



**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**  
**SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES**

**EVALUATION OF THE ADULT AND NON-FORMAL  
EDUCATION ASSOCIATION-ETHIOPIA's (ANFEA-E)  
WOREDA EDUCATION OFFICES CAPACITY BUILDING  
PROGRAM IN AMHARA REGION**

**ASSEN AHMED ASSEN**

**JULY, 2008**

**EVALUATION OF THE ADULT AND NON-FORMAL  
EDUCATION ASSOCIATION-ETHIOPIA's (ANFEA-E)  
WOREDA EDUCATION OFFICES CAPACITY BUILDING  
PROGRAM IN AMHARA REGION**

**BY**

**ASSEN AHMED ASSEN**

**A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of  
Addis Ababa University in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Educational  
Research and Development**

**INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH**

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**JULY, 2008**

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**  
**SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES**  
**INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH**

**EVALUATION OF THE ADULT AND NON-FORMAL  
EDUCATION ASSOCIATION-ETHIOPIA's (ANFEA-E)  
WOREDA EDUCATION OFFICES CAPACITY BUILDING  
PROGRAM IN AMHARA REGION**

**ASSEN AHMED ASSEN**

**Approval of Board of Examiners**

**Dr. Daniel Desta**

**Chairperson, Institute's Graduate Committee**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Signature**

**Dr. Wossenu Yimam**

**Advisor**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Signature**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Internal Examiner**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Signature**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**External Examiner**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Signature**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

*Nobody, but the almighty ALLAH is all through my way!!*

My greatest and heartfelt thanks go to my thesis advisor, Dr. Wossenu Yimam, for his scholarly comments and unreserved guidance on critical issues of this study. His brotherly approach towards assisting me is his remarkable character which remains with me for the rest of my life as a life principle.

Sincere thanks also go to WEO officials, who have provided me the necessary data for the study, and the staff and officials of ANFEA-E and Pact Ethiopia and to my organization (SCUK) for their unlimited assistance in my study.

My sincere and profound gratitude goes to my beloved wife W/ro Fatuma Ahmed in supporting me, especially taking care of the kids, while I am engaged in the study. Without her, the realization of this work would have been impossible.

I am also greatly indebted to all other members of my family and friends, especially Awol Ali Robsso, who helped me in one way or another during my stay in AAU as a graduate student.

**ASSEN AHMED**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	i
Table of Contents	ii
List of Tables	iii
Acronyms	v
Abstract	vi

### CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Profile of ANFEA-E	5
1.3. Statement of the Problem	7
1.4. Significance of the Study	10
1.5. Delimitation of the study	11
1.6. Limitation of the Study	12
1.7. Research Methodology	12
1.7.1. Methodology	12
1.7.2. Data Source and Sampling Techniques	13
1.7.3. Data Collection Instruments and Procedures	15
1.7.4. Methods of Data Analysis	18
1.8. Definition of Operational Terms	19
1.9. Organization of the Study	20

## **CHAPTER TWO**

<b>2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITRATURE</b>	<b>21</b>
2.1. The Concept of Program Evaluation	21
2.1.1. Program Evaluation	22
2.1.2. Types of Evaluation	24
2.2. When Should we Conduct an Evaluation	25
2.3. Models of Evaluation	27
2.4. Effectiveness of a Program	32
2.4.1. Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Training program	34
2.5. Efficiency of a Program	37
2.6. Impact of a Program	37
2.7. Sustainability of a Program	40

## **CHAPTER THREE**

<b>3. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA</b>	<b>43</b>
3.1. Characteristics of the Respondents	43
3.2. Analysis of the Findings of the Study	45
3.2.1. Effectiveness of the WEO Capacity Building Program	45
3.2.2. Efficiency of the WEO Capacity Building Program	50
3.2.3. Impact of the WEO Capacity Building Program	55
3.2.4. Sustainability of WEO Capacity Building Program	59
3.2.5. Best Practices and Challenges of the Program	60

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

<b>4. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>74</b>
4.1. Summary of Findings	74
4.2. Conclusions	79
4.3. Recommendations	82
<b>References</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	

## LIST OF TABLES

	<b>Page</b>
Table 1: Sample woredas, WEO Officials, program staff in ANFEA-E and Pact Ethiopia	14
Table 2: Characteristics of the respondents	44
Table 3: Program effectiveness	46
Table 4A: Response from WEO officials on Program Efficiency	52
Table 4B: Response from ANFEA-E and Pact Ethiopia staff on Program Efficiency	53
Table 5: Impact on Work Performance of trainees	55
Table 6: Planning and Relevance of Program Objectives	61
Table 7: Relevance and Appropriateness of Training manuals	63
Table 8: Contents of the training Modules	65
Table 9: Selection Procedures and Criteria of the Capacity Building Program	66
Table 10: Selection of Training Premises	67
Table 11A: Issues Related To Training Coordination (WEO)	68
Table 11 B: Issues Related to Training Coordination	70
Table 12: Challenges of the Capacity Building Program	72



## ***Acronyms***

<b><i>ABE:</i></b>	<b><i>Alternative Basic Education</i></b>
<b><i>ABEC:</i></b>	<b><i>Alternative Basic Education Center</i></b>
<b><i>ADA:</i></b>	<b><i>Amhara Development Association</i></b>
<b><i>AFL:</i></b>	<b><i>Adult Functional Literacy</i></b>
<b><i>ANFEA-E</i></b>	<b><i>Adult and Non-formal Education Association-Ethiopia</i></b>
<b><i>CBOs:</i></b>	<b><i>Community Based Organizations</i></b>
<b><i>EFA:</i></b>	<b><i>Education for All</i></b>
<b><i>ESDP:</i></b>	<b><i>Education Sector Development Program</i></b>
<b><i>GER:</i></b>	<b><i>Gross Enrolment rate</i></b>
<b><i>IFAD:</i></b>	<b><i>International Fund for Agricultural Development</i></b>
<b><i>MDG:</i></b>	<b><i>Millennium Development Goals</i></b>
<b><i>MoE:</i></b>	<b><i>Ministry of Education</i></b>
<b><i>NFE:</i></b>	<b><i>Non-formal Education</i></b>
<b><i>NGO:</i></b>	<b><i>Non-governmental Organization</i></b>
<b><i>PIP:</i></b>	<b><i>Program Implementation Plan</i></b>
<b><i>PMP:</i></b>	<b><i>Performance Monitoring Plan</i></b>
<b><i>SCA:</i></b>	<b><i>Save the Children Alliance</i></b>
<b><i>SCUK:</i></b>	<b><i>Save the children United Kingdom</i></b>
<b><i>SNNPRS:</i></b>	<b><i>Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Regional State</i></b>
<b><i>TEACH:</i></b>	<b><i>Transferring Education for Adults and Children in the Hinterlands</i></b>
<b><i>TTCs:</i></b>	<b><i>Teachers' Training Colleges</i></b>
<b><i>UNCRC:</i></b>	<b><i>United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child</i></b>
<b><i>UNESCO:</i></b>	<b><i>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</i></b>
<b><i>UPE:</i></b>	<b><i>Universal Primary Education</i></b>
<b><i>USAID:</i></b>	<b><i>United States Agency for International Development</i></b>
<b><i>WEO:</i></b>	<b><i>Woreda Education Office</i></b>

## **ABSTRACT**

*The major purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of ANFEA-E's Woreda Education Offices Capacity Building Program in selected woredas of the Amhara Region. Besides, the training impact, sustainability and best practices and challenges of the program were also considered as basic research objectives. The study was conducted in four woredas of the Amhara region namely: Qewet, Tarma Ber, Gubalafto and Habru. The subjects of this study were 16 WEO officials and 10 program staff of ANFEA-E and Pact-Ethiopia. Data for this study were gathered by means of questionnaires, interview and document review. The sample respondents were selected using purposive and availability sampling techniques and the data were analyzed using percentage, and mean for quantitative data and synthesis for qualitative data. The study found out, among other things, that in terms of achieving the intended objectives of the program WEO officials responded that the program is ineffective while the program staff of ANFEA-E and Pact Ethiopia replied highly effective; from the study, it has also been found out that WEO respondents have no idea about the proper utilization of resources allocated for the capacity building program, however, all program staff anonymously agreed that the program is efficient in terms of utilizing resources. The study concluded that the woreda capacity building program was efficient in terms of utilizing resources and implementing activities with minimum cost and shorter time, but not effective in terms of achieving the objectives as required; The study also concluded that there are some positive changes on the part of the trainees in bringing performance improvement and on the program as a whole. However, the implementing agency does not have impact indicators in its PMP and this may create difficulty in measuring the intermediate and long lasting impact of the program now and at the end of the program period; it has also been concluded that ANFEA-E did not design sustainability and phase out strategy in the inception period of the program. Inline with these findings and conclusions, the following recommendations were forwarded: the frequent staff turnover and restructuring of WEOs have to be minimized by putting in place proper motivation mechanism at WEO level (like organizing different training and other professional development mechanisms) as much as possible if the government wants to achieve the MDGs as planned and the program to be effective; ANFEA-E and the donor agency, Pact-Ethiopia, should revise their PMP in the remaining program implementation period and include qualitative indicators that could gauge the performance of trainees and improved system of WEO in managing NFE program; mainstreaming the NFE program into the WEO strategic plan and allocate sufficient budget is one of the recommendations.*

WOREDA CODE\_\_\_\_\_

RESPONDENT'S CODE\_\_\_\_\_

SERIAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_

DATE OF SURVEY \_\_\_\_\_

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**  
**SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES**  
**INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH**

**Form -A**

**Questionnaire to be completed by woreda education office heads and experts who have taken the training.**

**Dear Sir/Madam,**

This questionnaire is designed to solicit data for a post graduate research entitled” Evaluation of ANFEAE’s Woreda Education Offices Capacity Building Program in Amhara Region”.

The main purpose of the research is to determine the effectiveness of the program and identify the factors that affect its success. To this end, as one of the participants of the training, you are requested to express your opinion regarding the woreda education capacity building program run by ANFEAE. Your thoughtful responses to the questions are sought to be of great help to the success of this research. Therefore, please kindly extend your cooperation by frankly and honestly responding to the items contained in this questionnaire. Be sure that your responses are kept in strict confidence and used for academic purposes only.

***THANK YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR COOPERATION!!***

***NOTE.***

1. Please read each item carefully and record your genuine opinion on the basis of your experience in the training.
2. Please answer all questions in their order and do not leave any item unanswered.
3. Please do not consult others while responding to the items.
4. It **is not** necessary to write your name or sign on the questionnaire.
5. Please return the completed questionnaire to the designated person/supervisor.

**I. PART ONE: PERSONAL INFORMATION**

**Direction: Please fill the required information in the space provided:**

**Name of your Woreda**\_\_\_\_\_

**Your Current Position**\_\_\_\_\_

**Sex: Male**\_\_\_\_\_ **Female**\_\_\_\_\_

**Years of Service at Your current Position**\_\_\_\_\_

**Total years of service**\_\_\_\_\_

**Qualification:**\_\_\_\_\_

**PART TWO: PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS**

**Instruction: please answer the following questions by circling your answer if they are close ended questions; and give you opinion on the space provided if the questions are open-end.**

1. Have you been involved in the design and planning of Program objectives of the ANFEAE's WEO capacity building program?

- a) Yes
- b) No

2. What were the major objectives of the capacity building program?

a) To improve the management capacity of WEO officials on Non-formal Education program (NFE).

b) To increase the awareness of the WEO officials on the concept of non-formal education.

c) To improve the skill of WEO officials on the delivery of supervision services to NFE program.

d) All could be the objectives

e) Please mention if there are other objectives\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. If you say ‘yes’ to the first question, how do you get the relevance of the program objectives to your needs?

- a) Relevant    b) Average                      c) Irrelevant

4. Do you think that the program has achieved its intended objectives?

- a) Yes            b) No

5. If you say ‘yes’ for question 4, to what extent was it effective in achieving its objectives?

a) Highly effective

b) effective

c) average

d) ineffective

e) highly ineffective

6. If you think that the program was highly effective or effective, what were the factors behind the achievement?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

7. If you say ‘no’ to what extent it has not achieved its objectives?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

8. If you think that the program was highly ineffective, what were the major challenges not to be successful?

---

---

---

---

---

---

9. What results were expected from the program intervention at WEO management level?

---

---

---

---

---

---

10. What results were expected from woreda education experts due to the program intervention?

---

---

---

---

---

---

11. What results did you actually observe due to the program intervention?

**Quantitative results (outcomes):** (in terms of number of trainees, materials provided, budget allocation, frequency of supervision, etc)

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Qualitative results (outcomes):** ( in terms of changes in performance, quality of supervision provided, quality of plans prepared, etc)

---

---

---

---

---

12. What were the intended results of the program?

---

---

---

---

---

---

13. Please, describe if there are unintended results of the program?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**PART THREE: PROGRAM EFFICIENCY**

14. What kinds of material inputs were used for the capacity building program?

- a) Vehicles
- b) motor bikes
- c) stationery
- d) office equipments
- e) Please mention if there are others

---

---

---

---

15. Did ANFEA-E allocate enough financial resources to implement the program?

- a) Yes      b) no      c) I don't know

16. If you say "Yes" to the above question, to what extent ANFEA-E has utilized the resources efficiently?

- a) Highly efficiently      b) efficiently      c) average      d) inefficient      e) highly inefficient

17. If you say "No" to the above question; what were the reasons behind under utilization of resource?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

18. Did ANFEA-E assign qualified program personnel?

- a) Yes      b) No

19. If you say "Yes" to question no 18, could you describe how you measure the qualification?

---

---

---

---

20. If you say "No" to question number 18, could you describe the reasons?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



21. Please mention if you have any concerns, suggestions and recommendations about the utilization of resource in the program implementation?

---



---



---



---



---



---



---

**PART FOUR: IMPACT ON TRAINEES' PERFORMANCE**

22. Rate the outcome of the training on your work performance in relation to non-formal education program in your woreda?

Indicators	Rating scale				
	Very poor	Poor	Fair	good	Very good
	1	2	3	4	5
I have possessed professional knowledge and display understanding of all aspects of the non-formal education program					
I am able to develop policies and procedures on non-formal education in an appropriate manner					
I am able to interpret and apply policies, strategies and procedures accurately and consistently					
I am able to produce woreda based non-formal education plan					
I can produce woreda based non-formal education supervision manual					

I can organize and conduct training to colleagues					
I am able to strengthen the linkage between ABECs, community, NGOs and WEO					
I understand, support, and strive to meet annual plans and objectives of the education program in the woreda					
I am able to facilitate the decision making process					

23. Did the woreda design sustainability strategies together with ANFEA-E before the commencement of the program?

- a) Yes                      b) No

24. If you say "Yes" what preparatory measures are being taken by the woreda before the completion of the program?

---



---



---



---



---



---



---

25. If you say "No" what are you planning to do to sustain the program and redy to phase out?

---



---



---



---



---

**PART FIVE: BEST PRACTICES AND CHALLENGES**

26. What were the major successes of the program and rank them in order of highest importance?

---

---

---

---

---

---

27. Do you think that these successes can be taken as best practices of the program?

a) Yes      b) No

28. If you say ‘‘Yes’’ how does the success can be taken as best practices?

---

---

---

---

---

---

29. Do you think that these best practices can be replicated to other regions and wordas of the country?

a) Yes                      b) No

30. if you say ‘‘Yes’’ how do the successes can be replicated?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

31. How do you find the relevance of the training modules to your work?

- a) Highly relevant      b) relevant      c) moderately relevant      d) irrelevant  
d) highly irrelevant

32. to what extent the training modules are appropriate to the required level?

- a) Highly appropriate      b) appropriate      c) moderately appropriate  
d) Inappropriate      e) highly inappropriate

33. Have you been involved in the development of the training manual?

- a) Yes      b) No

34. If you say "Yes" to Q no. 31, how was your involvement?

- a) Involved only in the need assessment      b) involved in the need assessment and formulation of objectives and contents      c) involved in the need assessment, formulation of content and objectives and evaluation of the modules.

d) Others ( please specify)

---

---

---

---

---

---

35. How is the usefulness of the training modules to the trainees and the wordas?

- a) Highly useful      b) useful      c) moderately useful      d) useless  
d) Highly useless

36. Circle the training contents/components you have taken from the list below? You can circle as many as possible.

- a) Concepts of adult literacy  
b) Concepts and approaches of ABE  
c) Planning, managing and implementing NFE program

- d) Education supervision
- e) Gender
- f) Resource management
- g) Community mobilization
- h) Facilitation skill
- i) Leadership skill
- j) Networking and partnership
- k) Please mention if there are other contents you have taken

---

---

---

---

37. Who recruits and selects the trainees?

- a) Woreda education and training board    b) WEO head    c) ANFEA-E
- d) The combination of all

38. What are the minimum criteria for the selection of trainees?

- a) Based on their current position    b) relevant experience    c) based on government recommendation
- d) through written exam and interview

please list if there are other criteria \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

39. How was the training organized?

- a) One training for each woreda
- b) One training for many woredas together

c) Please mention if there are other ways of organizing the training

---

---

---

---

---

---

40. How was the training venue selected?

- a) ANFEA-E in consultation with zonal and woreda education offices.
- b) ANFEA-E selects its convenient place
- c) Zonal and woreda education offices select the venue
- d) I don't know

41. What were the criteria to select the training venue?

- a) Proximity/central place    b) better facilities    c) Explain if there are other criteria

---

---

---

---

---

42. Do you think that the time allotted to the training was sufficient enough to cover all the modules?

- a) Yes                      b) no

43. If you say "yes" why?

---

---

---

---

---

---

44. If you say ‘no’  
why? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

45. Mention some of the methods used in conducting the training?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

46. Were the methods participatory? a) Yes b) No

47. If yes, how was the level of participation of the trainees?  
a) high participation b) medium participation c) less participation

48. What are the major challenges of this program? Could you rank these challenges in order of their importance? 1, highest challenge; 2, next highest challenge, and so on.

- Shortage of training time
- Lack of financial and material resources
- High turnover of WEO officials
- Low female participation
- selection of training venue

49. Do you have any additional comments or recommendations as to how the program could be sustained?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



RESPONDENT'S CODE\_\_\_\_\_

SERIAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**  
**SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES**  
**INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH**

**Form –B**

**Questionnaire to be filled by ANFEA-E and Pact-Ethiopia Program staff**

This questionnaire is designed to solicit data for a post graduate research entitled” Evaluation of ANFEAE’s Woreda Education Offices Capacity Building Program in Amhara Region”.

The main purpose of the research is to determine the effectiveness of the program and identify the factors that affect its success. To this end, as one of the program staff in ANFEA-E or Pact Ethiopia, you are requested to express your opinion regarding the woreda education capacity building program run by ANFEAE. Your thoughtful responses to the questions are sought to be of great help to the success of this research. Therefore, please kindly extend your cooperation by frankly and honestly responding to the items contained in this questionnaire. Be sure that your responses are kept in strict confidence and used for academic purposes only.

***THANK YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR COOPERATION!!***

***NOTE.***

1. Please read each item carefully and record your genuine opinion on the basis of your experience in the program implementation.
2. Please answer all questions in their order and do not leave any item unanswered.
3. Please do not consult others while responding to the items.
4. It **is not** necessary to write your name or sign on the questionnaire.
5. Please return the completed questionnaire to the designated person/supervisor.

**PART ONE: PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS**

**Instruction: please, fill the questionnaire on the space provided and circle when there are close ended questions?**

1. What are the goals and immediate objectives of this program?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

2. Do you think that the program has achieved its intended objectives through providing different training modules?

a) Yes      b) No

3. If you say “yes”, to what extent the program has achieved its objectives?

a) Highly effective   b)effective   c) average   d) ineffective   e) highly ineffective

4. If you say “no” indicate the reason(s) why it has not achieved its objectives?

---

---

---

---

---

5. What were the major results/success of the program so far?

---

---

---

---

---

---

6. What are the major challenges of this program? Could you rank these challenges in order of their importance? 1, highest challenge; 2, next highest challenge, and so on

- Shortage of training time
- Lack of financial and material resources
- High turnover of WEO officials
- Low female participation
- selection of training venue

**PART TWO: PROGRAM EFFICIENCY**

7. Are the training courses adequately timed to suit the schedule of the participants?

- a) Yes      b) No      c) I don't know

8. If you say "yes", can you describe how they are adequately timed and fit into participant's schedule?

---

---

---

---

9. Are the training courses designed to ensure the greatest impact in terms of the acquisition of managerial skills and its use in the organization?

- a) Yes                      b) No

10. If you say "Yes", in what sense?

- a) In planning and management of NFE
- b) In quality supervision services
- c) In the frequency of supervision services
- d) Any other

---

---

---

---

11. Is the duration of the courses adequate to ensure acquisition of knowledge and skills to the levels required?    a)Yes                      b) No

12. If yes, How?

---

---

---

---

---

\_\_\_\_\_ 13 . Are the courses evaluated to ensure that the required quality is being provided and maintained?                      a) Yes                      b) No

14. If yes, how the courses are evaluated

---

---

---

---

---

---

15. What resources are allocated to implement this training program?

- a) Financial resource
- b) Human resources
- c) Material resources
- d) Time
- e) All

16. Do you think that all the allocated resources are sufficient to implement the program?

- a) Yes
- b) No

17. If yes, to what extent?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

18. How does the program utilize the allocated resources?

- a) Highly efficiently
- b) efficiently
- c) average
- d) inefficiently
- e) highly inefficiently

19. Do you think that additional resources are required to efficiently implement the program?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**PART THREE: PROGRAM IMPACT**

20. What are the major impacts of the program?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

21. Can you describe the impact of the program on the performance of the trainees?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

22. Do you think that the program didn't bring any impact?

- a) Yes
- b) No

23. If yes, why?

---

---

---

**PART FOUR: GENERAL COMMENT**

24 . Do you have any additional comments or recommendations as to how the program could be sustained and replicated to other woredas of the region?

---

---

---

---

---

SERIAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**  
**SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES**  
**INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH**

**Form-C**

**KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS**

**The purpose of this interview is to solicit information from Woreda Education Office Heads.**

1. Were you or your experts involved in the planning process of the capacity building program/
2. Do you think that the program objectives are relevant to your needs?
3. Do you have any idea about the allocation and utilization of resources of this program?
4. Have you been able to produce any document related to your work after the training?
5. What are the selection/recruitment criteria of the trainees? And how did you deal with the gender balance of the trainees?
6. Do you think that this program satisfies the need of the woreda education office?
7. What changes did you observe on the capacity of the woreda education experts after they have taken the training?
8. Do you think that only conducting the training at woreda level can solve the problem of management of non-formal education program in the country?
9. What are the best practices and challenges of program implementation?
10. Do you have any additional comments or recommendations as to how the program could be sustained and replicated to other woredas of the region?



SERIAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**  
**SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES**  
**INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH**

**Form-D**

**KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS**

**The purpose of this interview is to solicit information from Program Directors, Managers and senior advisor in ANFEAE and Pact Ethiopia.**

1. Were WEO heads and experts involved in the planning process of this program?
2. Do you think that the WEO capacity building program is achieving its intended objectives? How?
3. Can you explain the effectiveness of the program?
4. What is the impact of the program on the performance of the trainees and what factors attributed to the impact?
5. Do you think that the program has utilized the allocated resources efficiently?
6. What are the best practices and challenges identified during the course of program implementation?
7. Does the organization prepare phase out strategy before the commencement of the program or will it prepare when the program is close to end?
8. Do you think that only conducting the training at woreda level can solve the problem of management of non-formal education program in the country?
9. What possible options can be envisaged for further development and improvements (where necessary) to replicate the program through out the country?
10. Would you give me additional comment, suggestion or recommendation regarding the WEO capacity building program?

# **CHAPTER ONE**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY**

The right of getting basic education is one of the major rights of all children through out the world even if children are living under difficult circumstances. Article 28 of the 1989 United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) states “State Parties recognize the right of the child to education, and with the view to achieving the right progressively and on the basis of equal opportunity, they shall, in particular, make primary education compulsory and available free to all”. Implicated in this article is that all children have the same educational rights, no matter whether they are from poor or rich family, orphan, street children, refugee children, pastoral children, etc. In addition to the UNCRC, the 1948 Declaration of Human Rights (article 26) and the subsequent plans and commitments of the 1960s, 1970, 1980s and 1990s in which Ethiopia is a signatory member has assured the right of all people to education.

In response to this fundamental right, many countries in the world, including Ethiopia, have committed themselves to provide education to all people especially children, and they have committed to the agreement of Dakar Framework of Action on Education for All Initiative (EFA), Universal Primary Education (UPE), and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Ethiopia, as member state of the United Nations, had also endorsed and ratified the UNCRC on December 9, 1991 and it has since committed itself to the fulfillment of these rights.

Even though many countries have committed themselves to the global initiatives, there are still many children who are out of school across the globe. According to UNESCO (2005), an estimated 140 million children are out of school, a majority of whom being girls and children with disabilities. Among them, 90% live in lower middle-income countries and over 80% of these children are in Africa. Others within the school system but not receiving quality education are also countless.

In spite of substantial government investment on education in Ethiopia in the past few years, the provision of quality basic education to children is uneven. Large groups of children (about 4.2 million), out of the total 14 million school age children, are still devoid of the fundamental rights to education and basic skills required for their survival and development. It is, therefore, unlikely for Ethiopia that the formal schooling and the government alone can solve the dire education need of children in the near future (MoE, 2006).

As indicated above, the existing formal school system towards which almost all the sector budget has been directed has failed to accomplish its mission (universalizing basic education to all children) and the same trend can in no way address the basic educational needs of all children in the foreseeable future. In other words, government, International Organizations, donors, educationists, policy makers and practitioners have increasingly understood that achieving Universal Primary Education (UPE) and fulfilling the MDGs in the year 2015 only through the formal schooling system is very difficult unless an alternative approach is used to address the educational needs of all children.

In response to this educational need, Ethiopia rightly recognizes that the only way to achieve Universal Primary Education by 2015 as agreed to in the EFA goals is to use both formal primary schooling and alternative provision in a non-formal setting. Currently the Government of Ethiopia has commenced Alternative Basic Education (ABE) program through out the country based on the experiences gained from other countries and from local and International Non-Governmental Organizations working in Ethiopia. The government has also endorsed a National ABE strategy for out-of- school children and adults in September 2006.

Despite the government's efforts and its vigorous actions, the alternative education program has faced some challenges in terms of finance, human resource, and educational management systems (National ABE Strategy Document, 2006 and ANFEA-E Woreda Education Offices Capacity Assessment Document, 2005). For instance, no budget was allocated at national, regional and woreda level for the planning, implementation and evaluation of the ABE programs which are run by the government since its commencement.

Since the central government has given woreda administration the mandate to budget and decide on their own resources, many of them have capacity limitations especially in terms of budget allocation and human resources.

As a way of addressing these issues, many NGOs, Adult and Non-Formal Education Association-Ethiopia (ANFEA-E) is one, are involved in education programs especially in

ABE to speed up the UPE in Ethiopia. As a result of their intervention, many children are going to school in the primary schools and the GER reached 91.7% in 2006/2007 ( MoE, 2007). However, there is still a gap in the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the non-formal education component of the education system at National, Regional and Woreda levels (ANFEA-E, 2005).

Therefore, ANFEA-E believed that it is high time to design and implement a program that focuses on capacity strengthening of WEOs to enable the experts manage ABE/AFL program effectively and efficiently. As a result, it had launched woreda capacity building program throughout the country in 2005 and has trained many woreda education experts in different topics. It had prepared 10 training modules on the following issues: concepts of functional adult literacy; planning, managing and implementing non-formal education; concepts and approaches of NFE; educational supervision for NFE; gender; resource management; community mobilization; facilitation skill; leadership skill and qualities; and networking and partnership. Thus, the purpose of this research work is to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the program that has been launched since 2005 in some selected woredas of the Amhara Regional State.

## **1.2. PROFILE OF ANFEA-E**

Adult and Non-Formal Education Association in Ethiopia (ANFEA-E) was established in 1995 to promote and provide alternative basic education and functional literacy for out-of-school children, youth and adults, marginalized and underserved social groups in order to enable them develop livelihoods and realize their full potential. ANFEA-E works with community-based institutions and development partners, in the areas of project implementation, advocacy, training, material development, networking and research (ANFEA-E, 2007)

ANFEA-E has implemented activities in the areas of providing education and training opportunities to out-of-school children and adults as well as marginalized, under-served social groups; developing and popularizing effective, innovative, affordable, and contextually relevant basic education programs; linking alternative basic education and functional adult literacy to livelihoods, particularly for girls and women; developing training guides, manuals, instructional materials and newly-literate reading materials in the areas of Alternative Basic Education and Functional Adult Literacy; training government officers, implementers, and classroom facilitators on the purpose and provision of alternative basic education programs and post-literacy activities; and promoting areas of social concern related to non-formal education, including environmental protection, anti-HIV/AIDS initiatives, girls' education promotion, and related topics (ANFEA-E, 2007).

ANFEA-E's major strategic objectives are to:

- Introduce alternative basic education programs that are specifically designed for addressing educational needs of children with different impairments, HIV orphan children, working children and out-of-school girls.
- Put the community in the driver's seat through involving CBOs, and other community organizations in the design and implementation of the ABEC programs.
- Strengthening the capacities of community based organizations to enable them initiate and implement ABE on their own with limited external technical and financial assistances.
- Setting and making use of appropriate monitoring indicators with full participation of the community, beneficiaries and relevant government offices.
- Conducting studies, researches and documentations on the drawbacks of adult literacy programs implemented by different governmental and non-governmental implementers.
- Organizing consultative and sensitization workshops that dwell on the possible means of expanding functional adult learning programs.
- Integrating adult education programs with appropriate and proven women empowerment models and with other sound poverty alleviation measures.
- Integrating ABEC program with other supporting programs such as school health, HIV/AIDS education, and other livelihood programs, etc ( ANFEA-E, 2007)

ANFEA-E is currently implementing 8 projects in 4 regions, namely: Oromiya, Amhara, SNNPRS and Tigray in addition to the program under study. ANFEA-E has effective management structures in place, including a trained and qualified staff, a low incidence of turnover, a strategic plan, a monitoring and evaluation system and a well-articulated finance and personnel guidelines. ANFEA-E currently manages over 256,149 Euro in 2006 and has managed over 777,257 Euro over the life of its operations. ANFEA-E has trained over 5,194 people, to date and has reached 23,583 beneficiaries through its programs. ANFEA-E has worked with over 45 local NGOs, 10 international partners and scores of government offices at various levels. ANFEA-E has also served as the main non-formal education technical assistance provider for TEACH, a non-formal education program reaching 495,000 learners across Ethiopia. ANFEA-E has a reputation for sound fiscal management and implementing innovative non-formal education programming, and its members comprise the collection of leaders in the field of non-formal education and literacy in Ethiopia (ANFEA-E, 2007).

### **1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The successful provision of formal and adult education/non-formal education can be a catalyzing factor to bring about positive changes in several spheres of a given society. However, provision of quality basic education is a critical problem in Ethiopia. Such problem has implications not only in the overall development of the country, but also in other problems and vital challenges of the country as the struggle against poverty and HIV/AIDS in the third world countries.



Since addressing the quality education needs of all children in the country is a big challenge to the government of Ethiopia, especially through the formal school system, it has launched an alternative educational provision approach which is cost- effective, flexible and inclusive (National ABE strategy document, 2006). In order to make the alternative basic education provision approach efficient and reap the fruits thereby, putting in place proper management and leadership system is vital beyond policy initiative and strategy design.

As the scenario of ABE is new to many experts and given the orientation of teachers' training institutes (because most woreda education staff are graduates of Teacher Training Institutions and Colleges) is inclined towards formal education, one can say that there is a serious capacity limitation at Woreda Education Office (WEO) level to manage ABE and Adult Functional Literacy (AFL) programs effectively. Moreover, these experts are in a difficult situation to believe that ABE is as equally important as the formal school setting (ANFEA-E Woreda Education Offices Capacity Assessment Document, 2005).

Thus, it is difficult to ascertain that the ABE and NFE programs are effectively and efficiently managed, monitored and documented. As such, ABE's and NFE's contribution towards achieving the EFA and MDGs would remain questionable. ANFEA-E has identified this capacity limitation by conducting woreda capacity assessment in the country and launched a program in 2005 to build the capacity of woreda education experts in 51 woredas of Tigray, Amhara, Oromia, SNNPRS, Somali, Gambella, Benshangul Gumuz, and Afar. (ANFEA-E Capacity Building Program Document, 2005).

Therefore, the purpose of this research work was to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the on-going woreda capacity building program. To this effect, this research work has attempted to answer the following basic questions:

1. To what extent was the capacity building program effective in attaining its intended long and short term objectives?
2. To what extent was the program efficient in the utilization of resources?
3. What impact has the training program brought on the performance of trainees?
4. What strategies are designed to sustain the program?
5. What are ANFEA-E's best practices and challenges in implementing the capacity building program?

In line with the above basic questions, the research had the following specific objectives:

1. To assess whether the capacity building program has achieved its objectives and expected results as stated in the program document.
2. To examine the efficiency of the program
3. To assess the impact of the training program on the performance of the trainees and
4. To identify best practices and challenges that ANFEA-E encounters in implementing the capacity building program

#### **1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

Lack of professional and managerial capacity is one of the major challenges of providing quality education in Ethiopia (ESDP III Document, 2005). The government is trying its best in improving the level of managerial skill of the woreda education officials. However, such capacity building efforts often follow and suit the formal setting. In addition, there is a high financial constraint in doing so. Cognizant of this, many NGOs are filling the gap through different modes of support in which capacity building is one. ANFEA-E, as one of the advocators of promoting non-formal education in Ethiopia, is taking promising steps in building the capacity of the woreda education experts so that they can manage the ABE/AFL program effectively and efficiently.

Lessons drawn as well as best practices learnt from such program implementation need to be documented and should be made available to policy makers and practitioners as inputs and feedbacks. Besides, if this capacity building program is found to be effective and successful, the lessons will be replicated to other woredas of the country and many woredas will be benefited through better human resource development. ANFEA-E and the donor agency, Pact-Ethiopia, will also benefit from the program so that they can expand their program or revise/improve their objectives and strategies for future use.

## **1.5. DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY**

Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, program, or policy, including its design, implementation, and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision making process of both recipients and donors. Since the subject under study is an ongoing program, the investigation was delimited to assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of the program in terms of input, throughput (process) and impact from the years 2005-2007. As has been explained in the introduction part, the program under investigation is being implemented in 8 regional states. However, the study focused only on Amhara regional state because the researcher knows that this region had better and long years of experience in implementing ABE/AFL program as compared to the other regions. Besides, it is the first region where many NGOs especially ABE program pioneer organizations like Action Aid Ethiopia, Save the Children Norway and Denmark, and Amhara Development Association (ADA) have launched the ABE and NFE program in the region and contributed a lot in the endorsement of the ABE strategy at country level. It was also delimited only to see the capacity limitation of woreda education officials in managing non-formal education component. Therefore, formal education was not the subject of this study.

The study also focused on 4 purposely selected woredas of the 15 woredas in Amhara region which were included in the first batch of the capacity building program. The purpose of selecting the first batch of the program was that the researcher believed that these woredas have more experience and impact as compared to the second and the third intervention woredas.

## **1.6. LIMITATION OF THE STUDY**

One of the limitations of this study was to find the first batch trainees as some of them were transferred to other sector offices in the same woreda and some are totally left the woredas. As a result of this the student researcher was forced to reduce the original plan of sample woredas, which were five, to four woredas, as he couldn't find any of the trainees in Kobo woreda of North Wollo zone. Thus, the sample size, which represents only small fraction of WEO that are found in Amhara Region, is relatively small proportion of trainees and this may limit the generalizability of the findings of this study.

## **1.7. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **1.7.1. Methodology**

Both qualitative and quantitative research methods were used as appropriate methodologies to meet the intended purpose of the study. The use of these methodologies for the study has been found useful because this research work is designed to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of woreda capacity building program. The study also sought to identify and

document strategies and best practices in using resources that lead to efficient program implementation. Moreover, it tried to identify the strong points as well as the challenges that the implementing organization (ANFEA-E) had encountered in implementing the program. Therefore, the use of these methodologies enables the researcher to investigate the problem in breath and depth.

### **1.7.2. Data Sources and Sampling Techniques**

The woreda capacity building program which was launched in 2005 throughout the country includes 51 woredas in 8 regions. However, the student researcher purposely selected the Amhara region as his subject of the study because he had better exposure and work experience in the region and he believed that Amhara region had better experience in implementing non-formal education programs and there are also many LNGO and INGO who have large scale non-formal and ABE programs in the region. The program under operation is in 15 woredas of the region where the government of Ethiopia and donor agencies, like USAID, categorized them as safety net program woredas. The categorization of woredas as safety net was based on the status of food insecurity, remoteness and climatic conditions. Thus, the woredas were selected from near and remote distances and from highlands and lowlands. Out of these 15 woredas, only 4 were selected using purposive sampling technique as they were homogeneous based on the above mentioned criteria. Thus, for data collection conveniences and accessibility for the researcher, four woredas were selected from North Shoa and North Wollo zones of the Amhara region. These were Tarma Ber and Qewet from North Shoa; Habru and Gubalafto from North Wollo. Regarding the selection of the participants of the study, all training participants in each sampled woredas

were purposely selected. Therefore, WEO heads, education program heads, non-formal education experts, plan and program experts, and supervisors were the subject of the study. The number of trainees in 2005/2006 was 57 in all woredas of the region and the researcher believed that the trainees were heterogeneous in terms of qualification and position they hold in the WEO. Thus, all trainees in the sampled woredas, which were 16 in number, were included in the study. In addition to the training participants, all program staff in ANFEA-E (program director, program coordinator, finance manager and project managers and field training coordinators), and in Pact-Ethiopia (education program staff) and the program advisor were included in the sample. All respondents were selected on the basis of purposive and availability sampling techniques because the researcher believed that they were the right and relevant bodies to respond to the questions contained in the data collection instruments.

**Table 1: Sample woredas, WEO officials, program staff in ANFEA-E and Pact-Ethiopia**

<i>Sample woredas</i>	<i>WEO officials</i>			<i>ANFEA-E program staff</i>			<i>Pact-Ethiopia Education Program staff</i>			<i>Grand Total</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>T</i>	
<i>Habru</i>	4	-	4	4	1	5	5	-	5	14
<i>Gubalafto</i>	4	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
<i>Tarma Ber</i>	3	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
<i>Qewet</i>	4	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
<i>Total</i>	15	1	16	4	1	5	5	-	5	26

Given that the number of WEO officials and program staff at ANFEA-E and Pact-Ethiopia were small and manageable, all WEO (n=16) and program staff (n=10) were included in this study.

### **1.7.3. Data Collection Instruments and Procedures**

The relationship between a program and its results can be established only to the extent that relevant data are available. Methods to collect data must be selected on the basis of the nature of the data required and the sources available. The nature of the data required, in turn, will depend up on the evaluation design, the indicators used to capture the program's results and the type of analysis to be conducted.

Thus, the student researcher employed multiple data gathering instruments to collect data for this study. That is questionnaires, unstructured key informant interviews, and document review tools were principal instruments to gather data in this study of which questionnaires were largely employed.

#### **1.7.3.1. Questionnaire**

Two types of self-developed questionnaires (coded A-B) were prepared and distributed to WEO officials and program staff of ANFEA-E and Pact-Ethiopia. The questionnaires designed to WEO officials had five parts. The first part of the questionnaire dealt with the variables measuring the demographic characteristics such as sex, educational level, years of services and current position they hold. The second part of the questionnaire sought information about the effectiveness of the capacity building program, which incorporated



questions that seek answers whether the objectives of the program are relevant, and achievable as stated.

The third part of the same questionnaire looked at the efficiency of the program in terms of utilizing the allocated human, financial and materials resources. The fourth part comprised of questions designed to solicit information about the impact of the program on the performance of trainees. The final part dealt with the best practices and challenges of the WEO capacity building program and its replicability to other regions or woredas.

The second set of questionnaire, which was administered to program staff of ANFEA-E and Pact-Ethiopia, contained four parts: effectiveness, efficiency, impact and general comments on the program as a whole.

The questionnaires were administered to 16 (14 experts and 2 WEO heads) trainees in the selected woredas and 10 ANFEA-E and Pact Ethiopia program staff. The questionnaires were pilot- tested in North Shoa zone of Oromiya region-Aleltu woreda before the final distribution so as to protect from flaws when used in the field. This woreda is one of the program woredas for the capacity building program in the country, but not sample woreda for the study. Of the 16 questionnaires distributed to WEO officials, 15 were completed and returned. However, only 12 of the returned questionnaires were usable. Three of the questionnaires were rejected because the respondents did not fill them properly, and one respondent did not return as she was recently transferred to another sector office. Here, a 94% rate of return was perhaps attributed to the sense of responsibility these officials feel in

responding to a request that has to do with investigation of the capacity building program in their respective woredas.

From the 10 program staff of ANFEA-E and Pact-Ethiopia who had received the second type of questionnaire, 10 completed and returned giving a return rate of 100%. With the exception of few items left unanswered by few respondents, the returned questionnaires were largely usable.

The administration and collection of the questionnaires was undertaken by the researcher himself together with contact persons of ANFEA-E in each woreda.

#### **1.7.3.2. Key Informant interview**

Key informant interview was used to collect data from the Program Director of ANFEA-E, Education Program Director of Pact-Ethiopia and the Technical Advisor. Woreda Education Office heads were again included as key data providers since they were part of the trainees and were supervisors of their experts. The selection of the key informant interviewees was based on their close linkage to the program and based on their responsibility and accountability to the program planning, implementation and decision making power. The evaluator recognized the limitations of this instrument that it did not use random selection of subjects and thus, is subject to information bias and representativeness. However, a special care was taken in order to minimize the bias. The key informant interview, and the major part of the research coordination was done by the researcher himself.

### **1.7.3.3. File/Document Review**

This data collection method was employed to discover pre-existing data that could be used in the evaluation. Specifically, it sought insight into the specific program being implemented. Two types of files were reviewed using this method: program files and files on specific projects, clients and participants. The file review covered the program documents, monthly/quarterly and annual activity reports, planned and allocated budget and expenditures, quarterly monitoring documents, etc.

In general, all the data collection tools/instruments were validated by the research advisor and experts in ANFEA-E and Pact-Ethiopia and some selected woreda education experts who were parts of the capacity building program found in Aleltu woreda of North Shoa zone of Oromiya region, but out-side the sample woredas of the study so as to make instruments sharp and dependable before the actual survey is conducted.

### **1.7.4. METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS**

a) The first stage of the data analysis was reviewing the program documents to obtain background information and the main objectives and indicators of the program. A comparison was made between the program document describing the program and the actual results/outcomes achieved.

b) Information from the respondents was analyzed using percentage as per the descriptive characteristics of the program nature. The researcher developed a five point Likert type scale to measure the extent to which the capacity building program was important and effective for the intended objectives. Thus, percentage and mean were employed to analyze the data obtained from the questionnaires.

c) The information collected through open-ended questions and key informant interviews, once classified and/or tabulated, was analyzed through synthesis. Therefore, the qualitative data were analyzed and narrated to substantiate the data obtained from the quantitative values.

## **1.8. DEFINITION OF OPERATIONAL TERMS**

**Capacity Building:** is the process through which capacity is created on a certain community group or organization through providing training, materials or sharing experiences, etc (IFAD, 2002)

**Cost-effectiveness:** is a comparison of the relative costs of achieving a given result or output by different means. It is employed where benefits are difficult to determine (IFAD, 2002).

**Effectiveness:** a measure of the extent to which a project or program attains its objectives at the goals or purpose level; i.e. the extent to which a development intervention has attained, or is expected to attain, its relevant objectives efficiently and in a sustainable way (IFAD, 2002).

**Efficiency:** a measure of how economically inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc) are converted into outputs (IFAD, 2002).

**Impact:** is changes observed in the lives and work performance of people who passed through a certain program intervention as perceived by them and their partners at the time of evaluation (Roche, 1999).

**Sustainability:** the likelihood that the positive effects of a project or program (such as assets, skills, facilities or improved services) will persist for an extended period after the external assistance ends (Shediac-Rizkallah and Bone, 1998).

## **1.9. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY**

This research work has four chapters. The first chapter deals with the problem and its approach which includes introduction , statement of the problem, significance of the study, basic questions, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study, research design and definition of terms. The second chapter presents the review of related literature. Chapter three focuses on the presentation and analysis of the data. The last chapter deals with the summary of major findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

#### **2.1. THE CONCEPT OF PROGRAM EVALUATION**

Before explaining the concept of program evaluation, it is good to know the concept of evaluation briefly first.

There is no widely agreed-upon definition of evaluation. Some authors equate evaluation with measurement. Others define evaluation as the assessment of the extent to which program objectives have been attained. For some, evaluation is synonymous to professional value judgment. Whereas others argue that it is essentially a political activity. After a careful review of all these viewpoints, Worthen and Sanders (1987:7) defined evaluation as "determination of a thing's value." However, Case, Andrews and Werner (1988) provide a fairly comprehensive definition of evaluation. According to them, evaluation is to make an explicit judgment about the worth of all or part of a program by collecting evidence to determine if acceptable standards have been met. This definition of evaluation has two key terms: Standards are ideals or desired qualities or conditions against which actual objectives are to be measured. Evidence is information necessary to help us confirm whether or not the required standards have been met by the program.

For the purpose of this study, Evaluation is defined as the systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, program, or policy, including its design, implementation, and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. An evaluation

should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision making process of both recipients and donors (Cracknel, 2001)

### **2.1.1. Program Evaluation**

Program evaluation is carefully collecting information about a program or some aspect of a program in order to make necessary decisions about the program. Program evaluation can include any or a variety of different types of evaluation, such as for needs assessments, accreditation, cost/benefit analysis, effectiveness, efficiency, formative, summative, goal-based, process, outcomes, etc. The type of evaluation we undertake to improve our programs depends on what we want to learn about the program.

According to McNamara (1997), program evaluation is a management tool. It is a time-bound exercise that attempts to assess systematically and objectively the relevance, performance and success of ongoing and completed programs and projects. Evaluation is undertaken selectively to answer specific questions to guide decision-makers and/or program managers, and to provide information on whether underlying theories and assumptions used in program development were valid, what worked and what did not work and why. Evaluation commonly aims to determine the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of a program or project.

Other scholars such as Funnel, S. (1997), Ginsberg (2001), Weiss (1998) explained program evaluation as an assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of a planned, ongoing, or completed development intervention. An evaluation should provide information that is

credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors. In evaluation, we often want to determine the extent to which the program, policy, or project is contributing to a needed change. A program that is busy doing its activities but does not make a difference is not likely to be seen as worthwhile, at least from a program impact perspective. For example, if we have a program that trains people for employment but none of the trainees ever get a job, at some point the donors are likely to ask why they should continue to fund the program.

According to Funnel (1997), evaluation issues can include: Relevance: is the program still relevant to the problem it was intended to address? Effectiveness: to what extent does the intervention achieve its objectives? What supports and barriers affected achievement? Efficiency: is the program delivered in a timely and cost-effective manner? Impact: What happened as a result of the program? Sustainability: To what extent can the program sustain itself after the program funding ceases? External Utility: To what extent might the approaches, methods, and/or content of the program have potential value if applied to another context/program/project?

In general, program evaluation fits within the whole cycle of development. As problems are identified, policymakers, donors, NGOs or others develop programs to address the causes or consequences of those problems. Many assumptions are made in this process since all the information needed is rarely available. Evaluation serves as a necessary feedback mechanism, providing information to policy makers as well as program and project managers



so adjustments can be made to the existing interventions and policies, or to develop new interventions and policies (Funnel, 1997).

### **2.1.2. Types of Evaluation**

There are two basic categories of evaluations into which all the approaches may fall are called formative and summative by many scholars who write about evaluation.

Ginsberg (2001) points out that formative evaluation are those that provide information on a program's activities. They tell the evaluator and ultimately the consumer of the evaluation how the program is progressing. That information is useful for a number of reasons ideally, it is provided to help an organization develop and improve a program. In some cases, it is used as an ongoing assessment of how well a program complies with a set of standards and similar requirements.

Summative evaluation, on the other hand, examines how well a program has achieved its goals. Such information is useful to funding agencies in determining whether to renew or continue a program. It is also valuable information for others who want to know about the effectiveness of a specific program (Ginsberg, 2001).

According to another author, Weiss (1998), the notion of formative-summative is not accepted. She argues that formative-summative concept deals with the intentions of the evaluator-what the evaluator sets out to do. Instead, she came up with two other concepts: process and outcome evaluations. As to this author, process and outcome deal with the phase of the program being studied. Process evaluations occur while a program is in operations,

whereas outcome evaluations deal with the results of a program for the client or community. She also points out that evaluators' intentions may change during their work. What started out to be a summative effort may shift to summarize its achievements or lack of them.

In general, much of the evaluation literature suggests that formative evaluations are conducted during the operations of a program and do not necessarily indicate whether the program has succeeded. On the other hand, summative evaluations are designed to assess the achievements of programs in terms of their objectives. Therefore, it is possible to come to terms that this research work is formative type.

## **2.2. WHEN SHOULD WE CONDUCT AN EVALUATION?**

According to Gosling, L. and Edward, M. (2003), evaluation can occur at any point in the life cycle of a project or a program. They further pose queries like where in the program's life should we conduct evaluation? Before the program is conceived? Before the program is conducted during the planning stage? During the implementation of the program? Or should we evaluate when a program concludes? As to them, it is appropriate to consider collecting evidence for program evaluation in all these stages.

Frequently evaluation information is gathered in the following programming stages, according to Gosling and Edward (2003):

- a) **Program design stage:** This is the most common stage of conducting evaluation. The form of evaluation data gathered at this stage is a needs assessment. The information is used to determine program content and set the program goals.

- b) **Program start-up:** Evaluation information gathered at the beginning of the program helps us to establish a baseline from which changes in the participants or the impact on the community can be tracked. This usually involves carrying out a pretest or gathering baseline data on selected indicators.
- c) **In-progress or formative evaluation ( Monitoring):** This type of evaluation is conducted during the planning and implementation of a program to help make immediate changes or adjustments in the program and to prepare for summative evaluation. Formative evaluation helps programmers find the strengths and weaknesses in a program while it is still going on. Therefore, this type of evaluation is helpful for program improvement.
- d) **Program wrap-up or summative evaluation:** This takes place at the end of a program. Frequently this is the only evaluation conducted during the life cycle of an educational program. It sums up what has occurred in the program, asks for end-of-program reactions and attempts to assess success in meeting program objectives. It is used for program accountability purposes.
- e) **Follow-up:** This evaluation is conducted after participants have finished their involvement with the program. This type of evaluation looks for the longer term benefits of a program.

In a nut shell, we do not necessarily need to be research workers in order to evaluate our educational programs. There is a wide range of degrees of evaluations from casual everyday evaluations to scientific research. Perfect accuracy is not necessary, nor is it attainable. The evaluation should be structured to serve as a learning process. Evaluation principles can be

applied by all persons. We should be careful, however, in the use of evaluation principles to improve our judgments and decisions.

### **2.3. MODELS OF PROGRAM EVALUATION**

Models as a term loosely used to refer to a conception or approach or sometimes even a method of doing evaluation. Models are to paradigms as hypotheses are to theories, which means less general but with some overlap. Models are useful ways to understand the linkage between a program and its expected outcomes (Own and Rogers, 1999)

There are a wide variety of evaluation models, which prescribe what evaluators ought to do and explain how to conduct a particular type of evaluation (Patton, 1997).

Evaluation designs have tended to be formulated as ‘models’, which reflect a particular or discrete evaluation method, or an approach to a specific evaluation problem. These models have tended to be named after their originators, the problems they are committed to solve or both (Hopkins, 1989).

Different scholars like House, Stufflebeam, Madaus, Scriven etc, have developed different types of evaluation models. Most of the models have similar purpose but have slightly different names. Goal-based and objective oriented, Expertise-Oriented and Expertise Opinion, are cases in point.

Models can be classified in terms of their critical dimension of comparison: the audience to whom the evaluation is addressed, the methodology of the data collection, the ultimate outcome expected, the typical question that the model tries to address, etc (Madaus, Scriven

and Stufflebeam, 1983). For instance, Posavac and Carey (1992) classified evaluation models as Goal –based, Goal-free, Black Box, Fiscal, Accountability, Expert Opinion, and Naturalistic.

House in Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam, (1983) also categorized models into: Systems Analysis, Behavioral Objectives Approach, Goal-free Evaluation, Art Criticism Approach, Accreditation Model, Transaction Approach and Decision-making Models.

Hopkins (1989) on his part identified six models of evaluation: the classical (or agricultural-botany) research model; the Research and Development (R and D) (or industrial/factory) model; the illuminative (or anthropological) model; the briefing decision-makers (or political) models; the teacher as researcher (or professional) model; and the Case Study (or portrayal) model.

From the perspective of Non-Governmental Organizations, model can be classified as: logic model, outcome model and systems Model (Own and Rogers, 1999). For the purpose of this research work logic model is appropriate because it logically relates the objectives of the program with the outcomes achieved.

From all the models classified by different scholars, the most frequently used ones are briefly explained below:

The following models are based on the book written by Posavac and Carey (1992)

**Goal based Evaluation Model:**

This model emphasizes that evaluators work with staff to get the goals and objectives stated clearly and then measure the degree to which these goals are achieved. Examining goals and objectives seems to be an essential aspect of evaluation.

Tyler in Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam (1983) describes this model as whether or not students have met their goals, with the results informing how to handle a new instructional strategy (i.e., revise, adopt, reject).

Another education scholar Stake in Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam (1983) accredited the use of this model by saying that it is useful to measure student performance and progress using the key elements like goal statement, test scores analysis and discrepancy between goal and actuality.

Although this model is widely used, it is not without weaknesses. One weakness, according to Tyler in Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam (1983), is that the evaluator may overlook unexpected outcomes or benefits of instruction (in school environment) beyond original goals. Similar to this weakness, Posavac and Carey (1992) stated that some evaluators are so focused on the stated goals that they neglect to examine why programs succeeded or failed and to consider any additional positive effects or undesired side effect of the program.

**Goal-free model:**

In this model, according to Posavac and Carey (1992), the evaluator would spend a significant amount of time studying the program, the staff, the client, the setting, and the records to

identify all the positive and negative impact of the program. The evaluator works in the way that an anthropologist studies a particular culture or society for the first time. The advocates of this model believe that an attempt to avoid a premature focus on goals led to a suggestion that evaluators work better if they do not know the stated goals of the program. They added that evaluators who know the goals of the program might unintentionally focus on information that support the goals and not observe how the program is actually administered or assess the total impact of the program's clients.

According to Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam (1983), this model is primarily concerned with reducing the effect of bias in evaluation.

Patton (1997) on his part explains goal free model as the act of examining the extent to which actual clients' needs are being met by the program.

Like that of the goal - based evaluation model, goal-free model has some limitations as it over value documents and record keeping and follow checklist which in effect overlook some aspect of the advantage of looking at the goals in evaluation (Stake in Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam, 1983).

**Black Box model:**

This refers to those evaluations that examine the output of the program without examining the internal operation of the program. This model does not usually serve well when examining social programs for which the evaluation is expected to lead to program improvement. Mostly, this program is used by manufacturing product consumers because, for instance, automobile

consumers need to know which cars perform better than others, not why (Posavac and Carey (1992). We put this model here just to show other models other than social fields.

### **Expert Opinion Model:**

This model, according to Posavac and Carey (1992) and Patton (1997), seeks to remove the self-serving biases of inexperienced or traditional evaluators and involves having experts examine the program. Expert opinion evaluation can make use of objective data and clearly some decisions are based on quantified information as well as qualitative impression. This evaluation is often used when the entity being evaluated is large, complex, and unique.

According to Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam (1983), expert opinion models is done by a team of outside professionals visiting on- site. The local people have previously collected information and studied their program according to a set of external standards. The reviewers commend or disprove of the local programs.

For instance, private colleges and universities in Ethiopia can be accredited based on the recommendations of a team of experts who examine quantitative records, inspect the building, and talk with students, administration, staff and faculty.

### **Naturalistic Model:**

Evaluators who do not wish to restrict their vision by focusing on stated goals but want to improve the chances of remaining sensitive to richness of the program, sometimes carryout what is called a naturalistic or qualitative evaluation model. When using this model, the evaluator is the data gathering instrument, does not enter the setting with preconceived ideas



about the crucial variables, and seeks to understand the program and the stakeholders (Posavac and Carey, 1992).

Out of the above described models, goal-based, expert opinion, logic, and goal free models can be adopted to our context.

#### **2.4. EFFECTIVENESS OF A PROGRAM**

Program effectiveness is defined as a way of understanding whether a program or a project actually achieved its goals and objectives. According to Aspinwall, et.al (1992), program effectiveness is constantly concerned with whether the things we are doing continue to be appropriate, particularly in the context of rapidly and increasingly demanding external environment.

According to Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland (1998), program effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which a project attains its objectives at the goal or purpose level, i.e., the extent to which a development intervention has attained, or is expected to attain, its relevant objectives efficiently and in a sustainable way.

Another scholar, Roche (1999), looks at effectiveness as the assessment of the degree to which a project or program has achieved what is set out to do.

Many NGOs and government offices implement different and most popular development programs; however, there is limited evidence of their effectiveness due to lack of

comprehensive monitoring and evaluation systems. For instance, in Ethiopia, many alternative and non-formal education programs have been launched and implemented for the last 10 years by NGOs and the government. Some of these programs have been evaluated, but only limited evidences have been found on the impact of the intervention in the life of children. Most of the evaluation focuses on the inputs and processes, but not on outcome, impact or other quality issues. Due to this problem, the evaluation documents were not able to explain why the expected outcomes or impacts did not occur.

According to Ginsberg (2001), there are at least two reasons why programs do not work effectively: theory failure and implementation failure. As to him, theory failure concerns program theory where the rationale for why a particular intervention is considered appropriate for a particular problem with a specific target population. Program theory also helps choose appropriate measurement or methods to study the effectiveness of the program.

Implementation failure concerns quality of program implementation. Suppose that there is an excellent program that has been demonstrated elsewhere to work with the target population, but the implementation in one location may be weak due to lack of resources, inexperienced personnel, insufficient training or other reasons (Ginsberg, 2001).

### **2.4.1. Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Training Program**

The training cycle classifies the evaluation process as the final step whereby the effectiveness of a training program is scrutinized (Milkovich and Boudrea, 1988). According to Phillips (2004), training evaluation is an attempt to obtain a feedback on the effect of a training program and to assess the value of training in the lights of the feedback. It is a measurement of the total effect of the training program and the extent to which the training objectives have been achieved.

In other words, a training program has an ultimate purpose of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization through its serious concerns of measuring to what extent the training has achieved its goals.

According to Critten (1994), there is a feeling that the opinions of trainees are adequate measures of a training program if supplemented with opinions of supervisors, subordinates and peers. Others accept that evaluation should take place systematically to determine whether positive changes have occurred as per the stated objectives rationally.

Training evaluation therefore, should consist of several criteria like measures of changes in attitude and knowledge, self-report made by trainees on how they benefitted from the training, performance appraisals, etc (Critten, 1994).

### **2.4.1.1. Levels of training Evaluation**

Many literatures have explained about several approaches to training evaluation. Among them, some are briefly discussed below:

#### **A. Korb's approaches of Evaluation**

This level of evaluation has three parts where the effect of the training is seen at the training room, the impact on trainees after the training and the impact observed on the organization.

##### **i) In course evaluation of participation progress**

This is an appraisal of the effect of training at the training room level. In specific terms it involves an assessment of increased knowledge, acquired skills, changes in expressed attitudes, indication of interest, degree of participation, acceptance of training given, etc. In general the criterion measures the effectiveness of the training.

##### **ii) Impact on the participants after training**

It is an appraisal of the effect of the training on the performance of the trainees. The criteria involved are: the transfer of the training contents into changed behavior and attitudes on the job; the extent and duration of change; whether the changes are positive, productive and satisfactory for employees and whether objectives are met. Generally, the criteria determine the effect of the training on people in the organization.

### **iii) Impact on the organization**

This level involves the determination of the extent to which the training has contributed success at the organizational level. The success indicators include: improved supervisory and management force; improved interdepartmental functioning; improved efficiency; improved communication at all levels and greater satisfaction of stakeholders (Watson, 1979).

## **B. Kirkpatrick's Approach of Evaluation**

According to Kirkpatrick (1976), there are four levels of this training evaluation approach.

**Level 1, Reaction:** this is defined as how well the trainees liked a particular training program. Evaluation in terms of reaction is the same as measuring the feelings of the trainees. It does not include the measurement of any learning that took place.

**Level 2, Learning:** a favorable reaction to a program does not assure learning. The concrete change in knowledge, skills or attitude has to be revealed. Training program and trainer's ability has to be evaluated on the basis the quality of the content learnt and time allotted.

**Level 3, Behavior:** this is the manner and extent to which the trainees have applied his/her learning to the job. In other words, this is to check whether learners want to improve, recognize their own weaknesses, work in permissive climate, have some help from someone who is interested and skilled and have an opportunity to try out new ideas.

**Level 4, Results:** this is to mean stating objectives in terms of results such as reduced turn over, reduced costs, improved efficiency, reduction in grievance, and improved in moral which is hoped to lead to some of the previously stated results.

## **2.5. EFFICIENCY OF A PROGRAM**

According to Barrow (2000), efficiency is the art of doing things right. This implies that program efficiency examines a program whether it has achieved its goals and objectives with the allocated time and other limited resources. In other words, it is a measure of how economically inputs (fund, expertise, time, etc) are converted into outputs.

According to Roche (1999), efficiency assessment helps to decide whether the same results could have been achieved at less cost or whether significantly better results could have been achieved with only a small amount of additional resources. This is to mean that efficiency is the desired level of outputs against the lowest possible cost.

## **2.6. IMPACT OF A PROGRAM**

The importance of impact evaluation was brought to the world of aid evaluation community in 1985( Cracknell, 2001). This was due to the fact that a large number of projects that appeared to have been successfully completed were running into a series problem once they had been

operating for a short time. As a result of this realization, the World Bank has started to carryout impact evaluation for programs stayed 5-10 years after the implementation.

Cracknell (2001: 35) described what impact evaluation encompasses as follows:

*Impact evaluation encompasses all aspects of a program: project administration and management; execution of physical component; execution of intellectual component ( technical assistance, training, studies, etc); program cost and financing; the educational, social, economic and other impacts of the program; institutional development; and sustainability of project results. Evaluators ultimately try to make an overall judgment of the program values by comparing results achieved with efforts made.*

Some times it is confusing to many people to exactly differentiate among the different types of evaluation in terms of looking at changes observed. In order to clarify the type of changes occurred as a result of any program intervention, many scholars classify evaluation as process, outcome and impact evaluation. For the purpose of this study it is good to differentiate the concept of the three terminologies: process, outcome and impact evaluation first before giving detailed explanation on impact evaluation.

Process evaluation is the systematic assessment of the program for the purpose of improving its design, its delivery and the usefulness of the quality of services delivered to the program beneficiaries (Weiss, 1998).

Outcome evaluation on the other hand assesses the immediate effects of a program. The bottom line of program evaluation concerns these immediate effects and ultimate program impacts. Outcome evaluation as the term is used in program evaluation is concerned with measuring the short term or immediate effects of a program (Weiss, 1998).

In the case of impact evaluation, it is concerned with the ultimate effects desired by a program.

Below, some examples of evaluation objectives for process and impact evaluation are given:

According to Weiss (1998), program context and its significance; degree of meeting the program objectives; analysis of the cost-effectiveness (could also be classified as impact evaluation) ; identification of key actors (stakeholders) and their roles; strengths and weaknesses in program design; strengths and weaknesses in program implementation (e.g. program management, coordination and staff); identification of barriers to successful penetration of the program; exploitation of program results and outcomes, etc could be considered as examples of process evaluation objectives.

Changes in routine behavior; changes in investment behavior; benchmarking; spill over effect and multiplier effect; analysis of the cost-effectiveness (could also be classified as process evaluation) could be taken as some examples of impact evaluation (Weiss, 1998).

Therefore, impact evaluation is the process of assessing the impact of a program in an intervention area. In other words it is a method of measuring the change occurred in the lives of people, as perceived by them and their partners at the time of evaluation. It also assesses the sustainability enhancing changes in their environment to which the program has contributed. Changes can be positive or negative, intended or unintended (Dukan, 1996).



Roche (1999) also describes impact is assessed by analyzing the degree to which an intervention's outcomes led to change in the lives of those who are intended to benefit.

## **2.7. SUSTAINABILITY OF A PROGRAM**

Sustainability is the likelihood that the positive effects of a program or project (such as assets, skills, facilities, or improved services) will persist for an extended period after the external assistance ends (Goodman & Steckler, 1989).

Multiple understandings of the term sustainability exist along with a range of related terminology including institutionalization and routinization (Goodman & Steckler, 1989; Miles, Eckholm, & Vandenburg, 1987). Although each term implies the continuation of a program in some way, different emphases of meaning have been noted. These include whether the focus is on continuation of the benefits of the program to the stakeholders/participants; the perseverance of the new initiative itself (Goodman & Steckler, 1989); or the process of developing local capacity to enable a program to be maintained at the stakeholder/community level.

In some ways, this lack of consensus may be more reflective of the different objectives and theoretical positioning of the programs themselves. Consequently, Shediak-Rizkallah and Bone (1998) suggested three differing perspectives that shape different understandings of sustainability. These were developed from concepts related to public health, organizational

change and community capacity building. Each reflects a different locus for the development of sustainability and a different expectation about how each stage will be recognized.

Furthermore, the latter authors suggest that a single definition of sustainability is probably not possible, or even appropriate. Instead, they propose a broad explanation for sustained use that encompasses the concept of a continuation process and the diversity of forms that this process may take (Shediac-Rizkallah and Bone, 1998). In this way a working meaning can be given to sustainability based on the recognition that any effective definition will need to reflect the specific expectations of the program or setting to which the word sustainability is being applied.

Models of program development often present sustainability as the end stage of a linear process (Rogers, 1995). According to this way of thinking, sustained use follows from the replication of program during implementation. As a consequence, this model tends to support the notion of sustainability as a consequence of effective implementation requiring little independent support or planning to ensure its achievement (Goodman & Steckler, 1989). However, this position has been challenged to suggest that sustainability may constitute a distinct stage of program development (Yin & Quick, 1979). This view has been supported by the recognition of particular requirements for sustained use in the areas of, for example, funding arrangements, training and support (Yin and Quick, 1979).

Further, it has been indicated that the necessary conditions required for sustainability need to be planned for at the early stages of program development (Altman, 1995). Therefore, these

understandings tend to suggest that sustainability may develop from a more interactive relationship between the different stages of program development and may not be based on a simple linear process.

It has also been suggested that the process of program development (including sustainability) cannot be understood in isolation from the context in which the program is operating. From this position, actions undertaken to initiate sustained use are mediated through the differing structures and practices within individual settings and so create a unique set of factors for establishing sustainability. Such conditions suggest that the process for embedding new initiatives may be more complex and interactive than implied by the linear models of program development.

In general sustainability could be ensured in three angles: program, institutional and financial sustainability.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **3. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA**

This chapter deals with the presentation and analysis of the data collected from three sample groups of respondents: WEO officials, ANFEA-E and Pact –Ethiopia program staff. The data from these groups were collected through questionnaires. Key informant Interviews were also administered to senior program staff of ANFEA-E and Pact-Ethiopia and WEO heads. Moreover, additional information was gathered through document review. All the data gathered from the questionnaires were organized and analyzed in tabular form and interpreted using percentage and mean. The qualitative information gathered through open-end questions, interviews and document reviews were narrated and interpreted in a manner to buttress the quantitative information.

The first part of this chapter dwells on the characteristics of respondents from WEOs while the second part deals with the analysis of the data corresponding to the basic research questions.

#### **3.1. Characteristics of the Respondents**

The characteristics of the first group of the respondents (WEO officials) were examined in terms of sex, years of service, academic qualification and current position they hold in the woredas. The characteristics of the second set of respondents (ANFEA-E and Pact Ethiopia) were not tabulated and discussed here because the student researcher believed that it has no major importance to the study. The analysis and interpretation of the data were presented following each table.

**Table 2: Characteristics of the Respondents**

No.	Characteristics Categories	WEO Officials N=12	
		No.	%
<b>1</b>	<b>Sex</b>		
	Male	12	100
	Female	0	0
<b>2</b>	<b>Current position</b>		
	Education office head	2	16.7
	Formal education office head	2	16.7
	Non-formal education desk office	5	41.7
	Education program coordinator	3	25
<b>3</b>	<b>Years of service in their current position and total</b>		
	2-7 years	2	16.7
	10-15 years	1	8.3
	21-25 years	5	41.3
	More than 25 years	4	31.3
<b>4</b>	<b>Qualification</b>		
	BA/BSC	5	41.7
	Diploma	7	58.3

As it can be depicted from Table 2 above, all the WEO respondents were males. It may be recalled that in the sampling of respondents one female trainee was represented, but she was not able to return the questionnaire because she was recently transferred to another sector office.

The reason for very few representations of female trainees in the capacity building program was due to the fact that females were not usually assigned in higher positions of the woreda education offices since there were no qualified females in each woreda. According to the Program Director of ANFEA-E, out of the total trainees of the WEOs in the country, only 3% were females and this is one of the challenges of the program.

Table 2 also shows that all respondents hold the required position for the training. This implies that trainees were selected based on the minimum selection requirements of

ANFEA-E, who are WEO heads, supervisors, non-formal and formal education desk officers, education program coordinators, etc.

Table 2 further indicates that the work experiences of most of the respondents ranged from seven to twenty five years. This indicates that most of the trainees are more experienced and are familiar with the challenges and opportunities of the education system as a whole and it is believed that they are able to respond the questionnaires properly.

In terms of qualification, Table 2 discloses that 7 (58.3 %) were Diploma holders and the rest 5 (41.7%) were BA/BSc holders. According to the organogram and job descriptions of the WEOs in the country, WEO heads and experts should at least hold Diploma or BA/BSc degree. This also implies that the assignment of education experts and woreda education heads is based on educational qualification though the WEO heads are appointees of the government.

### **3.2. Analysis of the Findings of the Study**

#### **3.2.1. Effectiveness of the WEO Capacity Building Program**

According to the WEO capacity building program document of ANFEA-E, the goal of this capacity building program is to increase the educational attainment of both children and adults in disadvantaged areas and to improve the capacity of Woreda Education Offices to manage non-formal educational programs. The expected output of the program is to reach over 600 key WEO personnel in 50 target Woredas in Ethiopia, out of these 15 are in Amhara Region, and with special arrangement reaching 120 WEO staff from adjacent Woredas in five years time. The major activities of the program are conducting capacity

assessment of WEOs and identifying training needs; conducting studies to improve the quality of basic education in non-formal program; providing training to education officers; developing and distributing training modules for the woreda education offices; developing and distributing facilitators' and supervisors' manuals, and providing mentoring support to WEOs in managing the non-formal education sub-sector, etc.

As per the program document, the main specific objectives of the capacity building program were:

- to enhance the managerial capacity of WEO officials on NFE;
- to enhance the awareness of the officials on the concept and principles of NFE
- to strengthen the capacity of experts on monitoring and evaluation of NFE program in their respective woredas, etc

**Table 3: Program Effectiveness**

No.	Items	Respondents			
		WEO Officials		Program staff of ANFEA-E and Pact Ethiopia	
		N=12		N=10	
		No.	%	No.	%
<b>1</b>	<b>Do you think that the program has achieved its intended objectives?</b>				
	Yes	2	16.7	10	100
	No.	10	83.3	0	0
<b>2</b>	<b>If you say yes to the above question, to what extent the program has achieved its objectives?</b>				
	Highly effective	0	0	2	20
	Effective	3	25	6	60
	Average	0	0	2	20
	Ineffective	9	75	0	0
	Highly ineffective	0	0	0	0

Regarding the effectiveness of the program, both Woreda education officials and program staff of ANFEA-E and Pact-Ethiopia were asked different close-ended and open-ended

questions. Key informant interviewees were also asked to respond on the effectiveness of the program.

As depicted in Table 3, page 46, above, 10 (83.3%) WEO officials responded that the program did not achieve its intended objectives. However, as depicted in the same Table, 10 (100%) of program staff of ANFEA-E and Pact Ethiopia replied that the program has achieved its objectives. One of the indicators of program effectiveness is the achievement of intended objectives and goals.

As we can see above, there is high discrepancy between the two groups of respondents on the same question. For further scrutiny, both groups were asked the extent to which the objectives were achieved. Only 3 (25%) of WEO officials responded effective while 9 (75 %) said ineffective. In the case of the program staff, almost 80% of them said the program was effective and highly effective respectively. WEO officials were also asked to explain why the program was not effective. Most of them agreed that though the content of the training was relevant and very important to the trainees, and also enhanced their awareness, it was ineffective because of the following reasons:

1) they were unable to change it into practice as less attention was given to the program by policy executing bodies in their woredas; 2) the training was given once a year and there was no close follow up on the part of the implementing organization and there was high possibility of forgetting the issues; 3) there was no budget allocated for the NFE program by the WEO or by the implementing agency to cascade the program; and 4) there was high turnover of trainees, especially WEO heads. The problem of turnover was also highly emphasized by Program Directors of ANFEA-E, Education Program Director of Pact



Ethiopia and by the Program Advisor as the major challenge of the program. The frequent turnover of WEO heads has crippled the effort of experts and plans were not executed on time until the new appointee became familiar with all education programs.

Though there is high discrepancy between responses from the two types of respondents on the effectiveness of the program, it was found out from the key informant interviewees (Program Director of ANFEA-E, Education Program Directors of Pact-Ethiopia and the Program Advisor) and document review that most of the planned objectives have been met. According to them, many WEO officials were trained and their managerial capacity was enhanced; some of the trainees cascaded the training to their colleagues; and the level of their awareness on NFE has increased, NFE desk officers were being assigned at WEO level (ANFEA-E quarterly monitoring reports and supervision checklist, 2006-2007) and their monitoring and evaluation skill has been improved. This shows that, according to the key informant interviewees, there are gradual changes from time to time. According to the Program Advisor, this program was effective in the sense that trainees have been using the training modules on their day- to- day routines of their work, and the supervision manuals were being used for supervising the NFE program in their respective woredas.

In relation to the expected responsibilities after the training, WEO officials were asked to explain their responsibilities to be attained. Almost all respondents listed the following;

WEO Heads are expected to:

- allocate budget for NFE program by convincing the woreda cabinet

- mobilize the workforce ( experts, teachers, facilitators, etc) in order to meet UPE in the year 2015 in each respective woreda
- organize different training and workshops to experts, supervisors, directors, etc and create awareness on NFE program, etc.

WEO Experts are expected to:

- organize training to facilitators
- provide better supervision services to ABE centers and AFL programs,
- assist the provision of educational materials to the program

According to them, out of these expected duties, most of them were not met due to different managerial and technical problems encountered.

Concerning the expected outputs of the program, WEO officials and program staff of ANFEA-E and Pact Ethiopia mentioned the quantitative and qualitative outputs. According to them, more than 1320 WEO personnel were trained nationally, out of these 211 (16 females) were from Amhara region and 30 were in North Wollo and North Shoa. Training was also provided to 45 trainers for the NFE program, and 10 training modules were prepared, printed and distributed to WEO and trainees, supervision guidelines developed and distributed to WEOs (ANFEA-E Annual report, 2007). Thus, in terms of quantity, the program has accomplished more than the planned activities.

In terms of quality, most of the WEO officials did not recognize the outputs and were unable to put them properly. However, the program staff has mentioned some of the qualitative

outputs as some woredas have started planning NFE program; some started allocating reasonable budget to run NFE program in their respective woredas; some started supervising NFE programs regularly and started collaborating with NGOs which are working with ANFEA-E in the intervention woredas.

Even though information gathered from the ANFEA-E and Pact Ethiopia show that most of the planned objectives were achieved, it is found out that there is high discrepancy with the information gathered from WEO heads and experts in terms of achieving the objectives of the program. Moreover, though the objectives are met as it has been confirmed by the two groups, most of the trainees have left WEOs. As a result, most of the Woreda Education Offices are not benefiting from the trainee. Thus, it is possible to conclude that though the program implementing agency has its own reasons of success in quantitative terms, it is very difficult to make sure that these successes are objectively observed on the performance of trainees and they are not confirmed and recognized by the program beneficiaries. Therefore, in general, it is difficult to say that the program has been achieving its objectives as planned in terms of qualitative and quantitative changes and getting benefit out of it as there are many turnovers.

### **3.2.2. Efficiency of the WEO Capacity Building Program**

The program efficiency is measured in terms of budget allocation and utilization and working within the budget, allocation of time for the training, assignment of program staff and training moderators, etc. It also looks into the achievement of objectives against budget utilization. From the project proposal document and financial reports of 2007/2008, it is

observed that the total budgets allocated for the program in 2005/06, 2006/07, and 2007/08 were Birr 1, 769, 420.00, 2,782,746 and 2, 878,018 respectively. Totally the program has allocated Birr 7,430,184 for the last three years. Out of this, the total program expenditure for the last three years was Birr 5,727,736.25. Out of this expenditure, Birr 5,490, 998.00 was for program cost and the remaining was for administrative cost. According to the Program Director of ANFEA-E, the program was utilizing the financial resources more efficiently as the donor was transferring budget on yearly and incremental basis and based on current market value. This implies that the program cost would be sufficient enough to implement the planned activities and achieve the intended outputs.

When we looked at the Program Implementation Plan (PIP) and detail budget plan, it was clearly shown that much of the budget went to the training and preparation of manuals. In addition to the financial utilization, the program has also utilized the planned time efficiently. From the program document review and interviews held with the Program Advisor and senior program staff (ANFEA-E Program Director and Pact Ethiopia Education Program Director), it is understood that no activity was lagging behind the schedule and postponed to the next quarter or year in the past three years. All activities were done as planned. Moreover, with the given time, more woredas could be reached beyond the target woredas. Though the program has utilized the allocated financial, human and time resources efficiently, the program cannot not be considered effective as it has been explained earlier-high turnover. Regarding the efficiency, respondents were also asked questions as shown in the table below:

**Table 4 A: Response from WEO officials on Program Efficiency**

No.	Items	Respondents N=12	
		No.	%
<b>1</b>	<b>What kinds of material inputs were used for the capacity building program in your woreda?</b>		
	Vehicles, motor bikes, stationery, office equipment	0	0
	At least one of them	0	0
	There is no any	12	100
<b>2</b>	<b>Did ANFEA-E allocate enough financial resources to implement the program?</b>		
	Yes	0	0
	No	1	8.3
	I don't know	11	91.7
<b>3</b>	<b>Did ANFEA-E assign qualified program personnel?</b>		
	Yes	6	50
	No	6	50

As shown in Table 4A above, all respondents have no idea about the allocation and utilization of resources. This has been further confirmed by WEO heads during the interview session that ANFEA-E did not have any mechanism to let them know the amount of resources allocated for their specific woreda. This implies that ANFEA-E did not allocate budget and other resources directly to woredas. This is because ANFEA-E is an implementing agency by itself and its financial procedures does not permit it to do so. All respondents explained that the only thing they know about resource allocation is the distribution of training modules.

In terms of human resource, however, 6 (50%) of them responded that ANFEA-E has assigned qualified and sufficient personnel while the rest 50% of them said no. From the human resource requirements of ANFEA-E and as has been observed in the organogram of the same, it has enough and qualified program staff in executing the planned activities. However, the trainers for the capacity building program were outsourced from different organizations including TTCs, universities, Regional and zonal education bureaus, etc.

They were also asked whether they have any suggestion or concern about resource utilization. In this regard, all agreed that there was lack of transparency in resource utilization as ANFEA-E did not have any additional activities except providing training. They added that there was no close and frequent monitoring of the results and impact of the program. Besides, since there wasn't any pilot program that enabled trainers to practice what they have acquired, it is very difficult to say that the program is effective as the training is not applicable in actual terms on the ground. From the above description, it is possible to conclude that ANFEA-E does not share financial information to target woredas and does not share activity and financial reports to WEOs. This might have negative implication on the overall performance of the organization.

**Table 4 B: Response from ANFEA-E and Pact Ethiopia Staff on Program Efficiency**

No.	Items	Respondents N=10	
		No.	%
<b>1</b>	<b>Is financial resource allocated to implement this training program?</b>		
	Yes	10	100
	No	0	0
<b>2</b>	<b>Is human resource allocated to implement this training program?</b>		
	Yes	10	100
	No	0	0
<b>3</b>	<b>Is material resource allocated to implement this training program?</b>		
	Yes	9	90
	No	1	10
<b>4</b>	<b>Is time resource allocated to implement this training program?</b>		
	Yes	9	90
	No	1	10
<b>5</b>	<b>Do you think that the allocated resource is sufficient to implement program?</b>		
	Yes	7	70
	No	3	30
<b>6</b>	<b>How the program does utilized the allocated resource?</b>		
	highly efficiently	4	40
	Efficiently	4	40
	Average	2	20
	Inefficient	0	0
	Highly inefficient	0	0

In Table 4 B, page 53, above, all respondents from the program staff, however, responded that the organization has allocated sufficient resources (budget, staff, material and time). In terms of the sufficiency of the resources, 7 (70%) of them responded that the implementing organization has allocated sufficient resources to implement the program.

They were also asked to scale the extent of utilization of the allocated resources. In this regard, from the table above it was shown that almost 8 (80%) of them responded that the program has utilized the resources highly efficiently and efficiently. From the interviews made with the Program Directors of ANFEA-E and Pact-Ethiopia and from the financial and narrative report of ANFEA-E, it was understood that the financial resource was efficiently used to implement the planned activities and objectives. As explained earlier, 1320 WEO officials and more than 50 ToTs have been trained, which is more than the planned activities. Thus, it is possible to conclude that the program has used resources efficiently.

### **3.2.3. Impact of the WEO Capacity Building Program**

In this sub-topic, impact on the performance of trainees and on the program as a whole is treated. Table 5 below will depict us the changes observed on the performance of trainees.

**Table 5: Impact on Work Performance of Trainees (N=12)**

No.	Item	Very poor %	Poor %	Fair %	Good %	Very good %
1	How do you rate the outcome of the training on your possession of professional knowledge?	8	0	17	42	33
2	How do you rate the outcome of the training on your ability to develop policies and procedures on non-formal education in an appropriate manner	0	33	42	8	17
3	How do you rate the outcome of the training on your ability to interpret and apply policies, strategies and procedures accurately and consistently	0	8	42	25	25
4	How do you rate the outcome of the training on your ability to produce woreda based non-formal education plan.	0	8	17	42	33
5	How do you rate the outcome of the training on your ability to produce woreda based non-formal education Supervision manual	0	25	33	33	8
6	How do you rate the outcome of the training on your ability to organize and conduct training to colleagues	0	17	17	42	25
7	How do you rate the outcome of the training on your ability to strengthen the linkage b/n ABCE's, community, NGOs and WEO.	0	8	25	50	17
8	How do you rate the outcome of the training on your understanding, support, and Strive to meet annual plans and objective of the education program in the woreda	0	8	17	33	42
9	How do you rate the outcome of the training on your ability to facilitate the decision making process.	0	8	25	42	42

WEO officials were asked to rate whether they have acquired the necessary professional knowledge and display understanding of all aspects of the non-formal education program after the training.

As depicted in Table 5 on page 55 above, out of the total trainee respondents, 5 (42%) of them rated good and 4 (33%) rated very good. This implies that almost 75% of the respondents agreed that they have acquired the necessary professional knowledge of non-formal education and understood the concepts well. According to the interview held with the program advisor, the program has created awareness on the trainees on NFE program especially ABE for children and trainees were also able to understand that formal and non-formal education are complementary programs to achieve MDGs in 2015. After the training,



the trainees have also understood that NFE is part of the main duties of all sectors in the woreda including education, health, agriculture extension program, and women affairs.

With regard to their ability to develop policies and procedures, 5 (42%) and 4 (33%) respondents rated fair and poor respectively (Table 5 above). Here also it can be concluded that 70% of them were not able to develop policies and strategies after the training. As per the information gathered from the interview with 2 of WEO heads in Gubalafto and Habru woredas, since the training time was so short (5 days) and the modules were 10, they were not able to go in depth into each module and practice how to develop policies and procedures. Thus, they are not confident enough to say that they are capable of doing things effectively in this regard.

Concerning the ability to interpret and apply policies and strategies accurately and consistently, 6 (50%) of them replied fair and poor and 3 (25%) of them rated good. This implies that the majority of them were not able to interpret policies and strategies with the training. However, the WEO heads, in their interview, explained that since they were working for many years in the education system, they have developed the ability to interpret policies and strategies through these long years of service, not because of the given short-term training.

Regarding the ability to prepare woreda plan, 5 (42%) and 4(33%) of them rated good and very good respectively. In the interview, both of the woreda education office heads explained that after the training they were able to produce, together with their experts, their own NFE plan and integrate it with the general education plan of the year. Thus, in terms of

preparing NFE plan, the training helped them motivate the trainees and prepare their own plan, which could be taken as one of the performance improvement.

In Table 5 above too, WEO officials were asked to rate about their performance after the training. As to their ability to produce woreda-based non-formal education supervision manual, 4 (33 %) of them rated good, another 4 (33%) rated fair, and 3 (25%) rated poor. From the total percentage 7 (58%) have rated fair and poor and the rest good and very good. This has also been confirmed by the WEO heads that either they or the experts did not produce any manual after the training. This implies that most of them are not able to produce woreda-based non-formal education supervision manuals after the training.

They were also asked the level of their ability to organize and conduct training for their colleagues, 5 (42%) and 3 (25%) of them rated good and very good. The percentage of the two adds up to 8 (67%) which showed that many of them were able to organize training to their colleagues some how. The implication of this is that the training has brought them some kind of motivation and encouraged them to share their knowledge and skill to their colleagues in their respective offices.

WEO officials were also asked to rate whether the training prepared them to meet annual plans and objectives. Out of the WEO officials, 4 (33%) and 5 (42%) of them rated good and very good respectively. This implies that about 9 (75%) of them were able to strive to meet annual plans and objectives of the education program in each woreda. This may also contribute to the accomplishment of woreda plans on time with better efficiency.

As regards strengthening the linkage between communities, ABECs, NGOs and WEO, 50% and 17 % of respondents rated that there is good and very good relationship among them respectively. The WEO heads also added that a good understanding and working relationship have been established among these groups after the training and they have started to work together and see each other as development partners, not as independent entities. This may imply that coordinated work is done in promoting educational efforts of education in each woreda.

Finally, they were asked to rate whether the training helped them to facilitate the decision making process in their office. Of the respondents, 5 (42%) and the same 5 (42%) rated good and very good respectively. This implies that most of them (10 or 84%) were able to improve their decision making ability due to the training.

In general, from the respondents' rating it can be concluded that the training helped them to improve their work performance with regard to not only NFE but also other issues of the education system as a whole. This may imply that the program has brought some impact on the performance of the trainees before the end of the program period.

Open-ended questions were also posed to program staff of ANFEA-E and Pact-Ethiopia on the impact of the program. All of them responded that the impact is not yet observed as the program is on-going. However the student researcher, argue that on capacity building training program like ANFEA-E's, which has gone through three years of implementation, impact could not wait too long to be observed. Impact could be seen immediately after the training when the trainees have acquired the necessary skill and knowledge and apply it in their day-to-day activities and improve their work performance. Some of the performance

improvement and enhancement of the knowledge and skill of trainees mentioned above could be taken as intermediate impact of the training. The problem is that the organization is unable to track the impact of the training because it has not put any impact indicator in its Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP). From the PMP of ANFEA-E and Pact Ethiopia (2005-2009), it has been observed that there are no impact indicators that could measure the changes observed through and after the end of the program period. Only output indicators are put in the PMP which show only quantitative achievements of the program intervention.

#### **3.2.4. Sustainability of WEO Capacity Building Program**

The sustainability issue was raised to both program staff and WEO officials and the data is presented as follows:

Of the WEO respondents, 7 (58.3%) replied that ANFEA-E did not design sustainability strategies before the commencement of the program. The Program Advisor agreed with the response of the WEO as he explained that the program did not design phase out (exit) strategy at the planning stage.

They were also asked to explain their future plan to sustain the program if their answer was 'no' for the above question. The WEO officials replied that their future plan would be to link the capacity building program with the strategic plan of the woreda and the activities budgeted like the other activities to make the program sustainable.

However, from the interview held with Pact-Ethiopia Education Director, Program Director of ANFEA-E and the Program Advisor, it is understood that since the program is bi-lateral agreement with the government, there will not be a problem of passing over the program to

the government at the end of the program. They also added that even though the sustainability plan is not done before the commencement of the program, recently they have started to link the training with regional teachers' training colleges (TTC) and universities, and capacitate the instructors in these institutions with the concept of NFE. They have also started strengthening the libraries of these institutions with different books on NFE. Moreover, NFE units are being established recently in some TTCs like Gonder, Dessie, Debremarkos and Debre Birhan TTCs.

Even though some efforts are being made in the middle of the program period, usually sustainability and phase out strategies are to be designed and thought of before any program is launched. In this regard, ANFEA-E had limitations in this regard.

### **3.2.5. Best Practices and Challenges of WEO Capacity Building Program**

This part of the analysis deals with the major successes and best practices, relevance of the training manuals, relevance of objectives of the program to the work of WEO officials, contents of the training manuals, criteria of selecting trainees, selection of training premises, and issues related to training coordination.

With regard to the major successes of the program, most of the staff of ANFEA-E and Pact Ethiopia noted that the major successes were the replication of the training to other woredas of the country with minimum cost. As has been explained earlier the original plan was to reach about 51 woredas, but this time the program is able to reach more than 235 woredas in the country, and more than 50 woredas in Amhara region. The other best practices of the program was the preparation of relevant and appropriate training manuals based on the need

of the WEO and Regional Education Bureau and the assignment of mentors into the WEOs who could assist the NFE program in each woreda. The selection of the mentors was also considered as good practice because they were from the nearest educational institutions in the respective woredas. The process of selection criteria of the trainees was also considered as best practices because it directly involved the relevant bodies in each woreda and there was no politically affiliated intervention though the selection was made by the woreda education and training board.

**Table 6. Planning and Relevance of Program Objectives**

No.	Items	Respondents N=12	
		No.	%
<b>1</b>	<b>Have you been involved in the design and planning of program objectives?</b>		
	Yes	7	58.3
	No	5	41.7
<b>2</b>	<b>If you say yes above, how do you get the relevance of the program objectives to your work/need?</b>		
	Relevant	5	41.7
	Average	2	16.7
	Irrelevant	5	41.7

As depicted in Table 6 above, WEO personnel were asked whether they have been involved in the formulation of the objectives of the capacity building program. Of the respondents, only 7 (58.3 %) indicated that they have been involved in the process. From the capacity need assessment document of ANFEA-E, it was found out that Habru and Tarma Ber woredas of the Amhara region were samples of the need assessment study out of the 22 woredas selected in the country as a whole. Besides, from the key informant interviews made with WEO heads and senior program officials of the program implementers, it was understood that different consultation and discussions have been made with regional and

woreda education officials before the commencement of the program. Therefore, it is possible to say that ANFEA-E has involved the relevant bodies in planning its program. Thus, this program has made the beneficiaries aware of its objectives, outputs and activities and got approval from them. From project and program implementation procedures point of view, this capacity building program could be said successful and taken as best practice in sensitizing its plans and involving its clients in which one component of sustainability issue could be ensured right from the outset.

With regard to the relevance of the program objectives to their needs, 5 (41.7%) and 2 (16.7%) of them agreed that the objectives of the program were relevant and average to the program respectively. The other 5 (41.7%) declined to respond on the relevance probably because they were not involved in the planning process or they were not sure about its relevance. Two of the WEO heads, who were key informant interviewees, however, confirmed that the objectives of the program were very relevant to the program because, they said that, there was lack of awareness on the importance of NFE/AFL on the part of woreda education officials. Plus, less attention was being given to NFE program by all education staff in general and woreda cabinet members in particular.

**Table 7: Relevance and Appropriateness of Training Manuals**

No.	Items	Respondents N=12	
		No.	%
1	<b>How do you find the relevance of the training modules to your work?</b>		
	Highly relevant	8	66.7
	Relevant	1	8.3
	Moderately relevant	2	16.7
	Irrelevant	1	8.3
2	<b>To what extent the training modules are appropriate to the required level?</b>		
	Highly appropriate	10	83.3
	Appropriate	2	16.7
	Moderately appropriate	0	0
	Inappropriate	0	0
3	<b>Have you ever been involved in the development of the training manual?</b>		
	Yes	2	16.7
	No	10	83.3
4	<b>If you say yes to the above question how was your involvement?</b>		
	Involved in the need assessment	2	16.7
	Need assessment ,formulation of objectives and contents		
	Need assessment ,formulation of objectives and contents and evaluation of objectives		
5	<b>How is the usefulness of the training modules to the trainees and the wordas?</b>		
	Highly useful	9	75
	Useful	2	16.7
	Moderately useful	1	8.3

In Table 7 above, item 1, WEO officials were asked to measure the relevance of the manuals to their work. Out of the total respondents, 8 (66.7%) of them responded that the manuals were highly relevant and one respondent replied as relevant and the other two said the manuals were moderately relevant to their work. This implies that the manuals are prepared based on a need assessment and interest of the training participants and participation of the regional and zone education bureaus.

With regard to the appropriateness of the manuals, 10 (83.3%) and 2(16.7%) responded highly appropriate and appropriate respectively in terms of content, objectives, and level of difficulty.



From the key informant interviews and the review of the training manuals, it has been learnt that the manuals were prepared by professionals in the field of education particularly curriculum and instruction. Thus, is it possible to say that the training modules are well designed and tested based on the principles and requirements of manual or textbook preparation.

Trainees were also requested whether they have been involved in the preparation of the training manuals. Out of them, 10(83.3%) declined to say yes. Only 2 (16.7%) of them said that they have been involved. From the key informant interviewees, it has been confirmed that most of the trainees were not involved in the preparation of the training manuals. However, during the need assessment, WEO officials have given their opinion on what the content should be. This implies that even though trainees were not involved in the actual preparation of the manuals, their ideas have been taken into consideration by the manual developers. That is why most of them agreed on the relevance and appropriateness of the manuals in the above two responses.

Concerning the practical usefulness of the manuals, 9 (75%) and 2 (16.7%) replied highly useful and useful respectively. This implies that the manuals can be interpreted into practical work and be applied in the day-to-day activities of their respective work. It has also been confirmed from the manuals' review that all the training manuals were designed and prepared based on the actual and practical work of education offices. Therefore, preparing manuals based on the practical experiences of a certain work could be taken as best practice.

**Table 8: Contents of the Training Modules**

No.	Items	Respondents N=12	
		No.	%
1	<b>Have you taken training on concepts of adult literacy?</b>		
	Yes	10	83.3
	No	2	16.7
2	<b>Have you taken training on concepts of and approaches of ABE?</b>		
	Yes	10	83.3
	No	2	16.7
3	<b>Have you taken training on planning, managing and implementing NFE program?</b>		
	Yes	10	83.3
	No	2	16.7
4	<b>Have you taken training on Education Supervision?</b>		
	Yes	8	66.7
	No	4	33.3
5	<b>Have you taken training on Gender Issues?</b>		
	Yes	10	83.3
	No	2	16.7
6	<b>Have you taken training on Resource management?</b>		
	Yes	9	75
	No	3	25
7	<b>Have you taken training on Community mobilization?</b>		
	Yes	8	66.7
	No	4	33.3
8	<b>Have you taken training on Facilitation skill?</b>		
	Yes	4	33.3
	No	8	66.7
9	<b>Have you taken training on Leadership skill?</b>		
	Yes	3	25
	No	9	75
10	<b>Have you taken training on networking and partnership?</b>		
	Yes	10	83.3
	No	2	16.7

In Table 8 above, respondents were asked whether they have taken the list of training modules. This question was raised to substantiate questions raised in table 7 on the relevance and appropriateness of the modules. There were ten lists of training modules and the majority of the respondents have covered at least 8 of them. Only two modules, leadership and facilitation skills, have got the lowest percentage. This implies that during the training session, though the time was very short, the important contents were covered that help them run NFE program in their respective woredas. The two modules were left due to the time constraint during the training. However, it is possible to understand that

only covering a number of modules does not show the acquisition of knowledge and skill properly. Trainees might have a shallow understanding of the concepts and may not properly grasp the gist and objectives of the training manuals.

**Table 9: Selection Procedures and Criteria of the Capacity Building Program**

No.	Items	Respondents N=12	
		No.	%
<b>1</b>	<b>Who selects and recruits the trainees?</b>		
	Woreda Education and training board	8	66.7
	WEO heads	2	16.7
	ANFEA-E	1	8.3
	The combination of all	1	8.3
<b>2</b>	<b>What are the minimum criteria for the selection of trainees?</b>		
	Based on their current position	10	83.3
	Relevant experience	0	0
	Based on government recommendation	2	16.7
	Through written exam and interview	0	0
	Others	0	0

Table 9 above deals with the criteria for selection of trainees. The WEO officials were asked by whom they have been selected for the training. Accordingly, 8 (66.75) of them reported that Woreda Education and Training Board have selected them for the training and 10 (83.3%) of them responded that the selection was based on the current position they hold. From the interview held with WEO heads, it was found out that the woreda education and training board has the responsibility and the mandate of selecting trainees for all short and long term training in the woredas. Without the approval of this board, no trainee was able to attend any training conducted inside or outside of the woreda. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the trainees of this program are selected based on the relevance posts and the rules and procedures of the government, which is good for the NFE program.

**Table 10: Selection of Training Premises**

No.	Items	Respondents N=12	
		No.	%
<b>1</b>	<b>How was the training venue selected?</b>		
	ANFEA-E in consultation with zonal and woreda education offices	0	0
	ANFEA-E selects its convenient place	11	91.7
	Zonal and woreda education offices selects the venue	0	0
	I don't know	1	8.3
<b>2</b>	<b>What were the criteria to select the training venue?</b>		
	Proximity/central place	8	66.7
	Better facilities	4	33.3
	Others	0	0

In Table 10 above, WEO officials were asked about the criteria for selecting training venues. Out of the 12 respondents, 11 (91.7%) of them responded that the training venue was selected by ANFEA-E. This implies that WEO are not consulted in selecting the training venue, which might have a negative effect on the participation of trainees.

With regard to the criteria of selecting training venue, most of the respondents, 8 (66.7%) of them replied that the criteria for the selection of the training venue might be the proximity or centrality of places for targeted and adjacent woredas. The rest 4 (33.3%) of them replied better facilities. WEO heads were interviewed whether they have any concern about the selection of training venues. They responded that they were not happy with selection of the training venue because the training was conducted in schools and there was high disturbance and noisy environment and made them unable to attend the training properly. Besides, the seating arrangements, the air conditioning, the cleanness of the rooms were not attractive to take the training. The same question was also raised to the Program Director of ANFEA-E and he responded that they used schools to minimize cost

for hall renting, refreshment and other facilities. However, ANFEA-E shared the opinion of the WEO heads.

**Table 11 A: Issues Related To Training Coordination (WEO)**

No.	Items	WEO N=12	
		No.	%
<b>1</b>	<b>How was the training organized?</b>		
	One training for each woreda	0	0
	One training for many woredas together	12	100
	Other ways	0	0
<b>2</b>	<b>Do you think that the methods used in conducting the training were participatory?</b>		
	Yes	12	0
	No	0	0
<b>3</b>	<b>If yes, how was the level of participation of the trainees?</b>		
	High participation	10	83.3
	Medium participation	2	16.7
	Less participation	0	0
<b>4</b>	<b>Do you think that the time allocated to the training was sufficient enough to cover all the modules?</b>		
	Yes	2	16.7
	No	10	83.3

Table 11 A above deals with the training coordination of the program. WEO officials were asked whether the training was organized in each woreda or many woredas together at one time in one venue. All WEO respondents, 12 (100%) agreed that the training was organized in one place for many adjacent and relatively nearer woredas. According to ANFEA-E Program Director, when asked why they organized the training in such a way, he replied that the organization was able to minimize cost and address many woredas at a time. Secondly since there was shortage of trainers, it was good to use few trainers at a time efficiently if they organize the training in one place for many woredas. As a result of this way of organizing the training, they were able to reach many woredas before the end of the project period-2009. From this, it can be concluded that the implementing organization is using resources (money, time and human resource) efficiently in terms of organizing the

training. With regard to the participatory nature of the methods used in the training session, all of them, 12 (100%), responded that it was participatory. They were also asked to reason out why they said so. Most of them, 10 (83.3%) replied that the methodology was highly participatory in the sense that the trainers give group work, pair-work and reporting during the sessions. It can be understood that using participatory methods can help trainees share best practices and be able to enrich their little experience of NFE program in the future.

With regard to the sufficiency of time for the training, 10(83.3%) of them responded that the time allotted for the training is not sufficient. WEO heads, during the interview session, have strengthened the response of the experts in the sense that the time allotted for the training was very short (5 days) to cover the ten modules and it was like rushing. This implies that the shorter the time the less in depth the training is given. Practical exercises can be unthinkable with so little time.

**Table 11 B: Issues Related to Training Coordination (ANFEA-E & Pact Ethiopia)**

No.	Items	ANFEA-E and Pact Ethiopia N=10	
		No.	%
<b>1</b>	<b>Are the training courses adequately timed to suit the schedule of the participants?</b>		
	Yes	8	80
	No	1	10
	I don't know	1	10
<b>2</b>	<b>Are the training courses designed to ensure the greatest impact in terms of</b>		
	<b>a)the acquisition of managerial skills b) and its use in the organization?</b>	8	80
<b>3</b>	<b>If you say yes, in what sense</b>		
	In planning and mgt of NFE	8	80
	In quality supervision services	2	20
	In the frequency of supervision services		
	Any other		
<b>4</b>	<b>Is the duration of the courses adequate to ensure acquisition of knowledge and skills to the levels required?</b>		
	Yes	3	30
	No	7	70
<b>5</b>	<b>Are the courses evaluated to ensure that the required quality is being provided and monitored?</b>		
	Yes	6	60
	No	4	40

Similar questions were raised to program staff of ANFEA-E and Pact-Ethiopia with regard to the coordination of the training. Item 1 of Table 11 B above asked the adequacy of time allotted to suit the schedule of the participants. Out of the 10 respondents, 8 (80%) of them responded that the time was not adequately timed to suit the trainees schedule. As a result of this, many participants were not able to attend the second-round training because it was coupled with the recent National Election. However, the Program Director of ANFEA-E responded that the time was scheduled in consultation with the regional education bureau, though not fruitful.

From the above discussion it can be concluded that WEO were not advised in scheduling the training time. This also implies low participation of trainees in each training venue. One of the WEO heads explained that since the time was not enough and not planned in consultation with WEOs, most of the trainees break the training in the middle and left to their woredas. This may have bad implication on the performance of the trainees and effectiveness of the training program.

With regard to the design and development of the training manuals, they were asked whether they were prepared to ensure the greatest impact on the performance of the trainees and the program. Accordingly, 8 (80%) of them replied that the manuals were designed to bring impact on the performance of the trainees and benefit to the organization. They were also asked the type of impact that the trainees may improve and the same percentage of the respondents said in the planning management of NFE. However, 7 (70%) of them declined to say that the time allotted was enough for the trainees to acquire the desired skill and knowledge and the rest replied yes.

As has been explained by the WEO officials above, in general, the time allotment was not enough to make sure the acquisition of knowledge as required. The response of the program staff was also the same as the WEOs. Thus, it is possible to say that the time allotment for the training is not sufficient and it may affect the efficiency and effectiveness of the training program in general.

They were also asked if the courses were evaluated to ensure the required quality. six (60%) of the respondents replied that there has been evaluation of the courses and 4 (40%) of them replied no. According to the program director of ANFEA-E and the Program Advisor, the



courses have been field-tested before they were applied and they have been evaluated after they were applied. They also added that the courses were evaluated both by WEOs and professionals from different colleges and Universities. Thus, it can be deduced that the training courses are evaluated to fulfill the need of the trainees which is also good to improve and redesign some outdated contents and incorporate new ones. Therefore, evaluating courses before and after application could be taken as best practice of the program since most training courses, like this, are not usually do pre- and post- evaluation.

**Table 12: Challenges of the Capacity Building Program**

No.	Items	WEO Officials N=12		Staff of ANFEA-E and Pact Ethiopia N=10	
		Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
1	What are the major challenges of this program? Could you rank these challenges in order of their importance?				
2	Shortage of training time	3.83	3	3.9	3
3	Lack of financial and material resources	4.58	5	4.8	5
4	High turnover of WEO officials	1.33	1	1.1	1
5	Low female participation	1.83	2	2.0	2
6	selection of training venue	3.91	4	4.2	4

*Key: Mean =  $w_1f_1 + w_2f_2 + \dots + w_n f_n / f_1 + f_2 + \dots + f_n$ ; where W is weight given and F is frequency.*

Finally, WEOs Officials, program staff of both organizations (ANFEA-E and Pact Ethiopia) were asked to rank the major challenges of the WEO capacity Building Program in order of importance as entailed in Table 12 above by using numbers 1 for the biggest challenge and 5 for the least challenge. Based on the ranking of the two groups of respondents, high turnover of WEO officials, low female participation and shortage of training time were identified as the first three major challenges of the program respectively. It can be understood that frequent restructuring and repositioning of staff, particularly WEO heads, within the WEO as well as redeployment in other offices outside of education sector either in the same or in other woredas has been reported as hampering the sustained contribution of trained WEO

officials. This affects the impact of the program in improving the performance of trainees and the implementing organization in realizing its objectives. The low participation of females in the training may bring negative implication on the execution of government policies and strategies and it may be against the current government position.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **4. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This is the last chapter of the thesis. It concerns with the presentation of the summary of the major research findings; conclusions drawn from the findings as well as the recommendations for the solution of the problem under study in light of the basic questions raised in the first chapter.

#### **4.1. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

This study was conducted for the purpose of assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of ANFEA-E's Woreda Education Offices Capacity Building Program in selected woredas of the Amhara Region. Both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies were employed while questionnaires, key informant interview and document review were utilized for data gathering instruments. Percentage and mean are used to analyze the quantitative data substantiated by synthesis and description of the qualitative data. The study samples were selected using purposive and availability sampling techniques.

The major findings of the study are the following:

##### **Effectiveness**

1. In terms of achieving the intended objectives of the program, WEO officials reported that the program is ineffective while the program staff of ANFEA-E and Pact Ethiopia replied highly effective. Both of them have their own justifications. The formers reason out the ineffectiveness of the objectives in terms of qualitative changes and their practicability,

while the latter ones looked the effectiveness in terms of addressing the intended number of trainees, preparation of manuals, etc.

### **Efficiency**

2. From the study, it has been found out that WEO respondents have no idea about the proper utilization of resources allocated for the capacity building program, however, all program staff anonymously agreed that the program is efficient in terms of utilizing resources. Many woredas are reached with minimum cost and it is expected that all woreda experts in the country, particularly in North Wollo and North Shoa zones, will be trained before the end of 2009.
3. It was also found out that ANFEA-E did not share both financial and activity report to target woredas so as to show the progress of the program.
4. It was also found out that 880 WEO officials and more than 50 ToTs have been trained, 10 training modules were prepared and distributed to trainees and WEOs nationally. In the targeted woredas more than 16 personnel were trained and supplied with training materials, which is more than the planned activities.

### **Impact**

5. Almost 75% of the respondents agreed that they have acquired the necessary professional technical knowledge of non-formal education and understood the concepts well and could develop woreda-based NFE plan. However, most of them responded that they were unable to develop woreda-based NFE policies and strategies and unable to interpret these policies and strategies accurately and consistently. It was also found out that WEO

experts were not capable of interpreting policies and strategies, it is to mean that the training did not help them to do rather it is their former experiences and long years of service that make them capable of doing it properly.

6. Most of the respondents replied that they were not able to produce woreda-based non-formal education supervision manuals after they have taken the training due to lack of financial resource and strong commitment on the part of executive bodies in the woredas.
7. Of the WEO, some 67% agreed that they were able to organize training to their colleagues some how. The implication of this is that the training has brought them some kind of motivation and encourage them share their knowledge and skill to their colleagues in their respective offices.
8. It was also found out that 75% of them were able to strive to meet annual plans and objectives of the education program in each woreda. This may also contribute to the accomplishment of woreda plans on time with better efficiency.
9. When asked to rate whether the training helped them to facilitate the decision making process in their office. 42% and 42% of the respondents rated good and very good respectively. This implies that most of them (84%) are able to improve their decision making ability due to the training.
10. However, it was found out from the response of the program staff of ANFEA-E and Pact Ethiopia that it was very difficult to see the impact of the capacity building program in its three years time after the program was commenced. To them impact is seen after the program is completed.

## **Sustainability**

11. It has been found that 58.3% of WEO respondents replied that ANFEA-E did not design sustainability strategies during the inception and before the commencement of the program. However, the senior program staff assured that efforts are being made to sustain the program by taking different mechanisms while undertaking the program.

## **Best Practices and challenges**

12. The study has shown that WEO officers have participated in the planning process of the capacity building program at least by forwarding their opinion on the type of training to be organized.

13. Most of the respondents agreed that the objectives of the training were relevant to their work.

14. With regard to the major successes of the program, the replication of the training to other woredas of the country with minimum cost, the preparation of relevant and appropriate training manuals based on the need of the WEO and regional education bureau and the assignment of mentors into the WEOs who could assist the NFE program in each woreda, the fair criteria for selection of the trainees and the very limited involvement of political bodies were best practices of the program.

15. Out of the total respondents of WEO, 8 (66.7%) responded that the training manuals were highly relevant and one respondent replied as relevant and the other two said the manuals were moderately relevant to their work.

16. With regard to the appropriateness of the manuals, 10 (83.3%) and 2(16.7%) responded highly appropriate and appropriate respectively in terms of content, objectives, and level of difficulty.
17. It has also been found out that the manuals are prepared by professionals in the field of education particularly curriculum instruction.
18. The study revealed that WEO officials were not involved in the preparation of the training manuals..
19. Of the respondents, 8 (66.75%) confirmed that Woreda Education and training board have selected them for the training and 10 (83.3%) of them responded that the selection was based on the current position they hold. So the selection was appropriate.
20. Out of the 12 respondents of WEO officials, 11 (91.7%) responded that the training venue was selected by ANFEA-E and did not involve WEO for proper selection of venues.
21. With regard to the sufficiency of time for the training, 10 (83%) of WEO officials responded that the time allotted for the training was not sufficient. WEO heads, during the interview session, have strengthened the opinion of the experts in the sense that the time allotted for the training was very short (5 days) to cover the ten modules and it was like rushing. Respondents of the program staff also confirmed the inadequacy of the time for the training.
22. All WEO respondents, 12 (100%) agreed that the training was organized in one place for many adjacent and relatively nearer woredas. According to ANFEA-E Program Director,

when asked why they organized the training in such a way, he replied that the organization was able to minimize cost and address many woredas at a time. Secondly since there was shortage of trainers, it was good to use few trainers at a time efficiently if they organized the training in one place for many woredas.

23. With regard to the participatory nature of the methods used in the training session, all WEO experts revealed that it was participatory. They also reported the method was participatory in the sense that the trainers give group work, pair work and reporting during the sessions.

24. Most of the program staff reported that the training courses were evaluated to fulfill the need of the trainees which is also good to improve and redesign some outdated contents and incorporate new ones.

25. As to the challenges of this program, all trainees, program staff of both organizations (ANFEA-E and Pact Ethiopia) revealed that high turnover of trainees and very low participation of females in the training were the major challenges.

## **4.2. CONCLUSIONS**

Based on the major findings above, the following conclusions were drawn:

- As has been explained in the analysis part, there were discrepancies of responses among the training beneficiaries and the program staff of ANFEA-E and Pact Ethiopia on the effectiveness of the program. The WEO officials do not deny that the program has addressed the required number of trainees needed for each woreda, however they don't believe that the program has achieved its intended



objectives in terms of qualitative changes. On the other hand, the program staff claims that the program has achieved more than its intended objectives. Their achievement is measured in terms of the output they got as a result of the intervention. Based on the experiences gained from other program evaluation documents and from the related literature, it can be said that though the training is provided to many WEO officials and relevant manuals are prepared efficiently unless there are practical changes in the work of the WEO as a whole, to say that the program is effective would be difficult. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the program is efficient in terms of utilizing resources and implementing activities with minimum cost and shorter time, but not effective in terms of achieving the objectives as required.

- The study revealed that there are some positive changes on the part of the trainees in demonstrating performance improvement and on the program as a whole. However, the implementing agency does not have impact indicators in its PMP and this may create difficulty in measuring the intermediate and long term impact of the program now and at the end of the program period.
- As it has been found from the study, ANFEA-E did not design sustainability and phase out strategy in the inception period of the program. Sustainability can be ensured through three levels: financial sustainability, institutional sustainability and program sustainability. If three of them are not planned and prior preparation are not arranged before the commencement of the program, problems may occur at the end of the program period. Thus, it is possible to conclude that this capacity

building program may not continue and be replicated to other woredas of the zones, and regions of the country unless strong phase out and sustainability strategy is in place.

- The program evaluation has shown us that there are best practices of the program in terms of preparing the manuals based on the needs of the participants and selection of trainees and addressing as many woredas as possible with minimum cost and shorter time and evaluation of modules before and after applying them in the field. Thus, it can be concluded that the program has some components that could be easily replicated if the organization has started working on it before the end of the program period.
- It is also found out from the study that turnover of trainees and low involvement of female are the major challenges of the program. If there is high turnover it has cost implications and hampers the effectiveness of the program. The low level of female participation could also minimize the contribution of females in the development endeavor of the country as a whole and particularly in the woredas. Thus, it is possible to conclude that unless these problems are solved soon, the effectiveness and efficiency of the program as well as the gender equality will not be realized.

### 4.3. RECOMMENDATIONS

Finally, the following recommendations are forwarded to intervene with the problem investigated:

- It has been concluded that the woreda education capacity building program run by ANFEA-E is efficient in utilizing resources and covering many woredas with a limited time, human resource and budget, but not effective in terms of achieving its objectives as there is high turnover of trained personnel especially WEO heads and there are no major qualitative improvements on the work of the WEOs. These people are key to the program implementation and facilitate the decision making process. Therefore, to make the program more effective in the remaining time, the following measures should be taken:
  - a) The frequent staff turnover of WEOs have to be minimized by putting in place proper motivation mechanism at WEO level (like organizing different training and other professional development mechanisms) as much as possible if the government wants to achieve the MDGs as planned.
  - b) Instead of rushing into addressing more woredas with minimum cost, ANFEA-E should focus on the target woredas and show remarkable changes since NGOs are working to show that the program could be effective and replicated with minimum cost. ANFEA-E or the donor agency should understand that NGOs cannot replace the responsibility and accountability of the government; rather they show some exemplary work and leave the rest to the government.

c) To make the program more effective, it is also good to train the officials with better time allotment and attractive venue by giving more time to do practical exercises which is directly related to their day-to-day routine work (planning, supervising, report writing, budgeting, training facilitation, etc). Shorter time allotment for the training could affect the effectiveness of the program and the trainees will be in a difficult situation to translate the training into practical work.

- One of the constraints of this program, as identified in the study, is absence of clear impact indicators. All indicators on the PMP are focusing on quantitative changes like the number of woredas covered, the number of trainees, the number of modules distributed, etc. This creates a problem to measure the qualitative changes observed as a result of the intervention. Therefore, ANFEA-E and the donor agency, Pact-Ethiopia, should revise their PMP in the remaining program implementation period and include qualitative impact indicators that could gauge the performance of trainees and improved system of WEO in managing NFE program.
- Sustainability issue is one of the challenges of this program. To make the program more sustainable the following recommendations are forwarded:
  - a) Mainstreaming the NFE program into the WEO strategic plan and allocate sufficient budget. The WEO head should have to negotiate and convince the woreda cabinet members that NFE is an alternative way of addressing UPE and unless NFE is given equal attention like that of the formal education, the woreda couldn't achieve the MDGs in the year 2015.

- b) Involving regional teacher training colleges or universities in providing the woreda capacity building program. In the remaining time, ANFEA-E should start strengthening the capacity of the colleges in terms of training instructors and supporting them with related books on NFE. As a result, the colleges could establish NFE unit or department and start providing short or summer training program on NFE take advantage of it. Training ABE and AFL facilitators could be one of their areas of focus.
  
- c) ANFEA-E and the donor agency should devise a mechanism, before the end of the program period, as to how the program could be replicated to other regions. For instance, negotiating with the government to link the program to General Education Quality Improvement Program (GEQIP) which is being recently launched by the government with the support of donor groups of the country.

## REFERENCES

- Aspinwall, et.al. (1992). *Managing Evaluation: A Development Approach*. London & New York: Mackays of Chattam PLC.
- Barrow, C.J. (2000) *Social Impact Assessment*. London: Arnold Publisher.
- Case R.; Andrews, M. and Werner, W. (1988). *How can we do it? An Evaluation Training Package for Development Educators*. Canada: Research and Development in Global Studies.
- Cracknel, E.B, ( 2001). *Evaluating Development AID: Issues, Problems and Solutions*. London: Sage Publication.
- Critten (1994). *Investing in People: Towards Corporate Capabilities*. London: Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd.
- Dukan, W. (1996). *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge*. Newtown Square USA: Project Management Institute.
- Ginsberg, L.H. (2001). *Social Work Evaluation: Principles and Methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon
- Gosling, L. and Edward, M. (2003). *A Practical Guide to Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Impact Assessment (Toolkits)*. London: Save the Children UK.
- Hopkins, D. (1989). *Evaluation for School Development*. Milton Keynes, Philadelphia: Open University Press.

- IFAD (2002). *Managing for Impact in Rural Development: A guide for Project Monitoring and Evaluation*. Rome: IFAD. Retrieved (April 7, 2008)  
<http://www.ifad.org>.
- Kirkpatrick,D.L (1976). *Evaluating Training Program: The four Levels*. The ASTD.
- Madaus,G.F., Scriven, M.S., and Stufflebeam, D.L. (1983). *Evaluation Models: View Points on Educational and Human Services Evaluation*. Massachusetts: Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishing.
- McNamara, C. ( 1997). *Field Guide to Non-Profit Program Design, Marketing and Evaluation*. Toronto: Authenticity Consulting LLC.
- Milkovich,G. and Boudrea, J. (1988). *Personnel/Human Resources Management: A Diagnostic Approach* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Illinois: Business Publishing Inc.
- Miles, M. B., Eckholm, M., & Vandenburg, R. (Eds.) (1987). *Lasting School Improvement: Exploring the Process of Institutionalization*. Leuven, Belgium: ACCO.
- MoE, (2006). *Education Statistics Annual Abstract (Issue No. 13)*. Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.
- \_\_\_\_\_, (2007). *Education Statistics Annual Abstract (Issue No. 14)*. Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland (1998). *Guideline for Program Design, Monitoring and Evaluation*. Helsinki: International Development Cooperation.

- Owen, J.M., & Rogers, P.J. (1999). *Program Evaluation: Forms and Approaches*.  
London: Sage.
- Patton, M.Q. (1997). *Utilization- Focused Evaluation – The New Century Text (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.)*.  
London: Sage Publications.
- Phillips, J.J. (2004). *Handbook of Training Evaluation and Measurement Methods*.  
(3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Mumbai: Jaico Publishing House.
- Posavac, E.J. & Carey, R.G. (1992). *Program Evaluation: Methods and Case Studies*.  
(4<sup>th</sup> Ed.) Englewood, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Roche, C. (1999). *Impact Assessment for Development Agencies: Learning to Value  
Change*. London: Oxfam GB.
- Rogers, E. M. (1995). *Diffusion of Innovations (4th ed.)*. New York: The Free Press.
- UN, (1989). *The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child: General  
Assembly Resolution 44/25 of 20 November 1989*.
- \_\_\_\_\_, (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. General Assembly resolution 217  
A (III) of 10 December 1948.
- UNESCO, (2005). *Global Monitoring Report, 2006. Education for All*. Paris: UNESCO
- Watson, (1979). *Management Development through Training*. London: Addison-  
Wesley Publishing Company.
- Worthen, B. R. and Sanders, J. R. (1987). *Educational Evaluation: Alternative  
Approaches and Practical Guidelines*. New York: Longman.



Weiss, C.H. (1998). *Evaluation* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed). NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Yin, R. K., & Quick, S. K. (1979). *Changing Urban Bureaucracies: How New Practices become Routinized*. Lexington, MA: D. C. Health.

### **Journals**

Altman, D. G. (1995). Sustaining Interventions in Community Systems: on the Relationship Between Researchers and Communities. *Journal of Health Psychology, 14*, 526-536.

Funnell, S. (1997). Program Logic: An Adaptable Tool for Designing and Evaluating Programs. *Evaluation News and Comment, Vol. 6(1)*, pp. 5-7.

Goodman, R. M., & Steckler, P. H. (1989). A model for the institutionalization of health promotion programs. *Family and Community Health, 11*, 63-78.

Shediac-Rizkallah, M. C., & Bone, L. R. (1998). Planning for the Sustainability of Community-Based Health Programs: Conceptual Frameworks and Future Directions for Research, Practice and Policy. *Health Education Research, 13*, 87-108.

### **Unpublished References**

ANFEA-E, (2005). *Woreda Education Offices Capacity Assessment Document*.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2005). *Woreda Education Office Capacity Building Program Document*.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2005). *Organizational Chart (Organogram)*.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2007). *Annual Report of the WEO Capacity Building Program*.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2007). *WEO Capacity Building Program Financial Report..*

\_\_\_\_\_ (2007). *WEO Capacity Building Program Implementation Plan.*

MoE, (2005). *Education Sector Development Plan III.* Addis Ababa: Ministry of  
Education

\_\_\_\_\_ (2006). *National ABE Strategy Document.* Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as University advisor.

Name: Wossenu Yimam (Ph.D)

Signature:\_\_\_\_\_

Date:\_\_\_\_\_

### **Declaration**

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university and that all sources used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Assen Ahmed Assen

Signature:\_\_\_\_\_

Date:\_\_\_\_\_