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Abstract

Oromia has implemented Non Formal Basic Education (NFBE) curriculum. The program has served as an alternative approaches to complement the formal education program, so that it plays a great role in providing educational access for adults and children. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to assess the successes and challenges of implementation of NFBE Curriculum in Bale zone of Oromia Regional state. Based on the purpose of the study, the learning environment, the success & best practices of the programs, support for NFBE programs facilitators in terms of training & supervision, the availability of curriculum materials and challenges encountered were assessed.

To this end, descriptive survey method was used for the study. Data were gathered from officials, facilitators, center management committee (CMC) members and adult learners. Data collection tools were questionnaire, interview, observation and focus group discussion. The data gathered through questionnaire were analyzed using percentage whereas the data gathered through interview; observation and focus group discussion were transcribed, analyzed and triangulated with the quantitative data where necessary & appropriate.

Findings of the study revealed that implementation of the program have contributed a lot to providing; learning opportunity for adults and out-of-school children. Oromia Education Bureau changed the adult basic education program to functional adult literacy; facilitators training, their salary and the incentives provided were not sufficient; supervision and monitoring and awareness creation for the community were found to be low; there were problems of textbooks and facilitator’s manual, and poor educational facilities.

The efforts made to bring the school to the proximity of children and adult learners help learners to learn without going long distance; the shift in focus of non-formal adult basic education to functional adult literacy (FAL) encourages adult to come to NFBE centers to learn; lack of adequate supervision and training, shortage of learning materials and the inadequate linkage between NFBE centers & formal primary schools would have negative impact on utilization of resources in the NFBE centers.

Based on the major findings certain recommendations were made: Government bodies should coordinate the activities of stakeholders, the community awareness should be promoted, facilitators should be provided with short-term upgrading training, and fair incentives for facilitators should be in place to motivate them.
CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The most crucial resource that a country requires to bring about development and change is human resource. The development of this crucial resource can be realized through the provision of education. With this regard, UNESCO (2002:14), states that education serves three purposes. First, the skills provided by basic education, such as the ability to read and write are important in their own as a fundamental outcome of development. Second, education can help to reduce negative features of life. For example, free and compulsory primary education will reduce child labor. Third, education has a powerful role in empowering those who suffer from multiple disadvantages. Thus, women have benefited from education to live better life. This shows that, education has powerful impact in addressing social and economic barriers within a society, and is central to realize human freedoms.

According to Skagen and Dave (1976:6), education is human activity which is extended throughout the life span of an individual to attain the fullest possible development in personal, social and professional life. Derebsa (2001:175) stated that primary education provides fundamental basis for all further schooling, training or self education. It also provides the basis for developing the capacity to cope with rapidly evolving and changing society.
Realizing the importance of education, the United Nations adopted the universal human right in which the right to education is articulated in article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Right in 1948. This recognizes the intrinsic human value of education supported by strong moral and legal foundations. With this regard, education is a key to unlocking and protecting other human rights by providing the framework that is required to secure good health, liberty, security, economic well being and participation in social and political activity (UNESCO, 2002:14).

Ethiopia, as a member of the United Nations, committed itself in the year 1990 to the Education For All initiative and since 2000 to the Dakar Framework for Action which focuses on achieving the goals of education for all by the year 2015. In addition to that, the country strives to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, which include the achievement of Universal Primary Education. However, the government has realized that Ethiopia can not achieve universal primary education (UPE) by the year 2015 only through formal schooling. Thus, it has designed and implemented non-formal basic education (NFBE) as an integral part of the education system (MOE, 2006: ii).

With this regard non-formal basic education is found highly effective in providing learning opportunities to different target groups such as children who do not get enrolled in the primary schools, those who dropout from schools, youths and adults who released in to literacy and those who have never received and schooling (Mputu,2001:5)

Furthermore, Doni (1995:40) stated that non formal adult education helps adult population to attend their immediate needs, and deals with those who are actually involved in the production process. The majority of adult population is out of school hence non-formal adult education
provides access to education and training. Non formal adult education is an effective strategy to local development needs because of its flexibility and adaptability.

Ethiopia, where a number of economic and social problems such as backward farming, incremental degradation, poverty, poor health condition high prevalence of HIV/AIDS, high population growth, high rate of illiteracy, etc are prevailing, providing basic education for all is a recognized but unrealized need. One of the basic means of realizing this need is non-formal education program (Jember, et. al 1996:1).

In this regard, Tekeste (1996:43) states that non-formal education is relevant to teach basic education for the rural population and urban poor. Non formal education is delivered an alternative to the formal education in order to provide basic primary education for all. Hence non formal basic education program has three years cycle and is equivalent to the formal basic education (grade 1 to 4). Under this program education is provided for adults and children.

On the other hand, UNESCO (2005:28) asserted that the achievement of universal participation in education will be fundamentally dependent upon the quality of education available. For example, how well pupils are taught and how much they learn, can have a crucial impact on how long they stay in school and how regularly they attend. Moreover, the interest of parents to send their children to school depends on judgment they make about the quality of teaching and learning provided.

Thus, the success of achieving universal participation of primary education is determined by its quality which can be expressed in terms of the competence of teachers, the relevance of the curriculum, availability of teaching materials and necessary facilities.
Print (1993:1) discussed that curriculum is the essence of schooling and purpose of that accounts for teachers in school. This is more elaborated when we deal with the fundamental questions of the curriculum, namely, what to teach? How to teach? When to teach? And what is the impact of teaching? Derebsa (2004:197) stated that in order to achieve its aim, curriculum should be implemented in the way it is intended to be implemented. The importance of careful planning and development is fruitful only if teachers are aware of the product and have the skills to implement the curriculum.

Therefore, the effective implementation of the curriculum is realized in a careful planning and development of the curriculum as well as the skills and competence of teachers in its implementation.

According to MOE (2005:4), alternative basic education program (ABE) is considered as a means to reach several millions of out-of-school children from ages 7 to 14 and adults who denied attending formal primary education.

Alternative basic education is designed to provide access to education for unschooled children of age 7-14 and adults who denied attending formal primary education. In Oromia, the net enrollment rate, which was 3.5% in 2001/02, increased to 6.8% in 2004/05. Many NGOs in collaboration with the regional government have made much effort to expand this program in marginalized areas of the region. (OEB, 2005:13)

Bale zone, which is one of the marginalized zones of Oromia Region, is also widely implementing alternative basic education program for both adult and children. However, how effectively the program is implemented is of great concern. Thus, the purpose of this study is to investigate the
success and challenges of alternative basic education that has been implemented in the area under discussion.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

To realize Universal Primary Education (UPE) an innovative alternative approach has been already started in different regions of Ethiopia (MOE, 2002:24). For example, ESDP III of Oromia region states that NFBE programs serve to complement the formal educational program, it increase enrolment at primary level and plays great role in providing educational opportunities to all school age children and adults so that all of them complete primary education by the year 2015 (OEB, 2005 :49).

The Oromia Region, which has large number of out of school children and illiterate adults, is implementing Adult Basic Education & ABE in accessing basic education to rural areas in different zones. In this connection the GER of primary education which was 54% in 2001/02 among which 3.55% in NFBE centers has increased to 73.8% in 2004/05 among which 6.8% in NFBE centers (OEB, 2005:13-14). Derebsa (2002), states that the issue of curriculum implementation is linked to how efficiently learning takes place. Effective implementation is also based on training of teachers, availability of text-books curriculum materials and facilities.

Based on the above idea, it seems that NFBE curriculum implementation needs proper attention. The coordination between NFBE centers & formal school to use resources efficiently and to share experience, training and supervision provided to NFBE implementers, etc., have not been critically studied. Thus, this initiated the researcher to conduct research on the
success of implementation of NFBE in terms of providing access to education and quality education, and to assess the challenges that hinder the implementation.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The general objective of this study is to assess the effectiveness of NFBE curriculum implementation in Bale zone of Oromia Regional State and to analyze challenges encountered.

The specific objectives of the Study are:-

1. To identify the integration of NFBE and formal curriculum.
2. To assess the participation of stakeholders in NFBE curriculum preparation and implementation.
3. To examine training and supervision provided for effective implementation of the curriculum.
4. To identify the successes of NFBE curriculum implementation.
5. To examine the challenges of NFBE curriculum implementation.

Based on the objectives stated above, this study will be expected to answer the following basic research question:

1. What are the supports provided to NFBE facilitators in terms of training & supervision?
2. Are there adequate curriculum materials in the ABE centers?
3. Who is responsible for funding the NFBE program?
4. What are the achievements & best practices of the NFBE program in the zone?
5. What are the problems that have encountered the provision of NFBE program in the zone?
1.4 Significance of the Study

This study is intended to identify and examine the implementation of NFBE program in terms of curriculum development, competence of facilitators, supervision and support provided to the program and the participation of stakeholders in implementation.

Therefore, it would have the following significance

1. It will serve as reference for education planners, decision makers and implementers in the area of non-formal basic education program.
2. It will suggest solutions for the major problems of implementing non-formal basic education curriculum in Bale Zone of Oromia Region.
3. It will serve as a spring board for those who are interested to undertake more extensive research in the field of non-formal basic education.

1.5 Limitation of the Study

In conducting this study the researcher has faced the following problems that contributed for the limitation of the study.

1. There is a problem of literature particularly in the area of alternative basic education.
2. Financial constraint hinders the researcher to include more centers in order to obtain more data.
1.6 Delimitation of the Study

The study was intended to identify and examine the success and challenges of implementing alternative basic education curriculum. Thus, in order to make the study manageable it was delimited only to Bale zone where non-formal basic education was implemented. Accordingly, among 20 weredas which are implementing NFBE program only six weredas were included in the study to make the study manageable.

Furthermore, only the following aspects are included: learning environment, facilitators training and payment, curriculum materials preparation and availability as well as supervision and management of NFBE centers.

1.7 Operational Definitions

**Adult education:** is organized studies and activities provided to develop their knowledge, skills and attitudes that will equip them to perform their roles in society in more or less creative and critical way.

**Alternative basic education:** is non-formal provision of education required in primary school; basic literacy and numeracy from grade 1-4 for both adults and children.

**Basic education:** is the minimum knowledge, skills, attitudes and values that will enable learner to operate with reasonable expectation of their community or society.

**Curriculum:** is what students should know, be able to do and can be committed to (content), how it is taught (instruction), how it is measured
(assessment), and how the educational system is organized (context). It is a practical reference source for teachers containing the range of strategies that can be utilized to achieve course outcomes.

**Facilitators:** are trained or untrained teaching staffs for non-formal basic education.

**Non-formal education:** Education activities organized outside the formal system and designed to serve identifiable client and educational objectives.

**Stakeholders:** refers to those who have a vested interest in education, its process and outcomes.
CHAPTER TWO

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter deals with review of related literature. The review tries to analyze and systematize relevant information. Accordingly it assesses the concept and characteristic features of non-formal education, non-formal basic education and alternative basic education. Moreover, the experience of other countries on Alternative Basic Education (ABE) program and the current status of ABE program in Ethiopia are also examined.

2.1 Non-Formal Education (NFE)

2.1.1 Conceptual Framework of Non-Formal Education.

Non-formal education is any organized and semi organized educational and training activities that is implemented outside the formal educational system to serve a variety of learning needs of different sub groups of population both children and adults. Today, for developing countries it is used as an alternative to their formal education system which is aimed to make learning a national lifelong learning experience compatible with the interests of individuals and communities (Bishop, 1989:131). Non-formal education was suggested to local level program for poor adults, however, the program got attention of the oppressed third world. Its term was chosen by international development agencies (Labell, 1986:1).

Coombs & Ahmed (1974:8) define Non-formal education as “...any organized, systematic educational activity carried on outside the framework of the formal system to provide selected types of learning to particular sub groups in the population, adults as well as children.”
According to Bishop (1986:52) the objectives of non-formal education serve two groups:

- It provides chance of learning for those who have never been to school and
- It offers chance for those who have the basic skills of reading, writing and competing to practice them and to build on what they have learned

### 2.1.2 Characteristic Features of Non-Formal Education

Bishop (1989:134) identified the characteristics of non-formal education in terms of its relative costs, self-help and lifelong education.

1. **Relative costs of non-formal education**: the cost of non-formal education as compared to formal education is relatively lower because non-formal education can reduce capital cost by using borrowed or low rent facilities and reduce recurrent costs by using volunteers and part time personnel.

2. **Self-help**: in many non-formal education program the participants help to build their facilities and provide any service needed.

3. **Lifelong learning**: today it is believed that to confine education to the young is inappropriate as confining health service only to certain age group. Therefore, countries should work to provide lifelong learning system that will give flexible program and diversified range of learning options to every individuals throughout his/her life. Flexible program would provide a little education now and then, as appropriate, to renew ones conceptual knowledge over the courses of ones career. It also enables drop-outs to re enter the education system.

Mamo (1999:40) summarized the most important characteristics of non-formal education program as follows:
They provide relevant education to the needs and aspiration of target groups.

- They can be adjusted to the time constraints and related circumstances of the participants particularly the disadvantaged groups.
- They offer opportunity for lifelong learning in conjunction with formal education
- They provide experiences that can be of value for immediate practical use.
- They have greater and more intense applications of the local resources of the community.

2.2. Non-formal Basic Education

2.2.1. Definition of Non-formal Basic Education

Non-formal basic education is one of the strategies employed to achieve the objectives of non-formal education of providing education to those children and adults who have acquired something of 3Rs (writing, reading and arithmetic). It is not a matter of many years of schooling or so much content covered, but rather the requisition of certain basic skills, knowledge and attitude which will enable the individual not only to improve the quality of life but to continue his/her education to the best of his/her abilities. Non-formal basic education must be designed not only for children but also for youth and adults, who may have need of it Bishop, (1989: 52). He also identified that different countries interpret the concept of basic education in different ways. Accordingly basic education is:

- Synonymous with the first cycle primary schooling and shorter than formal primary schooling (USSR, Ethiopia, Sierra Leon)
- An alternative structure parallel to conventional primary education. (Brazil)
The acquisition of basic knowledge, attitudes and skills by all citizens in school or out (Tanzania)

Basic education activities are seen as providing parallel complementary provision of primary cycle but for groups who have failed to complete the primary cycle and for children who are not attending primary education (Carr, 1995:465). World Conference Education For All (WCEFA) (1990: xi) defined basic education as:

Basic Education refers to education intended to meet basic learning; it includes instruction at the first or foundation level, on which subsequent learning can be based, it encompasses early childhood and primary education for children, as well as education in literacy, general knowledge and life skills for youth and adults.

OEB&JICA (2005: i) indicated the main reasons for the why of basic education as follows:

Providing basic education does not only contribute towards economic development but also it is the means to acquire the necessary knowledge and develop one's ability that fully exploits the potential that leads to quality life in the society. It helps to improve people's quality of life by ensuring a healthy life by reducing poverty, creating harmony with environment and building a democratic and safe society. The promotion of basic education can foster mutual understanding and the development of a tolerant society.

Thomson (2001: 11), defines basic education as the first level of education at the base of education pyramid which is asset of basic knowledge, skills and attitudes formation, internalization and exhibitions of values for a variety of life that enable learners to change their own lives. It is an activity through which individuals acquire the essential knowledge and develop the ability needed to lead life in the society.
Basic non-formal education encompasses all activities that provide individuals with certain minimum of education considered indispensable and possible for the society. It implies the will to prepare the entire population for daily life in concrete manner. Non-formal basic education comprises the educational activities designed for those sectors of population which the school can not or could not reach (UNESCO, 1978:5). Basic non-formal education plays critical role in realizing the provision of education for all. The most pressing concern in basic education is to achieve universal primary education (UPE). Though efforts have been made for the provision of UPE there are still over one billion children out of school in the world (UNESCO, 2006:6).

Bishop (1986), indicated that to provide primary education for all means building about large number of (1000) schools every day and of large amount of teachers (one third of million) every year which most developing countries can not cope with the requirements of building these schools and training of the teachers. According to Bishop (1989) the two principal reasons why formal systems of education are becoming unable to meet the increasing demands on them are the high rate of population growth and the rising cost of formal system of education. Therefore, one great advantage of non-formal Education is that it is much cheaper than formal education. For the poor countries it can be the means of achieving most of their educational objectives at a price they can afford.

2.2.2. Characteristic Feature of Non-formal Basic Education

According to Ahmed (1999:326), the common features of non-formal basic education includes organization of the program, teachers,
learner, curriculum and teaching learning methods and physical facilities.

i. **Organization of the program:** the annual calendar, daily schedule and number of total yearly hours are determined by local circumstances. It is emphasizing on effective utilization of the possible shorter hours. Therefore, it needs community involvement in planning and management with accountability to community and parents.

ii. **Teachers:** can be Para professional including part-time and volunteer staff for all or most of the teaching personnel.

iii. **Learner:** in primary non-formal education the age requirement is flexible and no pre requisite although usually an ‘affirmative’ action approach in favour of the disadvantaged is followed.

iv. **Curriculum and teaching learning methods:** the curriculum and learning materials are adapted to local needs through simplification, shortening, condensing or structuring the curriculum. The evaluation promotion and certification criteria and procedure is flexible. A variety of approaches and methods such as self-learning, group and individual work, self-paced learning, multi grade classes, etc. are used.

v. **Physical facilities:** any convenient physical facilities like private homes, multiple uses of building or even open spaces with no capital investment for a building with in the primary education budget are used for non-formal basic education.

UNESCO (1978:5) summarized the characteristics of basic non-formal education as follows:

a) The organization, content and methods of basic education must be flexible and adapted to the needs, values and characteristics of the concerned community.
b) Basic education must provide an educational minimum which most frequently includes
- Learning elementary language skills
- Learning basic mathematical concept
- Acquisition of knowledge and functional skills
- Initiation in to natural science
- Acquisition of developmental and practical skills important for life activity such as agriculture, animal husbandry, craft, fishing, etc.
- Initiation in to civil life and
- Learning related to particular felt needs of the target group not covered above.

c) Basic education should be an integral part of life education
d) Basic education should provide functional practical training linked with development programs, which will enable people to improve their living conditions
e) Basic education should be a means of furthering the entire community
f) Basic education should be relatively low-cost educational service
g) Basic education is a means of democratizing education

From the above definitions, it can be safely argued that NFBE basically characterized by flexibility and adaptability to the needs of concerned community which provides functional practical training linked to development.
2.2.3. Adult Basic Education

Adult basic education refers to all forms of organized education and training that meet the learning needs of adults, including literacy and numeracy, as well as general knowledge, skills, values, and attitude that they require to survive, develop their capacities, live and work indignity, improve the quality of their lives, make informed decisions and continue learning (LIZI DVV, 2002:16)

Non-formal adult education provides opportunities that assist adults to meet and solve their daily problems, enhance their awareness; help to adjust to the changing world became essential.

Adult education helps people to adjust to change, to improve their life and to identify and solve their problems.

In this connection IIIZ/DVV: 2004, 126-127) describes that adult education has significant role to play:

The fifth international conference on adult education (Confentea V), held in 1997, looked ahead to the world’s new millennium by identifying adult learning as a key to the twenty-first century. The Hamburg declaration on adult learning adapted there forcefully express the vital significance of adult education and learning by identifying potential for fostering ecologically sustainable development, for promoting democracy, justice gender equity, scientific, social and economic development and for building a world on which violent conflict is replace by dialogue and a culture of peace-based on justice.
According to Evans (1981:28), adult basic education contains activities which focus on basic literacy and numeracy, development of community activities, and basic health, nutrition and family planning activities.

Adult basic education programmes not only provide literacy and numeracy skills and livelihood training; as a result of their incorporation into broader socio-economic and political development programmes they also deal with civic and pace education, environmental degradation, poverty reduction. HIV/ADS and community reconstruction (Thompson, 2001 in Hoppers, 2006:29)

In a broad sense, adult basic education generally comprises functional literacy programmes and life-skills training courses for adults. Such programmes, usually aim to impart: (a) communication skills language, numeracy, and social skills, including general civic, scientific, and cultural knowledge, and democratic attitudes and values; (b) life skills-knowledge of health, sanitation, nutrition, family planning, and the environment; and (c) basic work skills - problem-solving, practical, social-communication, leadership, and literacy and numeracy skills (Tuijnman, 1996:613)

2.2.3.1 Functional Adult Literacy (FAL)

Adult literacy, which is core of adult education, should be functional and is supposed to help adult learners in their immediate problems of life and work. Therefore, it has taken the form of health education, family life education, development skills education etc. UNESCO (1988:18).

Fordham, Paul and Others (1995:14) describe the guide line on making literacy functional as follows:

- The purpose of learners and promoting agencies should be
made clear to every one and should be coincide.

- Literacy project should be planned and thought about in an integrated way sectorially among sectors such as health, agriculture, education etc.
- Programs should be designed with the people and where possible by them.
- A new developments need to be built a local ideas and local cultural practices rather than models imported from somewhere else.

Thus, in order to make adult literacy functional and implement it successfully, the learners need to know why they learn, there should be integration among developmental sectors as well as it should be based on local context where it is implemented. According to MOE (2006:3) functional literacy refers to the practice of reading and writing put to some use as well as the acquisition and use of reading and writing to learn practical knowledge and skills useful for life like agriculture, health, civic education, cultural education and so on.

Knowles and Others (1998:48) assume that adult learners need to know why need to learn something before undertaking to learn it, they have a Variety of experience of life which represent the richest resource for learning, they are ready to learn things they need to know in order to cope effectively with life situations. This shows that the participation of adult leaner from the design stage through need assessment and awareness creation and consideration of their rich experience of life is vital.
2.2.3.2 Characteristics of Adult Learning

Adult learning is voluntary and intentional which is characterized by:

- **Learner centeredness**: Adults learn because they want to know something to help them cope with the problem of daily life.

- **Active learning**: Adult learning is learning by doing, by application and experience. The principle is "testing not banking of knowledge" as Paulo Firiere would say.

- **Acquiring knowledge and competence**: it is not only acquire new knowledge and skills but also the capacity of to apply the knowledge and skills acquired in concrete situation and by doing that develop competence

- **Social learning**: adults learn well from pears. Therefore, it is important to encourage group work and the sharing of experience (Fringes, et al., 1993: 3-7).

Adult learners differ from children in self concept, need to know, experience, readiness to learn, time perspectives and orientation to learning which is summarized as follows.
Table 4. Difference between children and Adult as learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self concept</td>
<td>-Dependent on teacher</td>
<td>-Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Expect and enjoy dependence</td>
<td>-Expect and enjoy independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-expect to be taught</td>
<td>-They like control feel responsibility of teaching self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-expect teacher to determine what, when and how to learn</td>
<td>-Learning is a process of sharing experience with the teacher and one another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Teachers are responsible to encourage self direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to know</td>
<td>-Needs to know what the teacher teaches in order to get promoted need</td>
<td>-Needs to know why they need to learn something before learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not for life application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Have few relevant experience to what is being taught</td>
<td>Have many epicenes teachers must draw on their expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Teachers must create pertinent expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness to learn</td>
<td>Children are not necessarily ready to learn. Teachers required to create</td>
<td>Adults come to class motivated and ready to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>motivation</td>
<td>-Adults learn in order to cope with real life tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time perspective</td>
<td>Children learn content for the future</td>
<td>Want for application to day can not tolerate studying that can not be applied to task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orientation to</td>
<td>Children and teachers are subject centered and enjoy being so</td>
<td>Adults and facilitators need to be task or problem centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.4. Alternative Basic Education (ABE)

2.2.4.1. Basic Concept of Alternative Basic Education

Save children USA (2003:4) defined alternative basic education (ABE) as any forms of basic education outside the formal school system undertaken by any organization including government organizations, non-government organizations (NGOs), faith based organizations, community based organizations (CBO) and other civil society organizations. It is a form of education that does not follow a rigid structure, timetable and mode of delivery and management. It is not different kind of education but rather a complementary process that uses different approaches delivering lower primary education. Its major objective is to enable children to access education with their vicinity, a relatively short time-frame and less cost as compared to formal schooling. Thus, the focus of ABE program is taking education closer to children, creating flexible learning environment for marginalized children and making basic education community owned and managed.

Non-formal basic education (NFBE) is highly significant in solving problems of equity, access to education and promotion of citizen’s effective participation in national development. Basic goal of any nation development program is to provide an education for its entire citizen. At the moment hundreds of millions of people have been deprived of education. The purpose of non-formal basic education therefore is to serve this disadvantaged group as alternative approach to basic education. (Bishop, 1986:5)

Sharafeddin (2000:18) indicated some innovative experiences in many parts of the world which include:
- Adoption of double or multiple shift arrangements where there is a shortage in school spaces or where children can not afford to learn full day.
- The use of educational resources throughout the year including holy day and during vacation.
- Adoption of large class size in areas of high student population.

2.2.4.2. Characteristic Features of Alternative Basic Education (ABE).

According to Sharafeddin (2000:3) alternative basic education approaches deal with a system of learning which is characterized by flexibility, capacity to recognize and creativity to utilize diversity and provision of opportunities to release the creative potential of the learners.

Some of the main features of ABE include:
- Proximity of learning centers to the community;
- Use low-cost local inputs;
- High degree of responsive to local realities and need;
- With in the community capacity of management;
- Highly localized, adapted and replicable;
- Open for innovation, and
- Appropriate for addressing gender and spatial disparities in education (Save Children USA, 2003:4).

Therefore, ABE program has the potential to alleviate the problem of rural children who have no access to basic education. As a result, it contributes to the improvement of school enrolment through establishing cost effective, flexible and easily accessible and community based basic education centers.
Alternative basic education program is built up on a number of experience based principles in planning and implementing non-formal primary education for children. These principles include community participation, flexibility, adaptability and relevance, accessibility, linkage with and integration with formal schools, cost-effectiveness, program integration with development work, sustainability, integrated and condensed curriculum, learner centered approach, local resource focus and gender equity (Ahmed, 1999:6). He further indicated that the success of alternative basic education program depends on how well these principles are made operational in day-to-day activities.

### 2.2.4.3. Dimensions of Alternative Basic Education

#### Approach

According to Action Aid Ethiopia (2002:23) alternative basic education has three dimensions:

A. **Alternative basic education is about taking education to children:** this shows that ABE is different from the conventional school which helps learners to come to school with out walking long and dangerous distance to come to school.

B. **Alternative basic education is about creating flexible learning environment for children:** this dimensions of ABE approach deals with promoting the innovative basic education program in a locality and removing the rigid features of the formal system and making things as much flexible as possible so that children especially girls, learn in the time most convenient to them and their parents.

C. **Alternative basic education is about making basic education community based and community owned:** The success of ABE is mainly depending on strong grass-root participation from design to implementation. Community participation in need identification,
planning, organizing and monitoring and evaluation is crucial for continuity and sustainability of the program. (UNICEF, 1993:42). In teaching children at village level ABE is also about grass-root empowerment, placing the local community at the forefront of the decision making process and enabling them to fully participate in all stages and process of the basic education program starting from need analysis and problem identification phase to the design and detail planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation phases. (Action Aid Ethiopia, 2003:23)

2.2.4.4. Guiding Principles of ABE and their Implications for Facilitators.

Ahmed (1999:5), Firdessa (2003:125) Sharafeddin (2000:3) identified general guiding principles of ABE from different documents and reports of field practices and lessons of many NGOs in planning and implementing the ABE program. Accordingly the success of an ABE program depends on how well these principles are made operational across all its components and activities. These principles are:

- Community participation and ownership
- Flexibility
- Adaptability and relevance
- Accessibility
- Gender equity
- Linkage and integration with formal school
- Cost-effectiveness
- Program integration with development work
- Sustainability
- Integrated and condensed Curriculum
- Local resources focus and
Learner centered approach.

The implications of Guiding Principles of ABE for facilitators

Action Aid Ethiopia (2003:26) explained the implication of the general guiding principles of ABE for facilitators as follows:

**Principle 1- Community participation and ownership:** Facilitators are supposed to be members of the community and are accountable to the community. Beyond regular classroom duties they should be able to mobilize and sensitize community members and children’s parents to participate in decision making process and to support the education program. Facilitators need to be trained how to facilitate community participation in an ABE program.

**Principle 2: Flexibility:** Facilitators are expected to negotiate and adjust school calendar and programs according to local needs and realities. They are also required to ensure that the necessary and agreed contents and total hours of learning are covered. Hence, facilitators need to be trained on how to understand local situations, negotiating, with people and create a workable plan agreeable to specific locality.

**Principle 3: Adaptability and relevance:** ABE curriculum and delivery approaches should be relevant and adaptable to local realities and the needs of learners. It is the tasks of facilitators that these requirements are met. Therefore, facilitators have to be equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills on how to adapt learning and make it relevant to learners’ needs.

**Principle 4: Accessibility:** ABE centers have to be accessible to children and particularly to girls. This means the centers have to be located near the vicinity of village settlements that can easily and safely be reached by
children. Facilitators have to know and device ways of influencing community leaders and members to make land and other resources available for locating the school in a suitable, safe and attractive position for children.

**Principle 5: Gender equity:** One of the key objectives of ABE is to address gender inequity by creating access for girl children to basic education. Facilitators are expected to play important roles in sensitizing community members on gender issues and the right of girl children to go to school. They have to be given gender training with a particular emphasis to education.

**Principle 6: Integration and linkage with formal school:** Facilitators should be able to initiate and maintain linkage with neighboring formal schools and teachers for collaborative work and exchange of experience as well as to facilitate transfer of children from ABE centers to formal schools. This implies, facilitators need to be trained on how to do these things properly and effectively.

**Principle 7: Cost-effectiveness:** One of the essential features of ABE is its cost effectiveness. However, undertaking a cost-effective program requires skills in careful identification, planning and utilization of local resources on the part of facilitators. It is necessary to train facilitators on how to identify and mobilize local resources, how to plan on available resources and efficiently utilize them and how to increase internal efficiency of education.

**Principle 8: Program integration with development work:** Academic learning alone does not prepare children for their life needs. Hence, learning has to be linked to the development needs and practices of the locality of the ABE centers. Facilitators need to have the capabilities and
skills required to relate learning to development of the area where the schools operate. They have to be trained on those skills that enable them to integrate learning with local development needs.

**Principle 9: Sustainability:** ABE programs initiated by NGOs, local government and other development agencies have to endure and continue providing access to basic education so long as they are required even if those who introduced the program withdraw. Facilitators have to enable institutions and their members to develop strategies for sustaining the program. This calls for training of facilitators on knowledge and skills on how to design strategies for different aspects of sustainability.

**Principle 10: Integrated and condensed curriculum:** The time and other resources available to ABE is limited while the learning centers have to be compatible with the requirements of formal schools that the learners have to eventually join. This situation calls for skills for condensing and integrating the curriculum that facilitators use. Hence they need to be trained on how to produce and use condensed and integrated curriculum in an ABE learning environment.

**Principle 11: Local resource focus:** Facilitators should be able to use the local environment and resources within it to enrich their lessons, to make learning relevant to local reality and assist children to properly understand their environment. Therefore, facilitators have to be trained on how to do these things.

**Principle 12: Child centered and activity based approach:** The learning process in an ABE program should based on approaches that put the child at the center of the learning process. The child should be actively involved in practical activities that promote self learning and interactive experience. Thus facilitators have to be acquired the
necessary techniques and skills of organizing in a child centered manner and they have to also be trained on how to prepare activity based learning materials

2.3. Non-Formal Basic Education Curriculum.

A curriculum is better explained as a smooth coherence between educational goals, key principles, learning components and learning process. Therefore, curriculum development refers to a systematic effort that harmonize the basic objectives, learning principles, and components with learning activities to realize the intended goals with in a given target group. (IIZ/Dvv, 2004:34-35)

2.3 .1. Curriculum Implementation of NFBE

Implementation in curriculum involves changing the status quo by accepting and implementing the new curriculum or part of a curriculum. If the curriculum is accepted and utilized successfully then it has to become institutionalized. The implementation of the curriculum will be expected to experience some difficulties which will reflect the effectiveness of the curriculum developers in meeting the needs of the curriculum clients. Thus, implementation of a curriculum is attempts to integrate the new curriculum into existing practice. To some extent the problems experienced in implementation of curriculum reside with the lack of systematic implementation procedures. For any new curriculum to be implemented it requires an educational institution change. Thus a plan or strategy is required to facilitate change to take place (Print, 1993:217).

Curriculum implementation is a process of putting the planned or developed program into practice which is the actual use of a curriculum.
The process is developmental and takes place at different levels. It focuses on the degree to which actual change in practice occurs and on factors which influence the extent of change. Changes can be externally developed innovation or locally developed. In either case individual implementers are involved in a process of change (Derebssa, 2004:197). Furthermore, Print (1993: 217) indicated that in implementing the curriculum it would be expected that some modification will be required. If for example, a curriculum was developed externally to school and then implemented within it, one would anticipate some modifications being necessary to take account of different local contextual factors such as varying nature of students, differing school resources, differing teachers, parental input variations, community supports, etc. What are useful for teachers in school are the realization, acceptance and support by central authorities of individual differences between schools.

Effective implementation of innovation requires time, personal interaction and contacts, inservice training and other forms of people based support. The personal contact among implementers or consultant is very important in order to the curriculum be utilized in practice (Derebssa, 2004:197).

2.3.2. Alternative Basic Education Curriculum.

ABE curriculum is a condensed version of the first cycle of primary formal school curriculum. Due to the linkage of ABE to formal education system, the curriculum of first cycle primary school and ABE must be similar in content to attain equivalent quality (OEB, 2000:87). According to OEB, (2005: 7) four subjects, namely, vernacular language, English, mathematics and environmental science are learned in ABE centers.
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In the preparation of ABE curriculum, issues of traditional practices and knowledge of spread and prevention disease could be included in the curriculum. To make the curriculum of ABE responsive issues related to backward cultural practices, economic activities, health care, environmental protection, nutrition, family planning, civic life, local skills, etc. should be included so as to solve the problems encountered (OEB, 2000:87). The curriculum of ABE is condensed in to three levels in such a way that it meets the national standard of minimum learning competency (MLC) for each level and each subject. In level one contents of formal education grade one and some of the content of grade two are included. In level two the remaining content of grade two and some of the content of grade three are taught. The remaining of grade three and grade four formal curriculum are included in level three. The above discussion can is summarized in table 2 bellow. (OEB, 2002)

Table-5. Comparison between formal and ABE curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade for formal school</th>
<th>Level of ABE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade four</td>
<td>Level three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade three</td>
<td>Level two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade two</td>
<td>Level one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.3. Adult Basic Education Curriculum

Adult basic education curriculum preparation for adult learners consists of two parts basic learning programs (grades 1-4) and other need based
programs (TGE, 1994:15-16). OEB (2008:7) states that adult basic education curriculum is prepared based on the specific situation of the target group. It is designed by connecting the curriculum to daily life activities (FAL) and to enable the learners to read, write and compute as well as to apply in their daily life. The program is implemented in three cycles. The subjects included in the curriculum are health, agriculture, family planning and environmental education.

### 2.3.4. Factors Affecting the Implementation of NFBE Curriculum

Implementation is a process of putting the planned or developed program into practice which is the actual use of an innovation in practice. The successful provision of NFBE thus depends on several conditions. UNICEF (1993:42) indicated some of the important factors that determine the successful implementation of NFBE program as follows:

- **Strong community and parental involvements:** community participation from design to implementation is crucial for successful implementation of ABE program. Therefore, the participation of community is important in need identification, planning, organizing, monitoring and evaluation for the continuity and sustainability of the program.

- **Policy environment:** Government’s policy should play strong and pivotal role in promoting the diversified educational needs and approaches. Therefore, policymakers have to establish a clear and workable policy and standards for local actions.

- **Fostering strong partnership:** Governments need to foster the involvement of civic societies such as community based
organizations, NGOs, parents, etc. in order to benefit from their contributions to the provision of the program.

- **Issues related to organization and management:** This includes curriculum development and implementation as well as capacity building and training of personnel. Short term initial training followed by frequent in service training is important to solve the problem of teacher’s lack of knowledge and experience.

- **Linkage of the formal system:** linkage with neighboring formal schools and teachers for collaborative work and exchange of experience as well as to facilitate transfer of children from NFBE centers to formal schools is crucial for sustainable and effective implementation of NFBE program.

### 2.4. Experience of Other Countries

#### 2.4.1. The Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC) Schools

The Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee schools was designed to provide basic education for the poorest and disadvantaged children who never attended primary education and who dropped out of formal schools in the rural area of Bangladesh. The BRAC program had targeted rural children of two different groups:

- Children of age 11-14 years who never attended schools and
- Children of age 8-10 years who dropped out of formal schools

(Wanna, 1999:72)

According to Ahmed et al (1993:123) and Sharafuddin (2000:4) the effectiveness of BRAC lies on its approaches in parents and community participation, curriculum, instructional centers and teacher selection which are the major components of BRAC program.
The parents and school staff: in BRAC schools there is active parents involvement in program design and implementation. The parents of most BRAC school students are illiterate and usually the most economically disadvantaged in their villages. Parents pay no fee for schooling. BRAC provides all students and teacher pencils, notebook, etc. However, parents assist BRAC staff in selecting the teachers and setting the school schedule. Parents of prospective students hold meeting with BRAC staff before a BRAC school opens. They also hold meetings after the opening of the school to discuss their children's progress, attendance, cleanliness and hygiene.

Instructional centers: BRAC schools are one-room one teacher schools. The school session is for 2:30-3:00 hours per day, six days per week and 268 days in a year with three years instructional cycle. The schools focus on special needs of girls. The distance from home to school is 1km-2.5km. This help child to travel less time and safely, which encourages especially girls to come to schools. Thus, parents do not worry that the girls will be teased by young men. The BRAC schools rooms generally have wood wall and an earthen floor with bamboo mat and a tin roof. The children sit on bamboo mat on the floor while teachers use on stool.

The curriculum: the curriculum consists of mother tongue, social science and mathematics which have been revised several times. The material is equivalent to grade 1-3 in the formal school system. During the third year BRAC schools include English in their curriculum to prepare those children who want to join formal school after completion of the school.

The students: about 70% of BRAC students are girls while the remaining are boys of which all are from poor family. They are children who denied access to education for reasons of poverty.
as well as gender. The students-teacher ratio is very low as compared to formal school which is 33:1 where the average students-teacher ratio in formal school is 65:1. Students are divided into small working groups in which fast learners help slow learners. BRAC students who complete the NFPE program enter grade four formal schools. They achieve better than formal school students in basic education assessment and basic literacy tests.

- **The teachers:** teachers in general are married adults out of which 90% are women who have completed nine or more year education. After being selected, teachers are given initial fifteen day training at BRAC centers. A periodical training at the beginning of each year follows the initial training. In BRAC schools the same teacher teaches the same batch students throughout the three years. (Sharafuddin, 2000:4)

Ahmed et al (1993) suggested the following BRAC experience which is applicable to other countries for effective implementation of NFPE program.

- Active parental and community involvement;
- Reduced capital cost;
- Comprehensive management support system that emphasized staff training;
- Flexible time-table and an organization that adjust services to students need,
- Small instructional units and proximity of school to children;
- Para professional teacher selected from the community with short pre service training, scheduled in-service training and strong supervision; and
Simplified and condensed curriculum for primary education that focuses on basic skills which is appropriate to the target population.

2.4.2. Basic Education in Urban Poverty Areas (BEUPA), Uganda

Thomson (2001:16) mentioned that the aim of basic education in urban poverty areas of Uganda is to improve the life perspectives of out of school children and adolescents between the age of 9 and 18. He further indicated the important features of BEUPA that contributes for the successful implementation of the program as follows:

- Application of mother tongue education and integrated approach to learning
- Development and utilization of the curriculum of a condensed version of formal primary school curriculum which includes instruction in psycho-social skills and living values education.
- Close relationship between formal school and BEUPA program.
- The delivery of curriculum shortened from five year to three year.
- Utilization of the expertise of the community which makes the school part of the community.
- Communities involvement in the program
- Application of child-centered and flexible approaches

Thompson (2001) also indicated the essential experience of BEUA of Uganda which can be transferred into other countries:

- Learner friendly, pedagogical process and learning environments contribute to facilitate learning acquisition.
The integrated nature of curriculum enhances the holistic development of learners in terms of intellectual, physical, emotional, and social development and promotes interaction between the formal and non-formal education systems.

Utilizations of the services of the community harmonizes the relationship between the school and the community.

2.5. Current Status of Non-Formal Basic Education in Ethiopia.

The Transitional Government of Ethiopia (TGE) has issued a new Education and Training Policy in 1994. According to the educational policy the formal sub sector comprises academic and technical training beginning from kindergarten up to territory level while the non-formal sub sector covers a range of basic education and skills training targeted at adults and out of school children and drop-outs (TGE, 1994:15). As a means of implementing its policy the government of Ethiopia launched a series of education sector development programs (ESDP). Through its education sector development programs the country takes a sector wide and integrated approach to the development of education. The main objective of ESDP is to improve quality, relevance, equity and access with special emphasis on primary education in rural and under served areas. Non-formal education three components that includes:

- The program of out of school children with age 7-10
- Literacy program for youth and adults whose age is above 15 year and
- Basic skills training for youth and adults in community skills training centers. (MOE, 2002:31)
ESDP II envisaged provision of basic education through alternatives mode to realize the goal of universalizing access of primary education by 2015. Accordingly, in the last two to three years, in specific regions centers were established. Most ABE activities are accomplished In Basic Education Centers, and are designed to enroll the same age group as Regular primary education. Since 2005-06, ABE enrollments have been included in reporting of Regular education—and therefore GER and NER reflect the contribution of ABE primary education in Ethiopia. (MOE, 2008:37)

Table 6. Enrollment in ABE by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>215,315</td>
<td>250,243</td>
<td>426,036</td>
<td>311,427</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>175,120</td>
<td>491,515</td>
<td>391,296</td>
<td>271,339</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390,435</td>
<td>741,758</td>
<td>817,332</td>
<td>582,766</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in the above table, ABE has increased in less than three years to over 817,000 enrolled students 2005/06 adding additional 5-6 percent coverage to the Gross Enrollment Rate (GER) for primary education. The numbers for 1999 E.C. are lower by almost 300,000 from 1998 E.C. because of underreporting largely by Oromiya, and a few other regions. The gross enrolment rate in the alternative basic education program for 1st cycle primary is 10.5% for both sexes, 9.7 for females and 11.6% for males (MOE, 2008:38).
Table 7. Characteristics of ABE by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Pupils enrolled</th>
<th>Number of facilitators</th>
<th>Number of centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>4,196</td>
<td>2,805</td>
<td>7,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>5,671</td>
<td>2,761</td>
<td>8,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>119,626</td>
<td>106,389</td>
<td>226,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>97,853</td>
<td>79,286</td>
<td>177,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benishan-Gumuz</td>
<td>11,461</td>
<td>8,573</td>
<td>20,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNP</td>
<td>62,600</td>
<td>55,110</td>
<td>117,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambella</td>
<td>4,140</td>
<td>1,653</td>
<td>5,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>5,880</td>
<td>14,762</td>
<td>20,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>311,427</td>
<td>271,339</td>
<td>582,766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MOE Annual abstract 2008

Adult and Non-Formal Basic Education is designed to address the Primary education needs of adults and others who are substantially older than the traditional primary school ages of 7-14. Data gathered for these programs, as acknowledged by the government, reporting accuracy is very uneven- both because many such programs are operated by non-government entities, and because many Regions are not yet fully sensitized to the role of this type of education. (MOE, 2008:38)

Table 8. Characteristics of Adult & Non-Formal Basic Education by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Pupils enrolled</th>
<th>Number of facilitators</th>
<th>Number of centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>1,769</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>2,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>45,969</td>
<td>22,318</td>
<td>68,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benishan-Gumuz</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNP</td>
<td>2,658</td>
<td>3,283</td>
<td>5,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambella</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>9,186</td>
<td>18,643</td>
<td>27,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60,816</td>
<td>46,012</td>
<td>106,828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MOE Annual abstract 2008
ESDP III stresses the importance of ABE program for achieving universal primary education (UPE) by the year 2015 by solving the problem of access in rural underserved and dispersed communities, pastoralists and semi-agriculturalists societies. (MOE, 2005:44)

With regard to the contribution of ABE then MOE abstract shows that in the year 2004/05 the enrolment rate of primary education in the formal program at national level is 79.8% while the enrolment rate in ABE program is 5.2%. As a result, if we include the enrolment rate in ABE program then the National level enrolment rate becomes 80% (MOE, 2005:7). On the other hand, in the Oromia Region the enrolment rate of primary education in the formal system is 80.9% while the enrolment rate in ABE program is 6.8%. This implies the total enrolment primary education including ABE program in the Region becomes 87.7%. (OEB, 2005:13)
CHAPTER THREE

3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. Method

The main objective of this study is to assess the implementation of non-formal basic education curriculum in Bale zone and to forward some possible strategies that need to be developed to improve the implementation of the curriculum. Thus, to arrive at this objective, descriptive survey method was employed. This method was selected on the assumption that it helps to gather enough information on the issue under study. According to Best & Kahn (1999) descriptive survey method is more effective to investigate the phenomena in assessing the performance in their natural setting. This method is used to describe the important points about opinion, attitudes and suggestions of NFBE beneficiaries, facilitators and officials.

3.2. Population and Sampling Procedures

Currently there are 20 woredas in Bale zone. For this study, only six (33.33 %) woredas were selected using purposive sampling technique. These Woredas are Goba, Sinana, Gasera, Golelcha, Ghinnir & Rayitu. In purposive sampling the researcher may select samples based on who can provide the best information to achieve the objective of the study (Kumar, 1999: 162).

Accordingly, the sample woredas were selected by using purposive sampling technique based on the following rationales:

1. In those woredas relatively a large number of Alternative Basic
Education centers have been implementing the program.

2. Geographical proximity to the researcher.

3. The sample weredas include all climatic condition in the zone.

The following table summarizes the respondents

### Table 9 Population and Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wereda/office</th>
<th>NFE Expert</th>
<th>CRC Supervisors</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
<th>CMC</th>
<th>Adult learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghinir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gololcha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rayitu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the selection of respondents, two regional NFBE experts, two zonal NFBE experts, 6 wereda NFBE experts and, 43 CRC supervisors, 59 facilitators, 24 adult learners and 20 CMC members were selected for the study. Adult learners & CMC members were selected only in three weredas where FGD was held.

### 3.3. The Source of Data

In this study both primary and secondary sources of data were employed. The primary sources of data were OEB non-formal education experts, zone education department non-formal education experts; the
sample woredas education office NFE experts, and CRC supervisors, center management committee (CMC) members adult learners and sample NFBE center facilitators. The secondary sources of data were government policies, strategies, reports of MOE as well as pertinent literature of adult education and alternative basic education.

3.4. Instrument of Data Collection

Both qualitative and quantitative data gathering instruments were employed. The major instruments used in this study will be:-

3.4.2 Questionnaires

Two types of questionnaires comprising issues related to basic questions were prepared for respondents in order to obtain the required information. First, the questionnaire was prepared in English language, then it was translated to Afaan Oromo to minimize and overcome language barrier and promote better understanding of the items contained in the questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of close and open-ended items that were administered to woreda education office non-formal education experts and CRC supervisors and sample NFBE center coordinators. Close-ended questionnaire consists questions that provide respondents alternative answers to choose one that fit their views so that the respondents can answer the question quickly in short period of time. The open ended questionnaire was provided in a way that they call for free response using their own words.
3.4.3 Interview

Interview was one of the major tools employed in this study. This technique was employed to acquire qualitative data about varies components of the program and to complement and obtain relevant data that were not handled by questionnaire. Semi structured interview was prepared to obtain information from woreda education heads, zonal education NFE experts and OEB NFE experts to cross check the responses made by the respondents through questionnaires.

3.4.1 Document Investigation

The data that was recorded from the education abstract of the region, of zonal and woredas documents form 2004/05 - 2007/08 were obtained through document investigation.

3.4.4 Focus Group Discussion

Focus Group Discussion was arranged at three woredas (Sinana, Gololcha & Rayitu) with sixteen members selected from center management committee & Adult learners in each woreda. This technique was employed to acquire qualitative data from students and CMC members about learning process, their interest towards the program and challenges and constraints faced to attend the program.

3.4.5 Observation

Observation was employed to record observable data and information. It was used to obtain data related to the presence of adequate learning materials, facilities and methods used in teaching learning.
3.5. Pilot Testing

A pilot test was conducted in two ABE centers outside the zone & sample woredas, namely in Shashemene wereda of West Arsi zone and the necessary correction was done before the final study was carried out.

The purpose of this test is to check the appropriateness of the items in the instrument and to make necessary amendments based on the obtained feedback from the respondents.

3.6. Data Collection Procedures

Convenient time was chosen for the respondents in order to maximize the quality of responses and degree of return.

The objective of the study was put in clear and understandable statement in order to avoid confusion. Assistants for the distribution end collection of the questionnaire were involved. The researcher also made a close follow up during data collection.

A questionnaire for woreda education supervisors, CRC supervisors, ABE center coordinators and facilitators was prepared first in English and then translated in to “Afan Oromo” to avoid comprehension barriers. Official contacts were made with the Bale Zone Education office to get permission and support for research work and then woreda education officials, ABE center coordinators and facilitators was informed about the objective of the study. After distributing the questionnaire and the interview time was arranged with the sample woredas and NFBE centers. The data gathered through questionnaire was coded and tabulated in tables by bringing together related issue and made prepared for analysis of data.
3.7. Data Analysis

In analyzing data gathered both qualitative and quantitative methods were employed. The data collected through questionnaire which lead themselves to quantitative analysis were computed using percentage and frequency distribution where as the data collected through interview, observation, open-ended questionnaire and FGD were transcribed, analyzed and triangulated with the qualitative data where necessary & appropriate. Then based on the data analysis interpretations were made to reach at certain findings. Finally, conclusions were drawn and possible solutions were recommended.
CHAPTER FOUR

Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data

This part of the thesis deals with presentation, analysis and interpretation of data gathered from education officials, facilitators, adult learners and community management committee members using questionnaire, interview and focus group discussion.

The chapter is categorized in two parts. The first part deals with the characteristics and background of the sample population involved in the study in terms of sex, age, education level and years of experience. The second part presents the analysis concerning curriculum implementation of NFBE program in Bale Zone: Oromia Regional State.

4.1 Characteristics of Respondents

4.1.1 Categories of Respondents

Respondents were categorized into four groups. There were 53 (33.97%) officials, 59 (37.82%) facilitators, 20 (12.82%) community management committee members and 24 (15.39%) adult learners. All respondents were actively participating in NFBE programs curriculum implementation as supervisors, non formal education experts, facilitators and adult learners.
4.1.2 Characteristics of Respondents in terms of Sex and age

Table-10. Sex and age distribution of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officials</td>
<td>facilitators</td>
<td>CMC</td>
<td>Adult learners</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>83.05</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Above 35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66.10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.04</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 10, from the total of 156 respondents of 137 (87.82%) were males while the remaining 19 (12.18%) were females. With regard to official respondents, 50 (94.34%) were males while only 3 (5.66%) were females. In the case of facilitators, 49 (83.05%) were males whereas 10 (16.95%) were females. Regarding CMC members 18 (90%) were males while 2 (10%) were females. Among adult learner respondents 20 (83.3%) were males whereas 4 (16.7%) were females. This indicates that there is a gender imbalance in all categories. Thus, female participation in implementation of NFBE programs was not adequate though in principle the program emphasizes giving priority to females.

With regard to age of the total respondents, Table 10 shows 68 (43.59%) were above 35 years. While few of them 20 (12.82%) were in the age range of 18-25 years. This shows most of the respondents 136 (87.18%) were above 26 years. Thus one can understand that the respondents were matured in terms of age level.
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4.1.3 Characteristics of Respondents In relation to Educational Level and Work Experience

Educational level and work experience of NFBE program implementers are necessary for effective implementation of the programs. Hence, the researcher examined the educational level and work experience of officials and facilitators. However, CMC members were not involved because of their relatively extreme education level and different occupations.

Table-11. Educational Level and Work Experience of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Educational level</th>
<th>Work experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officials</td>
<td>Facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8 complete</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10 complete</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTI certificate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>41 77.4</td>
<td>7 11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ed and above</td>
<td>12 22.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53 100</td>
<td>59 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8 complete</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>5 9.4</td>
<td>5 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>4 7.5</td>
<td>23 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59 100</td>
<td>59 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it is depicted in the above table, all officials were above diploma in educational level among which 41(77.4%) were diploma holders while 12 (22.6%) had BSC/BA/BEd and above. In the case of facilitators 28 (47.5%) were TTI graduates, 21 (35.5%) were grade 10 complete, 7 (11.1%) were diploma holders and only 3 (5.1%) was grade 8 complete.
This shows that, the educational level of facilitators was appropriate to the OEB standard. In this respect, OEB (2002:8) stated that the educational level of facilitators for non formal basic education should be grade 8 complete or above.

Regarding work experience of respondents, great majority of officials 44 (83.1%) were found to have work experience above 15 years. only 5 (9.4%) were found to have work experience between 11 to 15 years and the remaining 4 (7.5%) had work experience of 6 to 10 years. In the case of facilitators, 31 (52.5%) had 1 to 5 years experience. The remaining 28 (47.5%) have served above 6 years. In general, the majority of respondents 81(72.3%) were found to have work experience of 6 years and above. This long experience of respondents may help in providing valuable information to enrich the study.

4.3 Issues related to learning environment

Table-12 Education Officials and Facilitators Responses concerning Where NFBE Classes Take Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Officials</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>In formal primary school</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Under shades</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>In specific constructed centers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Others (farmer training centers, offices, kebele halls etc.,)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the currently used non formal basic education program centers, the respondents were asked where the programs take place. In
this regard, 23(43.5%) officials and 25(42.5%) of facilitators revealed that formal primary schools were used as NFBE centers, 14(26.4%) of officials and 16(27.1%) indicated that the program is implemented in specially constructed centers, 10(18.7%) of officials and 15(25.4%) of facilitators showed that Keble halls and religion schools were used as classes for the program. only 6(11.4%) of officials and 3(5.1%) of facilitators revealed that the programs were implemented under shades.

The respondents further indicated that the programs that were implemented in the formal schools were carried out before and after the regular working hours classes as well as on Saturdays and Sundays. On the other hand, the Kebele office and religion schools were not suitable for teaching learning process because of sound disturbance.

**Table 13 Education Officials and Facilitators Responses Concerning Availability Facilities in NFBE Centers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Officials</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there adequate facilities in NFBE centers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the table, 22(41.5%) of officials and 24(40.7%) of facilitators revealed that there were adequate facilities in NEBE program centers while 31(58.5%) of officials and 35(59.3) stated that there were no adequate facilities in the centers. The respondents also mentioned under open ended questionnaire that there was shortage of seats so that a considerable number of children and adult learners were sitting on stone or wooden longs. Respondents in FGD also raised problem of dusty classes because they have not concrete floor.
Table 14 Education Officials and Facilitators Responses with regard to the Organization and Approaches of Teaching Learning Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Officials</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How is class-room of NFBE organized?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Facilitators teach one subject for one level</td>
<td>9 (17.0)</td>
<td>11 (18.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Self contained</td>
<td>21 (39.6)</td>
<td>20 (33.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Mixed</td>
<td>14 (26.4)</td>
<td>18 (30.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Others</td>
<td>9 (17.0)</td>
<td>10 (16.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53 (100%)</td>
<td>59 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Which approaches of teaching-learning are used in NFBE?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Teacher centered</td>
<td>15 (28.3)</td>
<td>18 (30.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Learner centered</td>
<td>32 (60.4)</td>
<td>33 (55.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Other</td>
<td>6 (11.3)</td>
<td>8 (13.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53 (100%)</td>
<td>59 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 14 above concerning classroom organization of NFBE programs among respondents 21(39.6%) officials and 20(33.8%) of facilitators revealed that class-rooms were organized in self contained while 9(17%) of officials and 11 (18.7%) of facilitators stated facilitators teach one subject for one level. On the other hand, 14(26.4%) of officials and 18(30.6) of facilitators reveled that mixed type of class-room organization was used. Under open-ended questionnaire the respondents indicated that for adults self contained classroom organization was used while for children mixed way of class-room organization was used.
Regarding teaching-learning approaches used in NFBE centers, the majority of respondents 32(60.4%) of officials and 33(55.6%) of facilitators revealed that student-center method was applied in the centers. In addition to this, the researcher observed that in some NFBE centers for children facilitators used question and answer method as well as discussion while for adults they used discussion method.

This shows that the approaches utilized by the centers were similar to that indicated on the strategic document in which learners are at the center of teaching-learning process (OEB, 2002:3). Yet, the study also indicated that more than one-fourth, 15 (28.3%) of officials and 18(30.7%) of facilitators stated that teacher-centered approaches was also used due to lack of training and supervision in the centers while 6(11.3%) of officials and 8(13.7%) of facilitators indicated that both approaches were utilized.
Table 15 Education Officials and Facilitators Responses Concerning Evaluation Mechanism Utilized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Officials</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Which evaluation mechanism is used in NFBE centers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Summative assessment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Formative assessment</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Both</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 How do students transfer from NFBE centers to formal school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) By their class test/exam result</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) By taking achievement test provided by formal school</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Are NFBE students fit into the formal school system after transfer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it is depicted in Table 15 the great majority of respondents (39(73.6%) of officials and 41(69.5%) of facilitators) stated that formative assessment
is used to measure students progress. While 10(18.9%) of officials and 12(20.3%) of facilitators revealed both summative and formative assessment mechanisms were used. In addition to these finding Wereda Education Office Heads of sample wereds in the interview revealed that “formative assessment mechanism was used to measure students progress in NFBE centers.” Nov. 11-18, 2008. Therefore, in curriculum implementations of NFBE curriculum the assessment mechanism can be said that it was implemented in line with the Ethiopian Education and Training policy. TGE (1994) states that continuous assessment could be conducted to ascertain the profile of students at all level as well as in order to get promoted from one level to the next which students required to have a minimum of fifty present results.

Regarding students promotion from NFBE centers to formal schools 50(94.3%) of officials and 43(72.9%) of facilitators stated that students were promoted from NFBE centers to the formal school by their test results while 7 (11.9%) of facilitators responded that achievement test was given by formal schools where the students were supposed to enter.

Under open ended questionnaire the respondents revealed that most of the children who attended NFBE program did not complete the three cycles of the program because they transferred to formal school and registered at grade one.

With regard to NFBE students competence after transferred to formal school, 39(73.5%) of officials and 43(72.9) of facilitators responded that the students were competent where as 14(26.5%) of officials and 16(27.1%) of facilitators stated that the students were not competent. The findings through FGD showed that children from the centers dropped out from the centers either at first cycle or second cycle and joined to first grade formal school. As a result these students performed
better than the formal school students. On the other hand, the students who completed three cycles and transferred to grade five formal schools were not competent.

In the case of Adult learners who were participated in focus group discussion, it was revealed that their friends who joined formal school were competent. Officials in the interview also agreed with the discussion.

Table 16 Education Officials and Facilitators Responses concerning Linkage between NFBE centers and formal schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Officials</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What is the linkage of NFBE centers and formal schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a) NFBE centers as feeder to formal school</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>b) In experience sharing</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>c) In provision of training for facilitators</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>d) In exchange of instructional materials</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>e) Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 16, 38(71.7%) of officials and 42(71.3%) of facilitators showed that NFBE centers were linked to formal school in a way that NFBE centers serves as feeder to formal school. 23(43.4%) of officials and 25(42.4%) of facilitators stated that the linkage between the two institutions were based on experience sharing and in instructional materials exchange. On the other hand, 20(37.7%) of officials and
20(33.8%) of facilitators indicated that the linkage were based on provision of training for facilitators.

In addition to the above result, in the open ended questionnaire, the respondents indicated that there is inadequate linkage in experience sharing, in provision of training for facilitators and in exchange of instructional materials. In line with this, OEB (2002:8), states that the linkage between NFBE and formal school is necessary to strengthen the teaching learning process, in helping and supporting facilitators and in preparation and utilization of instructional materials between formal school teachers and facilitators.
### 4-3 Issues related to facilitators

Table 17: Education Officials and Facilitators Responses concerning Criteria to select facilitators for NFBE and their payment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Officials</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What are the major criteria to select facilitators for NFBE centers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Students who complete grade eight</td>
<td>14 26.4</td>
<td>15 25.4</td>
<td>29 25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Students who complete grade ten</td>
<td>40 75.5</td>
<td>43 72.7</td>
<td>83 74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Teachers with TTI certificate</td>
<td>24 45.3</td>
<td>26 44.1</td>
<td>50 44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Students who know the culture of community</td>
<td>39 73.6</td>
<td>43 72.9</td>
<td>82 73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Students who are accepted by the community</td>
<td>39 73.6</td>
<td>43 72.9</td>
<td>82 73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Others</td>
<td>11 20.8</td>
<td>12 20.3</td>
<td>23 20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How much is paid for facilitators per month?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) 100-200</td>
<td>- - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) 201-300</td>
<td>6 11.2</td>
<td>6 10.2</td>
<td>12 10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) above 300</td>
<td>24 45.5</td>
<td>26 44.1</td>
<td>50 44.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Others</td>
<td>23 43.3</td>
<td>27 45.7</td>
<td>50 44.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53 100</td>
<td>59 100</td>
<td>112 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Who pays the salary of facilitators?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Community</td>
<td>6 11.3</td>
<td>6 10.2</td>
<td>12 10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Government</td>
<td>24 45.5</td>
<td>26 44.5</td>
<td>50 44.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) NGOs</td>
<td>6 11.3</td>
<td>6 10.2</td>
<td>12 10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Others</td>
<td>17 32.3</td>
<td>21 35.7</td>
<td>38 33.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53 100</td>
<td>59 100</td>
<td>112 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>What are the terms of employment of facilitators?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Permanent employment</td>
<td>17 32.2</td>
<td>16 27.1</td>
<td>33 29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Part-time employment</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Full-time contract</td>
<td>18 33.9</td>
<td>21 35.6</td>
<td>39 34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Volunteer facilitators</td>
<td>18 33.9</td>
<td>22 37.3</td>
<td>40 38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53 100</td>
<td>59 100</td>
<td>112 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17 presents the selection criteria of NFBE facilitators and their payment. As indicated in the table, with regard to criteria to select NFBE facilitators, the most common criteria is found to be grade 10 complete, as responded by 40(75.5%) of officials and 43(72.7%) of facilitators followed by knowledge of the culture of the community and acceptance of the community which is responded by 39(73.6%) of officials and 43(72.9%) of facilitators. On the other hand, 14(26.4%) of officials and 15(25.4%) of facilitators stated that the minimum qualification requirement was grade 8 complete where as 24(45.3%) of officials and 26(44.1%) of facilitators responded TTI certificate was used as selection criteria.

In addition to the above findings, in the information obtained from interview with Bale Zone NFE expert indicated the following.

The minimum qualification used as criteria was grade ten complete. However, in situations where grade 10 complete students who know the culture of the community can not be found grade 8 complete having knowledge of the culture of the community were also recruited as facilitators (Nov. 25, 2008).

Furthermore, OEB NFE expert indicated that

In most cases teachers in the formal school were assigned as facilitators which were considered as one of the requirement for the promotion of their career structure. Moreover, graduates of TTI also served as facilitators to get participation certificate (Dec. 2, 2008)

According to OEB, (2002:15), where there is shortage of human resource the minimum qualification to select facilitators is grade 8 complete. Teachers in the formal schools are also considered as facilitators in NFBE centers.

As can be seen in Table 17 item 2 regarding the amount of salary paid for facilitators 6(11.2%) of officials and 6(10.2%) of facilitators responded that the payment was Birr 201-300 while 24(45.5%) of officials and 26(44.5%) of facilitators stated the salary was above 300. In open ended questionnaire the respondents revealed that most of facilitators served either without payment or they were teachers from formal school. Here
the problem is that the facilitators have dissatisfied for serving without payment and they had no motivation to teach.

As can be seen from Table 4-8, item 3 deals with the responsible body for paying facilitators salary. 24(45.5%) of officials and 26(44.5%) of facilitators stated that government was paying facilitators. 6(11.3%) of officials and 6(10.2%) of facilitators revealed that NGOs and community were paying for them. 17(32.3%) of officials and 21(35.7%) of facilitators indicated facilitators were not paid for they were serving either to get participation certificate or to fulfill the requirement for the promotion of career structure.

The study further indicated that facilitators in Rayitu wereda who were employed by NGOs have better salary which was Birr.500.

In other weredas facilitators who were employed by government were paid birr 300 while those employed by community paid birr.120 to birr.200. This difference and low payment may discourage facilitators in performing their responsibilities and duties.

As depicted in Table 4-8 respondents were asked about terms of employment of facilitators 17(32.3%) of officials and 16(27.1%) of facilitators revealed that facilitators were employed on permanent term and 18(33.9%) of officials and 21(35.6%) of facilitators stated the term of employment were fulltime contract. On the other hand, under open ended questionnaire the respondents indicated that facilitators were assigned from formal school teachers who were employed on permanent term. The remaining 18(33.9%) of officials and 22(37.3%) of facilitators revealed volunteers to get participation certificate were also participated as facilitators.

Furthermore, education officials at wereda level in the interview confirmed the above findings and mentioned that:

*Except Raytu wereda in other sample weredas most of facilitators were volunteer which were high school (grade 10) and T.T.I graduates and few of them were Diploma*
holders from different private colleges to get participation certificate which was taken as criteria during recruitment of teachers in the wereda. (Nov. 11-18, 2008.)

Table 18 Education Officials and Facilitators Responses concerning Training conditions of facilitators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Officials</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have facilitators get training?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If your answer for no. 2 is yes what is the mode of training of facilitators?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Pre service training for 15 days</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>In-service training for 5 days</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are contents of training of facilitators?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Guiding principles and working procedures of NFBE programs</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Gender issues focus on the special needs of girls</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Conditions that distinguish adults and children behavior</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>How to facilitate learning with student-centered and problem solving</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Preparation and utilization of teaching aids from local material</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Methods and techniques of continuous assessment</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Techniques of mobilizing community</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The success of implementation of NFBE is largely dependent on the quality of the training the facilitators have had. Therefore, training of
facilitators is crucial in building their capacity and to implement the program efficiently. According to OEB (2003:9), facilitators should get pre-service training for minimum of 15 days on children and adult's behavior and their difference, on preparation and utilization of teaching aids, on instructional planning, on assessment mechanism and on how to mobilize community to participate in NFBE program. Furthermore, on job training at each quarter of the year for 5 days should be provided for facilitators.

In this regard respondents were asked about facilitators training, mode and contents of training. As can be seen from Table 4-9, 27(50.9%) of officials and 29(49.1%) of facilitators stated that facilitators have got training while 26(49.1%) of officials and 30(50.9%) of facilitators revealed that facilitators did not take training.

This finding shows large numbers of facilitators were not undergoing training to effectively implement the NFBE program. Therefore, capacity building and training of facilitators is necessary in order to achieve the goals and objectives of NFBE curriculum implementation.

Regarding facilitators mode and duration of training 27(50.9%) of officials and 29(49.1%) of facilitators indicated that facilitators have been trained before their employment for 15 days. Where as 14 (26.5%) of officials and 16(27.1%) of facilitators stated that they have been trained through in-service training for 5 days.

With regard to the content of training the respondents revealed that the contents of training were on guiding principles and working procedures of NFBE program, gender issues focus in special needs of girls, condition that distinguish adults and children behavior, how to facilitate students with student centered and problem solving approach, preparation and utilization of teaching aids from local materials, lesson plan preparation.
student evaluation and assessment methods and community mobilization. This implies, the contents of training provided might help facilitators to effectively implement the program and it is also the same as that indicated on the guideline.

4-4 Issues Related to Curriculum

One of the factors in effective implementation of NFBE curriculum is the designing of relevant and learners need based curriculum and the preparation of learning materials. Its preparation is believed to be based on the information about the learners and the specific situation of local environment (UNESCO, 200151).

The following table presents the preparation and relevance of the curriculum
Table 19 Education Officials and Facilitators Responses concerning Preparation and Relevance of NFBE Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Officials</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No  %</td>
<td>No  %</td>
<td>No  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Is there specifically developed NFBE curriculum for adults?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Yes</td>
<td>35  66</td>
<td>38  64.4</td>
<td>73  65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) No</td>
<td>18  34</td>
<td>21  35.6</td>
<td>39  34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53  100</td>
<td>59  100</td>
<td>112 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Is there specifically developed NFBE curriculum for school age children?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Yes</td>
<td>35  66</td>
<td>38  64.4</td>
<td>73  65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) No</td>
<td>18  34</td>
<td>21  35.6</td>
<td>39  34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53  100</td>
<td>59  100</td>
<td>112 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Are there adequate text books in the center?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Yes</td>
<td>21  39.6</td>
<td>23  39</td>
<td>44  39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) No</td>
<td>32  60.4</td>
<td>36  61</td>
<td>68  60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53  100</td>
<td>59  100</td>
<td>112 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Do facilitators have manuals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Yes</td>
<td>17  32.1</td>
<td>20  33.9</td>
<td>37  33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) No</td>
<td>36  67.9</td>
<td>39  66.1</td>
<td>75  67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53  100</td>
<td>59  100</td>
<td>112 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Who developed the curriculum?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) MOE</td>
<td>11  20.8</td>
<td>13  22</td>
<td>24  21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) OEB</td>
<td>42  79.2</td>
<td>46  78</td>
<td>88  78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Supporting NGOs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53  100</td>
<td>59  100</td>
<td>112 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Are all concerned bodies participating in the curriculum preparation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Yes</td>
<td>36  67.9</td>
<td>39  66.1</td>
<td>75  67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) No</td>
<td>17  32.1</td>
<td>20  33.9</td>
<td>37  33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53  100</td>
<td>59  100</td>
<td>112 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Is the curriculum relevant to the local needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) High</td>
<td>14  26.4</td>
<td>16  27.1</td>
<td>30  26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Medium</td>
<td>39  73.6</td>
<td>41  69.5</td>
<td>80  71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Low</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2  3.4</td>
<td>2  1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53  100</td>
<td>59  100</td>
<td>112 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The success of NFBE programs depends on the quality of curriculum material to address the need of the local environment. Regarding this,
OEB (2002:14) stated that the content of the curriculum for adult Basic Education would be prepared based on the participation of the community. Besides, the subject provided for adults include Afaan Oromo, maths and environmental science. For adults who demanded to continue their education after completion of the three cycles, English is provided. For ABE program the curriculum is derived from that of formal school first cycle (grade 1-4) program. It includes Afaan Oromo, English Mathematics and Environmental science which is prepared by Oromia Region Education Bureau.

Table 19 presents NFBE curriculum issues. With regard to the presence of specific curriculum for the program 35(66%) of officials and 38(64.4%) of facilitators revealed that there was specific curriculum while 18(34%) of officials and 21(35.6%) of facilitators denied. In addition to this, NFE expert from OEB mentioned the following:

The curriculum provided for children was derived from formal school first cycle (1-4) curriculum materials which include Afaan Oromo, English, Mathematics, Environmental science and Aesthetics. For adults, the subjects were Afaan Oromo, Mathematics and Environmental science. The materials for adults were prepared in OEB in a way to address the need and level of adult learners. For adults who demanded to continue their education in formal school after the completion of the 3 cycles English that was prepared for children was given. Moreover, the OEB was changing adult basic education program to functional adult literacy program, which is already started at the beginning of 2001 E.C. It focuses on knowledge of their environment, health (HIV/AIDS), livestock production and health, agriculture and on how to increase agricultural production, protection of natural environment, fair administration, population, income generation etc. (Dec. 2, 2008)

In this connection Thompson, (2001 in Hoppers 2006:29) stated that adult basic Education program does not only provide literacy and numeric skills and livelihood training; but also deals with civic and peace
education, environment degradation poverty reduction, HIV/AIDS and community reconstruction.

Thus the shift that OEB attempted to functional aspect of adult basic education is encouraging and hence, it should be strengthened more. With regard to the availability of students text and facilitators manual majority of the respondent 32(60.4%) of officials and 36(61%) of facilitators and 36(67.9%) of officials and 39(66.1%) of facilitators revealed that there were not adequate student text and facilitators manual respectively in the centers. However, Bale zone NFBE expert in the interview revealed that:

*In the case of adult basic education the newly developed material for functional adult basic education currently distributing for centers so that there was some improvement in the case of adult education teaching materials while the case of ABE remains unchanged. (Nov. 25, 2008)*

From the result one can understand that it needs efforts to improve the provision of materials in order to implement the program effectively.

As it can be seen in the table (item 4) majority of the respondents (42(79.2%) of officials and 46(78%) of facilitators) stated that OEB developed the curriculum of NFBE. On the other hand, 11(20.8%) of officials and 13(22%) of facilitators stated the NFBE curriculum was developed by MOE. The ABE curriculum according to the interview was condensed and equivalent to that of formal school which helps to ensure smooth transfer to the formal schools. The main subject area it includes are Afaan Oromo, English mathematics, environmental science and aesthetics.

Item 5 deals with the participation of concerned bodies in the curriculum preparation. 36(67.9%) of officials and 39(66.1%) of facilitators of the
respondents stated that the concerned bodies were participated on NFBE curriculum preparation. However, in interview discussion wereda education office heads indicated that: “The curriculum was prepared and developed at OEB and sent to the zones and weredas. But the OEB provided training for officials about the implementation of the curriculum.”

Item6 deals with the relevance of the curriculum to local needs. Great majority of the respondents 39(73.6%) of officials and 41(69.5%) of facilitators revealed that the curriculum was relevant to the local needs. In addition to this findings, in FGD adult learners indicated that the content they learned helped them in their daily life and to continue their further education. Regarding ABE curriculum officials in the interview discussion mentioned that the curriculum is condensed from formal school ones in away to ensure the learners’ smooth transfer to formal school.
### 4-5 Issues Related to Management and Supervision

Table 20: Education Officials and Facilitators Responses concerning Guidelines

#### Management and Supervision of NFBE Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Officials</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Is there clearly stated guide for NFBE program in the region?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>If your answer is yes are you familiar with the guidelines?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do CMC members receive training that helps them to perform their duties and responsibilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) No</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>How often NFBE caners are supervised and monitored?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Once in a month</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Once in a semester</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Once in a year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Twice in a semester</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Who is involved in supervision?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) CMC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Wereda education office experts</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) NGO experts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Depicted in Table 20, 29(54.7%) of officials and 32(54.2%) of facilitators stated that NFBE program has an implementing strategy and guidelines. 29(54.7%) of officials and 31(52.3%) of facilitators revealed that they were familiar with the implementation strategy and guideline. During the interview, the education officials mentioned that though there was lack of coordinating the activities of stakeholders, the guideline was prepared by Oromia Education Bureau with clear statement on duties and responsibilities of stakeholders.

38(71.7%) of officials and 42(71.2%) of facilitators revealed that the CMC members did not receive training. In addition to this finding in FGD CMC members and adult learners mentioned that there was lack of awareness about the importance of the NFBE program. As a result, the community members were unwilling to participate in the program. CMC were assumed to manage NFBE centers but the above discussion shows that the activity carried out by CMC were found to be low.

Regarding supervision respondents were asked how often the centers were supervised and monitored. 25(47.2%) of officials and 26(44.2%) of facilitators stated that centers were supervised and monitored twice in a semester. 17(32.1%) of officials and 20(33.9%) of facilitators revealed that centers were supervised once in a month, 5(9.4%) of officials and 7(11.9%) of facilitators of them showed once in a semester and the remaining 6(11.3%) of officials and 6(10.2%) of facilitators) indicated NFBE centers were supervised once in a year.

OEB (2003:14), clearly stated that the wereda experts supervisors and the wereda NFBE committee are supposed to visit NFBE center either in two weeks or in a month.
Regarding Item 5 “who is involved in supervision?”, 43(81.1%) of officials and 48(81.4%) of facilitators) of the respondents revealed that the wereda education office supervisors and non formal experts supervised and monitored the NFBE centers. However, in FGD and during interview the participants indicated that monitoring and supervision on NFBE centers were low. Because of shortage of budget the wereda supervisors and experts visited centers either once in a semester or once in a year. This lack of continuous supervision and follow up might leads to weak implementation of the curriculum. On the other hand, in the field visit it was observed that the directors of the nearby formal school was found to be responsible in following and reporting the performance of NFBE centers to wereda Education Office. But among these directors they mentioned that it was difficult task that could not carried out properly. And facilitators also confirmed that directors give attention only to formal schools.

4-6 Issues Related to Funding NFBE Program

In the implementation of NFBE curriculum one of the most important features is the involvement of the community, NGOs and government. The NFBE centers are assumed that they are managed by joint responsibility of community, NGOs and government bodies. The following table presents the participation of community, NGOs and government in funding NFBE centers.
Table 21 Education Officials and Facilitators Responses concerning community, NGOs and government involvement in Funding NFBE centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community involvement</th>
<th>Officials</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Land provision</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Row materials</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Paying salary of facilitators</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 NFBE centers construction</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Provision of learning material (text, books, facilitators manual, desk, etc)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Labor provision</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Government involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Provision of professional support</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Provision of training</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Paying salary of facilitators</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 NFBE centers construction</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Provision of learning material (text, books, facilitators manual, desk, etc)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Assigning trained teachers</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NGOs participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Provision of professional support</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Provision of training</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Paying salary of facilitators</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 NFBE construction</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Provision of learning materials (text-books, facilitators manuals, desk, etc)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Assigning trained teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21 presents the involvement of the community, government and NGOs in funding NFBE centers. As it can be seen from Table 4-12 regarding community participation the highest contribution of the community is found to be land provision which was responded by 45(84.9%) of officials and 50(84.7%) of facilitators followed by land provision responded by 37(69.8%) of officials and 41(69.5%) of facilitators NFBE centers construction responded by 34(64.2%) of officials and 39(66.1%) of facilitators of the respondents and provision of raw materials responded by 29(54.7%) of officials and 33(55.9%) of facilitators.

On the other hand, the involvement of the community in paying salary for facilitators responded by 13(24.5%) of officials and 15(25.4%) of facilitators and in provision of learning materials responded by 25(47.2%) of officials and 26(44.2%) of facilitators were found to be low.

According to the discussion with the participants of FGD the respective community participates mainly in land, raw materials and labor provision.

With regard to government involvement, item1 (provision of professional support) responded by 37(69.8%) of officials and 41(69.5%) of facilitators item 6 (assigning trained teachers) responded by 48(90.6%) of officials and 52(88.1%) of facilitators and item 5 (provision of learning materials) responded by 42(79.2%) of officials and 48(81.4%) of facilitators were found high in government involvement. While item 2 (provision of training for facilitator, item 3 (paying salary of facilitators) and item 4 (NFBE center construction) responded by 24(45.3%) of officials and 26(44.1%) of facilitators and 24(45.3%) of officials and 26(44.1%) of facilitators and 25(47.2%) of officials and 26(44.2%) of facilitators respectively were found low in government involvement.
This means, the participation of government was high in provision of professional support and in assigning trained teachers and it was medium in provision of learning materials. On the other hand the involvement of government the remaining items (provision of training to facilitators, paying salary facilitators and NFBE center conclusion) have found to be low. Further more the participants in FGD and interview mentored that, though the supervision in some centers was conducted once in a year or a semester, in other centers there was a professional support provided by WEO supervisors and NFE experts. In addition to this in the discussion, they indicated that teachers in the formal school were assigned responsible to run NFBE as a requirement for there promotion in cheery structure.

In the case of NGOs involvement, except Rayitu wereda, in the other sample weredas (Goba, sinana, Gasara, Golocha and Ghindiir) no NGO was involved in the NFBE program. The participation of NGOs in the zone was low.

4.7 Good practices and challenges in curriculum implementation of NFBE program

In addition to quantitative information obtained through questionnaire all respondents were asked through open ended questionnaire, interview and FGD about the success and challenges of NFBE curriculum implementation.

4.7.1 Successes of NFBE, curriculum, implementation

With regard to success of NFBE curriculum implementation respondents indicated the following points under open-ended questionnaire:
• It provided learning opportunity for out of school children particularly for those from poor family and lived with others as a cowherd.
• It contributes for the establishment of committee for the children's right which forced families to send children who lived with them and their own children to NFBE centers.
• It prepared children for formal school.
• It helped adults to read and write and to know about their environment.
• It also encouraged adults to continue their further education.

4.7.2 Major Challenges facing the Effectiveness of NFBE Curriculum Implementation

On the other hand, the respondents also indicated major challenges of curriculum implementation as follows.

Lack of budget to recruit facilitators, shortage of human resource to recruit facilitators in particularly low land wereda, lack of interest to facilitate in the case where formal school teachers are assigned due to lack of incentives, lack of due concern from government bodies, lack of attention from the community due to lack of awareness and therefore, the community did not believe that the education in NFBE centers have the same value as that of formal school and the CMC also did not properly perform their duties and responsibility are major problems. In addition to this, except the WEO other concerned bodies did not involve in the program. On the other hand, because of draught particularly in low land wereda the communities change their residence frequently and the learners were forced to drop-out. Moreover, families who recruited cowherd school age children did not send the children regularly to the centers which results with absenteeism.
CHAPTER 5

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with summary, conclusion drawn and possible recommendations of the study

5.1 Summary

The main purpose of the study was to assess the success and challenges of NFBE curriculum implementation in Bale zone, Oromia Regional State.

Accordingly, the study was guided by the following basic research questions

1. What are the supports provided to NFBE facilitators in terms of training & supervision?
2. Are there adequate curriculum materials in the ABE centers?
3. Who is responsible for funding the NFBE program?
4. What are the achievements & best practices of the NFBE program in the zone?
5. What are the problems that have encountered the provision of NFBE program in the zone?

In dealing with the basic research questions, descriptive survey method was employed and relevant related literature was reviewed. Six Woredas were selected purposefully from the zone and a total of 156 respondents; that is 53 officials, 59 facilitators, 20 CMC members and 24 adult learners have participated in the study.
The data for the study were collected by means of questionnaire, interview, focus group discussions and document analysis.

The data collected through questionnaire was analyzed using percentage while the data collected through interview and focus group discussion were transcribed, analyzed and triangulated with the qualitative data where necessary & appropriate.

The data analysis led to the following major findings:

1. 43.5% & 26.4% of officials and 42.5% & 25.4% of facilitators revealed that most of NFBE classes were taking place in primary school and in especially constructed centers respectively. Particularly in centers constructed for NFBE program there was inadequate facilities so that children and adult learners used stone or wooden logs.

2. 39.6% officials and 33.8 of facilitators revealed that classrooms in NFBE centers were organized on self contained type. However, 17% of officials and 18.7% facilitators stated that in centers where two or more facilitators were available, facilitators teach one or two subjects for one level. The remaining indicated that mixed approaches were employed.

3. 60.4% of officials & 55.6% of facilitators indicated that the learning approaches used were student centered. But, 28.3% of officials & 29.5% of them indicated that due to lack of training and support from supervisors teacher centered approach was also practiced in some centers.

4. 73.6% of officials and 69.5% of facilitators showed that formative assessment was used to measure student's progress in NFBE centers. The study also showed that students from NFBE transfer
to formal school by their test results. However, most of NFBE program students used the program as a transition to formal school to register at grade one. As a result, they dropped out at the first or second cycle and registered at grade one informal school.

5. With regard to NFBE student's competence, the study revealed that adults who transferred to formal school performed better than children from NFBE centers.

6. Findings showed that linkages of NFBE centers and formal school were found inadequate in experience sharing, in provision of training for facilitators and in exchange of instructional materials.

7. The most common criteria used to select facilitators were knowledge of the culture of the community, acceptance by the community, completing grade 10 and TTI certificate. However, in cases where there is shortage of man power grade 8 complete students were also selected as facilitators.

8. With regard to the amount of salary paid to facilitators it was found that most facilitators served either without payment to obtain certificate for participation as facilitator or to fulfill career structure promotion requirement in the case of formal school teachers. The study also revealed that the amount of salary paid for facilitators ranges between 120Birr in centers where community pay and slightly more than 300 Birr in centers where government pay.

9. Regarding terms of employment for facilitators 35.6% of them were fulltime contract and the study also indicated that in some centers teachers employed on permanent base were also assigned as facilitators.

10. Regarding facilitators training, the study showed that large number (50%) of facilitators was not acquired the necessary skills and knowledge. However, findings also revealed that some
facilitators (50%) have been trained before employment and through in service training.

11. The content of training were guiding principles and working procedures of NFBE program, gender issue focus on special needs of girls, condition that distinguish adults and children behavior, how to facilitate students with student centered and problem solving approach, preparation of lesson plan, preparation and utilization of teaching aids from local materials, student evaluation and assessment method and community mobilization mechanism.

12. Findings showed that there were specific curricula for adult basic education program and for ABE program. The curriculum for adult basic education was based on adults' life activities and it includes the ability to read, write and calculate. The subjects were Afan Oromo, environmental science and mathematics in three cycles. For adults who demanded to continue their learning in formal education English was provided for them. However, currently, the Oromia Region Education Bureau changed the curriculum of adult basic education program to functional adult literacy and the subjects were health, agriculture, family planning and environment education.

The curriculum for ABE was derived from formal school first cycle (1-4) curriculum and arranged for three cycles. The subjects included were Afan Oromo, Environmental Science, Mathematics and Aesthetics.

13. The study (67.9% of officials and 66.1% of facilitators) revealed that there were not adequate student texts and facilitators manual in most centers. Currently, the material prepared for FAL distributed to Woredas and centers.

14. The ABE curriculum was condensed and equivalent to formal school which helps to ensure smooth transfer to the formal school
and it was prepared by OEB experts. The FAL curriculum was also prepared by OEB based on considering the specific locality in which the program was implementing.

15. The study showed that the adult basic education curriculum was relevant to the local needs.

16. The findings of the study (54.5% of the respondents) revealed that there was implementing strategy and guideline in which majority of the respondents were familiar with.

17. With regard to training provided for CMC members, the study indicated that they did not receive training and there was lack of awareness about the importance of NFBE programs.

18. The study showed that most of NFBE centers were supervised and monitored once in a semester. But, some centers were supervised once in a month while the remaining was supervised once in a year due to lack of budget.

19. 81.3% of the respondents revealed that Cluster resource center (CRC) supervisors and directors, Woreda Education office supervisors and NFBE experts and directors of primary school near the centers were involved in supervision.

20. The study indicated that the community participates in NFBE program mainly in provision of land and labor and they also participated in paying salary for facilitators.

21. Government involved in NFBE program in provision of professional support, learning material, training and paying salary for facilitators and in assigning trained teachers to the centers though it was not adequate.

22. The study revealed that the participation of NGOs in the zone was very low.
5.2. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings from the study, the following conclusions were drawn.

1. The study indicated that the NFBE programs were implemented in primary formal schools, on especially constructed centers, in farmers training centers, health posts, and under shades, to bring the school to the proximity of children and adult learners. This helps learners to learn without going long distance near their own village and work area.

2. The findings of the study revealed that in some centers either teachers in the formal school or volunteers to obtain participation certificate served as facilitators without incentives. Therefore, the inadequate training, low payment and lack of incentive might lead to lack of interest and commitment on the part of facilitators. This in turn would have a negative impact on the effective implementation of the NFBE program.

3. There were specific curricula for both NFBE programs that are adult basic education and ABE. Currently, the adult basic education program was shifted toward functional adult literacy (FAL) program in a way that the adult learner can use what they learn in their daily life activities. This shift in focus of the program could encourage adults to come to the center to learn and to improve their life.

4. The existence of inadequate linkage between NFBE centers and formal school would have a negative impact on utilization of resources particularly in the NFBE centers.

5. Lack of training and awareness creation for CMC members and stakeholders as well as lack of involvement in curriculum
development and preparation led to low contribution to the implementation of the curriculum.

6. Supervision and monitoring is essential in supporting and helping the NFBE implementers. However, the findings of the study indicated that supervision and monitoring of the centers were inadequate and were not implemented as expected. This might lead to inactive implementation of the curriculum.

7. Lack of adequate attention to NFBE programs in the zone could lead to more dropouts and hampers the overall attempt of the country to achieve universal primary education by 2015.
5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study and the conclusion drawn the researcher the recommends the following.

1. As the study showed, though the NFBE centers helped the learner to learn without going long distance from their village, the inadequate facilities and shortage of learning materials has negative impact on achieving the objectives of the program. Therefore, the OEB has to work with other sectors, NGOs and the community at large to create conducive learning environment.

2. In order to build the capacity of facilitators it is recommended that the OEB with other stake holders should organize short-term training programs like workshops, seminars, conferences, etc. for facilitators.

3. Findings showed that the OEB has started to implement functional adult literacy program. This requires the involvement of agriculture and health sectors. As depicted in the study the cooperation of these sectors was very low. Therefore, there should be coordination among the responsible offices like wereda agriculture office, woreda health office and so on in order to implement the NFBE curriculum successfully.

4. The study revealed that the linkage between formal schools and NFBE centers was inadequate. But it is believed that there should be strong link between the two institutions. Therefore, attention should be given in creating and developing strong relationship between NFBE centers & the surrounding formal primary schools in experience sharing and exchanging learning materials.

5. The study depicted that there is lack of supervision and monitoring. Thus, supervision and follow up should be implemented and strengthened as indicated in the guidelines to achieve the goals of NFBE program. Hence, cluster resource centers (CRC) around the
NFBE centers should organize training in collaboration with responsible bodies from the wereda office on the importance of supervision and monitoring for facilitators and the nearby formal school teachers.

6. The findings of the study indicated that there is lack of training and awareness creation for CMC members and other stakeholders like parents & NFBE participants. Therefore, awareness creation programs like conferences, seminars, discussion forums, etc., should be organized to sensitize the stakeholders and to develop common understanding of the importance of the program.
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Questionnaire to be filled by Zone Education Office NFE experts, & Woreda Education offices non-formal education experts and supervisors, CRC supervisors & NFBE centers facilitators.

Dear Sir/Madam

The purpose of this Questionnaire is to collect information for the research study on “The success and challenges of NFBE curriculum implementation in Bale Zone: Oromia Regional State.” The success of the study is highly depending on your response. Therefore, please fill the questionnaire honestly and responsibly.

The researcher is grateful to your cooperation in advance.

N.B. 1. Don’t write your name  
2. Put ‘X’ mark of your response on the space provided  
3. Write your additional comments and suggestion on the given space  
4. Date of response __________________________

Part I. General Information

1.1 Sex A) Male □ B) Female □

1.2 Age A) 18-25 □ B) 26-35 □ C) Above 36 □

1.3 Qualification A) Certificate □ B) Diploma □ C) BA/BS □

D) Others please specify __________________________

1.4. Field of Specialization __________________________

1.5. Service Year __________________________

1.6. Your Current Position __________________________

1.7. Your Woreda __________________________

1.8. Your NFBE center __________________________
Part II. Issues Related to Learning Environment.

2.1. Where does NFBE class take place?
A) In primary schools □ B) Under shades □
C) In special constructed centers □
D) Others (please specify) ____________________________

2.2. Are there adequate facilities of learning (seats, black-board, etc.) in the NFBE center/s?
A) Yes □ B) No □

2.3. If your answer in question ‘2.2’ is ‘No’ please mention the problem ____________________________

2.4. How is classroom of NFBE organized?
A) Facilitators teach one subject for one grade □ B) Self- contained □
C) Mixed of A&B □
D) Others (please specify) ____________________________

2.5. Which approaches of teaching-learning are used? (More than one response is possible)
A) Teacher centered □ B) Learner centered □

2.6. Which evaluation mechanism is used?
A) Summative assessment □ B) Formative assessment □
C) Others (please specify) ____________________________

2.7. How do students transfer from NFBE to formal school?
A) By their class test/ exam result □
B) By taking achievement test provided by the formal school □
C) Others (please specify) ____________________________

2.8. What is the linkage of NFBE centers and formal school?
2.9. Are NFBE students fit in to the system of formal school after transfer?
A) Yes  B) No

2.10. If your response for question ‘2.11’ is ‘No’ please mention the problem

Part III. Issues Related to Facilitators.
3.1. What are the major criteria to select facilitators for NFBE centers? (More than one response is possible)
A) Students who complete grade eight
B) Students who complete grade ten
C) Teachers with TTI certificate
D) Students who know the culture of the community
E) Students who are accepted by the community
F) Others (please specify)

3.2. How much is paid for facilitators per month?
A) 100-200  B) 201-300  C) Above 300
D) Others (please specify)

3.3. Who pays the salary of facilitator?
A) Community  B) Government/Wereda education office  C) NGO
D) Others (please specify)

3.4. What are terms of employment of facilitators?
A) Permanent employment  B) Part time employment
C) Full time contract □ D) Volunteer facilitators □

E) Others (please specify) ____________________________________________

3.5. Have the facilitators got training?
A) Yes □ B) No □

3.6. If your response for question ‘3.5’ is ‘A’, what is the mode and duration of training?
A) Pre-service training □ for 15 days
B) In-service training □ for 5 days
C) Others (please specify)______________________________________________

3.7. What are the contents of training? ((More than one answer is possible)
A) Guiding principles and working procedures of NFBE program □
B) Child psychology focuses on rural and pastoral children □
C) Gender issue focuses on the special needs of the girls □
D) How to facilitate learning with child centered, activity based and problem solving approaches □
E) Production and use of learning aids from local materials □
F) Methods and techniques of continues assessment □
G) Techniques of mobilizing community for effective community participation □
H) Others (please specify) ___________________________________________

Part IV. Issues Related to Curriculum
4.1. Is there specifically developed curriculum of NFBE program?
A) Yes □ B) No □

4.2. If your response for question ‘4.1’ is ‘Yes’, who developed the curriculum?
A) MOE □ B) OEB □ C) Supporting NGO □
4.3. Are all concerned bodies participated in NFBE curriculum preparation?
A) Yes  B) No

4.5. Are there adequate text books?
A) Yes  B) No

4.12. Do facilitators have manual(s) for teaching?
A) Yes  B) No

Part V. Issues Related Management & Supervision.

5.1. Are there clearly stated strategy and guidelines for implementation of NFBE program?
A) Yes  B) No

5.2. If your response for question 5.1 is ‘Yes’, to what extent you are familiar with the guidelines?
A) High  B) Average  C) Low

5.3. How often NFBE centers are supervised & monitored?
A) Once in a month  B) Once in a semester
C) Twice in a semester  D) Once in a year
E) Others (please specify)

5.4. Who involved in supervision & monitoring?
A) CMC  B) Wereda education office officials/ experts
C) NGO’s NFE experts
D) Others (please specify)

5.6. Do CMC members receive training that helps them to perform their duties and their responsibilities in implementing NFBE program?
A) Yes  B) No
5.7. To what extent the supervision & monitoring help to improve implementation of NFBE program?

A) High ☐  B) Average ☐  C) Low ☐

Part VI. Issues Related to Funding NFBE program.

Involvement of communities NGOs & government in funding NFBE centers are listed below. Show your choice by marking ‘X’ based on the degree of participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.1.</th>
<th>Community participation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1.1</td>
<td>Land provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.2</td>
<td>Row materials provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.3</td>
<td>Paying salary of facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.4</td>
<td>NFBE center construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.5</td>
<td>Provision of learning materials (text, facilitators guide, desk, facilities, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.6</td>
<td>Labor provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.7</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.2.</th>
<th>Government participation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1</td>
<td>Provision of professional support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.2</td>
<td>Provision of trainings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.3</td>
<td>Paying salary of facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.4</td>
<td>NFBE center construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.5</td>
<td>Provision of learning materials (desk, textbooks, facilitators guide, facilities, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.6</td>
<td>Assigning paid trained teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.7</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.3.</th>
<th>NGO’s participation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3.1</td>
<td>Provision of professional support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.2</td>
<td>Provision of trainings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.3.3 Paying salary of facilitators
6.3.4 NFBE center construction
6.3.5 Provision of learning materials (text, facilitators guide, desk, facilities, etc.)
6.3.6 Assigning paid trained teachers
6.3.7 Others

Part VII. General Suggestions and Comments.

7.1. What are the problems that have encountered the provision of NFBE program?

________________________________________________________________________________________

7.2. What are the achievements of the provision of NFBE program in the Zone/wereda/center?

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

7.3. What do you suggest for effective implementation of NFBE?

________________________________________________________________________________________
Addis Ababa University  
School of Graduate Studies  
Department of Curriculum Studies and Teacher Professional Development Studies  
Adult and Lifelong Learning Unit

Interview for Bale Zone education Office NFBE experts, OEB NFBE experts and Sample Woredas education office heads.  
The purpose of this Interview is to collect information for the research under take on the success and challenges of NFBE curriculum implementation in Bale Zone: Oromia Regional State. The success of the study is highly depending on your response. Therefore, I hope you give the response honestly and responsibly.  
I am grateful for your cooperation.

Part I. General Information

1.1 Sex [ ] A) Male [ ] B) Female [ ]

1.2 Age [ ] A) 18-25  [ ] B) 26-35 [ ] C) Above 36 [ ]

1.3 Qualification [ ] A) Certificate [ ] B) Diploma [ ] C) BA/BS [ ]  
D) Others please specify ______________________

1.4. Field of Specialization________________________________________

1.5. Service Year________________________________________________

1.6. Your Current Position________________________________________

1.7. Your Woreda ________________________________________________
Addis Ababa University  
School of Graduate Studies  
Department of Curriculum Studies and Teacher Professional Development Studies  
Adult and Lifelong Learning Unit

Focus Group Discussion with Parents & NFBE Center Management Committee

Part I Background Information
1.1. Woreda ____________________________
1.2. Kebele ____________________________
1.3. NFBE Center _______________________
1.4. Number of Participants Male _____ Female ____ Total _____
1.5. Age range ______________
1.6. Date _______________________

Part II Leading Questions
2.1. Are you interested in sending your children to NFBE centers? Why? Why not?
2.2. What is the contribution of NFBE centers for the children and/or for the community?
2.3. Do the children practice what they learn at home?
2.4. Have you ever gone to NFBE centers to observe or discuss about the learning of your children with facilitators?
2.5. Do you think the facilitators have the necessary knowledge and ability to teach your children?
2.6. Are there children from this NFBE center who transfer to formal school?
2.7. Have you got any training/orientation about the implementation of NFBE?
2.8. What are the success of implementing NFBE curriculum in this center?
2.9. What are the challenges of implementing NFBE curriculum in this center?
2.10. Please, if any additional comments, opinion and suggestion -------
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