behavioral objectives. This is not to imply that they are necessarily the most important; since they can be specified, however, they can more easily be targeted in the instructional program and assessed. From the standpoint of baseline data, this is the most tractable starting point. For other areas of influence, focused case studies might be the best way to collect more extensive evaluative information. In fact, the case study approach, already utilized on a limited basis in the research program, is very important in this context.

Sixth, assessment and measurement activities require considerable technical capabilities. There is no evidence that there is local expertise in these areas. The lack of infrastructure and personnel is a significant block to development management. Unfortunately, to monitor and collect information for development decisions, there must be a reasonable information architecture in place. But that is unlikely until there is further development. The MEC documents suggest one way of dealing with this situation. By assuming that the tests, as

developed, have general validity, then correlates of inputs and processes with these tests could serve as indicators that learner proficiency in each area is likely to be influenced by the program. This is a "weak" argument but the information infrastructure is also weak. The problems with correlational arguments are well known. Furthermore, those features that correlate may not in fact be features that will be targeted in the reform program. It has to be remembered that indicators merely "indicate"; they don't measure constructs directly. An indicator under one condition may not be an indicator under another one. Indicators work best when embedded in a context and an argument. Considering the problems outlined so far, now we have three aspects to the assessment package: measures of behavioral objectives, case studies that probe for effects, and indicators that have established relationships with important development outcomes. None of these features alone are particularly persuasive, but together they may help build a portrait of learning possibilities and likelihoods for learners in Namibia.

Seventh, there are other kinds of assessment information in the system. Teachers routinely give examinations. The exams are checked prior to administration to the learners by either the headmaster or the headmaster and a committee, including department heads. In the future, subject advisors may also be involved in checking the standards of papers to be set for schools. Marks of the learners are recorded and those records retained for sometimes 5 years or so. It would be worth gathering some of these records to check on pass rates over time and across the program. This information is not without problems. Teachers are not trained in test development, and neither necessarily are headmasters, department heads, or subject advisors. Field officials indicate that in their opinion, the exams are weighted toward rote memory at best; in some cases the language used in the paper is confused and ambiguous so scores would be difficult to interpret. Besides the fact that this is a serious problem that needs attention in the preservice teacher education reform, this does mean that pass rate is a "weak" indicator of educational outcome. The Instant Project has begun some training in classroom testing in mathematics and science (junior secondary), so perhaps the future of school data will be better. At a macro level there is another source of assessment information about the instructional program. Inspectors report to the regional office about the status and problems of the instructional program. If these reports were improved (when travel is possible), then more continuous assessment would be available and more subjective aspects of progress and deficiencies could be reported, as well as likely improvement in the supervision of technical classroom/school items and activities. A last and very macro assessment indicator would be the 10th grade examination results, with junior secondary and the bundle of feeder schools attributed with the outcome. Again, as a collection these indicators add to the "story" and the argument for progress or deficiency.

Eighth, indicators sometimes inadvertently become targets themselves. This can lead to distressing situations. For example, despite the value of pass rates and their institutional relevance, there was expressed some serious concern about publicizing these as indicators of quality (such that the more learners who pass the better the teacher/school). In some cases, it was clear that the pass rate was considered the "standard" of the school. In terms of the reform objectives to encourage increased access and integration, schools act to "protect" these rates and select learners who are less likely to change the standards to fill their quotas. The package of indicators must be selected carefully to avoid negative side effects.

Ninth, much of what is going on in schools/regions can be called "improving instructional readiness" rather than presuming instructional preparedness and looking for outputs. For example, if only 50% of the reform is in place in a region, there is no reason to expect that the influence of reform would be easily detected in learner achievement measures. (Depending upon the circumstances this situation may in fact provide an opportunity to use quasi-control groups but we will not look at that here because it is doubtful that the distinctions would be very clearly delineated.) The evolving nature of the reform means that the proficiency argument requires greater elaboration; output measures are not easily interpreted without their logical context verified. The list of indicators unfolds as follows:

- ▶ Inputs -- identified from the research as related to achievement;
- ▶ Readiness -- evidence that the reform program is in place, with variables possibly identified from the case studies already carried out (examples would include, textbook distribution, use of new curriculum, compliance with MEC policies such as democratic classroom practices, teacher participation in inservice programs, teacher qualifications, absenteeism, teacher evaluations);
- ▶ Immediate Effects -- achievement results, inspector reports, case study evidence.

At the moment achievement results are only available for math, English, and Oshindonga.

Tenth, the math, English, and Oshindonga proficiency tests were devised for multiple purposes. In the history of educational testing, tests designed for multiple purposes frequently fail to meet any particular purpose very well. Still, for Namibia, with limited resources and expertise, the tests are probably the only ones that will be developed in the near future and they are probably technically far better than anything else that exists in the system (including the new grade 10 exam, which will rely on exam panels to develop the instruments and these panels historically pay little attention to formal curricular validity; and including the classroom tests, which regional officers, even with their limited expertise, indicate are poorly constructed and at best, emphasize rote memory). So we must work with these new proficiency tests. When carefully examined, they would be difficult to unpack and in some cases, little information would be available. As indicated, they attempted to deal with the content that was common to both the old and new syllabi. Therefore, by their planned scope, they leave out some facets of the new curriculum. Given that the new curriculum is not in place, this was the best that could be done to get a transitional set of indices that would serve both now and the future.

Clearly, there are a number of opportunities for the development of a meaningful testing and assessment system. They are explicated below.

The first opportunity is the development of a minimal proficiency baseline. The math, English, and Oshindonga proficiency tests have not been developed to provide detailed information about programmatic impact and are generic in coverage rather than linked closely to specific curricular reforms. Changes over time will be difficult to interpret. Also, little local expertise exists. According to someone who has seen some of the preliminary data from the English test, it

appears that some learners, and even schools, "aced" the test while many others scored at chance levels. That is, because of the dramatic differential language skills, the test has successfully discriminated between those coping and those not. This is particularly important information at this early phase of the reform process. A concern is how novice readers of assessment data will translate the information. One suggestion is to unpack the tests in terms of three levels of proficiency: low, marginal, and adequate. That is, decide how many of the items are required to be correct to convince the language experts that there is some adequate proficiency demonstrated by the learner (and so on for the other categories). This presents a more modest claim for the tests and leads to useful categories for the evaluation of programmatic impacts and needs.

The tests seem to suffer from both floor and ceiling limitations. It would be difficult to interpret the quantitative scores of the tests, nearly impossible to interpret changes, and totally unconvincing in arguments for attribution to programmatic reform. Used as cutoff indices, they may more usefully serve the programmatic evaluative needs at this time of the reform until more precisely constructed instruments are available, after the specification of the new curriculum and its implementation. At the moment, very gross information is all that is required, and these tests can serve those needs.

This strategy implies:

- ▶ The establishment of categories, where three is recommended. This entails the assessment of the tests by subject area experts, so that there is broad agreement on the cutoff points.
- ▶ Counts of learners in each category, with combinations in ratios (compared to total number of learners in the context), and disaggregations based on sex and region. Other possibilities to be determined based on needed comparisons.
- ▶ Continued administration of these tests over time to assess the development of an adequate base of proficiency in these areas. Other tests in these and other areas should be developed in concert with the curriculum, so that eventually valid curricular information would be available.
- ▶ The tests may continue to serve other research agendas. Such possibilities would rest with the particular researchers.
- ▶ This test information should be combined with the case study information to provide a rich picture of schools at particular levels of proficiency. Such information may be very useful for programmatic adjustments and implementation plans.

The second opportunity is the development and reporting of contextual information. NIED personnel, primarily from the languages area, identified numerous, important indicators of school and program quality, from which they proposed the essential informational package that

they would require to ensure effective NIED activities. See the appendix for details. The final set of information needs that were assigned top priority were:

- ▶ Comparison of official curriculum versus ideal versions;
- ▶ Activities/performance of schooling versus MEC expectations and community expectations;
- ▶ External efficiency and societal appropriateness;
- ▶ School/classroom atmosphere and aesthetics, including learner focus ("Open Spirit");
- ▶ Headmaster/teacher/learner attitudes concerning the new "style" in schools;
- ▶ Teacher competency and ability, beyond the qualifications for teaching;
- ▶ Teacher attributes (integrity, sincerity, child-centered attitude, self-confidence) in terms of compatibility of teachers and learners;
- ▶ Exams and tests information, complemented by other assessments.

These exceed the regular proficiency test information and seek to place achievement in the context of the schooling process and the resulting influence on the individual. Most of this information requires school visits and extensive observations and ratings. The workshop group placed considerable reliance on the regional officials to carry out the tasks that would yield this information, recognizing the need for experience and expertise before the data would be useful. It would be immediately feasible to include some of these aspects in the case study work carried out and planned by NIED. Preliminary data could be collected through case studies and methodologies and instrumentation could be refined to yield better information in the future. There is little doubt that this effort will require training and technical assistance.

The third opportunity is the development of expertise in assessment. It is very difficult to develop expertise in any area quickly. Experience is an essential component. Nevertheless, the process has to be started or it will never be developed. There is virtually no local expertise available to the MEC. At the very least some effort should be made to provide training to those already engaged in activities that rely on assessment information (NIED, subject area advisors, inspectors, and teacher educators). Once organizational concerns have been worked out, the place for assessment expertise should be identified -- it may be in several places, for example, with the Directorate: National Examinations and Assessment, and also with NIED, Directorate: Planning and Development, and Directorate: Adult and Continuing Education. All of these entities will require some expertise as the organization matures and becomes capable of reflection. This effort will also require training and technical assistance, possibly utilizing some of the resources at the University.

The final opportunity is organizational development. There is an unreasonable number of things to do in order to improve assessment throughout the system. And there is a large number of different uses for assessment information (including many not covered here). Internally, the MEC efforts in assessment must be coordinated and communicated. Externally, cooperative relationships should be established (with the University, Teachers Colleges, external organizations and universities, etc.). Improvement in the quality of the assessments which are needed to monitor and influence programmatically the quality of schooling, will ultimately require a wide-ranging, professional cadre to debate and decide on the many technical issues surrounding the development, interpretation, and use of assessment in the Namibian context. Explicit efforts must be made to link entities that are or will be interested in assessment information, and this must be supported with advanced education and training.

### **3. Priority Actions**

The performance indicators for Namibia's education system and the related assessment and information systems are extremely important components of management. Both the demands of transitional politics and the resource and capacity constraints already noted, mean that choices and trade-offs will have to be made. Decision-makers must know what they want and what actions are taking them in the appropriate direction. Given that the imposition of additional tasks to the workload of the MEC and the ISDD, in particular, would be likely to encounter substantial opposition, the following are recommended as near-term priorities for the MEC:

▶ **Statistical Yearbook or Statistical Report**

Within ISDD there exist rich data on the educational system. Available data should be used to produce a summary document containing descriptive statistics and interpretive text that gives an overall picture of the education system and how it is changing. The document, utilizing data already available, can serve as a baseline for a general tracking of progress of the reform. Agreement on what measures would go into such a report would need to be reached.

▶ **Performance Indicators**

Accepting the initial document on indicators as a reasonable starting point, develop a workplan for extension and refinement of the indicator system over the next several years. Agreement needs to be reached on basic quality standards and other important measures of efficiency, equity and effectiveness. 1993 or 1994 may need to be the base year, depending on the standards selected for tracking.

▶ **EMIS Committee**

Establish an EMIS development committee (or more informal user group) to include not only representatives from ISDD but also from finance, planning, personnel, programs, and others concerned with planning, program development, control and resource allocation, to monitor the design and expansion of the EMIS so that it eventually encompasses all relevant activities and functions of the MEC.

This body might be given the coordination and approval function for all computer and systems acquisition decisions in the Ministry.

▶ **Staffing and Staff Development**

The ISDD has conservatively estimated its needs for additional staff at 10 to 12 professional persons. The addition of new staff, however, should be predicated on the creation of greater coordination between planning and information. There must not be an artificial distinction made between information production and information use.

A plan for staff development within ISDD and planning is essential. Foreign technical advisors predominant in these offices and local personnel must be in place at the time of their departure. The need is exacerbated by the policy of regionalization requiring coordination with headquarters in the preparation and training of planners and others in the regional offices.

Additionally, training associated with the improvement of assessment throughout the system is a priority. NIED personnel are likely candidates and a determination of their needs should begin immediately.

▶ **Assessment Data**

Data have been collected on a 10% national sample of schools for math, English and Oshindonga proficiency. Coupled with the five case studies and other research information, baseline data will be available to inform the process of curriculum development. Immediate next steps include 1) analysis of the proficiency data with other supporting data to estimate the current status of the system with respect to the core subjects; 2) specifications for assessment in math, science and English for grades 4-7; and, 3) interpretation of the results with regional officials and other appropriate institutions such as the Colleges and the University.

There are several other priority areas on which information is not yet complete, or on which further information needs to be gathered. These areas are seen as priorities because of their relation to the goals of the educational reform. Analysis of factors limiting supply and demand for basic education is outlined as one of the objectives in the Minister's Letter of Intent. This analysis, carried out on a geographic basis, is probably the most powerful dissemination tool for communicating educational information relating both to access and equity. It should serve various consultative groups given the readily accessible and visual nature of the displays. Its use also will be extremely important in skills development within the regions.

The Minister's Letter of Intent (1993) also describes conducting "initial studies on factors affecting learner flow patterns (e.g., repetition rates, dropout and retention rates, migration and other mobility factors)." This study would use as its starting point the data collected in the educational census, but would go further in querying the anomalies already uncovered across and

within regions. It is recommended that such a study, which is sensitive to different contexts and has potential use as a baseline within regions, should be utilized as a capacity-building exercise for the development of planning and policy analysis skills at the regional level. The new planning staff now appointed to the regions would be involved in the design of the study and its management, as well as some of the analysis surrounding the results of this study. It will afford an opportunity for the linkages to be developed between head office and the regions and hopefully, some commonality of purpose. The study, of course, has direct relevance to efficiency goals, but would also facilitate the honing of regionally-specific (and within region) policy formulation.

It is also recommended that a pilot study of school-level costs be carried out, together with collection of information on community (and individual, parental) financial support to education as a means toward defining potential, systematic data collection on this topic in the future. Until or unless there is substantial change in the finance department of the MEC, it is unlikely that school-level costs will be available. One of the most significant disparities in the educational system across schools within and between regions is likely to be parental (or community) and government contributions to educational finance; yet no data are gathered.

The various targeted studies referred to above should point in the direction of the production of policy options papers, from within the planning section of the MEC, utilizing ISDD data as a starting point and working, ideally, towards briefs which discuss the trade-offs involved in pursuing the goals of the educational reform.

#### Endnotes:

1. Marlaine E. Lockheed, Adriaan M. Verspoor, and Associates, *Improving Primary Education in Developing Countries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the World Bank, 1991). The statements can only be approximate for several reasons: Lockheed and Verspoor report ratios of salary to GNP, data are not precise, and the medians, unweighted means, and weighted means reported differ substantially for lower-middle-income countries. Salary is not explicitly defined by Lockheed and Verspoor, but their technical notes suggest it corresponds closely to the employment cost concept used here for Namibia; GNP is about 7% less than GDP in Namibia.
2. Treasury financial regulations require that orders be placed with Government Stores if they can supply; thus large amounts of orders for supplies and materials for MEC schools are directed to the Government Stores (about R15 million a year). However, order fulfillment by Government Stores is very much a random variable with a long average time lag; some goods ordered in 1988 were delivered to Keetsmanshoop in June 1992, and currently nobody can even estimate the value of orders placed by the MEC with Government Stores that have not yet been entered into the Government Stores computer system -- and the entry delay averages several months (most orders go direct from regional offices to Government Stores).

### **III. DELIVERING THE REFORM OF BASIC EDUCATION**

Delivering basic education reform means designing, developing and installing new practices and programs in schools throughout Namibia. The early stages of the reform process have focused on design and development tasks and installation of change is just getting underway. The MEC's Action Plan for 1992-1997 is ambitious and focuses on four critical educational resources: curriculum, teachers, teaching materials and facilities. The Ministry's intention is to provide new facilities and upgrade and maintain existing facilities. The Ministry plans to overhaul the curriculum, design and develop new syllabi, build English language competencies and develop assessment and examination systems. Related materials are to be developed, published, distributed and evaluated. Finally, the MEC plan calls for teacher education emphasizing inservice teacher education and a network of support services, management training for school principals, implementation of a new careers structure for the teaching profession and the introduction of a new preservice teacher education program. The review team has concentrated on curriculum reform and teacher education and the report will refer minimally to materials and facilities, acknowledging the extreme importance of their provision.

#### **A. Reforming the Curriculum**

Curriculum reform within the MEC is the responsibility of NIED's Division for Curriculum Development and Research. It began with the production of the Broad Curriculum Document and places priority on syllabi development for grades 1-7, on syllabi revision for the higher grades, on assessment and on installing learner-centered materials and methods in classrooms. The review team used school visits and interviews and workshops with MEC personnel, especially in NIED, to establish and analyze progress in curriculum reform.

#### **1. Accomplishments**

The progress made in the reform of the curriculum in the three years since independence is significant. The MEC has been able to accomplish five broad objectives:

- ▶ Promoting a clear and consistent understanding within regions (school personnel and regional office staff) of the objectives of the curriculum reform process; this is particularly true with respect to the learner-centered methodology. Numerous panels, training workshops, conferences, circulars, and other participatory forums at national, regional and local levels have contributed to the development of this common understanding;
- ▶ Attracting and recruiting a comprehensive set of curriculum support services (inservice training, teachers' resource centers, subject advisory services, donor agency initiatives in specific subjects, and volunteer instructors) to influence the reform process;
- ▶ Developing a basic physical infrastructure (new classrooms and schools, teachers' resource centers, basic equipment) in rural areas as an important first step in supporting the effective delivery of curriculum and instruction services;

- ▶ Democratizing the curriculum policy and development processes by involving a broad cross-section of the professional, union, private sector and parent communities in deliberating about issues affecting the school curriculum;
- ▶ Designing and implementing at least five coherent curriculum reform programs each involving numerous conferences, panel discussions, grassroots consultation, syllabus development, inservice training and other teacher support activities in the following areas;

A new and comprehensive curriculum for basic education (grades 8-10),

A new language policy in all schools, particularly with reference to the new medium of instruction (English),

A revised curriculum program for the Junior Secondary (grades 8-10) Level,

A revised curriculum for grade 4 math,

Specific initiatives in preparation for a new national examination structure (e.g., the shift in grade 12 examinations from the Cape Education Department to the International General Senior Certificate in Education by 1994).

In addition to these accomplishments, many initiatives are underway and are beginning to show results in the schools even though they must be considered preliminary and varied in importance from one region to another. Emerging strategies include:

- ▶ Provision of curriculum-related inservice training offered at various sites, including the regional teachers' centers, the head office, and the school clusters;
- ▶ Provision of subject advisory services responsible for subject supervision at the school site;
- ▶ Recruitment of non-Namibian qualified teachers (Americans, Nigerians, Ghanians etc.), particularly in critical subjects such as science, English and mathematics;
- ▶ Deployment of non-Namibian subject specialists to broaden the base of subject-specific support to teachers (e.g., the WUS-Denmark life science specialists);
- ▶ Design and distribution of new syllabi and textbooks, particularly in grade 4 mathematics and as part of the junior secondary curriculum reform initiative;
- ▶ Creation of regional teachers' centers and, eventually, "clusters" of centers closer to the school to provide curriculum support;

- ▶ Training of subject facilitators (these are ordinary teachers who receive further training in their subjects) to serve school clusters or schools in sub-regions.

## 2. Issues, Concerns, Constraints and Opportunities

The provision of education in Namibia, particularly in rural areas, resembles broad patterns in much of Africa. However, the complex mosaic of constraints, resources, strategies and opportunities are seldom identical to any other education system or even across the different regions within Namibia. For this reason, the particular manifestation of curriculum constraints and opportunities within the Namibian education system must be examined. In terms of curriculum practice the following ten constraints, not uncommon elsewhere, have been identified:

- ▶ Textbooks

There are insufficient textbooks provided; textbooks and other reference materials remain dominated by Afrikaans/South African sources; textbook content is inadequate and the distribution of textbooks is unreliable, particularly in Katima, the only region without a local publisher/distributor.

- ▶ Specialist Equipment

There is a shortage or complete absence of laboratory equipment, instructional aids, maps, atlases and other devices for the teaching of science, geography and the practical subjects.

- ▶ Language

The shift in government policy to English as medium of instruction has encountered difficulties in the following forms: teachers (and sometimes principals) are not always proficient in English; classrooms are multilingual; and most available textbooks are in Afrikaans.

- ▶ Curriculum Exposure

Learners experience minimal exposure to the curriculum as a result of factors which include: high drop-out rates, migration among nomadic groups such as the San, and the inaccessibility of roads for both teachers and learners during the rainy periods in parts of the North.

- ▶ Teacher Qualifications and Assignment

A significant number of teachers (4666 out of 9722 according to 1992 data) are unqualified; in rural areas, most of the teachers are unqualified. This is directly reflected in teachers' pedagogical knowledge and, particularly in the higher grades, in their subject matter competence. Teachers are often assigned to instruct in subjects for which they have not been trained and qualified teachers (Nigerians

and Peace Corps Volunteers) are on short-term contracts with little effort or opportunity to create sustainable and long-term impact among local teachers.

▶ **Teacher Support**

The preparation of teachers to support the reform process is at best unequal; teachers closer to the rural centers are more likely to benefit from inservice training, given the problems of transportation, than teachers in the rural periphery. Existing providers are few and their efforts are often uncoordinated. Teachers' centers have limited space to meet the demands for training support; and the inspectorate is still perceived as a source of control rather than support.

▶ **Syllabus Renewal**

At this stage few syllabi have been developed and distributed to support curriculum reform. Syllabi for grade 4 mathematics and junior secondary (grades 8-10) subjects are the only new syllabi developed at the moment. Most of the schools visited use syllabi and "schemes of work" dating back to the mid-1980s.

▶ **Combined Grades**

Primary school instruction is often delivered by a single teacher addressing two to five grades occupying a single classroom. This situation creates a near-impossible teaching situation, particularly for unqualified teachers. Invariably, combined grades mean that learners in any one of the grades receive less than full instructional attention and support from the teacher.

▶ **Traditional Pedagogy**

The legacy of traditional pedagogy is perhaps the most serious obstacle to democratizing teaching and learning in the classroom. Despite intervention to produce "learner-centered pedagogy", teachers often revert to traditional pedagogy for reasons which include the common observation that unqualified teachers often feel the need to be in control of the classroom situation since they are ill-equipped to deal with the uncertainty which accompanies alternative pedagogical styles, a situation exacerbated in overcrowded, multigrade classrooms.

▶ **Physical Space**

Classrooms are often overcrowded in rural areas, setting limits on alternative ways of organizing classrooms for the new pedagogy. Also, it is not uncommon to find classrooms located outdoors or in prefabricated buildings. On the other hand, senior primary grades often have less than 10 learners which in the context of limited classrooms often leads to the combining of grades in one room. In short, the physical space demands have direct implications for curriculum reform.

While the accomplishments noted earlier are beginning to stimulate system change, the curriculum reform process is likely to encounter important obstacles within the next 24 months. The critical shortage of funds to continue these interventions, to broaden the scope of teacher support activities, and to extend support to the rural periphery is widely recognized and has been addressed in Chapter II.

There exists a need to extend planning for sustainability of curriculum reforms particularly in reference to the short-term, non-Namibian volunteers. Further, added coordination within the ecology of curriculum support structures and personnel (Teachers Colleges, teachers' centers, inspectors and subject advisors, donor-assisted curriculum projects) is a necessity if there is to be maximum impact on the curriculum reform process. Currently, an excellent basis for coordination exists within the PIU where agreement has been facilitated on many aspects of preservice and inservice teacher education. The process being used to monitor grade 8 and 9 reforms is showing great promise.

The rural areas of Namibia have been unevenly penetrated by reforms and schools closer to the teachers' centers are more likely to receive the benefits of changes. Existing resources may be difficult to use, especially when teachers that are distant from the centers lack transportation and when their limited subject matter competence and professional training suggests that they are unlikely to try classroom innovations. In the case of science teaching for example, teachers rarely use the rich physical environment outside the classroom for curriculum purposes.

The distance of curriculum reform from actual classroom practice or teaching/learning conditions is evident. Teachers' centers bring national reform initiatives closer to the region, and this is an important step. However, considerable evidence from research and experience suggest that "behind the classroom door" teachers revert to familiar teaching styles and practices (mostly teacher-dominated instruction). In exceptional cases (WUS Denmark life science specialist in Rundu), where curriculum support has been taken to the classroom through focused and sustained individual work with teachers, there is evidence of impact and change in line with reform objectives.

The emphasis in subject support/advice towards (new) syllabus interpretation rather than on strengthening subject matter knowledge/competence, is a critical weakness in the more senior grades. Parenthetically, there is little evidence at the moment that subject advisors are making a difference in this respect, often because as former teachers promoted to their new posts, they have not been trained as specialists in the subject.

Finally, there is no systematic procedure (except for the routine collection of examination results) for evaluating the curriculum change and, therefore, there is no data collection mechanism to inform and guide the curriculum reform process.

Having examined opportunities and constraints in designing, developing and delivering instruction, three questions need to be addressed: What are the broad curriculum policy intentions designed to inform the reform process? To what extent have policy intentions been supported, transformed or inhibited in practice? And what are some recommendations for realigning policy to fit the constraints identified in both practice and strategy?

The Curriculum Guide for Formal Basic Education (Version 7, October 1992) is limited to grades 1 through 7 and outlines key areas of focus: goals, aims, scope, subjects, approaches to teaching and learning, and guidelines for assessment and promotion. Throughout, the Curriculum Guide defines goals and objectives which are universally accepted for basic education, outlines comprehensive content areas around which school subjects can be organized, specifies assessment and promotion procedures which are both systematic and fair, and offers creative approaches to teaching and learning which are aimed at democratizing the classroom environment. The most significant components of the curriculum reform specified in the Guide are the following:

- ▶ The shift to English as medium of instruction;
- ▶ The shift to a learner-centered methodology;
- ▶ The shift towards greater social relevance in curriculum content;
- ▶ The shift towards assessment which is continuous and formative in focus;
- ▶ The shift towards broadening learning opportunities through compensatory teaching and a comprehensive list of subject areas (scope) to which learners can be exposed.

There are five important limitations in this policy guiding document when considered against the review of curriculum practice in rural Namibian schools. The first limitation is the absence of an implementation strategy. While it is not uncommon for curriculum guides to sketch an ideal for curriculum reform, it is useful to provide some indication of the means by which the curriculum is to be implemented and the roles of different change agents (e.g., subject advisors, subject facilitators, etc.) in the curriculum reform process. The difficulties with the new language policy and the shift to learner-centered instruction are two events requiring a careful implementation outline.

Second, the document is silent on the diverse and variable contexts for curriculum reform and, therefore, there is an absence of any planning reflections on the implications of different levels of resource support for reform e.g., rural center/urban/rural periphery schools; private/public schools; former (white) privileged schools/community-built rural schools, etc.

Third, there is an absence of a **curriculum** evaluation strategy. This is perhaps the most important component of long-term reform since the only way to take forward the process of change is through systematic reflection and information-gathering on how this process unfolds in different contexts.

Fourth, the wide range of subjects, suggests curriculum overload especially in the primary grades. **Doing fewer things well may be an appropriate maxim, particularly in settings where most teachers are unqualified** (e.g., English, science and mathematics could compose 80% + of the curriculum and constitute the major focus of the entire reform process). Alternative methods for organizing this essentially content-driven curriculum is to rationalize the range of subjects e.g., the three different subjects -science, environment, health- could form a

single subject and a focus on skills such as problem-solving rather than on subject matter content is likely to have more focused, measurable and positive achievement outcomes.

Fifth, a disjuncture exists between formal curriculum requirements and capacities of teachers. The admirable features of the existing curriculum plan must be measured against the fact that more than 30% of Namibia's teachers are unqualified (see endnote 1). Continuous assessment using "a variety of assessment instruments" is a complex task even for highly qualified teachers; learner-centered instruction is seldom attained even in well-resourced school environments in which teachers have been exposed in training to such alternatives (e.g., evaluations of the United States experience with the discipline-centered curriculum in the post-Sputnik era); and the shift towards English language as a medium of instruction in multi-lingual classrooms where a different language (Afrikaans) was dominant for decades, requires meticulous planning based, in the first instance, on an assessment of "where teachers are" in their capacity for delivery in the English-medium.

Sixth, there is a weak linkage between teacher education, testing and curriculum development as co-dependent elements of any curriculum reform strategy. In the new preservice teacher education curriculum, there is evidence of an improved and close linkage among teacher education, curriculum development, assessment and evaluation. The inservice curriculum implementation courses for grades 8-10 and grade 4 have all included assessment.

In general, schools in rural areas are characterized by high motivation and enthusiasm for reform; similarly, expectations are running high. There is an important window of opportunity for taking forward the reform process. But herein lies a possible danger: that is, failure to show evidence of successful implementation in the next year could dampen motivation and undermine any future reform initiatives in the education sector.

The following recommendations, therefore, are put forward in the spirit of creating instances of success in the curriculum sphere which could encourage teachers and administrators but at the same time build an information base on successes and limitations which could further inform the reform process.

▶ **Syllabus Production**

Accelerate the design, production and dissemination of subject syllabi at all levels in the basic education sector.

▶ **Inservice Training**

Intensify and expand the inservice training program to support syllabus renewal **but** in ways which bring the curriculum reform process closer to existing conditions in the classroom. In exceptional cases (WUS Denmark life science specialist in Rundu), where curriculum support has been taken to the classroom through focused and sustained individual work with teachers, there is evidence of impact and change in line with reform objectives.

▶ **Curriculum Evaluation**

Design and implement a curriculum evaluation plan (building on existing, small-scale plans) which will evaluate the impact of past reform initiatives but also will inform the direction of future curriculum reform strategies e.g., detailed but focused case studies of 12 schools, sampled on a regional basis (2 per region) and reflecting the diversity of school contexts, in order to understand the ways in which specific curriculum reforms (e.g., the new language policy) impact on teaching, learning and assessment at the classroom level.

▶ **Pedagogical Strategies**

Operationalize the understanding of curriculum reform through specific pedagogical strategies (i.e., beyond syllabus interpretation) which are linked to the actual conditions of teaching in particularly rural schools (e.g., workshops on five to ten different strategies for implementing learner-centered instruction in resource-poor environments).

▶ **Support Services**

Coordinate the diversity of curriculum support services (e.g., foreign donors, international volunteers, teacher resource centers, etc.) to enhance the impact and long-term sustainability of the work of these multiple agencies.

▶ **Integration with Teacher Education and Testing**

Continue efforts to integrate three interdependent elements of curriculum change as part of the reform strategy i.e., teacher development, curriculum revision (syllabus, textbooks) and testing; e.g., involving teachers, teacher educators, testing specialists and curriculum design experts collectively in the development of curriculum, inservice training, and assessment measures.

### **3. Priority Actions**

It is important to place the progress and limitations in the curriculum area within a realistic time-perspective. Immense political pressures for reform, coupled with an initially broad resource base to support reform, has enabled Namibia to build an impressive infrastructural framework for curriculum reform i.e., extensive teacher education has already taken place, syllabi have been developed at high-speed, teachers (about 200) have been trained in test development, consultations on curriculum policy and development have been initiated throughout the country and, particularly in rural areas, different buildings have sprung up to support the training of teachers and to accommodate learners. In the space of two years, these are remarkable accomplishments.

**The next challenge is for Namibia to consolidate these initial reforms but in an environment where there is a rapidly shrinking resource base.** In this context, it will be important not only to sustain curriculum provision, as far as possible, but also to reflect on past reforms through curriculum evaluation. In this context, the following three short-term recommendations (1993) are offered as a way of sustaining the momentum of the reform process. These recommendations

are linked to the Minister's Letter of Intent (1993), and are connected to what the Ministry is already focused on in its programmatic agenda for 1993. Furthermore, they build on existing resources within the MEC.

- ▶ Complete the development of syllabi in mathematics, science and English for grades 4 through 7;
- ▶ Complete the preparation of the inservice training course which will assist teachers to implement the new curriculum in grades 4 through 7;
- ▶ Complete the design of a small-scale evaluation plan to assess progress and limitations in the curriculum reform as targeted for grades 4 through 7.

## **B. Developing Human Resources**

In an educational system that is aiming to build capacity and improve the quality of its output, human resource development is a key. Throughout the Ministry's Action Plan reference is made to training with emphasis placed on practical skills and on-the-job learning. The Plan makes a commitment to enhancing the knowledge, skills and attitudes of senior MEC personnel and stresses the importance of training regional staff. It notes the importance of training planners, management systems analysts, managers of all kinds, school mappers, external assessment personnel, and NIED staff (administration, word processing, materials production, gender awareness and management). Implicitly the Plan also suggests training in action research and in policy analysis. Finally, the Plan addresses comprehensively, the needs for teacher education at the inservice and preservice levels and proposes a variety of strategies for meeting the needs.

Throughout the review of the reform, the assessment team noted education and training needs. The review concentrated particularly on teacher education. The findings are reported below.

### **1. Accomplishments**

Teacher education is pivotal to the success of the reform because both preservice and inservice teacher education have a positive impact on teachers' pedagogical practices, their forms of interaction with children and peers, their current and future perceptions of the schooling process, and the discourse practices of education in a changing society.

So far, the MEC has been able to implement some of their plans regarding teacher education. The key to the success of the reform program lies in the ability of the MEC to establish and sustain inservice programs in all the regions. To this end, the MEC has been able to develop nationally and regionally based inservice programs for the implementers of the new curriculum essential in realizing the reform.

As far as preservice teacher education is concerned, the MEC has been able to upgrade the existing institutions to the status of Teachers' Colleges. Plans are underway to build new colleges at Rundu and Katima Mulilo. Staff in the Teachers Colleges have also been upgraded to the position of lecturers. Additionally, a new career structure for lecturers and school

teachers has been established so as to motivate and retain teachers and lecturers in schools and Colleges.

A new teacher education curriculum is essential for the reform. The MEC has developed the new BETD curriculum and first year students are already using the new curriculum in Teachers Colleges. To sensitize practicing teachers to the reform, the MEC has been able to institutionalize inservice programs for educational managers of the reform such as teachers, school principals, inspectors and planners at both the regional and national levels. Some school principals and teachers have actually been trained. To facilitate the inservice programs, the MEC has succeeded in creating and improving regional teachers' resource centers and school-based teachers' resource centers to enhance the quality of teachers and to expose them to their role in comprehending the form, the content and orientation of the reform and the strategies for achieving its short and long term goals.

The appointment of Regional Directors and facilitators in resource centers has been a problem in the past. Now the MEC has effected the appointment of some of the regional and school-based resource persons. The MEC has also embarked upon a program of refurbishing the existing facilities and the upgrading of equipment and materials in both new and old resource centers.

In keeping with its goal to democratize curriculum reform, Teachers Colleges and schools are now involved in curriculum development. Even in the Colleges themselves, the MEC is now encouraging a collegial form of management so that College staff can begin to have a sense of ownership of College programs and activities. College management and curriculum reform before independence were very authoritarian and repressive.

Improving the quality of English proficiency among College lecturers, teachers and learners is going to be critical for the success of the reform. Teachers Colleges and schools already have the new curricula. The "Lets Speak English" radio project is going on at the moment and the British ODA is currently assisting the MEC in providing inservice courses to teachers throughout the country. These achievements have also been backed by initiatives by the University of Umeå and Alberta courses in Teachers Colleges which are also concerned with improving the quality of practicing teachers in schools and Colleges. To this end, the extension of distance education courses to all teachers in the field will go a long way in raising the quality of teachers required to sustain the reform as far as content and pedagogy are concerned. In short, training is widespread and the results are beginning to be evident in practice. A summary of accomplishments follows:

- ▶ The development of nationally- and regionally-based inservice programs for the implementers of the new curriculum essential in realizing the reform;
- ▶ The establishment of new Teachers Colleges, the development of a new curriculum for the BETD and the admission in 1993 of the first year of the BETD student teachers;

- ▶ The institutionalization and development of inservice programs for educational managers of the reform such as teachers, school principals, inspectors and planners at both the regional and national levels;
- ▶ The creation and improvement of regional resource centers and school-based resource centers to enhance the quality of teachers and to sensitize them to their roles in the reform;
- ▶ The appointment of regional and school-based resource persons; the refurbishing of existing facilities and the upgrading of equipment and materials in both new and old resource centers;
- ▶ The development and implementation of the "Let's Speak English" course;
- ▶ The conclusion of the feasibility study to establish new Teachers Colleges;
- ▶ The development and establishment of the University of Umeå and Alberta courses in Teachers Colleges;
- ▶ The extension of distance education courses to all teachers in the field;
- ▶ The review of the establishments of the four Teachers Colleges and the placement of all lecturers on the college salary scale;
- ▶ The implementation of a college career structure and commensurate salary scale at all Colleges;
- ▶ The development of a new careers structure for school teachers.

As indicated in Table 1, the country currently has 4,666 inappropriately qualified teachers. The majority of these are teaching in the North and in rural areas in particular as evidenced by the large teacher/learner ratios in Ondangwa and Rundu compared to the other regions. This clearly shows that the MEC has at least succeeded in supplying schools with more qualified teachers. The distance education programs should be able to increase the number of qualified teachers in the majority of the schools in the near future.

**Table 1**  
**Qualified and Inappropriately Qualified Teachers per Region 1992**

<b>EDUCATIONAL REGION</b>	<b>QUALIFIED TEACHERS</b>	<b>INAPPROP. QUALIFIED TEACHERS</b>	<b>TOTAL No. OF LEARNERS</b>	<b>LEARNER/TEACHER RATIO</b>
Katima-Mulilo	734	196	26325	28.2
Keetmanshoop	745	362	23775	25.1
Khorixas	704	451	26641	28.0
Ondangwa	3652	2223	246388	44.9
Rundu	682	723	46035	32.8
Windhoek	3205	711	87189	28.1
<b>NATIONAL TOTALS</b>	9722	4666	456353	36.0

Source: Report on EMIS, "MEC and USAID, December 24, 1992, Tables 2.01.01 and 3.01.01.

Based upon learner/teacher ratios, growth of the learner population and a 6% annual attrition rate, it is estimated that hundreds of new teachers are needed by 1996. Refer to Table 2.

**Table 2**  
**Projection of Teacher Requirements 1993-1996**

<b>YEAR</b>	1993	1994	1995	1996
<b>LEARNER/TEACHER RATIO</b>	32	33	34	35
<b>NEW TRS NEEDED</b>	783	834	887	944

Source: Inger Anderson et. al. "Teacher Education Reform in Namibia," Ministry of Education and Culture, Windhoek Namibia, February 1991, p. 39.

According to projections made in 1991, 539 newly qualified teachers were to be available for posting this year based on enrollments at that time. If all the students completed their course (which is unlikely), this means that there was a short-fall of only 144 teachers. Therefore, the Colleges can actually satisfy the demand for teachers if they enroll to full capacity. It is envisaged that each of the new colleges will have a capacity of 300 students. Recent and current enrollments are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3**  
**Student Enrollments in Teachers Colleges 1991-1993**

<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>NUMBER OF STUDENTS (1991)</b>	<b>NUMBER OF STUDENTS (1992)</b>	<b>NUMBER OF STUDENTS (1993)</b>
Ongwediva	858	680	663
Rundu	82	85	94
Katima-Mulilo	212	244	255
Windhoek (Part-time)	358	666	763
Windhoek (Full-time)	140	148	332
Academy (Full-time)	529	429	--
Academy (Dist. Ed)	1730	1148	--

Source: Ministry of Education and Culture, Dept. of Teacher Education (PIU).

## 2. Issues, Concerns, Constraints and Opportunities

The analysis of progress made in the preparation of educational personnel is guided by the MEC's Action Plan. That Plan calls for the training of school principals, establishment of a network of regional and local resource centers, preparation of teachers for implementation of the new curriculum and improvement in English language proficiency, establishment of a regional teacher support network, and expansion of Teachers Colleges and development and implementation of preservice teacher education curricula. An analysis of each component of the MEC's plan for teacher education and support is presented below.

### ▲ **Training School Principals**

In order to improve the quality of school management which also has an impact on the activities of teachers and learners, the first objective was to train primary school principals through inservice programs. School principals, using the appropriate skills and management styles, can be the best conduits for instilling democratic values in both learners and teachers. The MEC's plan called for training of trainers in each region, training for principals, evaluation of the workshops, development of a training manual and training for school inspectors.

The 25 trainers for the regions have been trained and 300 primary school principals have also been trained. The second phase of training school principals is under way. In Ondangwa there are workshops for school heads that are scheduled for the year. Evidence from most regional resource centers shows that the few workshops that have taken place are all evaluated by the participants. The extent to which the evaluation is used to improve on the next workshops was not possible to assess. Training manuals are being developed as school principals and teachers

attend these inservice workshops. School inspectors have attended courses in Windhoek and Swakopmund. In reviewing these achievements, the following issues arise.

The first issue is the role of school principals in the supervision of teachers involved in the reform and their continuous role in the inservicing of school teachers who are either inappropriately qualified. The subject advisors are too few and in most regions, the schools are so far away from each other that in the absence of transport it is difficult for the subject advisors to visit more teachers each term. School-based supervision is essential if the quality concerns of the MEC are to be addressed adequately at the school level. School principals are essential in assisting teachers to plan their daily classroom activities, design and use appropriate instructional materials, adopt democratic and learner-centered classroom management styles and design, develop and implement evaluation and assessment procedures that enhance individualized instruction. This role of school principals is made problematic by the fact that the majority of the principals visited have high school diplomas. The ideal situation is for them to improve on their English language verbal proficiency and to have more management and academic training. Additionally, they all seem to be very young with little administrative experience.

The extent to which school principals can supervise teachers is questionable at this stage. The potential for using them to provide inservice training is compromised. The extent to which they are as yet prepared to introduce the reform in schools is also debatable. The marginal change that might accrue from inservice programs is very difficult to measure at this juncture.

The second issue of concern is the extent of the English verbal proficiency of school principals. Evidence from schools visited in all regions shows that many school principals have difficulty in communicating in English. Therefore, some of the inservice programs for school principals need to focus on improving their communicative skills in English if they are to be of any assistance to their teachers.

The third issue of concern is the level of education of school principals met in Ondangwa, Khorixas, Rundu and Caprivi. Very few school principals in these regions have degrees. This is not to impugn that degrees make a difference. This position takes cognizance of the fact that there are other factors such as facilities, learners' backgrounds, availability of textbooks, and so on, that affect the quality of a school. The majority have standard 10 plus a teacher education certificate. For the high schools it is essential to work towards a school head with a degree so that s/he can also gain some intellectual and professional legitimacy in the eyes of school teachers if the head's role in the inservice of teachers is to be meaningful and worthwhile.

A fourth concern is the school inspector who is critical in inservice programs for teachers. That role has to be facilitative. At the moment, evidence shows that school inspectors and circuit inspectors do visit schools. In some cases they are overwhelmed by work. A number of teachers reported that they saw the inspector once in 1992. In some cases, teachers reported that they had not seen their inspectors. Therefore, the current concept of regarding the inspector as a mentor and facilitator has to be enhanced through workshops.

A final and persistent concern is transport. The distribution and frequency of workshops in the regions visited seem to indicate that workshops are being equitably distributed and that all school principals and inspectors in a region have an equal chance of attending the workshops.

However, the MEC has to address the problem of transportation in the schools especially in the wake of rationalization and diminishing budgets for recurrent expenditure. Due to the distances involved, some school principals might find it very difficult to attend these workshops if they do not have transport provided for them.

#### ▲ **Resource Center Network**

The Ministry has a very comprehensive and well-articulated plan for the development and implementation of a network of teachers' resource centers that includes facilities at headquarters, in the regional centers and in schools. Facilities in Ongwediva, Katima Mulilo, Keetmanshoop and Khorixas are being refurbished and the centers in Swakopmund, Grootfontein, Mariental and Karasburg are being consolidated. Staff have been appointed at several locations and local centers are being constructed. The operating centers are providing inservice programs and the network continues to expand. The issues that arise in reviewing the impressive progress in this area relate largely to the capacity of the centers and to the coordination and management of their activities.

The first issue concerns the high demand for a variety of supporting services to be offered by the resource centers (not a bad problem to have). At present the centers are focusing on curriculum implementation, a reform priority. All the workshops for the Ongwediva and Rundu Resource Centers for 1993 are mainly subject-specific and are concerned with sensitizing teachers and school heads to the new curriculum. Inservice programs planned for the centers also need to address instructional support in the form of teacher's guides, textbooks, charts, science equipment, exercise books, pencils, teacher made materials and training in learner-centered pedagogical styles, classroom management, and the design, administration and use of teacher made tests. These services are in demand.

A second area of interest is the school-based teachers' center. Clearly there is a need and a demand for centers that are accessible to teachers, but facilities, materials and personnel are in short supply and even the regional centers are limited, especially with respect to personnel. The Resource Center visited at the Ongwediva Teachers College has excellent facilities and equipment, but they do not have permanent staff. The only staff member of the center is seconded from the Teachers College. This situation is undesirable because it means that there is no core staff at the resource center to give continuity and uniformity to the inservice courses that are being given to teachers and other educational officials who are pivotal in implementing the reform.

The ancillary staff that has been promised in the implementation plan has not yet been realized in the resource centers visited. Therefore, it is going to be difficult for most of the centers to sustain their involvement in inservice programs that are going to have a long lasting positive impact on the teachers.

A third concern, not surprisingly, is transport. The effectiveness of the resource centers is also challenged by the fact that the transport mentioned in the implementation plan has not been provided. In fact, the transport situation is so acute that mail to schools such as those visited in Okango and Tsumkwe takes two to three weeks to be delivered. It is unlikely from what the Regional Directors were saying that there will be transport provided to schools and resource

centers in the near future. Therefore, the frequency with which teachers can attend courses will be greatly reduced.

The network of resource centers that is envisaged in the implementation plan is in the early stages of implementation. A great deal has been achieved and the effectiveness of teaching pedagogy depends significantly on the ability of these centers to thrive and produce. The centers are dependent on donor funding, volunteers and other "soft" sources of support. A fourth and final concern must be sustainability of teachers' resource centers.

#### ▲ **Preparation of Teachers for the New Curriculum**

Central to the reform is the preparation of school teachers to use the new curriculum that has been designed especially in mathematics (grade 4) and core subjects (grade 8-10). The next phase is the implementation of the new science curriculum followed by environmental studies, social studies, English, Namibian languages, etc. The Ministry's plans call for a series of short courses to be delivered at the regional and local levels.

In the Teachers Colleges there is also a need for all the lecturers to have an exposure through the BETD which is intended to enable student teachers to cope with the new school curriculum. Observations in the Teachers Colleges indicated that new teachers will be well-exposed to curriculum changes as they are made.

Teachers are being prepared to implement the new curriculum by their regional centers as indicated by the courses offered and attended, by the courses scheduled for implementation and by reference to the guidelines to implementing the new language policy issued by the MEC. In these guidelines, the MEC is encouraging teachers and their regional authorities to make use of inservice language facilities being offered by the Rossing Foundation, NANTU and the CCN. The British Council also has a project for assisting Namibian teachers to learn English in country and in England. The "Lets Speak English" project, already mentioned, is another indication of the seriousness of the MEC in improving the language skills of practicing teachers. School principals are also being trained to provide the management backup that is required to implement the reform. When the review team visited Ongwediva, they found an inservice group of teachers actually working on adapting a text from Botswana for use in their schools. The Director of Curriculum indicated that this will not be the common practice in future.

The first issue related to preparation of teachers for the new curriculum, a primary concern everywhere, is increasing proficiency in English and this no doubt will be an issue for some time to come. Since the language of instruction is focal to the reform, the MEC has started by explicating its policy on this issue more than any other subject. The MEC has an English language program that looks promising. Materials are also being made available to schools and there are inservice programs for English teachers being mounted. Compared to the magnitude of the problem, the inservice workshops are probably insufficient to respond to the need.

The second issue to arise in the consideration of curriculum implementation is the capacity of the MEC to develop materials for all schools. Teachers are highly dependent on having appropriate materials to guide their teaching. The problem is financial resources. Interviews revealed that the MEC will prefer to let the private sector be involved in the development of

materials. If one takes the MacMillan case in English, it seems likely that the strategy is the preferred option. The fear is that such materials are bound to be very expensive and as the MEC becomes deeply involved with reform management, it might not be possible to sustain this aspect of the reform financially.

The third issue is the ability of the MEC to distribute syllabi, instructional materials and books to all schools. This may become increasingly difficult based on performance so far. There is an acute shortage of vehicles in the regions and some of the rural schools are very remote. Even schools that are accessible during the dry season, cannot be reached during the rainy season. The distribution system at the Ministry, the regions and the circuit offices will need to be streamlined so that materials get to schools in time.

#### ▲ **Teacher Support Network**

When one looks at the distances between schools and the paucity of instructional materials and facilities, it is essential that the regional teacher support network be developed fully if the quality of the teaching force is to be improved and sustained. The Ministry plans to identify, recruit, train and monitor resource teachers throughout the country. The MEC plans to use some regional personnel and the new associate teacher program to expand the network

At the moment, the MEC has been able to identify some individuals who can facilitate the regional teacher support network. However, the unavailability of qualified staff in some of the regions will make it difficult to realize this objective in the near future. Of six schools visited in Ondangwa, only one has a facilitator who is a Peace Corp volunteer. She is not a trained teacher. The selection of candidates in the regions has been hampered by the rationalization process taking place in the MEC. Therefore, training materials have not even been developed because they are dependent upon staff and finance.

#### ▲ **Preservice Teacher Education**

The Ministry's plans for preservice teacher education revolve around two significant undertakings that include the development and implementation of the new Basic Education Teaching Diploma (BETD) and the expansion of the capacities of Teachers Colleges.

The first year of the three-year BETD program is being implemented at this time and appears to reflect the learner-centered intention of the reform. College faculty are favorable towards the curriculum even though they are posed with the challenge of phasing out older programs simultaneously with the introduction of the BETD. Curriculum for years two and three has been developed and disseminated to the Colleges. Subject area panels, comprised of representatives from key educational institutions and interests, have been set up in the regions. The new curriculum has already been approved in the Colleges.

Put simply; the quality of the new BETD will depend very heavily on the availability of qualified staff, financial and material resources, the number of lecturers in each Teachers College and the ability of College administrators to maintain and develop the facilities they have at the moment.

The other major issue of concern that is bound to impact upon the quality of the Colleges is the period that student teachers spend in schools teaching. The current model of supervision is somewhat limited; although, the use of associate teachers and school principals has been initiated and shows promise. Currently the University of Namibia is not involved in this exercise. What is being suggested in this formulation is a negotiated and evolving partnership between the Colleges and the University so that the roles of the various institutions are clearly defined and appropriate, are realistic with respect to institutional capacity and are most conducive to meeting standards of academic freedom, democracy, accountability, quality and efficiency.

The quality of the Colleges will be enhanced when there is a comprehensive staff development program in the MEC. Currently information on bursaries does not seem to be distributed to all College lecturers who might be interested in pursuing further studies.

Looking at the enrollments in Teachers Colleges, it is clear that they are becoming accessible to more students from all over the country. The system of bursaries seems to be giving access to students who would otherwise not be able to attend a Teachers College. However, the future cost implications of the bursary scheme need to be examined very critically. Almost all of the Colleges use standard 10 as the main entry qualification. The Rundu College still operates at very low capacity. This is probably due to the fact it is occupying temporary facilities and has inadequate hostels.

The designs of the new Colleges have been completed and it is anticipated that they should have their first intake in 1994. Equipment for the new Colleges will be supplied by funds from the African Development Bank. The Government has been given a soft loan of R34.7 million with a grace period of twenty years. The loan will also assist in equipping the Colleges and the purchase of text books and other instructional materials. The establishment and filling of new posts is awaiting the rationalization that is being done by the Public Service Commission.

### 3. Priority Actions

There are a variety of opportunities for continuing the impressive progress in the training of educators. The review team established the following priorities for teacher education.

- ▶ Improve the facilities at existing Teachers Colleges and resource centers (libraries, laboratories and micro-teaching rooms, etc), this action is underway;
- ▶ Continue to evaluate and strengthen the capacity of the University in the area of and establish an articulation between the programs offered at Teachers Colleges and the University so that graduates from Teachers Colleges can continue to the University after completing their studies and enroll for the B. Ed. degree. As far as inservice training is concerned, encourage a partnership between the University, the Colleges and the MEC;

There is evidence to support the potential for an effective collaboration between the MEC and the University. Both parties are represented on the Task Force for Teacher Education Reform. Members of the Faculty of Education and of other

University faculties are represented on curriculum panels preparing the BETD, the Faculty of Education will participate in the final assessment of BETD students and the University in cooperation with NIED is establishing an upgrading diploma for teacher educators in Namibian languages. The Curriculum Coordination Group and the University continue to discuss the use of shared resources and the future can expect to include increased cooperation should present practices continue.

- ▶ Continue to review the sustainability of the reform as far as preservice and inservice teacher education is concerned. This is important especially in the inservice programs for grades 4-7 which the Minister's letter of Intent (1993) emphasized;
- ▶ Implement the comprehensive staff development program for all Teachers Colleges, Resource Centers, School Principals, and the associate teachers;
- ▶ Provide Teachers Colleges and Resource Centers with vehicles;
- ▶ Enhance the capacity of Teachers Colleges and resource centers in developing instructional materials especially learning and teaching guides in the vernacular languages, English, science and mathematics;
- ▶ Ensure that the period students spend teaching in schools is not less than six months during their entire three years at the College (the minimum of five months is being expanded through demonstration teaching, micro-teaching, observations, projects, etc. and these enhancements may add considerably to the quality of the program);
- ▶ There is an urgent need to build more staff houses for lecturers in the Colleges if the MEC is to retain and attract well qualified and experienced lecturers.

---

**Endnote:**

1. Another consideration, not elaborated in this document, is that minimum teacher qualifications seldom reflect the range of skills and competencies required for implementing curriculum reform.

## **IV. RECOMMENDATIONS**

As the basic education reform in Namibia is in the early stages of design, development and capacity-building, many challenges lay ahead. The purpose of this chapter is to indicate the strategies and actions by USAID and the MEC that, taken together, appear to be important in advancing the reform partnership. The recommendations include feedback to the MEC regarding priorities for its attention, suggestions to USAID as to how it may support the Ministry's priorities and recommendations to USAID for realigning the program in its remaining years.

### **A. A Summary of Feedback to the MEC**

Throughout this document the reviewers have identified mid-term to long-term opportunities related to advancing the education reform as well as action priorities that seem to be the most necessary and immediate tasks at hand. Following is a summary of the action priorities offered by the review team. From this list, it may be possible to derive conditionalities for future years of program implementation and, most particularly, tranche 4.

#### **1. Managing the Reform of Basic Education**

▶ **Information Systems**

Provide the resources and personnel needed to complete the planning for financial, personnel, and physical information systems and begin implementation.

▶ **Integration of Systems**

Establish mechanisms for coordinating the information systems and for integrating resource allocation and the information systems.

▶ **Regional Capacity-Building**

Strengthen the capacity of the regional offices particularly with respect to planning and management.

#### **2. Establishing and Monitoring Performance Standards for the Education System**

▶ **Statistical Yearbook or Statistical Report**

Within ISDD there exists rich data on the educational system. Available data should be used to produce a summary document containing descriptive statistics and interpretive text that gives an overall picture of the education system and how it is changing. The document, utilizing data already available, can serve as a baseline for a general tracking of progress of the reform. Agreement on what measures would go into such a report would need to be reached. The document could be produced annually.

▶ **Performance Indicators**

Accepting the initial document on indicators as a reasonable starting point, develop a workplan for extension and refinement of the indicator system over the next several years. Agreement needs to be reached on basic quality standards and other important measures of efficiency, equity and effectiveness. A realistic plan and timeline needs to be determined for deciding and tracking indicators.

▶ **EMIS Committee**

Establish an EMIS development committee (or a less formal "Information User Group") to include not only representatives from ISDD but also from education finance, planning, personnel, programs, and other MEC units and departments concerned with planning, program development, control and resource allocation, to monitor the design and expansion of the EMIS so that it eventually encompasses all relevant activities and functions of the MEC. This body might be given the coordination and approval function for all computer and systems acquisition decisions in the Ministry. (The committee is recommended in lieu of the added staffing that might be employed to provide this coordination service.)

▶ **Staffing and Staff Development**

The ISDD has conservatively estimated its needs for additional staff at 10 to 12 professional persons. Lack of staff is the greatest constraint to monitoring the education system effectively. Staffing gaps may be filled by temporary mid-level personnel; leadership should be retained by Namibians whenever possible.

The addition of new staff, however, should be predicated on the creation of greater coordination between planning and information. There must not be an artificial distinction made between information production and information use. Data collection and analysis must be well joined as the Ministry expands its planning, policy and reporting capacities.

A plan for staff development within ISDD and planning is essential. Foreign technical advisors predominate in these offices and local personnel must be in place at the time of their departure. The need is exacerbated by the policy of regionalization requiring coordination with headquarters in the preparation and training of planners and others in the regional offices.

Additionally, training associated with the improvement of assessment throughout the system is a priority. NIED personnel may be the appropriate candidates and a determination of their needs and the needs of other personnel should begin immediately.

While a comprehensive staff development plan will be important to guide the MEC in its future development, such a plan must await the completion of the rationalization process.

► **Assessment Data**

Data have been collected on a 10% national sample of schools for math, English and Oshindonga proficiency. Coupled with the five case studies and other research information, baseline data will be available to inform the process of curriculum development. Immediate next steps include 1) analysis of the proficiency data with other supporting data to estimate the current status of the system with respect to the core subjects; 2) specifications for assessment in math, science and English for grades 4-7; and, 3) interpretation of the results with regional officials and other appropriate institutions such as the Colleges and, perhaps, the University. While assessment is not intended to be overemphasized, it is essential that the system be able to track student proficiency in relation to the curriculum changes and other reforms that are ongoing.

There are several other priority areas on which information is not yet complete, or on which further information needs to be gathered. These areas are seen as priorities because of their relation to the goals of the educational reform. Analysis of factors limiting supply and demand for basic education is outlined as one of the objectives in the Minister's Letter of Intent. This analysis, carried out on a geographic basis, is probably the most powerful analysis and dissemination tool for communicating educational information relating both to access and equity. It should serve various consultative groups given the readily accessible and visual nature of the displays. Its use also will be extremely important in skills development within the regions.

The Minister's Letter of Intent (1993) also describes conducting "initial studies on factors affecting learner flow patterns (e.g., repetition rates, dropout and retention rates, migration and other mobility factors)." This study would use as its starting point the data collected in the educational census, but would go further in querying the anomalies already uncovered across and within regions. It is recommended that such a study, which is sensitive to different contexts and has potential use as a baseline within regions, should be utilized as a capacity-building exercise for the development of planning and policy analysis skills at the regional level. The new planning staff now appointed to the regions would be involved in the design of the study and its management, as well as some of the analysis surrounding the results of this study. It will afford an opportunity for the linkages to be developed between head office and the regions and hopefully, some commonality of purpose. The study, of course, has direct relevance to efficiency goals, but would also facilitate the honing of regionally-specific (and within region) policy formulation.

It is also recommended that a pilot study of school-level costs be carried out, together with collection of information on community (and individual, parental) financial support to education as a means toward defining potential, systematic data collection on this topic in the future. Until or unless there is substantial change in the finance department of the MEC, it is unlikely that school-level costs will be available. One of the most significant disparities in the educational system across schools within and between regions is likely to be parental (or community) and government contributions to educational finance; yet no data are gathered. Clearly, ISDD would need resources to undertake additional studies as proposed herein.

### **3. Reforming the Curriculum**

▶ **Syllabi for Grades 1-7**

Complete the development of syllabi in all subjects for grades 1 through 7.

▶ **Inservice Training for the Syllabi**

Complete the preparation of the inservice training courses which will assist teachers to implement the new curriculum in grades 1 through 10.

▶ **Curriculum Evaluation Plan**

Complete the design of a small-scale evaluation plan to assess progress and limitations in the curriculum reform as targeted for grades 4 through 7.

### **4. Developing Human Resources**

▶ **Facilities**

Improve the facilities at existing Teachers Colleges and resource centers (libraries, laboratories and micro-teaching rooms, etc).

▶ **Role of the University**

Evaluate and continue to evolve the role of the University in preservice and inservice activities in teacher education especially in curriculum development, validation and monitoring and in student supervision during school-based activities. Establish an articulation between the programs offered at Teachers Colleges and the University so that graduates from Teachers Colleges can continue to the University after completing their studies and enroll for the B. Ed. degree.

▶ **Priority Identification**

Review the sustainability of the reform as far as preservice and inservice teacher education is concerned (particular reference is made to teacher education, resource centers, staff development that currently is donor-supported, volunteer teacher programs receiving international support). This is important especially in the inservice programs for grades 4-7 which the Minister's letter of Intent (1993) emphasized.

▶ **Staff Development**

Develop a comprehensive staff development program for all Teachers Colleges, resource centers, school principals, and the associate teacher program.

- ▶ **Transport**  
Provide Teachers Colleges and resource centers with vehicles and plan to sustain recurrent costs.
- ▶ **Instructional Materials Development**  
Enhance the capacity of Teachers Colleges and resource centers in developing instructional materials especially learning and teaching guides in the vernacular languages, English, science and mathematics.
- ▶ **Student Teaching**  
Expand the period students spend teaching in schools to a period not less than six months during their entire three years at the College.
- ▶ **Housing**  
There is an urgent need to build more staff houses for lecturers in the Colleges if the MEC is to retain and attract well qualified and experienced lecturers.

#### **B. Suggestions for USAID Assistance**

Imbedded in the series of priority items provided above are opportunities for USAID to target specific technical assistance to the MEC beyond that which is provided at present. It is suggested that targeted technical assistance be near-term in nature and be offered by USAID primarily to strengthen the management capacity of the Ministry. It goes without saying that any assistance would be provided at the invitation of the MEC and with consideration for coordination with other donors. The suggestions include:

- ▶ **Systems Development and Support**  
USAID could provide technical assistance on systems development and software acquisition for information systems for finance, expenditure, and materials and orders flows; and possibly technical assistance for the new financial planning unit, particularly on how to make estimates of the recurrent cost implications of reform proposals. Technical assistance might be provided on the preparation of proposals and budgets for development projects that will be responsive to the expected new requirements of the NPC. Support to MEC must be provided with sensitivity to the administrative burden that accompanies the addition of senior consultant personnel.  
  
USAID could provide further support to the above systems in the form of hardware and training, particularly for regional personnel. Sponsorship of a pilot project in a single region might be a good start.
- ▶ **Administrative Structures**

USAID could provide technical assistance on administrative structures for planning, accounting, expenditure and inventory controls, and resource allocation. As foreign advisors are numerous, short-term assistance, mid-level technical support or re-deployment of current staff may be options for increasing assistance to the MEC without straining the MEC's capacity to absorb the external resources. Plans for such support must be responsive to the rationalization of the MEC.

▶ **Special Studies Unit**

USAID may wish to consider providing training and technical assistance for a special studies unit, should such a unit be established.

▶ **Statistical Yearbook**

Because USAID has as a priority the creation of a program baseline and reporting of progress on the reform, USAID may desire to support the MEC in producing a yearbook establishing a baseline drawn from available data. The baseline report has not been done due to lack of adequate staffing.

▶ **Human Resources Development**

Academic training is not considered here as a near-term objective. USAID may, however, wish to define strategies for short-term technical training that respond to immediate Ministry needs and priorities. Training in planning, policy analysis, statistics, information systems, applied research or testing and assessment may be desired by the MEC.

It is doubtful that the complete reform of the planning and management systems of the MEC can take place in less than five years, and the total costs are probably far beyond what USAID can realistically or sensibly finance. However, technical assistance and training requirements are things that USAID should seriously consider. The more ambitious approach included in the suggestions above, and possibly a very helpful strategy, would be to offer to assist with computerizing in a coordinated manner, responsive to regional needs and headquarters needs, one or two regional offices as a pilot project for the MEC as a whole. Collaboration with other donors would be required and desired.

The types of technical assistance and training support that are suggested above can be provided through existing contracting mechanism such as ABEL, IQCs, PRISM and the like. There should be no need for new contracting mechanisms.

### C. Recommendations for Realignment of the USAID Program

The review of progress and the conclusions and recommendations offered to this point in the report relate largely to specific elements of the reform program and are concerned with immediate next steps that can help the people of Namibia achieve their educational aims. Taking

a somewhat broader view along with a critical assessment of the USAID role in contributing to the program, leads the reviewers to offer additional observations and recommendations.

### **1. Resource Sufficiency**

The first observation relates to the sufficiency of resources to support and sustain the reform of basic education. The resources are not available to operate the system in its present form let alone to introduce needed changes. The reform is highly dependent on donor assistance, and that assistance, while substantial, cannot be guaranteed. Already, governments are pulling back from some of their commitments. Therefore,

- ▶ USAID should identify strategies for targeting its resources particularly towards reform initiatives.

### **2. Budgetary Flexibility**

The second observation is linked to the first and addresses the fact that the Ministry of Education and Culture has virtually no budgeting flexibility. Resources allocated to the MEC are already fully obligated in salaries, hostel and catering commitments. Given that resources are limited and inequities in resource distribution are great and are sustained by current practice, the MEC must be able to manage its resources and target its resources to reform priorities. Therefore,

- ▶ USAID should study the merits of linking its support to the Government's achievement of budgetary reforms that provide resource allocation options to the MEC.

### **3. Reform Timeline**

The third observation is that USAID's requirements and expectations regarding reform program outputs and impacts, while generally compatible substantively with the aims of the GRN, are incompatible with respect to timing. For example, the years 1993-1996 will be used for the development of several performance measures for the education system, but USAID expects progress reporting beginning now. Further, USAID expects quality, efficiency and equity improvements to show gains for three years by 1996 when the first cohort of learners in the reform program will not complete the cycle until 2003. Therefore,

- ▶ USAID should alter the program by either extending the timeline for achieving desired performance outcomes, by modifying the results expected in 1996 or both.

### **4. Capacity for Reform**

The fourth observation is that the education system is short of competent Namibian staff throughout the country. Expatriates dominate in many key positions and Namibian staff appear to be underutilized at the same time. A great deal of training is going on and the quality is, in many instances, high. The training system, however, lacks coordination and has not yet been

able to reach many of the people in key areas such as planning, management and research, although an MEC committee is taking on this task. Therefore,

- ▶ USAID should make use of various projects, some centrally funded such as ATLAS and HRDA, to support training. The training must be based on a comprehensive training plan and must, to the extent possible, utilize local and on-the-job training opportunities to minimize disruption to the system.

## 5. Disjuncture in Priorities

The fifth observation is that the USAID support to basic education in Namibia, implicitly (and to some extent, explicitly) emphasizing policy analysis, planning, information management, monitoring and measurement competes with the priority that the Ministry has placed on school-level improvements and field-based initiatives. It is not to say that the MEC disagrees with the USAID concern about system-wide performance, but it is to say that Government resources will in the near term be targeted to MEC school-based policy priorities leaving few Government resources available for centrally-based planning and management initiatives. Therefore, assuming confidence in its own program plan and the full support of the MEC,

- ▶ USAID should develop strategies to support the improvement of planning and management systems and in the broadest sense should define the program aims in terms of policy, planning, management and administrative outcomes particularly at the central and regional levels.

## 6. USAID-MEC Collaboration

The sixth observation is that the basis for productive USAID-MEC collaboration has eroded during the first two years of the reform program and the discordant nature of the relationship can be attributed, in part, to some features of the program design. The annual tranche deadlines and related conditions precedent, are driven more by needs of the USAID program requirements than by the decisions, actions and priorities of the MEC. Furthermore, up to 1993 conditions precedent have been attached to technical performance of MEC units, rather than to broader reforms of policy and implementation strategy. Conditions precedent have included process rather than outcome measures due largely to the fact the system is highly transitional and impact reporting is probably premature. Therefore,

- ▶ USAID should limit and define the conditions precedent and, at the same time, should target the most serious policy and capacity constraints to reform rather than the technical performance of MEC work units.

Finally, it is important to recognize the highly transitional nature of the basic education reform infrastructure and the fragility of its future. Resources are declining and a rationalization and reorganization of the system soon will impact on all concerned. Therefore, it is imperative that USAID's monitoring and support system be fully able to identify and assess changes as they occur and initiate adjustments that will no doubt be required.

## **APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX A: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED**

**APPENDIX B: LIST OF INTERVIEWS, SCHOOLS VISITED**

**APPENDIX C: TEAM SCHEDULE**

**APPENDIX D: TCC AGENDA, DISCUSSION GUIDE & LIST OF ATTENDEES**

**APPENDIX E: DEBRIEFING AGENDAS**

**APPENDIX F: TESTING AND ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP MINUTES**

**APPENDIX A**  
**LIST OF DOCUMENTS**

**BERP - SECOND ANNUAL REVIEW**

- Discipline From Within - A guide for Parents and Learners
- Discipline From Within - A guide for Principals, Teachers, Learners, Parents and communities
- The Broad Curriculum for the Basic Education Teacher Diploma
- Namibia: Educational Book Supply and Distribution
- Education and Culture in Namibia: The Way Forward to 1996
- Report: Personnel Needs Assessment
- Framework for a Costed Basic Education Reform Strategy Takes Shape in the Ministry of Education and Culture
- Basic Education in Namibia: A Framework for Nation Building to the Year 2000 and Beyond
- Pedagogy in Progress: Challenges and Opportunities - Phase I
- Language Policy Evolution and Implementation: Choices and Limitations
- Preparation of an Integrated Teacher In-Service Education Programme
- Education, Culture and Training in Perspective: Annual Review and Further Directives for 1993
- Guide to the National Literacy Programme in Namibia
- Draft Plan for Review of the Educational Management Information System for the MEC
- Curriculum Guide for Formal Basic Education
- Improving the Quality of Basic Education
- National Conference: The Implementation of the New Language Policy

**TRANCHE 1 CONDITION**

- BERP 673-003 PIL No.1
- Letter of intent from Minister Nahas Angula, dated 20 March 1992
- Letter from Minister Herrigel to Minister Angula, dated 20 March 1992 concerning additional financing for FY91/92
- Letter from Director - Treasury "Guideline Amount 91/92 Financial Year: Vote 09"
- Letter from PS, Ankama "Outline of Ministry's Projected Expenditure for FY 91/92 for the Primary School Education Budget
- Letter from Attorney-General certifying that all representative authorities which were established by the South African administration in Namibia prior to Independence have been abolished.
- Letter from Minister Angula "Increase of Guideline amount 1991/92 - BERP"
- Letter from Dr. Ngavirue inviting donors to attend inaugural committee meeting on support to BERP

- Letter from Secretary to the Cabinet on "Special Financial Authorization on NIED"
- Letter from Damaseb, Acting Secretary to the Cabinet on the Establishment of NIED
- Letter of Intent from Minister Angula dated 20 May, 1992
- PAAD approving \$16,000,000
- Action Memorandum dated March 25, 1991
- Letter from Jack Lambert - Ministry's concerns for the LOI
- Letter from Robin Horn reply to Lambert's letter
- Background Note on Education Indicators

### TRANCHE 2 CONDITION

- Namibia Basic Education Programme Policy Matrix
- Status of Tranche 2 conditions
- Towards Education for All
- Transmittal Letter of the Ministry of Education and Culture for Documentation Satisfying Tranche 2 and 3 Conditions under the MEC/USAID Basic Education Reform Sector Assistance
- Basic Education Reform Action Plan  
(Pages 1 - 12 and Section I)  
(Pages 1 - 44, Section III)  
(Pages 45 - 90, Section III)
- Report on Basic Education Reform in Namibia  
Cost, Resources and Sustainability: Projection for 1993 - 2002  
Vol. I, Main Report (Pages 1 - 44) and (Pages 45 - 100)
- Report on Basic Education Reform in Namibia  
Costs, Resources and Sustainability: Projections for 1993 - 2002  
Vol. I, Annex A - Population and Enrolment  
Annex B - Salary Expenditure per Learner  
Annex C - Technical Notes on Budget Analysis Models  
Vol. I, Annex F - Technical Notes on Resource Envelope Analysis  
Vol. II, Annex D - Technical Notes for Enrolment and Cost Projection Model  
Annex E - Detailed Cost analysis of the Framework for Basic Education Reform (Pages 1 - 67) and (Pages 68 - 134)

### TRANCHE 3 CONDITION:

- Letter of Intent for 1993 School Year - MEC
- Plan for the Upgrading and Provision of Basic Education Level School Facilities 1993
- Preliminary Report on English Language in the Primary Schools
- Report on National Learner Baseline Assessment Preliminary Results
- Evaluation Report; Educational Book Supply and Distribution (Part I)

- Evaluation Report; Educational Book Supply and Distribution (Part II)
- The Broad Curriculum for the Basic Education Teacher Diploma
- Curriculum Guide for Formal Basic Education
- Report on The Educational Management Information System to Track and Monitor Changes in Program Indicators
- Program Indicators for Monitoring Basic Education Reform

**APPENDIX B**  
**PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

B-1

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>TEL. NO.</u>
AGAPITUS, A.	Chairman TCC and Director of Primary Education.	
AMUSHILA A.	Chief of Education, Planning, Ondangwa Region	
ANDREAS NASHONGO M.	Lecturer, Professional Education, Ongwediva Training College.	
ANGULA, Nahas	Minister of Education and Culture	
ANKAMA, V.	Permanent Secretary, MEC	
AVENSTRUP, Roger	Education Advisor, MEC	221920
BEVACQUA, Frank	FSU technical advisor, ISDD	
BONGJOH, Felix	AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK Senior Education Analyst/ Project Officer - Agriculture and Rural Development, Department South Region	
BURGER, Louis	Under Secretary, Formal Education, M.E.C.	221920
CHAMBERLAIN, Dick	Language Advisor	
DIAZ, Lg.	Directorate of Education and Culture	
DU PLESSIS, Joy Ms.	Ongwediva Teachers College, Science Dept.	
GAROEBE, Mr.	Director, Khorixas Region	
GRANT-LEWIS, Sue	Evaluation and Assessment Advisor	

67

GREEF, Willie	Director of Financial Administration, M.E.C.	221920
HAMUNYELA, Meriam Ms.	Ongwediva Teachers College, Head of Professional Education Dept.	
HANGAH, Philemon	Lecturer in Languages Dept., Ongwediva Teachers College	
HATUIKULUPI T.N.	Head of Languages Dept., Ongwediva Teachers College.	
HERERO, David D.	Inspector of Education and Culture, Opuwo	
HIGGS, Peter	UNESCO	293-9311 X 3221/3223
HÖVELMANN, Wendy	External Resources, MEC	221920
KALE, Mrs.	Chief Education Officer, Primary Education, MEC, Rundu	
KANN, Ulla	External Resources, MEC	221920
KANDAWIRE, Prof. D.M.	UNIVERSITY OF NAMIBIA	3072353
KAURE, Mr.	Chief Inspector, Khorixas	
KLEMENTS, Namwira, Mr.	Rundu Planning Officer	
LAMBERT, Jack	Advisor	
LE ROUX, Andre	Director, Personnel, MEC	
LOUBSER, J.L.	Deputy Director, Ondangwa Region	
LUKA, Mr.	Katima Teachers Resource Centre	
LUPALEZWI, Mr.	Chief Education Officer, MEC, Katima Mulilo	
MAM BIRAM JOOF	UNESCO - Education Adviser for Namibia	2002160/ 229220 X 2160
MENDELSON, John	ISDD	

MUKENDWA, Joseph	Director, Planning, MEC	221920
MUKONO, Boniface	Deputy Director, MEC, Katima Mulilo Region	
MUSHE, Alex	Rector, Katima Mulilo Teachers College	
MUTONYI, Florence Ms.	Ongwediva Teachers Col- lege, Maths. Department	
NDAKUNDA, T.H.	Chief Inspector, Ondangwa Region	
NESBITT, Rod	Advisor on Assessment, FSU	
NESTOR, Mr.	Director, Support Services	
NEUMBO, John	Regional Physical, Khorixas	
NYAMBE, Alfred	Inspector, MEC, Katima Mulilo	
ODIN, Dr. Björn	Educ. Dev. Unit, Katima Mulilo Teachers College	
SHIKUKUMWA, Immanuel	Inspector, Rundu Ministry of Education & Culture	
SHILONGO, Mrs.	Chief Education Officer, MEC, Rundu	
SHIMHOILENI, R.K. Mrs.	Chief of Education, Non- Formal Education, Ondangwa Region	
SHINYEMBA, D.N. Mrs	Chief of Education, Tea- cher Education, Vocatio- nal and Technical Educa- tion, Ondangwa Region	
SINVULA, C.M.	Regional Director, Edu- cation & Culture, Katima Mulilo Regional MEC offices.	
STEYN, Lizeth	Head of Department, Rundu Teachers College	

STONE, Simon	Researcher, NEPRU	
SWARTS, Patti Ms.	Director: Teacher Education, NIED, MEC	
SWARTZ, Mr.	Central Bureau of Statistics, N.P.C.	
TJONDE, Gerson	Senior Subject Advisor, (Otjiherero), Opuwo	
TJOZONGORO, Mr.	Chief Educational Planner Windhoek Region	
TREWBY, Richard	Director, Languages, MEC	221920
VAN DER MERWE, I. Mr.	Director: Curriculum Research and Development, NIED, MEC	
VAN NIEKERK, Holly	Acting Head, Kavango Teachers Centre	
VAN VUUREN, Mr.	Inspector of Schools, Gobabis	
VATUVA, Pauline Ms.	Head of Social Studies, Dept., Ongwediva Teachers College	
VOIGTS, Friedhelm	Chief, ISDD, MEC	

**SCHOOLS VISITED**

<u>NAME OF SCHOOL</u>	<u>PERSON CONTACTED</u>	<u>VISITED BY</u>
AASVOËLNES PRIMARY SCHOOL	Mr. Musongo, Principal	B. Bryant J. Jansen
ALFA PRIMARY SCHOOL	Mr. Jim Kahohoi	P. Dzvimbo Wes Snyder
BEN VAN DER WALT, Gobabis	Deputy Head	J. Cobbe
BERTHOLT PRIMARY SCHOOL	Principal	A. Riddell
BRAUNFELS AGRICULTURAL SECONDARY SCHOOL, Khorixas	Mr. Goamub, Head	P. Dzvimbo Wes Snyder
DEUTSCHE SCHULE WINDHOEK	Mr. Schlenther, Principal	A. Riddell
DRIMIOPSIS PRIMARY	Head	J. Cobbe
EFIDI PRIMARY SCHOOL Ondobe Area	Mr. Erasmus Naikaku, Head	P. Dzvimbo Wes Snyder
ELIM PRIMARY, Khomasdal	Head	J. Cobbe
EMMA HOOGENHOUT, Windhoek	Head	J. Cobbe
EPUKIRO CATHOLIC SCHOOL, R.C. Mission, Epukiro	Head	J. Cobbe
F. GOEB PRIMARY SCHOOL, Khorixas	Mr. Aoxamub, Head	P. Dzvimbo Wes Snyder
GOBABIS PRIMARY, Gobabis	Head	J. Cobbe
GOOD HOPE PRIMARY SCHOOL, Post 10, Epukiro	Head	J. Cobbe
HIPPO NGK BOESMANSKOOL, Epukiro	Hostel Manager	J. Cobbe
KATIMA MULILO PRIMARY SCHOOL	Mr. le Grange (Principal)	B. Bryant J. Jansen
KEHEMU JUNIOR & SENIOR SCHOOL	Mr. Hauseku, Principal	B. Bryant J. Jansen
KIZITO SECONDARY SCHOOL	Michael Sibuku, Principal	B. Bryant J. Jansen
LEEVI HAKUSEMBE SECONDARY SCHOOL	Mr. Kavara, Principal	B. Bryant J. Jansen
LISELO PRIMARY SCHOOL	Ms. Limbo	B. Bryant J. Jansen

11

MAFUTA PRIMARY & SECONDARY SCHOOL	Mr. Mutabalizi	B. Bryant J. Jansen
M.H. GREEF PRIMARY SCHOOL	Mr. Crighton, Principal	A. Riddell
MOKJANI THLABBELLO HIGH SCHOOL	Head	J. Cobbe
ONGWEDIVA RESOURCE CENTRE	Mr. Jason Mbodo, Acting Head	P. Dzvimbo Wes Snyder
OSHAKATI PRIMARY SCHOOL	Mr. Herbert, Head	P. Dzvimbo Wes Snyder
OSHELA SECONDARY SCHOOL	Mr. Thomas Kaulawa, Head of Department Mrs. Jacobina Kayofa, Superintendent Mr. Simon Sheuyange, Ass. Superintendent	P. Dzvimbo Wes Snyder
OTJINENE JUNIOR PRIMARY SCHOOL, Otjinene	Head	J. Cobbe
OTJINENE SENIOR PRIMARY SCHOOL, Otjinene	Head	J. Cobbe
OTJINENE JUNIOR SECONDARY SCHOOL, Otjinene	Head	J. Cobbe
POST 3 COMBINED HIGH SCHOOL & JS SCHOOL, Epukiro	Head	J. Cobbe
RUNGA JR. PRIMARY SCHOOL	Mr. Hamutenya	B. Bryant J. Jansen
TISELO PRIMARY SCHOOL	Ms. Esther Limbo	B. Bryant J. Jansen
TSUMKWE JR. SECONDARY SCHOOL	Mr. Meyer, Principal	B. Bryant J. Jansen
WELWITCHIA PRIMARY SCHOOL, Khorixas	Mr. Dax, Head	P. Dzvimbo Wes Snyder
WITVLEI PRIMARY, Witvlei	Head	J. Cobbe

**APPENDIX C**  
**SCHEDULE - SECOND ANNUAL REVIEW**

C-1

WEEK	DATE/TIME	DETAILS
WASH./ WIND- HOEK	Monday January 25 1993	Brigitte Hanke comes on as back-up secretary; prepare Welcome Kits, Briefing books.  Creative ETA's:  Brenda Bryant : January 30 James Cobbe : January 31 Peter Dzvimbo : January 31 J. Jansen : February 7
WIND- HOEK WEEK I	Monday, February 1  08:00 a.m.   09:30  10:30-11:15  11:15-11:30  p.m.	In-house at USAID (nitty gritty and logistics finalizing meetings and presentations).  Conference Room:  A. Welcome - M. Johnson B. B. Belding C. Michelle re tickets, reservations, logis- tics.  Depart for MEC. Briefing by MEC Rev. Coord. Team : Min. Conference Room.  Official Opening of second Review; MEC, Mi- nister's Conf. Room. Minister Angula, B. Belding and B. Bryant.  Setting of informal consultations  Meet with MEC Review Team (Agapitus, Tait, Grant Lewis).
	Tuesday, am February 2 a.m.  2:30-3:15pm	ETA Wes Snyder School visit Peter Dzvimbo to meet ADB team.  Briefing on School Mapping, Room 277, led by John Mendelsohn with ISDD staff.
	Wednesday, am February 3, 2:00-4:00	Meeting with Teacher Education Team (PIU and CCG), Room 303, led by Patti Swarts.
	Thursday, February 4	School visits, Windhoek W/D Tait, MEC
	Friday, February 5 8:30-9:30 am  p.m.	Briefing on Teachers' Resource Centres. Resource Centre Conf. Room. Rory Douglas and Cathy Powell Miles.  Briefing on Regions to be visited. MEC/Review Team Members.

73

WEEK II FIELD	Monday, February 8 07:15 08:30 09:00  02:30 05:00	<p><b>TEAM I - KHORIXAS/ONDANGWA</b>  <b>TEAM MEMBERS:</b> MEC : Gert Fourie  USAID : Victor Levine  CREATIVE: Dzvimbo &amp; Snyder</p> <p>Depart Windhoek (charter plane) Eros Airport  Arrive Khorixas - Met by Regional Rep.  Depart for school visits  Welwitschia Jr. Secondary  F. Gaeb Primary School  Braunfels Agricultural School  Meeting with Regional Office Staff  Close of day. Lodging: Khorixas Rest Camp.</p>
	Tuesday, February 9 07:30 09:00  02:00 03:00 04:00 05:00	<p>Depart Khorixas (charter plane)  Arrive Opuwo. Meet Regional Rep./Inspector  School visits:  Putuavanga Jr. Secondary School  Alfa Primary School  Kameru Primary School  Team must take packed lunch from Hotel  Depart Opuwo  Arrive Oshakati. Met by Ondangwa Reg. Rep.  Brief meeting with Ondangwa Regional staff.  Close of day. Lodging: Oshendira Club.</p>
	Wednesday, February 10 08:00     05:00	<p>Depart for school visits  Team is interested in the fol. institutions in  addition to the schools listed:  Ongwediva Teachers' College  Ongwediva Teachers' Resource Centre  Inspection Circuit offices</p> <p>Schools identified by Mr. Nangolo:</p> <p>Oluteyi Primary  Sheetekela Primary  Onkumbwiimbi Primary  Ashipala Secondary School  Eengedjo Secondary School  Oshela Secondary School</p> <p>Close of day. Lodging: Oshendira Club.</p>
	Thursday, February 11 08:00	<p>Continuation of Wednesday program.  Lodging: Oshendira Club.</p>
	Friday, February 12 08:00 11:30 02:00 04:30	<p>Continuation of Wednesday program.  De-briefing with Regional Office  Depart Ondangwa  Arrive Windhoek</p>

<p>Monday, February 8</p> <p>06:15 09:00</p> <p>01:00 02:00 02:30 05:00</p>	<p><b>TEAM II - RUNDU/KATIMA</b> <b>TEAM MEMBERS:</b></p> <p>MEC : Klaus Linow; Dolf van Jaarsveld USAID : Belding CREATIVE: Jansen &amp; Bryant</p> <p>In Tsumkwe, plane will be met by Mr. R. Kandjimi (Rundu Inspector) and another regional rep. with a car. That rep. will fly to Rundu with team but Mr. Kandjimi will remain in Tsumkwe. If you manage, it would be nice touch to bring along enough lunch to share with the 2 Rundu Regional Reps.</p> <p>Depart Windhoek (charter plane) Eros Airport Arrive Tsumkwe. Meet Rundu Regional Rep. Visit schools Tsumkwe Jr. Primary and Aasvoelnes Primary? Team must pack lunch from Windhoek Hotel Depart Tsumkwe; joined by van Jaarsveld of MEC. Arrive Rundu Meeting with Regional Office Close of day. Lodging: Rundu Recreation Club.</p>	
<p>Tuesday, February 9</p> <p>08:00</p>		<p>Depart for schools with Regional Rep. Schools to be visited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Leevi Hakusembe Secondary School</li> <li>- Ruuga Primary School</li> <li>- Sauyemwa Senior Primary School</li> </ul> <p>Lodging: Kavango Guest Lodge.</p>
<p>Wednesday, February 10</p> <p>08:00</p> <p>02:00 03:00 04:00 05:00</p>		<p>Depart for schools with Regional Rep. (continuation of Tuesday program). Schools to be visited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- One urban primary school</li> <li>- Rundu Teachers' College</li> <li>- Rundu Teachers' Resource Centre</li> </ul> <p>Depart Rundu Arrive Katima Mulilo Brief meeting with Regional Office Close of day. Lodging: Zambezi Lodge.</p>
<p>Thursday, February 11</p> <p>08:00</p> <p>PM</p>		<p>Depart for school visits Team is interested in visiting (Thur &amp; Fri):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- primary schools</li> <li>- junior secondary schools</li> <li>- Katima Teachers' College (optional -- teacher training specialist will not be on this team)</li> </ul> <p>Meeting with Regional Office. Lodging: Zambezi Lodge.</p>

1  
15

	<b>Friday, February 12</b> 08:00  02:00 05:00	Depart for schools with Regional Rep. (continuation of Thursday program) Depart Katima Arrive Windhoek
--	---	---

<p>WEEK II</p>	<p>Monday, February 8</p> <p>07:00</p> <p>PM</p>	<p><b>TEAM III - WINDHOEK</b>  <b>TEAM MEMBERS:</b> MEC : Mrs. A. Tjoutuku (NIED)  driver from Windhoek  region, possibly Mr.  Tjozongoro, Windhoek  Region  CREATIVE: Dr. James Cobbe</p> <p>Regional Office Combi to collect Jim at Safari  Hotel. Visit schools in Witvlei and Gobabis.  Possibly Drimiopsis.  Lodging in Gobabis Hotel (MEC made bookings).</p>
	<p>Tuesday, February 9</p> <p>06:30</p> <p>07:30</p> <p>01:00</p> <p>PM</p>	<p>ETA Riddell  Depart Hotel for Epukiro.  1. Hippo Primary School  2. Epukiro Post 3  3. Epukiro P.S.  Lunch  Lodging in Gobabis Hotel (MEC made bookings).</p>
	<p>Wednesday, February 10</p> <p>08:00</p> <p>PM</p>	<p>Depart for Otjinene  1. Petrus Adams  2. Groot Aub  3. Baumgartsbrunn  Return to Windhoek</p>
	<p>Thursday, February 11</p> <p>a.m.</p> <p>p.m.</p>	<p>Windhoek Teachers' College  De-brief with Windhoek Region</p>
	<p>Friday, February 12</p> <p>08:00</p>	<p>Depart for Urban Schools  1. Suiderhof  2. Manduma  3. Katjumune</p>

	Sunday, February 14	ETA - R.L. Shortlidge
WEEK III	Monday, February 15	U.S. Government Holiday/USAID officially closed.
WIND- HOEK	09:00 a.m.	De-briefing on field visits. Creative/USAID/MEC Review Team Members. In MEC Resource Centre Conference Room.
	2:00-4:30pm	Assessment Workshop: Test validation (RCRR). Led by C. Wesley Snyder.
	Tuesday, February 16, 11:00-1:00	Meeting with Technical Coordinating Committee. Minister's Conference Room. Agenda: Framework/ Action Plan and Tranche 4 Conditions.
	2:00-4:30pm	Assessment Workshops: Further Analysis of Test Results (may be broken into subject groups) Resource Centre Conf. Room, led by C. Wesley Snyder.
	Wednesday, February 17 08:00	Briefing on EMIS.
	9:00-12:00	Workshop on Cost, Revenue and Sustainability Analysis. Resource Centre Conf. Room. Led by Victor Levine, Abby Riddell, James Cobbe.
	14:00-16:30	Workshop in Indicators (RCCR). Led by Friedhelm Voigts with ISDD.
	Thursday, February 18 10:00-01:00	Workshop on Curriculum.
	02:30	Review Team Meeting with USAID to prepare for our reporting activities.
	Friday, February 19 08:00	Review Team Meeting with USAID. We should distribute any draft materials at this time. The agenda will focus on major findings/ insights, conclusions/recommendations and Tranche 4 suggestions. Each of us should plan to address the group and we should expect the format to be informal and interactive.
	02:00	Review with USAID and MEC. At Thursday's meeting we will discuss the agenda.

WEEK IV	Monday, February 22	CREATIVE/USAID USAID Offices : B. Belding/R.L. Shortlidge/ Johnson
	Tuesday, February 23	
	Wednesday, February 24 09:00	Meet with Minister Angula: Shortlidge, Belding, Levine, Bryant.
	Thursday, February 25	
	Friday, February 26	Submit final report.

REVIEW TEAM MEMBERS

CREATIVE ASSOCIATES	USAID	MEC
Dr. Brenda Bryant, Team Leader	Ms. Barbara Belding	Minister Nahas Angula
Dr. C. Wesley Snyder Jr.	Dr. Victor Levine	Mr. Ambrosius Agapitus
Dr. James Cobbe	Mr. Mark Johnson	Mr. Davey Tait
Dr. Jonathon Jansen	R.L. Shortlidge	Dr. Sue Grant Lewis
Dr. Peter Dzvimbo		
Dr. Abby Riddell		

60

**APPENDIX D****BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAM REVIEW TEAM SEMINAR WITH THE  
TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE (MEC)  
16 FEBRUARY 1993****Overview of the Review**

The Basic Education Program Review Team has studied documentation provided by the Ministry of Education and Culture (MEC), has held meetings with MEC personnel and has spent one week in field visits observing and meeting with learners, teachers, teacher educators, preservice teachers, resource staff, technical advisors, volunteers, principals, regional administrators and regional professional support staff. Based on field visits, the Review Team has begun to identify the achievements of the Basic Education Reform Program and to discern actions that will be required in the future in order to continue the progress that is already evident and impressive.

**The Purposes of the Seminar**

The TCC Seminar is intended to involve the Technical Coordinating Committee in furthering the Team's understanding of the Basic Education Reform Program. The team is aiming to document the Program's achievements, to identify constraints and issues that affect continued progress and to suggest priorities for action in the years to come giving special attention to achievements that must be realized in 1993. To this end, the objectives of the seminar are to:

- Share the Review Team's findings related to management of the basic education reform, provision of information for decision making, delivery of instruction, and the development of educational personnel;
- Discuss the opportunities that currently exist to strengthen management, information systems, instruction and personnel during 1993-1996;
- Recommend priority actions for 1993;
- Suggest how USAID can best support the Reform Program in 1993.

**Meeting Strategy**

Following the opening of the meeting and a general introduction to the Basic Education Reform Program Seminar, the group will be divided into four groups; each group will occupy one side of the conference table and attendees will choose the group they wish to join. Using the attached document as a starting point, each group will proceed through the following discussion:

- Review and catalogue achievements - 10 minutes.

81

- Given the current constraints and demands on education, discuss and expand the list of opportunities that should be pursued during 1993-1996 - 40 minutes.
- What are the outstanding achievements the TCC hopes for in 1993? Discuss and select priority actions for 1993 - 30 minutes.
- Report to the whole group - 5 minutes/group - 20 minutes.

Each group will identify a discussion facilitator, a spokesperson and a timekeeper.

Group Assignments for USAID and Review Team Members

- Group 1:      **Management of Basic Education Reform**  
                  Victor Levine, Brenda Bryant, Jim Cobbe
- Group 2:      **Provision of Information to Guide Decisions**  
                  Richard Shortlidge, Wes Snyder, Abby Riddell
- Group 3:      **Delivery of Instruction**  
                  Barbara Belding, Jonathan Jansen
- Group 4:      **Development of Educational Personnel**  
                  Mark Johnson, Peter Dzvimbo

02

## **APPENDIX D**

### **REVIEWING THE BASIC EDUCATION REFORM PROGRAM** **Discussion Guide for the TCC - 16 February 1993**

The Basic Education Reform Program in Namibia is defined in a variety of policy documents that have been provided to the USAID Review Team. Those documents include the Action Plan and the Minister's Letter of Intent for 1993 as well as numerous documents that spell out specific achievements resulting from Namibia's investment in education. The Review Team has organized its field work around the themes that are common to these documents in order to be comprehensive in its analysis while remaining focused on those aspects of the reform that the educational leadership deems to be critical. Following is a summary of the components of the Review.

#### **1. Planning and Management of Basic Education Reform**

Management includes planning, organization and administration, and resource allocation. During 1992 the Ministry of Education and Culture (MEC) concentrated its efforts on action planning, on studying costs associated with the reform and on determining the types of indicators that might serve as management tools in tracking and reporting on progress during the reform and beyond. The MEC has undertaken a reorganization of the education system and has installed administrative operations at the regional level. For 1993, the MEC is stressing regionalization and regional capacity-building.

##### **a. Achievements in Management of the Basic Education Reform - 1992**

- Widespread awareness of basic education reform at the headquarters, regional and school levels;
- Awareness of and pride in the unification of the education system;
- Initiation of regionalization and outreach to remote communities; expansion of the inspectorate and the subject advising functions;
- Improved access to schools along with increased community support for promoting school attendance;
- Widespread access to and participation in various decision-making processes;
- Introduction of a planning process that links costing and program goals.

- b. **Opportunities in the Management of Basic Education Reform - 1993-1996.**
- Improvement of linkages between finance and planning;
  - Improved information systems in finance, personnel, and physical facilities and materials;
  - Improved mechanisms for resource allocation;
  - Improved dissemination of and use of data for making policy decisions or for refining policies;
  - Refining of the system for distributing books and materials;
  - Management training for headquarters and regional personnel; strengthening school-level management;
  - Detailing of the regionalization plan to include central-regional linkages, commonality of purpose, integration of tasks, exchange of data, etc.
- c. **Priority Actions for 1993**
- Complete the planning for financial, personnel and physical information systems and begin implementation;
  - Establish mechanisms for coordinating the information systems and for integrating resource allocation and the information systems.

2. **Provision of Information to Guide Decisions Regarding Basic Education Reform**

Information systems are threefold: policy information and analysis, educational research and the measurement of student performance. During 1992 the Ministry concentrated its efforts on policy information and analysis and specifically on the development of its capacity to reliably describe the educational system. The development of an Educational Management Information System has been undertaken, primarily, by the Information, Statistics and Data Division (ISDD) of the MEC. The educational research function will reside within the National Institute for Educational Development (NIED) while monitoring of student performance remains in the initial stages of design. During 1993 the MEC is placing emphasis on the study of learner flows.

- a. **Achievements in Providing Information to Guide the Basic Education Reform - 1992.**

54

- Collection and reporting of the 15 day and annual education census statistics;
  - Implementation of school mapping, GIS;
  - Completion of the baseline learner assessment;
  - Initial exploration of indicators for monitoring the reform of basic education.
- b. **Opportunities for Providing Information to Guide the Basic Education Reform - 1993-1996.**
- Establishing crude, simple indicators that can be used immediately to track progress and to provide a broad, descriptive overview of the changes in the educational system;
  - Initiation of the development of minimum school standards;
  - Improved dissemination and use of available data at central and regional levels accompanied by needed training for regional personnel; dissemination to the general public;
  - Continued identification of more appropriate indicators that can be used for management purposes in the long run;
  - Initiation of the integration of management data (financial, personnel and physical) with ISDD data;
  - Continue to refine and develop baseline learner assessment tools and strategies;
  - Implement recommendations in the textbook study;
  - Study repetition (learner flows).
- c. **Priority Actions for 1993**
- Develop a baseline and track simple and meaningful indicators;
  - Build capacity within the ISDD and planning sections of the MEC (e.g., through a policy study such as learner flows).

3. **Design, Development and Delivery of Instruction (Curriculum, books and materials and facilities)**

The components of the instructional delivery system include provision of curriculum; deployment of teachers; provision of books, equipment and other materials; and increase in facilities. During 1992 the MEC has concentrated its efforts on developing core curriculum for grades 8-10 and for mathematics in grade 4; revising the book distribution system; improving the teacher/learner ratio; and constructing classrooms. During 1993 the Ministry is giving priority attention to developing curriculum for grades 4-7 and to planning for and initiating school upgrading, stage 1.

a. **Achievements in Design, Development and Delivery of Instruction - 1992**

- Promoting a clear and consistent understanding within regions (school personnel and regional office staff) of the objectives of the curriculum reform process; widespread awareness of the learner-centered methodology;
- Recruiting a comprehensive set of curriculum support services including inservice training, teacher resource centers, subject advisory services, donor initiatives in specific subjects, and volunteer instructors to influence the reform process;
- Developing a basic physical infrastructure in rural areas as an important first step in supporting the effective delivery of curriculum and instructional services;
- New curriculum implemented in grades 8-10 and grade 4 mathematics.

b. **Opportunities for Delivery of Instruction - 1993-1996**

- Developing a strong qualitative data base on the curriculum reform process. This data base is critical for evaluating the impact of past reform initiatives but also to inform the direction of future curriculum reform strategies;
- Integrating three critically interdependent elements of curriculum change as part of the reform strategy i.e., teacher development, curriculum revision (syllabus, textbooks) and testing (e.g. as a start consider involving teachers, teacher educators, testing specialists and curriculum design experts collectively in each of the following activities: curriculum development, inservice training, assessment measures);

46

- **Realigning the curriculum reform process with existing conditions in the classroom so that the reform strategy incorporates limitations such as the lack of instructional resources and low skill levels among teachers;**
- **Operationalizing the understanding of the curriculum reform through specific pedagogical strategies (i.e., beyond interpretation of the syllabus) which are linked to the actual conditions of teaching particularly in rural schools;**
- **Coordinating the diversity of curriculum support services to enhance the impact and long-term sustainability of these multiple agencies;**
- **Intensifying the training of subject advisors in both pedagogical skills and subject matter competence, and then increasing the contact time of advisors with teachers at the classroom level.**

**c. Priority Actions - 1993**

- **Establish mechanisms to design, pilot and implement a curriculum evaluation plan; e.g., detailed but focused case studies of 12 schools, sampled on a regional basis (2 per region) and to reflect the diversity of school contexts, in order to understand the ways in which specific curriculum reforms (new language policy) impact on teaching/learning/testing at the classroom level.**

**4. Development of Educational Personnel**

**Personnel development includes preservice and inservice teacher education; training for school principals; and the professional development of other technical, administrative and managerial staff of the school system including MEC regional and headquarters personnel. During 1992 personnel development efforts aimed at inservice education for junior secondary teachers, at preparation and introduction of the first year of a three-year Basic Education Teaching Diploma and at management training for school principals. The MEC plan for 1993 stresses inservice training for teachers in grades 4-7.**

**a. Achievements in Personnel Development - 1992**

- **The development of National and Regional based in-service programs for the implementers of the new curriculum essential in realizing the reform;**

- The establishment of new Teachers Colleges, the development of a new curriculum for the BETD and the admission in 1993 of the first year of the BETD student teachers;
  - The institutionalization and development of in-service programs for educational managers of the reform such as teachers, school principals, inspectors and planners at both the regional and national levels;
  - The creation and improvement of Regional Resource Centers and School Based Teachers' Resource Centers to enhance the quality of teachers and sensitizing them to their role in comprehending the form, content and orientation of reform and the modus operandi of achieving its short and long term goals;
  - The appointment of Regional and school based resource persons; the refurbishing of existing facilities and the upgrading of equipment and materials in both new and old Resource Centers.
- b. **Opportunities for Personnel Development - 1993-1996**
- Staff-development of lecturers in teachers colleges to raise their qualifications to undergraduate and post graduate degree levels;
  - Enhance the institutional capacity of the MEC by staff- developing Namibians where expatriates are performing key roles;
  - Amplifying the academic and professional leadership role of the University of Namibia in Teacher Education;
  - Staff-development of personnel in the Regions in order to reinforce their managerial skills and attitudes in realizing the goals of the reform;
  - Re-enforce the training of subject advisers to support the teaching function in schools;
  - Enhance management training system-wide at both the regional and national levels;
  - Development of regional personnel; development of capacity, together with planning, in production of policy briefs, discussion papers on policy trade offs and targeted research across regions to more finely hone policies to different contexts (e.g., learner flows, schooling effectiveness related to baseline learner assessment).

c. **Priority Actions - 1993**

- **Intensify the process of equipping Teacher Resource Centers and Teachers Colleges;**
- **Develop a comprehensive staff development program for the MEC at all levels.**

189

**APPENDIX D**

D-10

**FINAL TCC WORKSHOP - FEBRUARY 16, 1993**

**TCC MEETING - ATTENDANCE**

1. Sydney R. Grant - MEC/NIED
2. Abby R. Riddell - Creative Associates
3. Jonathan D. Jansen - Creative Associates
4. Kuzvinetsa Peter Dzvimbó - Creative Associates
5. Jim Cobbe - Creative Associates
6. F.B. Koopman - Examinations Directorate
7. H. Patemann - MEC/NIED
8. Cliff Olivier - MEC/NIED
9. Patti Swarts - MEC/NIED
10. Richard Trewby - MEC/NIED
11. M.J. Mukendwa - MEC/Planning
12. P.M. Simataa - MEC/Planning
13. Victor Levine - USAID
14. Ulla Kann - MEC
15. Greg Miles - MEC
16. Friedhelm Voigts - MEC/ISDD
17. Louis Burger - MEC
18. Kowie van der Smit - MEC
19. Frank Bevacqua - MEC/EMIS
20. M. Johnson - USAID
21. J. Lambert - MEC
22. Wes Snyder - Creative Associates
23. Justin Ellis - MEC/ANFE
24. Sue Grant Lewis - MEC
25. Brenda Bryant - Creative Associates
26. B. Belding - USAID
27. Roger Avenstrup - NIED

90

- 28. I.F. van der Merwe - NIED
- 29. Jan Alberts - NIED

**APPENDIX E**  
**DEBRIEFING AGENDAS**

**MEC/USAID Debriefing - 19 February 1993**  
**Review of Progress in the Reform of Basic Education**

1. Welcome
2. Overview of the Debriefing
3. Summary of Findings and Recommendations
  - Curriculum and the Delivery of Instruction
  - Teacher Education and the Development of Personnel
  - Planning, Management and Information Systems
    - Efficiency
    - Equity
    - Learner Proficiency
4. Open Discussion.

92.

Basic Education Reform Program : Second Annual Review  
Team Debriefing - 19 February 1993

The purposes of the meeting are to:

- Review the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the Basic Education Reform Program Review Team;
- Agree on the documentation that will be submitted as final deliverables by the Review Team.

A G E N D A

1. Overview of the Approach to the Review - Brenda.
2. Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations
  - Planning & Management of Basic Education Reform - Jim.
  - Information to Guide Decisions - Abby and Jim.
    - Equity indicators and related information - Abby
    - Efficiency indicators and related information - Jim
    - Learner proficiency - Wes
  - Design, Development and Delivery of Instruction (Curriculum, materials and facilities) - Jonathan
  - Development of Educational Personnel - Peter
3. Discussion of Tranche 4 Conditionalities.
4. Other Recommendations to USAID.
5. Final Deliverables.

93

**APPENDIX F**  
**TESTING AND ASSESSMENT**  
**WORKSHOP MINUTES**

The following document summarises a four hour workshop that spanned the 12th and 13th of February. About 12-15 people participated in the various discussions. Most came from the language group of the proposed NIED.

The first two hours of work concentrated on the details of the language proficiency tests (particularly English) and the specification of the kinds of information that are available from the formal system and that which is not as readily available (see Table 1). In the last two hours, the larger list was reduced to the highest priority information for the language group, as they undertake their work on reform (see Table 2). To further specify these informational needs, the group articulated the 'who' (the part of the MEC responsible for the collection of the data) and the 'how' (the suggested methodology, noting that other approaches would be considered where possible) (see Table 3). The initial activity would be within the central MEC so that the efforts would be coordinated, organised, and the information disseminated to all interested subunits across the Ministry. A suggestion for the localisation of responsibility was the assignment of the function to NIED. It was estimated that the planning and procedural discussions would take about 2 years, if a task force were appointed soon to undertake the research and development activities required to plan and implement the tasks. Most tasks would involve the regional offices. It was estimated that all elements could be in place, thus establishing this part of regionalisation, within about 5 years. In order to carry out these tasks to establish the information system, the particular needs were itemised (see Table 4).

The underlying rationale is that curriculum development requires information. The better the information, the more likely that NIED can do a better job. It was recognised that there are various components of the education system that must be involved in these activities throughout the effort. And it was recognised that the system may be differentially activated across and within regions, but that any information would be useful on the priority items. To initiate this plan, NIED will need to present a proposal for the CCC for eventual consideration by the TCC. This workshop served as the initial brainstorming for the development of the necessary proposal documents.

94

TABLE 1

INFORMATION ON PEDAGOGIC EFFECTIVENESS/  
LEARNER PROFICIENCY

Formal Points of Departure

- Syllabi as Required
- Curricular Materials
- Facilities of School
- School/Classroom Test Results and Grade Pass/Fail Rates
- Moderation of School/Classroom Tests
- Student/Teacher Sex Distributions
- No. of Children in Classroom
- Teacher's Qualifications
- Teacher Experience
- School Attendance
- Teacher Absenteeism
- Teacher Proficiency in Language
- Availability of Textbooks
- Review of Learner Exercise Books
- Inspector Observation Notes
- Subject Advisor Observation Notes
- Research Tests in English, Maths and Oshidongo
- Internal Efficiency
- External Examination Results

Less-Readily Available Information

- "Hidden" Curriculum
- Match between Activities in Schooling vs. Life
- What Learners Think about their Schooling
- School/Classroom Atmosphere and Aesthetics
- Headmaster, Teacher and Student Attitudes
- Community Participation
- Parent-Teacher Evening Review of Schooling by Parents
- "Open" Spirit in Classroom -- Learner Focus
- Actual Activities/Performance of Schooling vs. What Community Wants and Expects of Schooling
- External Efficiency
- Worklife Quality of Teachers (including satisfaction with salary)
- Teacher/Learner Expectations of each other, class and schooling
- Richness of Personality and Experience of Teacher/Learners

95

**TABLE 2****PRIORITY MONITORING AND EVALUATION INFORMATION  
NEEDS (not ranked within)**

- Official Curriculum versus Ideal
- Activities/Performance of schooling versus MEC and Community Expectations
- External Efficiency
- School/Classroom Atmosphere and Aesthetics
- Headmaster/Teachers/Students Attitudes
- Exams/Tests, complemented by other assessments
- Teacher Competency and Ability
- Teacher Attributes related to Compatibility of Teacher/Learners

**TABLE 3**  
**MEETING THE INFORMATION NEEDS:**  
**WHO AND HOW**

<u>PRIORITY</u>	<u>RESPONSIBLE AGENCY</u>	<u>APPROACH</u>
Offic. Curr.	Central	Curriculum Panels External Review
Activities	Region	Classroom Obs Information from past
Ext. Efficiency	Unclear	Tracer Studies
Atmosphere/Aesth.	Region	Classroom Obs.
Attitudes	Region	School visits Surveys Inservice Training
Exams/Tests	Central/Region	Research Samples JSCE
Competency	Region	Classroom Obs.
Attributes	Region	Unknown

**TABLE 4****NEEDS TO ESTABLISH THIS INFORMATION SYSTEM**

1. Responsibility assigned by Minister to some agency; possibly a new function of NIED with others involved (e.g., University, Teacher Colleges, ISDD).
2. Money needed for more staff both at NIED and Regions; there are staff who can carry out some of the tasks but more would be better.
3. Money needed for operational costs (e.g., travel, materials).
4. Consultants are needed to facilitate the establishment of the information methodology and database, as well as provide advice and lessons learned on these topics from other sources.
5. Training is needed for professional development to establish the capabilities and for inservice to follow up and implement the system.
6. A communication network is required to obtain and discuss the information so that it has influence and usefulness.