

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
RESEARCH AND GRADUATE PROGRAMS OFFICE
REGIONAL AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
(RLDS)

**THE ROLE OF NGOs IN SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT: The Case of
Meki Catholic Secretariat in Dugda Bora Woreda-Eastern Shewa,
Oromia Region**



BY: ADEM RABO

JUNE, 2002
ADDIS ABABA

RLDS
A3R6
2002

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

RESEARCH AND GRADUATE PROGRAMS OFFICE

**THE ROLE OF MEKI CATHOLIC SECRETARIAT IN SCHOOL
DEVELOPMENT: THE CASE OF DUGBA BORA WOREDA IN EASTERN
SHEWA**

BY ADEM RABO



APPROVED BY

SIGNATURE

1. Tegegne G/ Egziabher (Ph.D)

CHAIRMAN

2. Ayalew Shibeshi (Ato)

ADVISOR

3. Zewdineh Yimtatu (Ph.D)

EXAMINER

4. Habtamu Wondimu (Ph. D)

EXAMINER

Adem Rabo

Ayalew Shibeshi

Zewdineh Yimtatu

Habtamu Wondimu

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

RESEARCH AND GRADUATE PROGRAMS OFFICE

**THE ROLE OF NGOs IN SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT: THE CASE
OF MEKI CATHOLIC SECRETARIAT IN DUGDA BORA
WOREDA-EASTERN SHEWA, OROMIA REGION**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO RESEARCH AND GRADUATE
PROGRAMS OFFICE
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER IN REGIONAL AND LOCAL
DEVELOPMENT STUDIES (RLDS)**

BY

ADEM RABO

June 2002

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor, Ato Ayalew Shibeshi, for his patient supervision and advice from which I benefited much. My thanks go to Self Help Development International-Ethiopia (SHDI) and its staff Dr. Awole Mela, Charity Development Association (CDA) and its General Manager Brother Mohammed Ali; and Mr. Fethi Abdulkadir and Ato Ya'ekob Ahmed who extended financial and moral assistance with out which the realization of this study was very difficult.

My thanks are also extended to Oromia Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Bureau, which has sponsored my studies. Finally, I am thankful to Ato Kamal Kedir who send this sponsorship to me in time monthly through banks by facilitating it.

ADEM RABO

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS	PAGES
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS-----	I
TABLE OF CONTENTS-----	II
LISTS OF TABLES-----	VI
ABSTRACT-----	VII
ABRIVIATIONS-----	VIII
1. CHAPTER ONE: -----	1
1.1. INTRODUCTION-----	1
1.2. PROBLEM STATEMENT-----	3
1.3. THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY-----	8
1.3.1. DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AREA-----	8
1.3.2. DATA COLLECTION METHODS-----	9
1.3.3. SAMPLING PROCEDURES-----	9
1.3.4. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY-----	10
1.3.5. THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS-----	11
2. CHAPTER TWO-----	12
2. PARTICIPATORY DEVELOPMENT APPROACHES: - Literature Review -----	12
2.1. WHAT IS NGO?-----	13
2.2. LOCAL PARTICIPATION IN NGOs DEVELOPMENT WORKS-----	14
2.3. THE CONCEPT OF PARTICIPATION-----	15
2.4. THE NEED FOR PARTICIPATION -----	17

2.5. LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION-----	18
2.6. PRINCIPLES OF PARTICIPATION-----	21
2.7. METHODOLOGIES OF PARTICIPATORY APPROACHES-----	22
2.8. PARTICIPATORY RURAL APPRAISAL-----	22
2.9. BENEFICIARY ASSESSMENT (BA)-----	23
2.10. SARAR-----	24
2.11. THE KEY PRINCIPLES OF SARAR METHODOLOGY-----	25
2.12. NEED IDENTIFICATION IN SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT-----	26
2.13. SUSTAINABLE SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT-----	29
2.14. WHAT IS SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT?-----	30
2.15. LOCAL CONTRIBUTION FOR SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT-----	32
2.16. COLLABORATION OF NGOs WITH STAKEHOLDERS AND POLICY FRAMEWORKS-----	34
2.17. PARTICIPATORY MONITORING AND EVALUATION-----	34
2.18. PRINCIPLES OF PARTICIPATORY MONITORING AND EVALUATION-----	36
CHAPTER THREE-----	38
3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC REALITIES AND THE ROLE OF NGOs IN ETHIOPIA-----	38
3.1. POPULATION-----	38
3.2. TOPOGRAPHY AND CLIMATE-----	38
3.3. CLIMATIC CLASSIFICATION-----	40
3.4. RELIGION AND ETHNICITY-----	41
3.5. ECONOMY-----	42

3.6. EDUCATION REALITIES-----	42
3.7. SCHOOL AND SCHOOL FACILITIES -----	44
3.8. ZONAL DISTRIBUTION OF GOVERNMENT AND NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS IN OROMIA-----	46
3.9. NGOs-GOVERNMENT RELATIONS: EXPERIENCES OF COUNTRIES-----	48
3.10. NGOs AND STATE RELATION IN ETHIOPIA-----	52
3.9. NGOs AND POLICY PRESCRIPTIONS IN ETHIOPIA-----	55
3.9.1. NGO REGISTRATION-----	55
3.9.2. AGREEMENT SIGNING AND PROJECT APPROVAL PROCESS-----	56
3.9.3. NGO PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION-----	57
3.9.4. REPORTING-----	58
3.9.5. OTHER IMPORTANT POLICY MEASURES-----	59
3.9.6. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF NGOs IN ETHIOPIA-----	60
3.9.7. SECTORAL INTERVENTION OF NGOs-----	62
3.9.8. ZONAL DISTRIBUTION OF NGOs IN OROMIA-----	62
CHAPTER FOUR: - THE RESEARCH FINDINGS-----	64
4. THE RESEARCH FINDINGS	
4.1. MEKI CATHOLIC SECRETARIAT AND ITS DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES-----	64
4.2. MEKI CATHOLIC SECRETARIAT AND THE EDUCATION SECTOR-----	65
4.3.1. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK OF CATHOLIC CHURCH IN ETHIOPIA-----	65

4.3.2. MEKI VICARIATE-----	66
4.4. ANALYSIS OF MEKI CATHOLIC SECRETARIAT SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES-----	66
4.5. CATHOLIC SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT AND STAKEHOLDERS BASIC NEEDS----- -----	67
4.6. STAKEHOLDERS PARTICIPATION AND CATHOLIC SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT--- -----	71
4.7. CO-SIGNATORIES AND BENEFICIARY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES-----	74
4.8. MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF MCS SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT-----	77
4.9. THE ROLE OF BENEFICIARY COMMUNITY IN SCHOOL MONITORING AND EVALUATION-----	79
4.10. FUTURE SUSTENANCES OF MCS DEVELOPED SCHOOLS-----	81
4.11. GOVERNMENT POLICY AND MEKI CATHOLIC SECRETARIAT-----	85
CHAPTER FIVE-----	87
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS-----	87
5.1. SUMMARY-----	87
5.2. CONCLUSION-----	89
5.3. RECOMMENDATIONS-----	93
REFERENCES-----	97
ANNEXES: - QUESTIONNAIRE	

LIST OF TABLES**PAGES**

1. Table 2.1. Conventional and participatory monitoring and evaluation approaches.....	36
2. Table 3.1. Administrative zones, zonal capitals.....	40
3. Table 3.2 Gross enrollment ratio by Regions.....	42
4. Table 3.3 Government and non-government schools by Regions and grade levels.....	45
5. Table 3.4 Number of schools by grade level, zones and government & non-government in Oromia.....	47
6. Table 3.5 Gross enrollment, teacher-student and student section ratio in Oromia: By zone.	48
7. Table 3.6 Geographic distribution of NGOs in Ethiopia.....	61
8. Table 3.7 Distribution of NGOs in Oromia.....	63
9. Table 4.1 School distribution in East Shewa under Meki Catholic Secretariat Mission Centers.....	67
10. Table 4.2 Number of schools in East Shewa zone by Woreda; government, NGOs and private.....	68
11. Table 4.3 Shows Addressing of beneficiary real needs.....	70
12. Table 4.4 Community participation in school development.....	73
13. Table 4.5 Beneficiary contribution for school development.....	76
14. Table 4.6 Community participation in school development monitoring and evaluation.....	80
15. Table 4.7 Beneficiary characteristics and school sustainability.....	83

ABSTRACT

The main idea of this paper revolves around three major issues. The first issue emphasizes on the gap filling of NGO in development endeavor where the government could not reach with its maximum strife to meet the needs of its society. The second and the major point deals with participatory development approaches that are especially advocated by many development oriented NGOs operating nationally and internationally.

It is generally believed that NGOs have good experiences and strategic approaches than government organizations in participating the target communities and concerned stakeholders in development projects. They work in close relations with beneficiaries; identify their real problems and address the felt needs of the community collaboratively in all aspects.

Many scholars believe that participatory development approaches create self-realization and sustenance and motivate the target population for their own initiated development activities. They also stress on participation of stakeholders for it further enhances the sustainability of the projects. The third point examines government policy and NGO operations. Comprehensive and conducive policies create good working environment for NGOs and smooth relationships with the government.

This research examines the development of school infrastructure by MCS in East Shewa zone with the participation of beneficiary communities and concerned government institutions. The research is based on personal experience, beneficiary interview, co-signatory work review & discussions and library and documentary works on NGOs.

The findings of the study on MCS revealed that no survey was conducted to identify the basic and priority needs of the community. Community and stakeholders participation was very minimal in project identification, design, planning and implementation. Thus MCS is expected to participate all concerned stakeholders in all stages of school development to insure self-reliance among them and the sustainability of the development. Though MCS has good records with government policy implementations at operational stages, the organization abstained from commenting it in any perspectives.

ABBREVIATIONS

- BA - Beneficiary Assessment
- CDA - Charity Development Association
- CRDA - Christian Relief and Development Association
- CSA - Central Statistical Authority
- DPPC - Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Commission
- DPNM - Development Policy Management News Letter
- EC - Ethiopian Calendar
- ECS - Ethiopian Catholic Secretariat
- EEA - Ethiopian Economic Association
- EMI - Ethiopian Management Institute
- GDP - Gross Domestic Product
- GNP - Gross National Product
- GUVS - General Union of Voluntary Society
- IDS - Institute of Development Studies
- LDs - Line Departments
- MCS - Meki Catholic Secretariat
- NGO - Non-Government Organization
- NPDPM - National Policy on Disaster Prevention and Management
- ODPPB - Oromia Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Bureau
- OEB - Oromia Education Bureau
- OSSREA - Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern Africa
- PPP - Purchasing Power Parity
- SARAR – self-esteem, Associative Strengths, Resourcefulness, Action planning and responsibility
- SHDI - Self Help Development International
- TGE - Transitional Government of Ethiopia

CHAPTER ONE

1.1. INTRODUCTION

During the past four decades, the world is experiencing an educational explosion. The number of enrollments in all levels of education has been increasing unprecedently. Due to this incidence, public expenditure on education is consecutively increasing. Though the share of the developing countries in the expansion of the world education system is quite high, all countries of the world are experiencing this educational explosion (Tilak, 1998: 1-3).

Taking into account the role of education in transforming the natural skill of human beings into productive human capital by inculcating skills required, governments are investing huge amounts of resources for the development of educational facilities. By doing so, developing countries are unable to fulfill the needs of their people in this respect. Issues of educational qualities are also moving increasingly into the forefront of educational agenda of policy makers in developing countries.

Recognizing the critical problems being faced by the third world countries in supporting their educational development, donor agencies such as bilateral organizations and NGOs are highly involved in the development of educational projects. Ethiopia is one of these developing countries that are receiving large amount of support for the expansion and quality improvements of the educational sector.

In addition to multilateral, regional and bilateral agencies, NGOs are contributing for the development and expansion of Ethiopian education. One of these NGOs is Meki Catholic Secretariat. The organization has been implementing different school projects development and

operation in many parts of the country. The NGO has many school developments starting from kindergarten up to technical training. This study was confined to schools found in East Shewa zone Dugda Bora Woreda of Oromia Region.

The study investigated the participation of the community and relevant stakeholders in need identification, project design, planning, implementation and monitoring & evaluation.

The ultimate goal of any project is development; development that is desirable is always centered on people. Because of people centered characteristics of development, it becomes obvious that any project that results in beneficial impact on people brings development. Therefore, the more people participate in project, the greater the impact of the project on the community, and the most developmental the project is.

Inadequate participation of the communities in need identification, design and management of the projects/programmes is evidently a major setback in socioeconomic development. To achieve the developmental goals, no resources such as project inputs, and the local beneficiaries capable of contributing to these goals should be neglected. Without involving the communities and other stakeholders, sustainability will remain unfulfilled. If sustainability is not fulfilled, development itself is nothing but it will become wastage of resources.

Stakeholders' participation ensures that projects are more efficient, effective and sustainable. They are more efficient because, by involving all interested parties, a wider knowledge pool is available that supports better design and implementation; financial and other costs may also be shared. They are more effective because, stakeholders' varied interests have been identified and

addressed in the design, and shared ownership of the development means that there is a greater chance of achieving the intended outcome. They are more sustainable because people are encouraged to use their knowledge and take initiatives; and they gain skills and confidence to maintain the benefits once the implementation is over.

Another bottleneck that may undermine NGO-state collaboration and the sustainability of the school development is the delay or absence of policies conducive for smooth development execution. Delay or absence of policies can determine the success or failure of a development project and erode good relationship between NGOs and state.

1.2.PROBLEM STATEMENT

Currently, the roles of non-governmental organizations in development programs are getting momentum in Ethiopia. Education is one of the development aspects [even the basic one] in which NGOs are being involved. Being the basic human rights in which everyone is entitled, the development of schools by government and NGOs has given special attention realizing equal access to education for every native member at large. Given the limited public resources for education in particular and other social services in general, NGOs are filling the gap in all aspects to certain extents.

Believing that “better education and health services to vulnerable, often excluded groups such as those who are illiterate, disabled, elderly, chronically ill or separated by language barriers can help them overcome social obstacles and increase their productivity”, the government of Ethiopia is expanding educational infrastructures greatly and intensively than any time in the past (Thomas and et al, 2000:). To this end, NGOs are changing their attention from relief

operations, which were their main activity in the country to sustainable development activities. It seems that they have accepted the role of education and health in “improving peoples ability to shape their lives strengthening their functionality in society and contributing to their welfare directly”(Thomas, 2000:50).

Meki Catholic Secretariat is one of the NGOs currently operating in Ethiopia in education and other comprehensive development programmes. This thesis focuses on the development of schools by the organization in the Eastern Shewa zone with special reference to the involvement of the Secretariat in Dugda Bora district (Meki). The focal points of the study are the assessments of school development in line with the need of the community they meant for, their participation, contribution to the development of schools, the sustainability of the schools, collaboration of the implementing agency with government organizations and policy issues. 1

Any development activities are expected to answer some basic needs of the society for which they are proposed. Even if the type of the problems to be settled are immense, the community should set the priorities for their multitudes of unsolved inquiries. Filling the gaps without the felt need of the focal people may not answer their question. Needs may vary across cultures and societies. Identifying the problems largely associated with the basic needs of the community should be the role of development agency in collaboration with the target community in concern of what makes life worth living in different cultures and societies (Brohman, 1996: 209). Thus, the study investigated whether the developments of schools are in line with the need of the stakeholders in general and the community in particular. 1

Participation of the community and other stakeholders in the development processes is another point of study. In spite of the multi-dimensional concept of participation, the researcher wants to

stress on the participation of the beneficiary communities and pertinent government organizations in the identification, designing, implementation and monitoring & evaluation of the development of school projects. The researcher conducted this study in the sense that “many of the accepted wisdom about NGOs focus on the poor, cost effectiveness popular participation, flexibility and the innovation.” But there are many occasions in which this concept remained “illusive” (Nibretu, 1998: 4, Brohman, 1996:251). Brohman (1996:201-202) has clearly explained this idea in the following statement.

Development is viewed as a top down process in which important decision making is controlled by major international institution incorporations with local third world elites. Typically international and national ‘experts’ have conceived and designed development projects from the outside. The people to whom these projects are supposedly directed exist mainly in the abstracts as socioeconomic indicators. Popular participation is normally restricted to some hastily organized meetings of which the outside experts ‘brief’ local people the objective of the projects.

The above statement clearly shows the type of participation followed by many NGOs that are described by many donor agencies as ‘the promoters of the participatory development programmes’. This study is expected to explore the level of the participation accredited to the development of schools by Meki Catholic Secretariat.

In any development initiatives, once the real senses of belongingness developed in the community for their own development activities through the types of participation that will build self realization, contributing to such types of development will be the easiest as long as the

service provided by NGOs are tailored to the needs of the communities and capacities of the people. Contributing to support their full implementation can not be a different task.

People can contribute to the development effort in many ways. Starting from the provision of the materials, knowledge and labour to the suggestion of the constructive idea, contribution may take different forms. These will surely help to reduce the cost of development projects, keeps the sustainability of the projects and develop sense of ownership in the target communities. Managing these issues will also help to build self-reliance among the society and initiate them for their own development reducing external expectations all the time. Unfortunately many organizations overlook this issues in their development agendas. This study examined the role of school development with the support of community contribution.

Many development projects have failed without bringing the expected benefits. Sustainability of school projects can also be realized by initiating the beneficiary communities to involve in all levels of development stages. Developing the sense of ownership, creating awareness and empowering the beneficiaries towards full management of their affairs will contribute more for future management and sustainability of the project. This should be done before the phasing out of the project from the development site and be realized before the withdrawal of the implementing agency. The society and the respective government organization should be ready to hand over the project or facilitate the way in which the implementing agency could manage the operational stage. Otherwise the school will collapse or remain unfunctional if there is no responsible body to over take the responsibilities for the continuing provision of the expected services.

The government recognized that the task of development is mammoth and cannot be tackled by it alone. NGOs were becoming a more significant force of development. They were recognized for their abilities to work effectively with grassroots communities and often as an important intermediary between local communities and government or donors. Moreover most NGOs emphasize joint work with user groups, intermediary organizations and other stakeholders.

For smooth work relationships, government requires NGOs to register and follow the policy guidelines of the country in their development endeavors. This will help the government to follow the flow of foreign money, the NGOs activities and also to support NGOs by allowing duty free importation of materials. Since development without coordination is impossible in modern society, government shouldn't overlook and underestimate the important role of NGOs in development. Therefore, for the tolerant and smooth collaboration of government and NGOs, there should be policy guidelines that recognize the useful role that NGOs can play in attracting foreign capital in to the country and promoting development objectives at a time when the government's own resource have stretched to the limit. The formulation of policy avoids open confrontation with government. Lack of policy framework often creates a situation where political influence rather than the use of empirical document information determine where and how NGOs can work (Mungate, 1993:28). Based on the policy statements Ethiopia has, the level of NGO collaboration with government structures at Woreda, zonal and regional levels was assessed in the study. The requirements of some major national state have also been taken into consideration.

This study investigated community participation in need identification, design, implementation processes and their contribution to school development. The sustainability of the developed

schools and collaboration of the NGO with stakeholders, and adherence to the policy guidelines of the national and regional governments concerning NGOs were also the focus of this study. Thus, the study reveals whether the school development intervention by Meki Catholic Secretariat is inline with the needs of the community or filling the development gap that could not be covered by the government.

1.3.RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES

1.3.1.DESCRPTION OF THE STUDY AREA

Dugda Bora Woreda is one of the 12 Woredas in East Shewa zone of Oromia Region. The area lies in the Great Rift Valley system of the Horn crossing Ethiopia. Ecologically, the Woreda is characterized by dry and arid climatic conditions of the low land area of the Rift Valley regions. The district is selected as a study area from all other Meki Catholic Secretariat development centers in the zone purposively. MCS is selected for this study since the organization is involving in education sector more than any NGOs in the area. The main reason for selecting the Woreda is:

1. The existence of all levels of schools starting from kindergarten through elementary, secondary and technical training in the Woreda.
2. Accessibility of the study area so as to complete the thesis in time with limited research fund and time available.
3. Dugda Bora Woreda is the center for MCS project and the coordination office exists in Meki- the capital of the district.
4. It is also easy to manage school study and conduct discussions with project office since the office exists in the same Woreda.

5. Conducting study in all Woredas of the zone can not be manageable due to the time limit and lack of funds.

1.3.2. DATA COLLECTION METHODS

Both qualitative and simple quantitative techniques are used in carrying out the study. Relevant data were collected from primary as well as secondary sources by employing face to face interview, observation and reviewing relevant literature. Face to face interview involved systematic beneficiary survey (Questionnaire), interview with NGO's field staffs and concerned government officials from Woreda to the regional bureau levels by using structured and unstructured interview methods for the triangulation of the results. Secondary data were collected from published and unpublished sources such as NGO's base line survey documents, reports, books, journals, policy documents, and other important publications and documents.

1.3.4. SAMPLING PROCEDURES

The selection of zone and Woreda are purposive. Schools were selected for study beginning with kindergarten and including all grades/levels of schools constructed by Meki Catholic Secretariat. These include one kindergarten, one elementary school, one secondary school and one technical school. Four schools of different levels are taken and their respective adjacent beneficiary Kebeles dwellers were systematically sampled for interview. From each school adjacent Kebeles, representatives were selected by systematic sampling methods. 189 representatives of the beneficiaries adjoining the schools were sampled for interview and other relevant stakeholders such as Woreda, zonal and regional education and disaster prevention and preparedness line bureaus and staff from the Secretariat were interviewed and discussed on the subject.

An interview and discussions with government officials and NGO staffs were conducted by the researcher himself while the beneficiary communities interviews were administered by trained enumerators trained for 2 (two) days about this study under the supervision of the researcher.

In the project proposal, the researcher has intended to take a sample size of 200 beneficiaries. The dwellers were sampled from the Kebele records by systematic sampling method. During conducting the interview, 11 people were not found by the enumerators. Some left the area on permanent and temporary ways and some died. Only one person refused to be interviewed. Thus, the interviews were conducted with 189 representative samples. The Sample is taken from the 1992 EC Kebele residents' registration files.

1.3.5. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The general objective of the study is to examine the Meki Catholic Secretariat school development in the zone whether the development intervention is inline with the needs of the communities in development areas or filling the gap and the needs that could not covered by the government; or based on the organization's own development and philanthropic strategies.

Hence, the specific objectives of the study are: -

1. To assess the participation of the community in the identification, design, planning, implementation and monitoring & evaluation of school development;
2. To study whether the development of schools are based on the felt-needs of the targeted beneficiary society;
3. To find the contribution of the beneficiary communities in the development efforts;
4. To investigate the sustainability of the school development being undertaken by the organization;

5. To examine the development collaboration between the NGO and government and some policy perspectives;
6. To recommend some NGO development implications based on the findings of the study.

1.3.5. THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Based on the objectives of the paper, the following major research questions were formulated and treated in this study: -

1. Did the community and the government participate in MCS schools project identification, design, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation?
2. Was the development of schools based on the felt-needs of the target communities?
3. What were the contributions of the communities in the development of schools?
4. How was the sustainability of school developments addressed by the stakeholders?
5. Had the MCS been adhering to the government policy prescriptions? What inconveniences did the organization face in actuating the Regional NGOs guidelines and the National policy directives?

CHAPTER TWO

1. LITERATURE REVIEW: PARTICIPATORY DEVELOPMENT APPROACHES

This chapter deals with scholarly views of participatory development approaches. It mainly focuses on what participation is and or not, the role of participatory development in meeting the basic needs of the target population in need identification, contribution to the development projects, participatory monitoring & evaluation, the sustainability of the development and government policy concerning NGOs operations.

Since independence, countries in Africa have undergone many ups and downs to achieve sustainable developments. Pre-occupied with crisis, relief & drought management one after another, most African governments have not succeeded in meeting the aspiration of their pre and post independence generation. In addition, the central planning and structural adjustment programmes they adopted have failed to promote development management and achieve their stated objectives.

Sub-Saharan African countries are faced with several social, economic and political problems. One major aspect of these problems is crisis in state capacity. Pertaining to this incapacity of the state, NGOs emerged to fill some gaps of the development of social services. One of these social services is the development of education and educational infrastructure. Many NGOs, religious organizations and foreign communities have been involved in the development of education in various ways recently in Africa. The government of Ethiopia like other Sub-Sahara African countries invites NGOs and charitable institutions to supplement its efforts (NPDPM, 1995:59).

2.1. WHAT IS NGO?

Different literatures define Non-government organizations in various ways. But the core of the concept revolves around related and similar context. Copestake (1993: 5) defines NGOs as “registered, private, independent non – profit organizations”. Informal association, groups and unregistered organizations are excluded by this definition.

Campbell (1996:1-2) said that NGO is “ an organization established and governed by a group of private citizens for a stated philanthropic purpose, and supported by voluntary individual contribution.” This definition does not include the NGOs that are supported by bilateral organizations and governments.

Brohman (1996:253) quoting the United Nations definition of NGO stated that “non governmental organization ... refer to organizations that had a consultative status and received some funding from that body. ... non governmental organization has come to mean any private or community based organization that may receive funding from governments or international organizations but is not direct appendage of them.”

One thing, which the researcher wants to stress here, is that the term NGO and civil society may overlap in many cases. Though NGOs are the member of the civil societies, their specific functions are not far away from the above definitions. In principle, NGO is distinguished from private commercial sectors in that the ‘profit’ of its investment “is wholly for the benefit of its clients; the recipients of the assistance it offers. Unlike a commercial company, an NGO does not necessarily re-invest profit for growth per se; and its ‘shareholders’ are project beneficiaries rather than individual investors or employees” (Bennett and Gibbs, 1996: 1). Civil society

includes “NGOs, trade unions, women’s organizations, farmers, academics, human rights groups, community based organizations and similar groups” (Long, 2001:10).

Generally, NGOs can be divided in to two major categories. These are international NGOs and indigenous (local) or national NGOs. International NGOs are those, which offer funding to, or operating in foreign country than their origin or native country. National NGOs operate only in their country of origin.

2.2. LOCAL PARTICIPATION IN NGOS DEVELOPMENT WORKS

“The growing stature of NGOs in development is related to the decline of the state as the dominant development actors in Africa. There has been a paradigmatic shift since the 1970s in the attitudes of donors and development policy-makers, away from state centered development models towards more participatory, ‘bottom – up’ approaches” (Maxwell, 1996:2).

IDS working paper further elaborates the reason why participatory working approaches are adopted by donors. It says that “the downturn in many economies in the developing world, rising debit, falling terms of trade and the disappointing results of several years of structural adjustment programmes caused donors to recognize the limitations of macro economic interventions. They began to pay greater attention to participation as one of the ways to improve development results” (Maxwell, 1996:9). OSSREA NEWS LETTER states the need for participation by all development actors is for drawing their experiences, knowledge and resources to the realization of common objectives (Kasahun, 2000: 12).

The pioneers of participatory works have also developed a theory of participatory works in 1970s. One of the proponents of such works Paulo Freire established the basic scheme of the theory. Long (2001:7) clearly reflects his idea in his work of “participation of the poor” in the following manner.

His theory was based on the conviction that every human being no matter how ‘ignorant’ or submerged in the ‘culture of silence’ is capable of looking critically at his world, and that, he can gradually perceive his personal and social reality and deal critically with it. Those who, in learning to read and write come to a new awareness of self hood and begin to look critically at the social situation in which they find them selves, often take the initiative in acting to transform the society that has denied them this opportunity of participation.

Participation needs catalysts. But the initiators should recognize the indigenous knowledge of the target people.

2.3. THE CONCEPT OF PARTICIPATION

Given the shortcomings of top – down development efforts, participation has come to be recognized as an absolute imperative for development. Nevertheless, it has remained an elusive concept. Many scholars define participation in several ways. Long (2001:14) defines participation as “a process through which stakeholders influence and share control over their own development initiatives, decisions and resources which affect them.” This implies that the influences of the stakeholders may help in directing the development activities in the way they need.

Brohman (1996: 252) had organized the views of different scholars in his work and their major explanation revolves around the following main ideas.

1. Community participation as equitable sharing of the benefits of the projects;
2. Voluntary contributions to projects without any local influence over their share;
3. An active process to increase local or community control;
4. An active process by which beneficiaries influence the direct and execution of a development project with a view to enhancing their well being in terms of income, personal growth, self – reliance or other values they cherish;
5. He distinguished between coerced participation, induced participation and spontaneous or bottom – up participation. In his view he stressed on bottom – up participation which comes closest to the ideal mode of participation as it reflects voluntary and autonomous action on the part of the people to organize and deal with their problems unaided by governments or their external agencies;
6. Similarly, he identifies authentic participation in which local people democratically control project decision making, and ‘pseudo’ participation, in which projects are carried out according to prior decisions made by outsiders.

Scholars commonly agree that participation, if it is to really release the people’s own creative energies for development must be much more than the mere mobilization of labour forces or the coming together to hear about pre-determined plans. Thus, they agree that participation must be more than a policy statement. There must be a genuine commitment to encourage participation in all aspects of development work. Strengthening this idea, Burkey (1993: 57-58) (in explaining

the idea of Mohammed Anisur Rahman) stated that “participation is a process whose course cannot be determined from outside. It is generated by the continuing praxis of the people, by a rhythm of collection and reflection. ... Hence participation is a continuous educative process, a process of progressive conscientisation.”

Participation does not mean the exclusion of development implementers. But, it is a process through which stakeholders influence and share control over development initiatives, decisions and resource affect them. Full participation of stakeholders facilitates the timely accomplishments of the plan and ensures future sustainability of the services expected from the development.

2.4. THE NEED FOR PARTICIPATION

Participation should not be only in sharing the fruits of development, but also in contributing to the process of development at every stage from planning to evaluation through implementation and monitoring. The reason why participation is preferred or sought is many. Brohman (1996:51-3), Mathur (1986: 16-17), Burkey (1993: 56-70), ODPPB (1999:14) and EMI (2000:4-5) specify why participation is sought.

1. Participation helps to improve the design of policies so that they correspond to the needs and conditions of the people to whom they are directed;
2. Participation is a means of improving the quality and relevance of projects by facilitating their implementation;
3. Participation at the planning stage provides planners with information which is otherwise hard to come by;

4. Help people to accept change more willingly;
5. It reduces cost by mobilizing unused labour and other local resources;
6. It facilitates the timely completion of projects;
7. Participation increase efficiency, reduce cost of monitoring on the spot and promote for their own development;
8. It enables identification of community needs and helps to customize development activities to meet these needs;
9. It provides legitimacy to the project activity, promotes commitment and the participation of the people in its implementation and assures sustainability by building local capacity;
10. Participation is the essential part of human growth, that is the development of self-confidence, pride, initiative, creativity responsibility and cooperation;
11. It leads to greater control of poor people over their own life. Through the acquisition of knowledge and awareness, they become better able to understand the causes of their poverty and be in a better position to mobilize and utilize the resources available in order to improve their situation.

What are explained in the above points helps to internalize the development project to the life of the community and insure the sustainability of the developed infrastructure and secure lasting benefits.

2.5. LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION

While community participation is useful for many purposes, there is no common agreement among the scholars to what extent that intensity should be. Therefore, it is advantageous to

distinguish between levels of intensity in community participation. The study made in Philippine identifies six modes of participation (Mathur, 1986: 19).

1. Where only the educated and moneyed people in the community involved without the participation of the grass roots or the beneficiaries;
2. Where the people or beneficiaries are asked to legitimize or ratify projects identified and formulated by the government;
3. The people are consulted about the project but they do not actually participate in the planing and management of the project;
4. The people are consulted form the very start and they actively participate in the planning and management of the projects;
5. The people or the beneficiaries are represented in the highest policy making body of the agency;
6. The representative of the people control the highest policy making body of the agency.

If the real purpose of participation is to develop human capabilities, the participants must obtain local autonomy in which people discover the possibilities of exercising choice of their own and there by become capable of managing their own development.

Different literatures verify different levels or intensity in participation. Participation can take different forms. The forms range from information sharing and consultation methods to different mechanisms of collaboration and empowerment that may give stakeholders ample chance to influence and control the development projects (Rietbergen-Mc-Cracken, Narayan, 1998: 4-5), Long (2001:16) and EMI (2000:11) identify the following mechanisms of participation: -

1. **Information sharing:** - sharing information with beneficiaries through dissemination of written materials, information seminars, presentation and public meetings
2. **Consultation:** - planners consult the beneficiary communities to secure feedback for project planning, design and implementation stages by conducting consultative meetings, field visits and interview
3. **Joint assessment:** - involvement of the beneficiaries in participatory assessment and evaluations
4. **Shared decision-making:** - greater degree of control over the project in participating at all stages of its development. The decision making participation is a higher level of intensity that help to solve resource conflicts, seek agreements, engender ownership, invite public review of draft documents and subsequent revisions
5. **Initiating action:** - the highest level of participation in which the community take the initiative in terms of actions or decisions pertaining to planning their own development projects

In our case, all actors of development should practice shared decision making if not able to adopted initiating action stages. This does not mean that our community can not take any initiative in their own development program. But development actors who are working for the well being of our community should exercise at least the decision making practice as stakeholders in the development paradigm. The motive to use participatory development methods and the approach to practice depend upon one's perspective on, or philosophy of development. But participatory development should not be a manipulative tool to engage people in a pre determined process, an expedient way to achieve results, or an attempt to support a democratic and empowering process (Keough, 1998: 187).

2.6. PRINCIPLES OF PARTICIPATION

In order to enhance real participation of the target beneficiaries, development actors are expected to follow the basic principles of participation. Some of these basic principles are ODPPB, (1999: 15), EMI, (2000:14-15), Mathur, (198:21) and Keough, (1998, 190-194): -

1. Beginning participation at the very lowest level by giving equal opportunities to the poorest “than to the wispy musings of those who will not identify with them”;
2. Introduce participation in all stages of the development process pre-planning exercise, plan development and implementation to monitoring and evaluation;
3. Adhering to democratic practices and avoidance of solitary vote;
4. Acknowledge the diverse ways of knowledge and respect for people;
5. Approach each situation with humility and respect understanding the potential for local knowledge;
6. Put reality before theory. Make the real issue the starting point than theory;
7. Gathering local support and exercise an option for community;
8. Suggesting local contribution to the project;
9. Take a holistic approach and recognize the complexity of human interactions and the limitations of human designed liner process models;
10. Seek interdisciplinary approach since development is multifaceted;
11. Accept uncertainty and stand by conviction of the value of participatory methods;
12. Insure whether the women’s concerns are addressed.

2.7. METHODOLOGIES OF PARTICIPATORY APPROACHES

Participatory development approaches begin with stakeholders analysis in which each of them learn about each other's roles, and plan for their participation. It involves different participatory methodologies such as Participatory Rural Appraisals, SARAR and Beneficiary Assessment. These methodologies can be accepted throughout the project stages. They can also be used for participatory monitoring & evaluation. By using the combinations of these methodologies, better results have been achieved in many developing countries. Let us see each of them in brief.

2.7.1. PARTICIPATORY RURAL APPRAISAL

NGOs are the forerunners of participatory approaches to development. From these approaches, Participatory Rural Appraisal is being used in many developing countries. At the initial stage, this method was developed for rural areas of the tropics. Recently, its major elements are being used in urban development projects (Kanshahu, 2000: 137).

Participatory Rural Appraisal was developed in 1980s by research institutions and NGOs in Asia, Africa, Europe and United States. It also includes Rapid Rural Appraisal and Agro-ecosystems Analysis. The techniques help in learning rural people's livelihoods addressing the social and physical conditions of rural communities. Participatory Rural Appraisal become an important tool for involving local people in development project, and communicate with the project staff in their own terms. It is "methodologies for shared learning between the local people and outsiders to enable development practitioners, government officials and local people to plan together appropriate interventions" (Rietbergen-Mc-Cracken, Narayan, 1998: 6-7 and 123).

The National Policy on Disaster Prevention and Management prescribes that NGOs submit the project idea and area of operation to line departments. Line departments will accept the project idea after examining it whether the idea goes inline with their development plan. Then the project proposal will be prepared with the NGOs “ with full involvement of the community.” It is also clearly stated that “the project should ensure full community participation” (NPDPM, 1995: 70).

Therefore, Participatory Rural Appraisal can be used as one of the methods for the mobilization of expected participation. Its techniques used to develop a planning method that realizes resource management and plan by involving beneficiaries. By using the approach, one can manage the contribution of indigenous knowledge, skills and labour for the planning and implementation of the development activities from the local people. Since it is a systematic activity carried out by multi-disciplinary team, it enables to acquire new information quickly that will lead to new hypotheses. “ The goal of PRA is development characterized by social acceptability, economic viability and ecological sustainability”(Kanshahu, 2000: 141).

2.7.2. BENEFICIARY ASSESSMENT (BA)

Beneficiary Assessment is a participatory method developed in 1980s by World Bank in the study of urban slums in Latin America. The method gives due considerations to the poor beneficiaries in development projects to express their sentiments. It involves “the use of verbal techniques to facilitate a dialogue with local people.” The analysis of the collected data is left to the outside researcher. Beneficiary Assessment technique involves “higher level decision makers in designing and implementing the consultations with beneficiaries...”(Rietbergen-Mc-Cracken, Narayan, 1998: 7).

2.7.3. SELF-ESTEEM, ASSOCIATIVE STRENGTHS, RESOURCE FULLNESS, ACTION PLANNING AND RESPONSIBILITY (SARAR)

SARAR is a methodology developed by mother and son working together in poor communities in Philippines in 1970s. It was mainly used for raising awareness and empowering the communities to plan local-level development activities and to organize them for the implementation of these activities. The SARAR techniques “empower the stakeholders at different levels to assess, prioritize, plan, create, and evaluate initiatives” based on self-esteem, associative strength, resourcefulness, action planning and responsibility bearing (Rietbergen-Mc-Cracken, Narayan, 1998: 195).

SARAR is recognized for its educative methodology that facilitates working with different stakeholders at different levels, and helps to engage their creative capacities in problem solving and planning. The SARAR attributes and capacities are considered as the minimum for participation to be dynamic and self-sustaining process. According to Rietbergen-Mc-Cracken and Narayan (1998: 196-197), SARAR can be used in: -

1. A broad-based community development context to help generate awareness of particular problems and commitment to address these problems;
2. An agency context to facilitate a joint analysis by staff at all levels, and to help re-orient and train staff in the adoption of more participatory approaches in their interactions with other stakeholders;
3. SARAR methods have been used to help communities to develop their own action plans as part of project planning, and to help them to organize for the implementation of these plans;
and
4. The techniques can also be used to evaluate the existing activity at the local level.

Thus, SARAR methodology has been applied extensively within the development activities of various agencies and NGOs for its contribution to the empowerment of stakeholders of different levels. At the local level, aims not prescriptively to change behavior within the communities, but to stimulate fresh thinking processes. It also aims to enable community members to transform themselves into more capable managers of their lives, and to take responsibility for project activities at the local level. At the agency level, SARAR facilitates non-hierarchical collaboration involving junior and senior project staff in analysis and problem solving (Rietbergen-Mc-Craken, Narayan, 1998: 196).

2.7.3.1. THE KEY PRINCIPLES OF SARAR METHODOLOGY

SARAR methodology has some basic principles, which emphasizes on the fostering and strengthening of the stakeholders involved in it. These principles are believed to enhance the development of people's own capacities for self-direction & management, and the quality of participation among all of the stakeholders. The key principles identified by Rietbergen-Mc-Craken and Narayan (1998: 297) are: -

1. **Associative strength:** - the capacity to define and work toward a common vision for mutual respect, trust, and collaborative efforts;
2. **Self-esteem:** - a sense of self-worth as a person as well as a valuable resource for development;
3. **Resourcefulness:** - the capacity to visualize new solutions to problems even against odds, and the willingness to be challenged and take risks;
4. **Action planning:** - combining critical thinking and creativity to come up with new, effective, and reality-based plans in which each participants has a useful and fulfilling role; and

5. Responsibility: - for follow-through until the commitments made are fully discharged and the hoped-for benefits achieved.

Due to the lack of awareness of what to be done, the attitudes of the beneficiary communities could be negative. In this case, community development agents/social workers have to play an important role in educating the target group. It is therefore advisable that the planning processes of a project should start right from the community. This can be facilitated by using the above discussed methodologies in combinations or separately. Since they are not the only methodologies in participatory development approaches, a development practitioner can use different survey and research methodologies to investigate the felt-needs of the local population and enhance stakeholders participation.

2.8. NEED IDENTIFICATION IN SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT

Modern education started in Ethiopia during the reign of Minelik II. But the educational system did not fully developed until 1940s. However, tradition of education traced back to the church education of the Axumite States and the Quranic schools that lasts up to the present time (Fasil, 1990). Thus, the people of Ethiopia had have been an experiences of schooling their children long ago.

After the beginning of modern school system and the establishment of the Ministry of Education and Fine Arts, greater attention has been given to the educational sector- to the tasks of policy design, planning and implementation. In support of the government strive and response to the needs of the people many Non-government organizations have been involving in the

development of education infrastructures and school operation. One of the organizations involved highly in education sector is Meki Catholic Secretariat

One of the main reason for the failure of the development interventions carried out in top-down procedure is that the implementation of the activities are carried out without the identification of the need and priority setting of the community where the intervention is conducted. Therefore, prior to designing any development programs, the community has to be given a chance to identify their own needs and prioritize them according to their level of problems. Community can participate by providing socio-economic data or information of the area in base line survey and Rapid Rural Appraisals (RRA). Such way of development intervention, when implemented will be sustainable in terms of management, administration and operation & maintenance of the project in collaboration with the community.

Because NGOs are small, flexible and working directly with poor communities, they are better able to experiment with such approaches than larger bureaucratic organizations. Scholars argue that NGOs enhance empowerment and people's participation in their development endeavors. Their view holds that being small and less bureaucratic than government organizations, they operate closer to the beneficiaries, have greater knowledge of local resources and hence they are in a better position to realize the aspiration of the people (Campbell 1996:2). He said that "they are neither coercive nor profit seeking, focusing instead on empowerment and economic wellbeing." Thus, their position is more advantageous to identify the basic needs of the development-affected communities. Moreover, the viability of the development initiatives depends on the level of participation. "The decisive question is not who initiates the development

process ...(Schemale, 1996:8). But the initiated development activities should meet the needs of the target communities.

Schools are institutions where manpower resources are developed. These human development centers need special attention when its physical infrastructure develops. Emphasis should be given to “site, land scapping, play ground and other lands, and classrooms, corridors, weighting and sanitary facilities of the building” (Tamirat, 1999:14). These should be identified with full participation of the beneficiaries.

As the need for modern education is increasing from time to time, the community and other development actors need to identify school compound in consideration to the future expansivity of the school plants based on the technological advancement, introduction of new subjects and new method of teaching, the ever increasing needs for modern school and curriculum changes. The increase in student population due to natural population growth, the expansion of educational programme and population mobility is forcing the expansion and construction of schools (Tamrat, 1999:17). These can not be manageable unless the society believe in it and fully engage in internalizing their problems, and also contribute to it.

Unless society believe that the school is accessible to their children, school development alone cannot be a solution to education problem of the area. If not technical issues like topography, geography, suitability to meet curriculum needs, suitability for construction, attractiveness and school size; location of school, accessibility, the school environment and remoteness should be assessed in collaboration with the beneficiaries (Tamrat, 1999: 22-28).

Agreements on priority needs and problem-solving methods can be reached among the stakeholders by using local knowledge, and needs should be identified according to their priorities. The beneficiaries agreement on priorities of needs is expected to include their participation in implementation, monitoring & evaluation methods, and the type of contribution they provide (i.e. money, materials, labour, attendance of meetings and involvement in monitoring). To have a successful project, the community should accept it and provide moral, physical and financial supports. One way by which local community realizes that they have a role in development project is participating them in all stages of the project cycle. “But more importantly, *the key to success is to involve them in the identification of needs because a project is an answer to people’s needs*” (emphases added) (Kanshahu, 2000: 35-36). School developments are not either. The concepts are central to school projects.

2.9. SUSTAINABLE SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT

Education is the main means of development. Due to lack of capacity, there are many aging children in Ethiopia who have not got the chance to school. Starting from school physical infrastructure to the fulfilling of the necessary materials and teachers require huge investment. These vast investment-requiring establishments should last long providing the expected benefits from education and its roles.

The roles of education are immense. Some of them are (Taddele, 1999:1): -

1. Providing the preparation and training of skilled human resources to manage capital, technology and services;
2. Facilitating, by means of trained personnel, the generation and advancement of knowledge in pure and applied fields; and

3. Performing a consciousness raising function with respect to the use of energy, population control and environmental protection.

According to the World Bank paper for example, educating women increases their income earning capacity, improve their productive health, lowers infant and child mortality and benefit both current and future generation. The paper stresses that “investing in human capital is therefore crucial for economic growth, poverty reduction, and environmental protection” (Thomas and et al, 2000: 50).

The sustainability of the above benefits must be insured by insuring the sustainability of school developments. The expected sustainability can not be realized with out the effective and productive partner-ship of government organizations, the community, private sector and civil organizations (DPMN Bulletin ((Editorial), 2000:3).

2.9.1. WHAT IS SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT?

Development endeavors are expected to last long without failing provision of benefits for which they are meant. Therefore, sustainable development is the development that is likely to achieve lasting satisfaction of human needs for the improvement of the quality of human life. Sustainable development is that which does not degrade environmental quality nor shouldn't reduce productivity in the long run (Elliott, 1996:3).

Though there is no single definition of the concept of sustainability, the following statements represent the most central themes of the concept. In World Commission on Environment &

Development Journal, (Elliott, 1996:6) defines sustainable development as “development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations”. This definition specially related to the use of natural resources. Definition specifically related to development projects is that which Schemale forwarded. He defines sustainability as “the continuation of benefit flows to people/ communities at the grass roots level both after development and independent of the existence of the organization” (Schemale, 1996:8). Schemale (1996:8) further states that the level of sustainability is measured by “the percentage of project initiated goods and services that is still delivered and maintained ... years past the termination of the donor resources, the continuation of local action stimulated by the project, and the generation of the success or services and initiatives a result of project building capacity.”

A key component of development initiative is the viability of the development itself. This viability can be realized through the participation of people from project identification, design, formulation, planning, implementation and monitoring & evaluation. Further components of the viability of the project can be achieved through developing self-reliance among the society. Though the role of outsiders is undeniable, the utilization of local human and material resources should obtain the upper hand so that future managing mechanisms could be established (Schemale, 1996:9). These can be built by participation. Participation builds local knowledge, strengthen local capacity to assess, prioritize, plan, create, organize and evaluate. It helps the building of self-esteem, associative strength, resource fullness, action planning and responsibility to maintain the development. This will keep the development non-decreasing over time, manage all assets, human resources, physical and financial assets. Therefore, there is a need to integrate the technical structure and the power of the mass so that projects could achieve planned

objectives and targets for the longer period of time (Taddele, 1996: 38, Pearce, Barber, Markondya, 1990:3-4).

As indicated in the above discussions, the concept of sustainability is based on the belief that school project implementation should result in benefits that have a lasting effect. This can be obtained by making participants more self-reliant in the management of the project once external project assistance in terms of funds and management skills have stopped. Another strategy to achieve project sustainability is to use appropriate technology and local available resources. A project should use skills that can easily be obtained locally, with or without special training. The services of the project should meet the needs of local beneficiaries. A sustainable project should also have plans to insure the continuity of supportive institutions. Development projects may fail when defectively planned, due to lack of emphases for their sustainability, insufficient stakeholders participation, faulty appraisal & selection and ineffective project co-ordination. Poor project management, political instability and insufficient government participation are also the major factors for the failure (Kanshahu, 2000: 122-123).

2.10. LOCAL CONTRIBUTION FOR SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT

Development will necessarily involve the use of physical, financial and human resources. The use of resources will depend on who controls the available resources and how decisions are made affecting their use. Some resources may come from external sources; this implies a degree of control by outsiders. This raises questions of self-reliance.

People have unique skills and knowledge to contribute. Thus, development practitioners have to respect and well come their knowledge and intelligence (Keough, 1998: 189). NGOs may claim

that they are cost effective than governments. There is also a view that NGOs are more active in economically stable and resources endowment and self-sufficient areas than drought prone and famine vulnerable areas (Nibretu, 1998:4).

As the goal of development is not to develop things, but to develop man (Mathur, 1986:14-15), man has to contribute to his own development. Mathur states that there is a trend in the third world nations to generate the concern with the participation of target groups in their own development. In this case he identifies three main points in development paradigm: -

1. There is a growing awareness among many developing nations that their greatest resources in development process is their own people;
2. Ready consumption of delivered entities is dependent up on actual demand;
3. Centralized patterns of development decision-making have generally been unable to accommodate local socio-cultural variations or mobilize needed local resources.

NGOs, those generally characterized with flexible, decentralized and uncomplicated with bureaucratic channels should use the untapped local human and material resources in a way that self-reliance may develop among the society in contributing to their own development efforts. NGOs should also work to enhance local contribution and establish self-reliance, self-sufficiency among the target societies.

2.11. COLLABORATION OF NGOs WITH STAKEHOLDERS AND POLICY FRAMEWORKS

Prior to the 1980s, the community was seen as the passive recipients of development facilities planned and supplied by government and other Non- governmental organizations. Recently,

community and other stakeholders' participation in all development endeavors have assumed an increasingly important recognition. It is believed that communities and other stakeholders have both the right and the responsibility to be involved in identification, planning, implementation and evaluation of the development programs that either positively or negatively affect their livelihoods. Furthermore, participation of all the stakeholders is accepted as a strategy for sustainable development.

It has to be noted that stakeholders' participation is not a mere concept of influencing the decision and execution of the development project. But it takes into account the communities affected by the project and the interest and concerns of all the people and institutions affected by the development program. This is again governed by policy guidelines, which specify the roles of each party in the development activities.

2.12. PARTICIPATORY MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Schools belong to the beneficiaries. Their sustainability ultimately depends on how much the beneficiaries and other stakeholders are able to monitor and evaluate performances. In this case, all stakeholders of the school project development need to be involved in the monitoring and evaluation right from the inception of the project. Participatory monitoring and evaluation insure clear problem statement & prioritization, and create & promote sense of ownership of the projects. They also enhance the sustainability of development undertakings.

Scholars define participatory monitoring and evaluation in many ways. Accordingly, the concept of participatory monitoring and evaluation is defined as an interactive process of gathering and analyzing information that helps to examine progress, effectiveness, outcomes and impacts of

development programs/projects. It is a process of collaborative problem-solving mechanism through the generation and use of stakeholders' knowledge that leads to corrective actions and participatory decision-making. It involves stakeholders at different levels together to assess development undertakings and take the required corrections in time (Berhanu, 2000:3, Rietbergen-Mc-Cracken and Narayan, 1998:190).

Monitoring and evaluation are interrelated concepts in the sense that they are processes of gathering and analyzing information to be used for the effective management of the development endeavors. However, they are distinct concepts in their focuses and strategies.

Monitoring is a continuous or periodic review of project implementation focusing on inputs, activities work schedules, outputs, etc. It is designed to provide constant feedback to insure effective and efficient project performance and enables the timely identification and correction of deviations in every stages. It provides the opportunity to remedy undesired situations before damages occur or get worse. Thus, monitoring is usually conducted as an ongoing activity throughout the life of the project. Evaluation is a systematic review of the performance, effectiveness and impacts of a project. In most cases, evaluation is undertaken at a certain times, such as at project mid-term or completion and several years after the completion of the project depending on the purposes of the evaluation (Berhanu, 2000:4-5 and Rietbergen-Mc-Cracken, Narayan, 1998:190).

2.12.1. PRINCIPLES OF PARTICIPATORY MONITORING AND EVALUATION

In participatory monitoring and evaluations, conducting users survey or asking community members to respond to questionnaires does not qualify as participatory. Instead, stakeholders at

all levels should be the main actors in monitoring and evaluation processes. They are responsible for collecting and analyzing the information, and for generating the information for change.

Participatory approaches to monitoring and evaluation differ from conventional methods in several ways. Table 2.1. Clearly shows their distinction in comparison.

Table 2.1. Conventional and Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Approaches.

Comparing questions	Conventional Approach	Participatory Approach
<i>-Who</i>	* External experts	* Stakeholders, including communities and project staff, outside facilitators
<i>-What</i>	* Predetermined indicators, to measure inputs and outputs	* Indicators identified by stakeholders, to measure process as well as outputs or outcomes
<i>-How</i>	* Questionnaire surveys, by outside “neutral” evaluators, distanced from project	* Simple quantitative or qualitative methods, by stakeholders themselves
<i>-Why</i>	* To make the project and staff accountable to funding agency	* To empower stakeholders to take corrective actions

Source: Adopted from Rietbergen-Mc-Cracken and Narayan, 1998:193.

According to Table 2.1, conventional monitoring and evaluation tends to be a linear, predetermined, and extractive process to fulfill a management or financial accountability

requirement rather than to identify and respond to a project's changing needs. Outside evaluators are expected to keep "neutral" and facilitate the process.

In other words, participatory monitoring and evaluation involves a more open-ended and iterative approach, whereby the stakeholders themselves conduct the research, and analyze the findings; and make recommendations. The actual works of participatory monitoring and evaluation are decided during the process rather than before, and the work usually includes assessments of the quality of the process as well as quantity of the outputs of a project.

CHAPTER THREE

3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC REALITIES AND THE ROLE OF NGOs IN ETHIOPIA

3.1. POPULATION

Ethiopia is the third populous nation in Africa. According to the 1994 Population and Housing Census, the population size of Ethiopia was 53,477,265. The 2000 Statistical Abstract revealed that the projected total population of the country is 65,344,000. The average growth rate of the population has been 3% per annum. Life expectancy has increased from 43 to 52 years in 1998 (CSA, 1994:7, 2001:18) and Nibretu, 1998:29).

Oromia is one of the most densely populated regions in the country. It has about 18,732,525 population. From these, East Shewa Zone accounts for 1, 668,184. The 1994 Population and Housing Census of Ethiopia indicated that the population size of the Woreda (Dugda Bora Woreda) is 134,454 of which 28,030 live in urban and 107,114 live in rural areas (CSA, 1996:310).

3.2. TOPOGRAPHY AND CLIMATE

Ethiopia is a large country with an area of 1,223,000 sq. km, which is two times the size of France or three times that of Japan. Its topography is characterized by rugged mountains, flat topped plateaus, deep gorges, incised river valleys, rolling plains and many other physical features. Its altitude ranges from the Danakil depression in Afar (110 meters below sea level) to Ras Dashen Mountains (4620 meters above sea level).

Ethiopia has five different ecological zones. These include Wurch (above 3500 meters), Dega (2500 meters), Woyina-Dega (1500-2500 meters), Kolla (500-1500 meters) and Bereha (below 500 meters) which is found at lowest low land areas of the country (Nibretu Kebede, 1998:29).

The physical setting of Oromia occupies the central position in the country forming a watershed for the neighboring regions and countries of the Horn of Africa. It has an estimated area of about 353,690 sq. km that accounts almost for 32% of the total country areas. Territorially, its surface extends from the South-Eastern national border with Kenya across the center extending to the border of Sudan.

Thus, Oromia has a total borderline of 5,672 km that contacts with all the regional states of Ethiopia except Tigray Regional State. The longest boundary contacts are with the Regional State of Nations, Nationalities and Peoples of Southern Ethiopia and Somali, which are 1860 km and 1410 km respectively. Addis Ababa City Government is enclaved within the heart of Oromia (Regional Atlas of Oromia, 1997:3). The City of Addis Ababa had been serving as the Capital of the Region until Adama was announced to be the Capital recently. See Table 3.1 below for further information about the Region.

Table 3.1: Administrative Zones, Zonal Capital, Districts, Population and Area Size of Zones in Oromia Regional State.

S/N	Administrative Zone	Size		Capital	No. of Zonal District	Population size as of 1994 Census	
		In km ²	%			Pop. in millions	%
1	Arsi	23060	6.5	Assella	20	2.33	11.8
2	Bale	66430	18.8	Robe	17	1.28	6.5
3	Borena	95290	26.9	Negelle	12	1.50	7.6
4	E. Hararge	24610	7.0	Harar	15	1.92	9.8
5	W. Hararge	17230	4.9	Chiro	10	1.33	6.8
6	Ilu Abba Bor	15870	4.5	Mettu	12	0.89	4.5
7	Jimma	18490	5.2	Jimma	13	2.06	10.5
8	E.Shewa	13860	3.9	Adama	12	1.76	8.9
9	N.Shewa	11290	3.2	Fiche	12	1.21	6.2
10	W. Shewa	21600	6.1	Ambo	23	2.44	12.5
11	E.Wollega	21980	6.2	Nekemte	17	1.32	6.7
12	W.Wollega	23980	6.8	Gimbi	17	1.62	8.2
	Oromia	353690	100	Adama	180	19.67	100

Source: - Extracted from the Regional Atlas of Oromia (1997:5).

Administratively, Oromia is sub-divided into twelve zones, 180 Woredas and has 375 towns. The rural parts of the Region have 10,161 Peasant Associations while the urban parts have 564 Kebeles in 375 towns (Atlas of Oromia, 1997:1).

3.3. CLIMATIC CLASSIFICATION

Topographically, Oromia inherits the general topographic characteristics of Ethiopia except in certain cases. The climatic region ranges from arid & tropical lands to wet areas and from hot

tropical low lands to cool tropical high lands. The prevailing climatic types of the Region are grouped into three major categories (Atlas of Oromia, 1997:51): -

1. **Dry Climate:** - Includes the hot-arid and the hot semi-arid sub units;
2. **Tropical Rainy Climate:** - Characterized by sub-humid to pre-humid with 600-2800mm of annual rain fall and temperature of moisture region;
3. **The Temperate Rainy Climate:** - High land with moderate temperature and ample precipitation.

Within the Region, though there is great differences from place to place, Eastern Shewa can be categorized under the first two item numbers in most cases.

3.4. RELIGION AND ETHNICITY

Ethiopia enshrines the World's two major religions of Islam and Christianity. Both religions almost holds equal number of followers that accounts for around 40% (i.e. 80% of religious populations in the country) for each of them. In Oromia too, Islam and Coptic Christianity penetrated the Region from the Near East. There are also some traditional religion called Wakeffata followers in the South-Eastern part (Borena zone) of Oromia. Nowadays, the number of Protestants is increasing particularly in urban areas (Atlas of Oromia, 1997:3).

Ethiopia is the land of cultural varieties. Around 80 ethnic groups native to the country live in co-existence. The dominant ethnic classifications belong to Oromo, Amhara and Tigray. Oromia Regional State is the prime Region for the Oromo nation. Other ethnic groups are also residing in the Region though they area minority. Mostly, they are found in urban centers and bordering areas. Amhara is the dominant among the other ethnic groups living in Oromia.

3.5. ECONOMY

The most salient characteristic of many Third World countries is their poverty. This is manifested at the national level by the lower per capita gross domestic products (GDP), unequal income distribution, poor infrastructure, limited use of modern technology, and low consumption of fossil fuels and nuclear energy. At the household level, economic underdevelopment expresses itself in widespread abject poverty including substandard housing and substantial malnutrition. Ethiopia is one of the most poverty stricken countries in the world where the above mentioned characteristics are widely observed.

In 1990s, the average real GDP per capita for the entire developing countries was 2,904 with great variation among different countries. From the developed countries, USA for instance is 15-20 times wealthier than Ethiopia or Rwanda. Ethiopia belongs to the bottom substantial African nations and has \$450 GDP per capita less than that of Sierra Leon (\$580) and Mali (\$550) (Handleman, 2000:4).

The Ethiopian Economic Association annual report on Ethiopian economy indicated that Ethiopia is “ranked at 210th out of a total of 210 countries in GNP per capita measured at the Purchasing Power Parity (PPP)...” The report says that by any measure, Ethiopia is one of the poorest countries on earth (EEA, 2000:1). According to world development report 2000/01, the GNP per capita and the GNP measured at PPP for Ethiopia is \$100 and \$599 respectively. GNP per capita ranks the country 206 while GNP measured at PPP ranks 200 (World Bank, 2001:274).

Generally, the Ethiopian economy is dominated by agriculture. The sector engages about 87% of country’s population, generates 65% of GNP and contributes for almost 100% of export items (Nibretu, 1998:30).

3.6. EDUCATION REALITIES

The Ethiopian government has given high priority to the education sector. Regional States are also pursuing Regional development goals based on the identified priorities. Accordingly, new

curriculums have been developed to address the needs of the community and to empower the students to create their own means of livelihoods.

The educational indicators set for the Educational Sector Development Programme reflect the educational development in the country as much as possible besides the limitations and problems prevailing in terms of quality and coverage. According to the Education Statistics Annual Report, the gross enrollment ratio for all levels of education in Ethiopia is at a very low coverage. In 1993 E.C [2000/01] for example, only about 109,358 children have been reported to have access to kindergarten schools out of the estimated total 5,490,418 of the relevant age group. In the same year, the gross enrollment in primary schools (Grades 1-8) aged population is estimated at 12,904,379 of which only 7,401,473 (57.4%) were enrolled in regular and evening programs (MOE, 2001:3-4). See Table 3.2 for gross enrollment ratio in kindergarten, primary (at grade 6 and grade 8 levels) and secondary schools by Region.

Table 3.2: Gross Enrollment Ratio by Region and by level

S/N	Regions	Kindergart en Schools	Primary Schools		Secondary (9-12) schools
		Enrollment	Grades 1-6	Grades 1-8	
1	Tigray	2.2	83.6	73.9	23.0
2	Afar	0.6	13.3	11.5	3.3
3	Amhara	1.3	64.5	53.3	9.5
4	Oromia	1.4	69.2	57.9	10.8
5	Somali	0.3	13.0	10.6	0.7
6	Ben. Gum	1.8	106.5	88.5	10.1
7	SNNPR	1.5	75.8	63.8	9.7
8	Gambella	0.8	113.5	95.8	17.9
9	Harari	12.0	120.1	105.3	50.2
10	A. Ababa	35.7	131.5	118.3	60.7
11	D/Dawa	9.7	83.6	75.7	32.0
	Ethiopia	2.0	67.9	57.4	12.9

Source: - Extracted from Education Statistics Annual Abstract (MOE, 2001:3-8)

Enrollment in higher education in 1993E.C [2000/01] was 87,431 in all Programmes of regular, evening and summer/Kiramt leaving diploma program in distance education. Out of this, the biggest portion (58.97%) is in diploma programs followed by the undergraduate degree (39.56%) and postgraduate (1.47%). The total number of higher institution graduates in the same year was 17,969 (SIC) (MOE, 2001:8).

3.6.1. SCHOOLS AND SCHOOL FACILITIES

As indicated above, the enrollment rate and school coverage is at lower level despite the current strive to improve the situations. In Ethiopia, there are 11,780 primary and 424 senior secondary schools administered by government and non-government in the year 1993E.C [2000/01]. Totally, there were 12,204 schools. In 1992E.C [1999/2000], there were 11,330 government and 570 non-government schools serving 6,703,518 and 33,399 students respectively. In this year, there were 121,220 government and 7,711 non-government-employed teachers (CSA, 2001:358 and MOE, 2001:83).

These show us that there are dynamic changes in education sector pertaining to the government attention to the sector. Table 3.3 shows the number and Regional distributions of government and non-government schools.

Table 3.3: Government and Non-government Schools by Regions and Grade Levels

Ser. No.	Region	No. of Government Schools		Non-Government Schools	
		Primary	Sen. Second.	Primary	Sen. Second.
1	Tigray	860	33	28	4
2	Afar	123	6	8	-
3	Amhara	2913	79	15	2
4	Oromia	4335	124	173	9
5	Somali	243	10	7	-
6	Ben. Gumuz	278	10	7	-
7	SNNPR	2219	81	86	3
8	Gambella	135	6	1	-
9	Harari	39	3	7	1
10	A. Ababa	73	24	214	25
11	D/Dawa	4	2	12	2
	Ethiopia	11222	378	558	46

Source: -Extracted from Educational Statistics Annual Abstract (MOE, 2001:83)

School facilities are among the main determinants of qualities of education. Where school facilities lack, there is a general belief that the quality of education will be hampered greatly. Many of Ethiopian Schools lack such facilities. By facilities, the researcher mean availability of workshops, laboratories, well-equipped libraries, better spaced classrooms, etc. Non-government schools are relatively more equipped with necessary school facilities though their number is very small compared to the needs of the country.

3.6.3. ZONAL DISTRIBUTION OF GOVERNMENT AND NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS IN OROMIA REGION

Distributions of schools of all levels among different zones of Oromia Regional State show high concentration of schools in certain zones while some have less number. Arsi, West Shewa, East Hararge and West Wollega leads other zones by having more number of schools. But the distributions of all level of schools vary from zone to zone. The following data clearly explain this idea.

Table 3.4: Number of Government and Non-government Schools by zone and grade levels in Oromia

S/N	Zones	Government Schools					Non-Government Schools				
		Grade 1-4	Grade 5-8	Grade 1-8	Grade 9-12	All Schools	Grade 1-4	Grade 1-8	Grade 9-12	Grade 1-12	All Sch
1	Arsi	147	1	324	16	488	3	8	-	-	11
2	Bale	192	-	218	13	423	1	3	-	-	4
3	Borena	157	-	126	7	290	29	20	-	-	49
4	E.Harar	281	-	152	8	441	6	6	-	-	12
5	W.Hara	164	2	108	5	279	3	1	-	-	4
6	Ilu Abb	215	-	142	11	368	-	-	-	-	-
7	Jimma	177	-	207	10	394	4	2	-	-	6
8	E.Shew	103	-	149	12	264	11	38	1	3	53
9	WShew	113	-	318	15	446	2	5	1	-	8
10	N.Shew	103	-	132	8	243	1	-	1	-	2
11	E.Woll	121	-	203	11	335	1	3	-	-	4
12	W.Woll	183	-	239	8	430	10	1	1	2	24
	Oromia	1956	3	2318	124	4401	71	97	4	5	177

SOURCE: - Oromia Education Bureau, obtained on request (December 2001)

Note: - Most of non-government schools are concentrated in the three zones of East Shewa, Borena and West Wollega.

Table 3.5: Gross Enrollment, Teacher- Pupil and Student Section Ratio in Oromia: - by Zone

SN	Zone	Gross Enrollment Ratio				Student : Teacher ratio				Student : Section ratio			
		Gr 1-4	Gr 5-8	Gr 1-8	Gr 9-12	Gr 1-4	Gr 5-8	Gr* 1-8	Gr 9-12	Gr 1-4	Gr 5-8	Gr 1-8	Gr 9-12
1	Arsi	104	33	70	12	89	38	68	40	79	61	74	73
2	Bale	81	28	55	12	57	28	45	39	53	42	50	60
3	Borena	72	20	47	4	73	39	62	33	78	65	75	65
4	E.Hara	87	20	55	4	89	48	77	39	86	70	82	63
5	W.Har	69	19	45	5	70	39	60	34	80	74	78	76
6	Ilu Abb	101	39	71	13	46	40	45	37	56	59	57	77
7	Jimma	78	19	50	6	76	34	61	34	74	55	69	75
8	E.Shew	92	35	64	20	78	37	60	48	84	64	78	88
9	W.she	76	27	52	11	80	37	62	46	76	53	69	77
10	N.She	69	19	45	9	62	31	51	38	65	50	62	74
11	E.Woll	81	41	61	17	60	39	51	54	66	60	64	75
12	W.Wol	107	44	77	9	87	51	73	48	80	69	77	76
	Oromia	85	28	58	10	73	38	60	42	74	59	70	75

Source: - Oromia Education Bureau, obtained on request (December 2001).

* Gr: - Grade

Enrollment ratio decreases drastically with the increments of grade levels in all zones of the Region. Particularly, grades 9-12 records reveal very low enrollment ratio.

3.7. NGOs-GOVERNMENT RELATIONS: EXPERIENCES OF COUNTRIES

The degree to which national and international NGOs are able to have policy influence depends on the nature of the relations with government. Whether NGOs leaders are able to cultivate close personal contacts with the powers of the existing state or not is one of the best predictors of the major and sustainable impacts.

The Chilean experience shows us the rise of NGOs in Chile in 1970s has been in response to the growing socio-economic and political crisis prevailed in the country. "Struggling against human rights violations, political operations and the neo-liberal economic model created the conditions for their emergence. Protected by the church, NGOs in Chile have begun to articulate an alternative development programme for the country." Currently NGOs are playing key roles. They have been involved in educating the people, and training volunteers to defeat the dictatorship in the country. They are also working towards the promotion of democracy and strengthening of a civil society based on collective self-reliance (Wils and George, 1993/94).

NGOs and government relations in St. Vincent and the Grenadines in the Caribbean trace three distinctive stages. The first stage was the period of the colonial rule that lasted till the end of 1960s. This period was characterized by the birth of many service or welfare NGOs. The second stage was marked by the national resistance till 1979. This period saw the birth of NGOs that work for the development of anti-colonial consciousness. The third period was characterized by the rise of development oriented NGOs that greatly involve in project promotion.

Jamaica experienced two distinct and opposing umbrella organizations. The first umbrella encompasses 67 member NGOs established in 1940 and primarily oriented to service/welfare approach. Initially, it was funded by USA Multi-National Company and latter on by Jamaican government. These resulted in the loss of its autonomy being subjected to funding agencies. It has close relationships with the government almost bordering on dependence. The second umbrella came into being in 1984 embracing 12 development oriented NGOs. This group of

NGO focuses on “net working and support to its members and does not receive any grant from the government.” It “maintains autonomous and dignified posture towards government” which resulted in a lot of tension in its relationships with the government. Currently, it is attempting to play an active advocacy in respect of government policies and programmes.

NGOs were the victims of political suppression during the period of dictatorship in Argentina. They were incapable to defend themselves in the absence of any support from the church or any other institutions. Since the return of democratic governance, a new generation of NGOs is emerging in the country. Thus, a new space has been opened for relating with the government. Though the past experience of the days of dictatorship is still weighing heavily, NGO-government relations are evolving (Wils and George, 1993/94).

In Sri Lanka, Sarvodaya Movement has grown to a large size since its establishment in 1950s. It covers about 10,000 villages (one-third of the Sri Lanka) and have 9,000 full time workers and 41,000 field workers with an annual budget larger than the Ministry of Rural Development. Sarvodaya Movement involves vastly in to the hinterland with its mighty resources, strong spiritual & moral philosophy and leadership. This makes the organization an object of envy by the officials in power. But its size and mighty has helped to survive and continue to contribute great. Nowadays, by demonstrating an alternative ways of life, it is changing into social movement (Wils and George, 1993/94).

After independence, a large number of NGOs have emerged in Bangladesh and played great roles in the reconstruction of the country. More than 200 NGOs have been receiving fund from

foreign donors. For the control of these NGOs, the government issued restrictive legislation, which has been resisted by the NGO coalition. The legislation requires that all NGO projects have to be approved by government before they can be implemented. But there is a large NGO called BRAC which manage to obtain credibility and recognition in the eyes of the government. BRAC obtained this status in a nation wide child survival programme called Extended Programme of Immunization. In this programme, the NGO covered about 85,000 village in Bangladesh to help organize people to take advantage of the programme. It is this exemplary collaboration with the government in a national programme, which helped to build the credibility and recognition from the government (Wils and George, 1993/94).

Jordan has 630 philanthropic NGOs that are organized under an umbrella of General Union of Voluntary Society (GUVS), and have more than 80,000 people working with them. The government brought in legislation in 1966 to provide legal framework for registration and gave the Ministry of Social Development an authority to register, investigate and direct NGOs in the country. The Ministry has also authorized to approve the names of the elected representatives of NGOs after security clearance is obtained. Jordan NGOs have autonomy in raising funds from national and international sources up to \$30 million per year. In this case, an interesting fund raising mechanism is by drawing National Lottery in Jordan by GUVS volunteers to finance the work.

At last, in Indonesia, NGOs working in the village is expected to require permission from provincial government with an acknowledgement from Regional government. The provincial governments do not provide this permission easily many times, and even if the permit is given,

local planning agency may not allow NGOs to work smoothly. If local NGO work is different from the official plan, it may create disagreement and NGO may be forced to withdraw its work from the village. In such case, only personal relationship and understanding with the local government can solve the problem. This situation “makes the NGO dependent on the personal whims and fancies of the local officials” (Wils and George, 1993/94:6-18).

3.8. NGOs AND STATE RELATIONSHIP IN ETHIOPIA

NGOs-state interactions could be confrontational as well as collaborative. NGOs may see collaboration as unnecessary restrictive mechanisms. Recognition of the potential for collaboration can raise question like ‘why it was not being realized’? Individuals and their respective institutions, broader political, social and economic factors (Copestake 1993:5) can also determine the scope for collaboration.

The Ethiopian history of the political economy determines the type of relation between State and NGOs. Since the emergence of the long-lived religious affiliated missionaries and that late 1984 drought and famine responded groups, NGOs have been involved in different activities and programs. It is after 1984 that direct and indirect assistance of international community expands in different sectors. Under these conditions, relations between NGOs and state have passed different periods. The first major period is the military regime and socialist ideology. Under this regime, relation between NGOs and state is characterized by strict state control and hostile environments. The hostility was reflected in expulsion of humanitarian NGOs, prohibition from challenging government policy, and giving an option to operate through state structures at local level. During this period, even the mother coordinating body for NGOs- i.e. the Christian Relief and Development Association /CRDA/) was only “limited to ensuring the autonomy of member NGOs and promoting inter – NGOs co-operation”(Campbell, 1996: 14).

After the establishment of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, civil society institutions services are somewhat expanded. More liberal political and economic environment has been created for NGOs including the grassroots participation approaches. Willingness and the desire to incorporate NGOs project into national development objectives and the autonomy given to CRDA to coordinate NGOs offered potential for facilitating co-operative NGO – state relations (Campbell, 1996: 15).

But there is still a gap to be fulfilled by both parties. Government should guide NGOs participation in development in terms of its areas of participation and general development of the country as a whole. For this purpose, there should be comprehensive policy guidelines that govern stakeholders recognizing their potential for collaboration. Ethiopia has no such comprehensive government policy on NGOs. However, there is the trust of government policy statements and guidelines by ministries and regional bureaus. The guide line for the implementation of the national policy on disaster prevention and management (NPDPM, 1995:1) states that “ concerned line departments are expected to develop additional details on those components of the manual which fall under their mandates.” The manual admits the deficiency of the guidelines and its future refinements. Therefore, detailed policy instruments are lacking and there is no clear demolition and specific descriptions, which govern the activities of NGOs in development in details.

Education is a process by which human being transmits his knowledge’s, values that enables individuals and society to participate in development, strengthen problem solving capacity, helps human being to choose best way of doing things and introduce changes of all round in preserving

his environment. Education promotes respect for human rights and democratic values in such a way that people develop mutual understanding and co-operation (TGE, 1994: 1-2).

Saying little about the advantages of education, Ethiopian education system has been slimed by inadequate educational facilities such as overcrowded classrooms, shortage of books and other teaching aids and low quality teachers training and then low quality education. Lower primary education participation, limited opportunities for upper education levels and repeated relapse and discontinuity in literacy campaigns are other major problems. Insignificant level of education infrastructure especially to the largest rural population hinders the provision of education in general and quality of education in particular (TGE, 1994: 3).

Pertaining to these problems, the TGE has given priority to education among the other development endeavors. For this purpose, a policy dealing with all levels of education was formulated in 1994. This policy has given emphasis for the expansion of education and decentralized, efficient and professionally coordinated participatory system in management and administration of education system in general. In this policy paper, a general statement briefing the involvement of non-government organizations says, “ government and non-government organizations can establish training programs, according to their needs”. It also states that “ due attention will be given to popular participation production, distribution, utilization, up keep care and safety of educational technology and facilities. The participation of various organization and individuals will be enhanced. ... clear guidelines, stating the rights of all involved in education, will be issued to ensure participatory and proper professional relations in their activities (TGE,1994: 26-29).

The policy does not indicate the role of the non-governmental organization in clear manners. According to the information obtained from the Ministry of Education public relation services head Ato Shimeles Latike, the expected “clear guide lines” for those NGOs who can participate in education has not yet been issued. The absence of clear guidelines for NGOs activities can lead to misunderstanding among state officials and NGO staffs. It also creates problems in following up their works, as there is no clear-cut criterion to base on.

3.9. NGOs AND POLICY PRESCRIPTIONS IN ETHIOPIA

3.9.1. NGO REGISTRATION

The general guidelines of the National Policy on Disaster Prevention and Management (NPDPM) issued in 1995 authorized the Relief and Rehabilitation Commission later on Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Commission (DPPC) to register NGOs desired to work in Ethiopia. The registration is required to provide legal status for NGOs working under the framework of the guidelines and policy & regulation of the country. Thus, every NGO desiring to work in Ethiopia must get registered in the Ministry of Justice to get legal status and sign operational agreement with DPPC. Project agreement is entered with Regional Bureaus where they implement their projects. NGOs are expected to fulfill some requirements to be registered and obtain legality. These include (NPDPM, 1995:62-63): -

- * Submitting their request to the Ministry of Justice with supporting documents;
- * Certificate of registration in the country of origin for international NGOs;
- * Supporting letter from funding organization; and
- * Project idea by area of preference, experience and credentials of their board members (for local NGOs).

3.9.2. AGREEMENT SIGNING AND PROJECT APPROVAL PROCESS

After securing certificate of registration from the Ministry of Justice and signing the general agreement, NGOs should submit their project proposal with plan of operation to DPPC. The proposed plan of operation is expected to include (NPDPM, 1995:65): -

- ❖ The type of activity they would like to undertake;
- ❖ The type and amount of resources they allocate to undertake the planned activities;
- ❖ The agency they would like to channel their funding through;
- ❖ The agreed terms of operation with the recipient and annual plan of operation; and
- ❖ Areas of operation.

After reviewing the plan document, Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Bureau (DPPB) will approve the project and signs a tripartite agreement in the presence of Line Departments (LDs) and NGO themselves. The role of DPPC at the national level and BPPB at the Region is only to see the document from policy perspectives and its conformity with the basic principles of the policy guidelines. However, the line departments/ line Bureaus examines the technical feasibility of the development plan and check whether their program is inline with the development direction of the country or not.

NGOs project may have national coverage or targeted to one or more Regions. In this case, the approval and implementation of such project involves the joint agreement between DPPC, the Regional States (with their line Bureaus) and the NGOs themselves. Decision is made based on the immediate needs and priorities of the Region, or its development direction. Thus, the Regional States have the right to accept or reject proposals based on the pre-established criteria

(NPDPM, 1995:67-70). The objectives of NGOs registration and project agreement signing are (Nibretu Kebede, 1998:36): –

- ♦ The need to publicize their activities to the people and to the donors;
- ♦ For accountability of their works;
- ♦ To make sure that they have capacity to accomplish the intended activities; and
- ♦ To assure whether the NGOs are free from litigation for criminal act, anti-religion, anti-race, anti-government activity and other social taboos.

3.9.3. NGO PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The general guidelines state that “the partner LD shall monitor the progress of the project through site visits and reports and NGO should promote transparency in all its activities.” It further notifies that monitoring can be managed through monthly and quarterly reports that the NGOs submit to co-signatories and through site visits. To verify reports (NPDPM, 1995:71-73). Basically, line Bureaux/LDs conduct field visits to monitor and evaluate projects at least once in the middle of its implementation by a team of members. DPPC plays a coordinating role and acts as the head of the team in the evaluation process. DPPB performs similar functions at the regional level.

3.9.4. REPORTING

NGOs are expected to report to relevant LDs, BPPB and DPPC about their works. Accordingly, the required reports are categorized under two general sections

1. Overall Status Report: - These types of reports are required by DPPC as a legalizing body of NGOs in the country. The needs for such types of reports are originated “to know the NGO

resources, operation and other related matters on regular basis.” Under this category, the following reports are needed from NGOs (NPDPM, 1995:73-74): -

- **Status Report:-** an annual report to be submitted in January each year on the resource status of the agency
- **Fixed Asset Reporting:** - an annual report to be submitted to DPPC every January
- **Resource Utilization Report:** - annual report to be submitted to DPPC every January
- **Stock Report:** - monthly report to be submitted to DPPC Desk Officer at the beginning of every month.

2. Activity Related Report: - These reports are required at various levels i.e. DPPC, Regional Line Bureaus, DPPB, zonal DPPD, zonal and Woreda LDs. Since the reports are too many for NGOs to report, Regional Bureaus are ordered to duplicate and disseminate the reports to their respective LDs at zonal and Woreda levels. But, NGOs should submit to all Regional Bureaus that are involved in the development projects. The types and frequencies of reporting is as follows (NPDPM, 1995:75-76): -

- **Quarterly Progress Report:** - Reports of projects/programme progress in every three months
- **Terminal Report:** - detailed report submitted by NGOs at the end of the project period
- **Project Performance Evaluation Report:** - analytical report executed by LDs that focus on the technical aspects of the projects (such as impact, sustainability, community role, linkage with development objectives, etc.)
- **Report by Funding Agency:** - only submitted to DPPC or DPPB quarterly on funds granted to implementing NGOs or LDs together with the purposes of grant.

Besides the above mentioned requirements and other crude policy statements, NGOs are expected to be “operational, should adhere to the rules and regulations of the government, follow this guideline

[NPDPM], respect the general agreement as well as specific project agreements, and aim at assisting the people and the government and/or eliminating vulnerability to disaster” (i.e. NPDPM, 1995:77). The general guidelines did not touch any specific sector of development programs and there are no specific rules and regulations concerning particular sectors. Education sector is one of the fields about which nothing is issued similar to other field of development for NGOs’ guiding.

3.9.5. OTHER IMPORTANT POLICY MEASURES

Taking the diversity of NGOs in Ethiopia into considerations, the government has issued the following policy measures: -

1. Due to the existence of persistence problems in the country, the policy underlines the urgency of promoting self reliance and sustainable economic development by giving priority to and building the capacity of forgotten, backward and affected areas;
2. Encourages registered NGOs to generate and mobilize additional resources from external sources on behalf the people of Ethiopia and utilize effectively;
3. Allows NGOs to be involved in income generating activities that would support the implementation of their projects;
4. Urges NGOs to incur minimum for overhead costs vis-à-vis to direct costs;
5. Create employment opportunities for Ethiopian nationalities. The policy states that the number of expatriate staff should not be more than three including the country representative. Shortage of competent national staff, technical requirements of the project and the size of capital to be invested are considered in approving the employment of expatriate staffs. Unless the nature of the project forced them, it is impossible for NGOs to employ expatriates for a project that worth below one million Birr;

6. Requires that all the available documents and accounts are audited by local chartered accountants. In order to increase accountability to the government, the selection of auditors should be done jointly by donors and government. It also states that a system involving the beneficiary communities must be established to control the embezzlements, corruption and poor performances of NGOs (NPDPM, 1995:76-81).

3.10. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF NGOs IN ETHIOPIA

During the 1997, there were around 307 NGOs in the country from which 162 were local and 145 were international (Nibretu, 1998). Currently, there are 416 NGOs from which 127 international and 289 are national. Table 3.6 shows the Regional distribution of NGOs.

Table 3.6: Distribution of NGOs in Ethiopia

Ser. No.	Regions	Number of NGOs
1	Addis Ababa	100
2	Afar	10
3	Amhara	65
4	Oromia	95
5	SNNPR	70
6	Tigray	27
7	Somali	25
8	Ben. Gumuz	15
9	Harari	10
10	Gambella	90
11	D/Dawa	13
	Ethiopia	416

Source: - Up dated data obtained from DPPC by interviewing/Decemder/2001

Note: - Some NGOs are working in more than one Region at a time.

The distributions of NGOs are not based on the economic statuses of the regions. It is not also based on population sizes and geographic area of the regions. Addis Ababa for instance, has more developed economy than any region and its population is very small (2,570,000) in comparison to that of Oromia or Amhara which hosts 32.15% and 30.13% of the country's population respectively (CSA, 2001:22). Economically, these two Regions are by far less developed than Addis Ababa.

3.10.1. SECTORAL INTERVENTION OF NGOs

As long as their work is inline with the NPDPM and its directives, and other government policies, there is no restriction on NGOs; involvement in different programmes. Thus, NGOs working in Ethiopia are involving in the following major sectors.

❖ Social Welfare	100 NGOs
❖ Health Care Programme	60 “
❖ Education and Training	60 “
❖ Water and Sanitation	95 “
❖ Agri., Soil and Water Conservation	41 “
❖ Integrated programmes	60 “
❖ Relief and Emergency Services	26 NGOs*

* NGOs operating in Relief in addition to the above sectors

From 416 NGOs, 107 are just entering into work by signing agreements.

3.12.2. ZONAL DISTRIBUTION OF NGOs IN OROMIA REGION

In Oromia, NGOs are running 254 projects in twelve zones by allocating 1,091,639,993 budget in cash and 10,382,828 MT in kind. They have 13,566,568 beneficiary population.

Table 3.7: Distribution of NGOs in Oromia

S/N	Zones	No. of NGOs	No. of Projects	Project Budget		No. of Beneficiaries
				In Cash	In Kind/MT	
1	N. Shewa	22	26	95,840,240	-	484,810
2	E. Shewa	54	56	167,874,371	5,060	620,402
3	W. Shewa	33	36	123,997,411.9	3,454	886,066
4	E. Wollega	6	7	6,451,639.5	-	55,905
5	W. Wollega	3	6	35,754,464	-	478,978
6	Ilu Aba Bor	3	4	32,621,570	315	16,204
7	Jimma	9	12	26,488,880	950	404,498
8	Arsi	11	17	40,517,381.7	565	356,542
9	Bale	5	9	55,970,448	5,800	509,767
10	Borena	15	30	103,220,998	3,220	837,356
11	E. Hararge	7	11	86,211,975	5,720	1,664,828
12	W. Hararge	6	9	77,193,319	9,467	94,240
13	More than one Zone	19	31	239,997,297	10,348,277	7,156,982
	Oromia	193*	254	1,091,639,993	10,382,828	13,566,568

SOURCE: - Taken from ODPPB reports (December 2001).

* Note: - An NGO may work in one or more zones at a time. Therefore, the total number does not show the number of NGOs Working in the Region

CHAPTER FOUR

4. THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1. Meki Catholic Secretariat and its Development Objectives

Implicitly, the central theme of the Meki Catholic Secretariat's development endeavor is meeting the needs for children's basic education, health care protection and overall development; equipping the students with basic skills and provision of rehabilitation therapy for handicapped children. The development objectives include meeting the needs for women's health and medical care, creating income generation opportunities and provision of clean and safe water. The scope of development covers the sectors of education and child development, health care, safe water supply, women in development (WID) and agriculture. The implicit short-term objectives of the secretariat are: -

- ❖ More healthy children and women with reduced mortality rate and access to safe water supply;
- ❖ Increased school enrollment;
- ❖ Improved early childhood care and development practices;
- ❖ Enhanced youth and women skills and improved access to parents for undertaking income generation activities.

Where as the long term expected out-puts are: -

- ◆ Improved development of children, better opportunities for alleviating poverty and attaining social and economic security; and
- ◆ Enhanced capacity to meet children's needs and an empowered community.

4.2. Meki Catholic Secretariat and the Education Sector

Education, as a very important factor to human development is a high priority in the overall development endeavor of the country. Hence, the Secretariat has extended its involvement in school development to various localities of Rift Valley area of East Shewa, Arsi and Bale zones of Oromia Region by establishing vocational and technical schools, school for the blind, rehabilitation of handicapped center and early child development centers.

The education programme of the project has been designed for the following specific and implicit objectives to be achieved with in the duration of the project period;

- 1- Increasing the number of school enrolled children through provision of basic education;
- 2- Running early child development programmes in an already established kindergarten;
- 3- Equipping vocational school enrolled students with basic skills in carpentry, mechanics, dress-making ...

The major activities that are meant to cover in the learning needs of children encompasses academic education, sport, drama, moral and sport at kinder garden, Elementary, secondary schools, school for blind and handicapped centers while vocational education covers carpentry, mechanics, dress making... .

4.3.1. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK OF CATHOLIC CHURCH IN ETHIOPIA

The Archbishop of Addis Ababa leads the Catholic Church. Ethiopia is divided in to eight dioceses, which serve approximately 560,000 people in total. The Episcopal archdiocese is based in Addis Ababa. However, there are apostolic vicariates in Awasa, Soddo –Hosanna, Harar, Meki and Nekemte next to the eparchy of Adigrat. Jimma has been added as an apostolic prefecture.

Overall policies are set at the Ethiopian Episcopal conference. Each bishop however is responsible for the activities of the church in his diocese. In Ethiopia, there are also fifty religious orders (43 female and 13 male), working in parishes, hospitals, clinics, schools, WID programmes etc.

The Ethiopia Catholic Secretariat (ECS) has been established in Addis Ababa for coordination at national level of church activities, social work, human development, and welfare and relief services. There are eight different departments, among others for education, medical services, and welfare and development.

4.3.2. MEKI APOSTOLIC VICARIATE

Meki started as a prefecture in 1980, and became a vicariate in 1992. In Meki vicariate, there are ten mission centers. Each of which has on average four outstations. They are based in Alem Tena, Asella, Gambo, Goba, Gighessa, Mine, Robe, Shashemamme, Woragu, Wonji, Zuway and Meki itself. The focus of this paper is Meki vicariate school development activities.

4.4. ANALYSIS OF MEKI CATHOLIC SECRETARIAT SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT

Meki Catholic Secretariat is the overall coordinator of a programme called “ East Shewa, Arsi and Bale comprehensive development programme”. Under this programme, school development is one major component. The Secretariat had built 22 schools currently operating in East Shewa zone of Oromia Region. See Table 4.1 showing school distribution under 7 mission centers of Meki Catholic Secretariat in East Shewa zone.

Table 4.1: School Distribution in East Showa under Meki Catholic Secretariat Mission Centers

S/N	Type of schools	Meki Catholic Secretariat Mission Centers						
		Alemtena	Chighessa	Gambo	Meki	Shashemen	Wonji	Zuway
1	Kindergarten	1	1		1	2	2	2
2	Elementary school	-	1	1	1	1	2	2
3	Secondary school				1			1
4	School for blinds					1		
5	School of dress making		1					
6	Technical school				1*			1

Source: Adopted from quarterly reports to ODPPB by MCS

* Technical school was available but now closed down.

As indicated in the above table, MCS has all grade level of schools starting from kindergarten to secondary and technical training. The specific study area i.e. Dugda Bora Woreda and the study site Meki holds all level of schools except that the technical school is not functioning currently.

4.5. CATHOLIC SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT AND STAKEHOLDERS BASIC NEEDS

The need for schools in East Shewa zone in general and Dugda Bora Woreda in particular is not yet close to the expectations of the community and the realities set by the Education Bureau of the Region. Thus, there are many gaps that need to be fulfilled in school construction. Table 4.2 shows school developed by government, NGO and private sectors and their distribution by Woredas.

TABLE 4.2. : NUMBER OF GOVERNMENT, NOGS AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN EAST SHEWA ZONE BY WOREDA

S/N	Woreda	Government schools				Non-government schools				Private schools			
		Primary		Secondary		Primary		Secondary		Primary		SECONDARY	
		1- 4	1- 8	9-10	9-12	1- 4	1 - 8	9 -10	9 - 12	1- 4	1- 8	9 - 10	9 - 12
1	Adama	13	25	3	1	1	3	-	1	1	4		
2	Ada'a	13	24	1	1		1	-	-		3		
3	Akaki	7	3					-	-				
4	A/Negelle	4	32		1		1	-			1		
5	Adami TJK	8	5	1		1	3	-	1				
6	Bosat	9	9	1				-	-				
7	Fantalle	4	10		1	1	1	-	-	1			
8	Siraro	8	9					-	-				
9	Lume	2	13	1			1	-					
10	Shashemen	4	32	1	1		7	-	1		1		
11	Gimbichu	4	12					-	-				
12	D/ Bora	11	14			1	1	-	1				

Source: - East Shewa Education Department (February 2002)

As we can observe from the table above the scarcity of the school is acute in some Woredas above first and second primary levels.

Pertaining to the wide spread school scarcity in the area, NGOs have little involvement in school construction .One of the NGOs is MCS that has large share in school development than any NGOs in the area. Some of the schools developed by MCS backs to a decade and more years. In those days, there were no schools in places where the organization built the current operating schools. Additionally, MCS has been opening new school in recent years. However, community and other concerned stake holders are not properly participating in need identification design,

implementation and operation as per the Regional NGO Guideline and National policy on disaster prevention and management issued by the country. The MCS is filling the created gap and other stakeholders are celebrating the situation, as there is no any other alternatives. According to the discussion made with Oromia Education Bureau / department from the Woreda to the regional level, ODPPB, and MCS, the community and other concerned stakeholders are consulted for the purposes of information sharing and exchange of views through meetings called by MCS. In most cases, the MCS write a formal letters for the purposes of sharing views only. There is no case where the organization conducts a form of survey that helps to identify the priority needs of the community and other stakeholders. The data collected from the beneficiary sample survey also confirms the above explanations.

TABLE 4.3. Shows Addressing of the Beneficiary Real Needs

S/N	Description of the variable	Number of the respondents out of 189 sample population		
		Frequency	%	Remark
1.	Initiation of School Development			21 (persons) responded that they don't know who initiate.
	- By Community	11	6	
	- By Meki Catholic Secreta	130	69	
	- By government organization	12	6	
	- All in collaboration	12	6	
2.	Addressing of Community real problem in school development			
	- Real and basic needs addressed	157	83	
	- Real need not addressed	16	8.5	
3.	Approval of School Construction			Only 19 (Person) said that all in collaboration approve it.
	- Approved by MCS and community	15	8	
	- By MCS and government organization	52	28	
	- MCS alone	54	29	
4.	Acceptance of schools by the community			
	- Accepted	153	81	
	- Rejected	1	0.5	
	- Partially accepted	7	4	
5.	Identification of school problems as			
	- The fist priority	141	75	
	- Not the fist priority need	10	5.3	

Source: - Own survey of February 2002

As indicated in Table 4.3, initiation of school development, approval and identification processes are almost solely conducted by MCS. Other stakeholders have little involvement. However since

there were no schools in the intervened area, the community has accepted the developed schools as the only solution to their immediate problems. Out of the sample survey identified for the research question, 81% accepted the developed schools while only 0.5% (1) person said he is inconvenient with them. Though the beneficiaries are in agreement with the levels of schools developed by MCS, the high school fees paid by parents for schooling their children and the low capacity of the schools to cater the large number of students are forcing them to complain excessively. We will discuss more about this under sustainability issues.

4.6. STAKEHOLDERS PARTICIPATION AND CATHOLIC SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT

Basically, participation is not a lip service or motivation of the beneficiaries in the development process though we are addressing their basic and priority needs. It should be the real involvement of all concerned stakeholders in a particular development endeavors from the very beginning to the utilization of its fruits.

From the survey conducted by this research paper, all the Catholic schools are developed in needy, remote and schools scarcity (almost school less) areas. All government signatories and the beneficiary communities confirm this reality without any hesitation. But they all agree that Catholic Secretariat did/does not conduct any survey in identifying the problem of the society except that it is addressing the untouched needs of the beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

The reason mentioned by co-signatories for not participating the stakeholders and the beneficiary communities are: -

- Since school problems were common to all corners of the country, it was not much enforcing to invite other stakeholders to identify the existing problems.
- As there was no clear policy guidelines and specific NGO governing bodies and regulations, there were no urging situations in the past for MCS to follow participatory development approaches.
- Most of Catholic schools are very old and their time of development had not required survey and participation due to the existing policy of the then government/regime.
- Currently, though policy guidelines and governing bodies are identified, Catholic Secretariat is working with stakeholders at the level of opinion sharing by formal letter for exchange of ideas.
- Co-Signatories are not strongly enforcing the Catholic Secretariat to work according to their specific responsibilities and country's/Region's policy guidelines. All blame each other for their failurity.

The only thing the MCS did in school development endeavors as the project Office State is that “formal letter writings and meetings for exchange of views and news.” Community participation is “not so much. In some minimal cases, communities are asked their general views. The extents that the community’s participate does not exceed beyond consultation and information sharing”.

Let us see the results of the schools’ beneficiary survey regarding the above discussions. See Table 4.4 for understanding the characteristics of community participation in school development.

Table 4.4: - Community Participation in School Development

S/N	Description of variables	Respondents Responses (Out of 189 sampled survey)		Remark
		Frequencies	%	
1.	Participation of community in the school development/ construction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participate - Not participate 	21 141	11 75	The remain didn't respond
2.	Stages at which the community started participation in school development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Problem identification - Site Selection - School Construction - From need assessment to School development 	9 5 11 8	5 3 6 4	
3.	How they begin to participate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Represented by Kebele - Initiated by MCS - Represented by government offices - Participate willingly 	9 7 2 8	5 3.7 1.06 4	
4.	Role of participants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information sharing - Consultation - Joint assessment and evaluation - Deciding on different aspects of school development 	11 8 11 9	6 4 6 5	

Source: - Own survey of February 200

Participation from the community side is very minimal. Out of 189-survey sample population, only 21 person (11%) said that they participate in school development in one way or another. Leaving the non-respondents for question raised regarding participation, 75% said that they did not participate in any level of participation stages in school development processes. Even those who said that they were participating in school development confirmed that their participation is not consecutive. 5% involved during problem identification, 6% participate in school construction processes and only 4% participate from need assessment to full school development activities. The manner of participation varies according to their invitations to participate in school development activities. They were represented by government offices, MCS and by their own willing. See the preceding table above.

4.7. CO-SIGNATORIES AND BENEFICIARY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Currently, development partnership is getting momentum due to the burden it releases and the role-played for the sustainability of the development endeavor. Stakeholders' contributions minimize the expected costs of the project and motivated self-reliant development activities among the participants. It also initiates the sense of ownership among beneficiaries. This leads to the proper management of the developed infrastructure for lasting benefit provision and also enhances beneficiaries self-motivated development feelings in their localities.

Contribution for common development motivates campaigning for common development initiatives among the users of the fruits of their endeavors. This paper analyzes the contributions of the beneficiary communities and the other concerned stakeholders on the fields of school development processes by MCS in Dugda Bora Woreda.

Co-signatories (ODPPB and Oromia Education Bureau) have a lion share from the government side. ODPPB facilitates duty free importation of the necessary equipment from the foreign markets including vehicles. Custom duties are covered by the Regional State for all items MCS imports concerning the schools and other agreed upon projects. Further more local purchases, Electricity and water supply, telephone or radio communication services are facilitated by ODPPB in collaboration with Education Bureau and MCS. Education Bureau provides the necessary technical support when required by MCS. It also facilitates the provision of school compound and designs in collaboration with other stakeholders. At the operation stage, books and other necessary teaching aids are provided to Catholic schools as available and when required.

Catholic Secretariat is the sole responsible in covering the construction costs and school facility fulfilling. Though the government has no capacity to cover costs of construction and school facilities, MCS did not require any involvement from the government side to share the burden.

Concerning the development of school infrastructure, MCS did not require any contributions from the beneficiary communities. Communities did not refuse to contribute. But MCS avoid cost sharing attitude. Table 4.5 shows beneficiary responses regarding school development contributions.

TABLE 4.5. : Beneficiary Contribution for School Development

Ser. No.	Description of items	Community Respondents		Remark
		Frequency	%	
1.	Community contribution			
	- Contributed	12	6.3	
	- not contributed	146	77	
2.	Type of contribution			
	- Money	7	4	
	- Labour	9	5	
	- Materials	2	1.06	
3.	Local Resource Utilization			
	- Hiring local labor forces	128	68	
	- Contracting out the project	80	42	
	- Employing outsiders of the locality	18	9.5	
4.	Reason for not contributing (community)			
	- Not asked	139	74	
	- Economic problem	22	11.6	
	- Lack of interest to contribute	0	-	

Source: - Own survey of February 2002

The contribution mentioned (6.3%) in the above table does not directly related to any type that MCS asked from the society; but it is in the form of hiring local labor forces for school projects. Except hiring labor for school construction, community was not asked to contribute for school infrastructure development. However those respondents who are sending their children to MCS schools are paying high school fees for school operations currently. No community member has said uninterested to pay any contribution for school projects though some respondents complain about their personal economic problems that hinders them from contributing.

The current development strategy of the government confirms that the community has to contribute certain amount to their development projects for sharing costs and motivating

development initiatives among the society. The sharing of costs is also intended to develop self-sustenance and avoid dependency syndrome. But Catholic Secretariat seems failed to adhere to these issues in initial project identification and infrastructure development. The strategy followed by MCS does not comply with NGO guideline and participatory development approaches. MCS should take community contribution for the sake of not having capacity for its self but for participating beneficiaries in their development activities.

4.8. MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF MCS SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT

According to the information obtained from ODPPB, Oromia Education Bureau (OEB) and NGO Guideline, NGOs are implementing agencies. In most cases, NGOs implement development projects by fulfilling solely project budget, manpower, necessary equipment, organizing required administration structures and units and managing the whole development processes. They are responsible to submit annual and quarterly action plans before the end of every year in December. During implementation period, they are obliged to report the progress of the project quarterly to the Co-signatory line Bureaux and departments. The same is true when government offices and NGOs implement projects in collaboration.

Line Bureaux require quarterly and annual performance report, fixed Assets, Audit and terminal reports from NGOs. Using performance reports and quarterly review meetings, co-signatories monitor and evaluate the development activities of NGO projects in general. MCS school projects are some of such development interventions that are continually supervised, monitored and evaluated by concerned government offices.

Centrally, Disaster prevention and preparedness commission and ministry of justice monitor and evaluate MCS activities and all other NGOs development performance. Especially, they require Audit Report and activity performance reports. DPPC in particular supervise project at field level to see their progress in addition to the quarterly and annual reports.

At the Regional and zonal level, OEB and ODPPB follow up MCS school development activities through the above mentioned different reports and quarterly review meetings. OEB closely supervise MCS technically while ODPPB facilitate in most cases joint terminal evaluation and quarterly review meetings. Starting from the Woreda level, all co-signatories appreciate the regular and in most cases the timely reporting system of MCS performance reports. The only complain the researcher encounter about reporting is over utilization of budgets. The reporting format has been developed at the Regional level in collaboration with all NGOs representatives and Regional Bureaux. The Format clearly identifies activities, budget per unit of the activity, Capital and Recurrent expenditure. Construction and Non-construction activities are identified. New and ongoing construction activities have separate reporting pages.

By using the reports, quarterly report review is compiled and sent to all signatories and regional council by ODPPB. The copy of the review is sent to implementing NGOs so that they can provide feedback on the raised issues. In cases when the parties are not satisfied with the responses, they will conduct round table discussion with the organization and reach on consensus. ODPPB is responsible to facilitate such sessions being a focal point for NGO and government line Bureaux. In quarterly report review, the following parameters are being used by ODPPB.

- Timely reporting of the performance
- Implementation of planned activities in the time frame.
- Implementation of unplanned activities during the quarter (if any)
- Capital, activity and Recurrent budget utilization VS the activity performances.
- Reconciling budget expenditure and performed activities with the project document and annual plan of operation
- Plan VS achievement comparison
- Examining level of collaborations with stakeholders.
- Examining any change reported, required or amended in project plan and in the agreed upon document.

Through monitoring and supervisions conducted during project development and implementation period, no major disagreements have been reported as mentioned by government signatory Bureaux except over utilization of budgets and minor deviations from action plans. At initial project identification, design and approving, Catholic Secretariat is blamed by Line Bureaux and beneficiary communities for not participating stakeholders. After project agreement is signed, the organization follows up the guideline and stick to the project agreement. Thus, no major complains were raised in the monitoring and evaluation reports about MCS. In other ways, MCS restrain to give any information on these subjects. But it openly condemned unprocedural and excessive involvement of Woreda Education office in the school activities.

4.9. THE ROLE OF BENEFICIARY COMMUNITY IN SCHOOL MONITORING AND EVALUATION

In all stages of Catholic school development, community participation was very minimal. Most of the community (sample) does not know whether MCS school development activities are monitored or evaluated. The Line Bureaux and the MCS it self confirmed that rarely communities are invited for providing information and are susceptible to casually structured and unstructured question and answers. Conventionally, they are not required to participate in assessment and problem analyses. Table 4.6 shows participation of community in MCS school development processes.

TABLE 4.6. : Community Participation in School Development Monitoring and Evaluation

Ser. No	Parameters Description	Responses of the Beneficiaries (189)		Remarks
		Number	%	
1.	Community Participation in monitoring and evaluation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate • Not Participate • Doesn't Know 	38 134 17	20 70.9 10	
2.	Invitation of community representative for parameter setting by Co-signatories <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invited • not invited 	38 16	20 8.5	The remain do not know
3.	Participation on of the beneficiaries in analyzing the monitoring and evaluation findings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate • Not participate 	28 68	15 36	ditto

Source: - Own survey of February 2002

You can observe that beneficiary communities are neglected to participate in their affairs. Even the government Bureaux who formulated the guidelines that urges participatory development

approaches did not practice their statements and rules. The value of the guideline does not pass than its print on the paper. Those who responded that they participated in monitoring and evaluation did not analyze the findings except three people. Thus, the role of the beneficiary communities has been neglected by implementing and executing agencies.

4.10. FUTURE SUSTENANCE OF MCS DEVELOPED SCHOOLS

Sustainability is the central theme of any development activities. In places where there is no sustainability, projects will not provide the expected benefits to the target community. Without considering long future service provision of the intended projects, expending resources is wastage. When we come to discuss the sustainability of MCS School projects, the community is schooling their children in the developed schools than any other government or private schools in their area. By sending their children to MCS schools, they are contributing great for the operation of the schools in the form of school fees currently. The schools are receiving high fees than any other schools in the locality. The community is highly complaining about high fees levied by MCS on the students. But they are forced to continue schooling their children in the same schools due to: -

1. Quality of education

- Full day work or teaching program
- Better teachers' qualification and devotion than government schools.
- Close monitoring and supervision of school operation than any other schools in the area.
- Managing students discipline through ethical or moral education.
- Strong students performance evaluation system etc.

2. School facilities

- Better-equipped classrooms and schools compound recreational facilities.
- Relatively standardized student-class ratio (30-50) in a class
- Comparatively better equipped library, workshops, teaching aids, laboratory and other related school facilities.

3.High students' performance results than other non- MCS Schools.

According to the data gathered from the beneficiary communities and concerned government organizations, the above mentioned specific criteria for MCS schools are those qualities which urge the community in continue to teach their children in the schools. Though MCS emphasize that “What the students pay as a school fee is very minimal compared to what the schools contributes to the society”, the beneficiaries responded that they are ready to quit sending their children to MCS schools if they will get another opportunity. There are cases when those parents whose two or three children reached the age of education but send only one or two children to MCS school and send the remaining child to other school due to high costs that will incur on them if they send all to MCS schools. There are also cases where a family or families restrain to send their children to Catholic schools due to the high amount of school payment that they cannot afford. This condition will undermine the sustainability of the schools in cases when the society gets alternative solutions that can replace what MCS schools are providing currently. Table 4.7 shows the responses of the beneficiary communities regarding MCS schools.

TABLE 4.7. Beneficiary Characteristics and School Sustainability

S/N	Inquiry Description	Beneficiary Responses		Remarks
		Frequency	%	
1.	Parents Sending their children to MCS Schools.			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sending • Not Sending 	125 63	66 33.3	
2.	Reason for not sending to MCS School			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Fee • Limited Capacity of Schools 	37 24	19.6 12.7	
3.	Differences observed among students who learn in MCS Schools than Others	182	96.3	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In students performances 	175	92.6	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Discipline 	165	87	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethical or moral education 	123	65	
4.	Difference Observed by Community among students who learn in government schools than MCS			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Low results of students performance 	140	74	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less disciplined manner • Poor quality of education 	127 145	67 67	
5.	On termination of MCS school Projects			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Community Will take Over Operation •Community Will Appeal to government 	13 168	6.9 88.9	

Source: - Own survey of February 2002

MCS has put a “sanction” on the community to teach the students in the schools. The organization justifies this restriction in relation to the capacity of the existing schools to accommodate all needy people and maintaining teaching and learning quality. For this purpose, it has put the following measures for students who can learn in the schools.

1. Academic intelligence
2. Age factor.
3. Conducting entrance exam to reduce high demands or applicants
4. Full day school attendance that is very tempting for poor families and the rural farmers.

MCS is not conducting awareness creation programs among societies regarding the sustainability of schools and building the capacity of the beneficiary community to wards taking the responsibility of school operation in the future. The community believes that MCS will continue school operation for long periods of time in the future. In cases when the organization terminates its operation, they are not in a position to take over the responsibility for operating schools. To the contrary, they want to appeal to government to hand over and continue the service.

From the government side, the project document and the signed agreement states that Oromia Education Bureau shall take over the schools when Catholic project will terminate. The termination processes are explained in the phase out strategy in both project document and operational agreement. Generally, it is stated that Catholic Secretariat will hand over the schools to Oromia Education Bureau with all their facilities and cover their operational costs for a year after phase out. To finalize this section, the researcher expresses that MCS is expected to expand the schools capacity in collaboration with communities and government in order to accommodate

the appeal of the beneficiaries and deal with school fees with all the stakeholders. Thus, community may participate in schools sustainability.

4.11. GOVERNMENT POLICY AND MEKI CATHOLIC SECRETARIAT

MCS had fulfilled all the requirements of the government centrally and regionally. It had secured: -

- Registration for legality from Ministry of Justice;
- Operational agreement with DPPC;
- Project agreement with Regional Bureaux, and
- Is working based on the education policy of the country.

All government stakeholders confirmed that MCS is in good relationship and compliance with government policies. They said that no major inconveniences have been recorded about government policy and guidelines concerning MCS in particular. Especially, Oromia Education Bureau and ODPPB express that the organization is collaborative in all aspects of the policy issues except participating the communities and concerned line Bureaux in need identification, design and formulation of projects. After passing these stages, there are no major violations and deviations observed in MCS operations.

In other hand, MCS reserves responding to the question raised regarding government policy and NGO operations. The organization totally chooses not to respond on the raised questions fearing the negative repercussions. It wants to respond positively for all inquiries. But, the researcher chooses the first alternative because he found that the answers would not reveal the reality between government policy and NGO operation. The reason expressed by the organization is it wants a “safe” way of working with government based on the existing polices than to

recommend any thing. The organization perceives that in case the organization recommends the policy, it will violate the current operation atmosphere that exists between government and the NGO. Thus, it restrains not to publicize any comment concerning government policy issues. Therefore, we have no more discussion on this subject beyond what have been said.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. SUMMARY

The findings of the study are stated in major parts of the paper. For the purposes of reminding the main points, the following summary is provided as follows.

1. With the objective of enhanced education programme and widely dispersed Mission Centers for the achievements of this objective, MCS has built 22 schools in East Shewa Zone that comprises kindergarten, primary, junior secondary, senior secondary schools and technical training centers.
2. During problem identification, design, planning and implementation of school projects, MCS did not conduct any assessment or survey to identify the basic needs of the target population. Stakeholders and community participation was hardly measurable in all stages of school infrastructure development. But all the developed schools fulfilled the untouched gap in the sector and are solution to the scarcity of the schools in the area. If ever participation is mentioned, it went not more than consultation for the purposes of information sharing and exchange of ideas.
3. The development of MCS schools in the area started more than a decade ago. The scarcity of the schools in those days was common to all the corners of the country. Participatory development approaches may not be the principles of the then regime and the period itself. However, MCS is following its old day's strategies of filling the gap without assessing the priority needs of the target population in current school development. Beneficiary priority needs were not being set and concerned stakeholders

were consulted for information purposes than real participatory development approaches that enhance self-reliance among the target groups.

4. Beneficiary communities were not required to contribute for school development. The communities were not also refused to share the costs of their own developments. But the MCS avoids cost sharing attitudes as replayed by MCS project office. On the other hands, co-signatory government Bureaus were involved in contributing for school development and operations. Their involvement was revealed more or less in facilitating duty free importation of necessary equipment, facilitating local facilities fulfillment and technical supports when required. At the operation stages, community pays school fees as operation costs through their children who attend education in MCS schools.
5. Government and NGO staffs had been conducting monitoring and evaluation on MCS school projects. Communities had no major roles in this respect. In cases the team for monitoring and evaluation wished to inquire them for the purposes of information gathering, the representatives of the communities were invited for structured and semi-structured questions. Participating the communities in assessment and problem analysis was not internalized to the monitoring and evaluation procedures of the LDs.
6. If not forever increasing and unendurable school fees that is tempting the community to stop sending their children to MCS schools, the sustainability of the schools will be conditional. It is well stated in the project document in the phase out strategy of MCS projects from the area that Oromia Education Bureau will hand over the schools with all the facilities and with one-year operation costs. If MCS is to continue school operations, school fees should be reduced in consensus with community and co-signatories. The

capacity of the schools should also be enhanced to accommodate the demands of the target population through common contributions of all stakeholders.

7. MCS is in good collaboration with government stakeholders and policy guidelines at the operation stages of the schools. It is fulfilling all the requirements from the government side. However, the organization refused to respond to questions related to policy issues. It also abstained from providing any comment on government policies concerning NGOs in fear of the repercussions. In principle, MCS should strive to comment government policy on points that need to be improved, changed, amended or to be formulated for further improvements of policy and avoidance of inconveniences in NGOs' operations in the country.

5.2. SUMMARY

The basic theme of this study is investigating stakeholders' participation in school development in all its stages of infrastructure establishments. The findings of the research are discussed in the preceding chapter above. In this section, the researcher concludes the following main points: -

Meki Catholic Secretariat, being the focal point of this study in school development is currently operating in East Shewa, Arsi and Bale zones of Oromia Regional State. The organization has established 22 schools in East Shewa (the study area) comprising all level or grades starting from kindergarten to high schools and technical training centers. The general objective of MCS schools development is meeting the needs of children's basic education. Meki Vicariate was established in 1992 to coordinate the development

activities of the Catholic Church with its 10 mission centers in East Shewa, Arsi and Bale zones. These mission centers are responsible for their church development activities coordinated under MCS.

MCS school development in the study area (Dugda Bora Woreda) backs to two and above decades. Establishments of school started in this Woreda – especially in Meki town when there was no government involvement in this respect. No survey was conducted to identify the basic needs of the community. But schools were developed to fill the existing gap in the education sector. Currently, old schools are expanding and new developments are also emerging. However, MCS is following the old day fashion and its non-participatory approaches in need identification. The organization did not conduct any survey to identify the basic needs of the community. Though policy and guidelines are formulated at Central and Regional levels to guide NGO development involvement and participatory development approaches, MCS seems reluctant to adhere to these directives at the initial development intervention stages. The communities and other concerned stakeholders are being consulted to exchange ideas and information when they feel necessary on ‘formal’ meeting (s) than real participatory development approaches. The executive co-signatory government organizations (at the Regional level) blame each other for their inability to enforce the organization to strictly follow the guidelines and policy directives. Though MCS did not conduct any survey to identify the needs of the community, the community accepts the developed schools, as there is no other solutions to their immediate problems besides the high school fees being paid by the parents.

Beneficiaries and co-signatories are partners in development. They are partners in that all share costs of the project according to their role and responsibilities indicated in the project document and agreement. The study reveals that co-signatories were contributing their lion-share according to the agreement and project document. This does not mean that signatories have been performed all the requirements per their agreement. However, in one way or another, they have been involving greatly in facilitating duty free importation of foreign purchases and local facility fulfillment (ODPPB), and provide technical supports (OEB) based on their limited capacity on request. On the other hand, the beneficiary community was neglected to contribute to the development of the schools. Except hiring local labour force and utilization of some resources, no contribution was required from them. At initial school development periods, the community was not mobilized to contribute any thing. It is at the school operation stages that they began to do so in the form of school fees levied on those students attending their education in Catholic schools.

MCS is fulfilling all the requirements of Line Bureaux during project implementation period. Annual plan of operations, performance, assets and audit reports are being submitted to DPPC, Ministry of Justice and Regional Line Bureaux and departments. In return, these government offices are supervising, monitoring and evaluating the status of MCS projects hierarchically. There is complaining from MCS side about the excessive involvement of Woreda Education Office in the activities of school operations. On the other hand, the beneficiary communities did not have significant roles in project supervisions, monitoring and evaluation processes. Even the government concerned

organizations have been ignored the on participation of the communities in these respects. Seldom, their representatives are invited to be questioned for the sake of information provision in structured and pre-planned manner. Hearing the results of the evaluation and other related decisions has not been familiar to them. Thus, the beneficiary communities are obscured from school development intervention in many phases though they are using them when operation started by paying the ever-mounting fees that is tempting their endurance.

The sustainability of schools emanates from the service they provide to the beneficiaries. All the stakeholders are satisfied by the development of schools in the area. The communities are sending their children to learn in. Since all schools answers the untouched problems of the society, the demands for such intervention are so high. But these are about to be detained due to high school fees required by MCS and the low capacity of schools to handle all demanding beneficiary population. The community is about to switch off if other alternatives are available to school their children than to pay such high fees. Some have already started this action by sending their children to Zuway, Modjo and Nazareth (Adama). What are forcing the beneficiaries not to stop sending their children to MCS are: -

- ♠ Relatively better quality of teaching and learning environment in MCS schools,
- ♠ Unavailability of the required grade schools in their vicinity than MCS built schools,
- ♠ Lack of capacity (income) to send their children to teach in far places.

Therefore, the government has to intervene and regulate school fees and enhance school capacities to accommodate the demands of the community through different strategies.

Policy directives and guidelines help to facilitate working environments among the different partners. MCS is one of these partners working with Central and Regional government Offices and beneficiary communities. The organization has been fulfilling all the requirements of the government and is currently working in collaboration & smooth relationships. It is responding to the requirements of the Regional and Central State policies and guidelines. The government Officials confirms that MCS is working in compliance with policy guidelines and prescriptions. However, MCS refused to provide any comments regarding the government's policy and guidelines in fear of the publicizing of the comments. This fear itself indicates that there are inconvenience with the policy issues and MCS operations. As an NGO, the organization should have expressed out the ailments of the government policies and recommend on those issues that need to be improved, changed and formulated. But, the passive ways chosen by the organization does not indicate the convenience of the policy. Rather, it curtails further improvements and development of the policy in the near future.

5.3. RECOMMENDATIONS

Any development intervention is expected to be inline with the government's policy guidelines and the beneficiaries' basic needs. Otherwise, the intervention may not achieve its objectives. It may even result in producing unexpected negative impacts among the target groups and the stakeholders. Intervention can also be well accepted by all stakeholders (like MCS school development projects in cases of no choice) though the partners have no real participation in development processes. But it may results in situations that will not commensurate with the beneficiaries' capability and level of living unless measures are taken to rectify it. Similarly, the

following points should be taken into consideration and actuated in the school development projects of MCS.

1. Though the development of schools are the solutions to the prevalent problems of the beneficiaries and other concerned stakeholders, need assessment survey incorporating the target people and the government organizations must be conducted to identify the real and felt needs of all stakeholders so that the prior problems of the area could be addressed. Without assessing the basic needs of the community and concerned stakeholders, project development may not be the solution the prevalent problems of the target population.
2. By addressing the real problems of the target population and concerned stakeholders, duplication of activities can be reduced and common target will be identified. Unless the felt-needs of the community addressed and the stakeholders participated in problem identification, the projects may not fulfill their prime objectives. Then, the partners should participate in real sense in all development stages of the schools to mitigate problems that will arise during infrastructure development and latter operation periods in collaborations.
3. Once concerned stakeholders participated from the inception of the school development projects, we can mobilize resources to realize their priority needs. It can also be easy to manage the contribution expected from them as we are commonly addressing common goals and objectives. Even the types of contribution can be identified in collaboration and reach consensus. Thus, concerned stakeholders contributions ease the burden of implementation costs, and also develop self-reliance among the partners for future development initiatives. Therefore, contribution and its roles should be indorsed and induced to the development strategies of MCS activities.

4. Participation of the beneficiary communities and concerned government organization should not be haphazard and when one party desired to do so. The organization should schedule itself for real participatory development approaches, works for and strive to enhance such approaches among stakeholders through different capacity building methods. It should also reform itself with the current development agenda and government policy guidelines to bring real participatory approaches in its all development interventions.

5. Government co-signatory Bureaus are so reluctant in executing policies and guidelines concerning NGOs. Unless they strictly adhere to the rules and regulations themselves, commanding others to follow becomes very difficult. As revealed in this study, they blame each other for their weaknesses in executing NGOs guidelines while they recognize that, participatory approaches are being violated. Therefore, we recommend that they have to strongly hold their position of executing the government policy guidelines and setup common discussion forum for self-evaluation.

6. The beneficiary communities are highly complaining about the alarming school fees and the low capacity of schools to accommodate their demands. As indicated in the findings of this study, the target population is about to switch off if they find other possibilities to teach their children than sending them to Catholic schools. Thus, the government, MCS and the communities should seek common strategies to reduce school fees and enhance the capacity of the schools urgently in order to solve the current prevailing problems. In suing common strategies, the following points may serve as common grounds: -

- * Stakeholders contributions to enhance the capacity of the schools so that they can accommodate the demands of the community by expanding the existing schools.

- * The government should allow the NGO on especial cases to raise its own income that can help to subsidize its schools operations so that it can reduce the school fees that is being levied on beneficiaries.
- * Involvement of government in school operation by hiring teachers and subsidizing the school operations

7. Government policy is not sacrosanct. It is rather subjected to changes, reforms, amendments and recommendations in time and situations. However, in its effective time, working with its prescriptions creates smooth relationships among the parties and eases the barriers that may arise in the course of development activities. Inconveniences and restrictions revealed in the processes of implementations should be approached and solved in consensus. But, MCS refuse to reveal all the goods and odds of the government policy in the pretext that not to “violate” its current “good” operation statuses in publicizing whatever ailments this policy has with the organization’s operations. However, we recommend that the organization must change itself & its “principles” and struggle for changes that will benefit both parties in combating common problems.

REFERENCES

- Bennet, J. and Sara, G., 1996. *NGO funding strategies: An introduction for Southern And Eastern NGOs*, UK, INTRAC Publication.
- Berhanu Berkie, 2000. *Participatory monitoring, evaluation and reporting* (unpublished), EMI, Addis Ababa.
- Brohman, J., 1996. *Popular development: Rethinking theory and practice*, USA, Blackwell Publishers.
- Burky, S, 1993. *People First: A guide to self-reliant participatory rural development*, London, Zed Books, Ltd.
- Copestake, J. G., 1993. *Non-government and organization and state in Africa: Rethinking roles in agricultural development*, London, Routledge.
- CSA, 2001. *Statistical Abstract*, Addis Ababa.
- CSA, 1999. *The 1994 Population and Housing Census of Ethiopia*, Results at country level Vol. II, Analytical Report, Addis Ababa.
- CSA, 1996. *The 1994 Population and Housing Census of Ethiopia*, Results for Oromia Region, Summary Report, Addis Ababa.
- CSA, 1996. *The 1994 population census and Housing Census of Ethiopia*, Results for Oromia Region, Vol. I, Part II, Statistical Report on education and economic activity, Addis Ababa.
- DPMN Bulletin, 2000. *Development policy management in Sub Saharan Africa: Strategic Long term planning and policy management*, Vol. VII, No. 2, Addis Ababa, Commercial printing Enterprise.
- Elliott, J. A., 1996. *An introduction to sustainable development: The Developing world*. New York, Routledge publishing.
- EMI, 2000. *Participatory Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting*. Addis Ababa.
- Ethiopian Economic Association, 1999/2000. *Annual Report on Ethiopian Economy*, Addis Ababa.
- Fasil G. Kiros, 1990. *Implementing educational policy in Ethiopia*. World Bank discussion papers No. 84, USA.
- Handleman, H., 2000. *Third World Development*. Second Edition, New Jersey, Prentice Hall.

- Rietbergen-Mc-Cracken, J. and Deepa, N., 1998. *Participation and social Assessment: Tools and techniques*, The World Bank. Washington DC, USA.
- Kanshahu, A. I., 2000. *Planning and implementing sustainable project in developing Countries: Theory, practice and economics*, printed in Singapore.
- Kasahun Berhanu, 2000. *Collaboration and networking among stakeholders: Implication for development research and citizen empowerment*. OSSREA NEWS LETTER Vol. XVIII, No. 3, Addis Ababa.
- Keough, N., 1998. *Participatory development principles and practice: Reflection of Western development worker*. Community development Journal, Vol. 33, No.
- Long, C., 2000. *Participation of the poor in development initiatives: Taking the rightful place*. UK, Earthscan publications Ltd.
- Mathur, H. M., 1986. *Administering development in the third world: Constraints and choices*. New Delhi, Sage Publication.
- Maxwell, S., 1996. *Does European aid work? An Ethiopian case study*. Institute of Development Studies, UK, Brighton.
- MEDAC, 1997. *The Regional Atlas of Oromia*, 1997. Physical Planning Department, Printed by the Ministry of Economic Development and Cooperation, Finfinne.
- MOE, 2001. *Education Statistics Annual Abstract*, Education Management Information System (MOE), Addis Ababa.
- Mungate, D., 1993. *Government experience of collaboration with NGOs in agricultural Research and extension*. In Kate and James G. Copestake (ed.) *Non-governmental Organization and the state in Africa: Rethinking roles in sustainable agricultural Development*. London Routledge.
- Nibretu Kebede, 1998. *Non-governmental organization and their economic contribution to Ethiopia*. MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- NPDP, 1995. *General guidelines for the implementation of the national policy on Prevention and management*, Addis Ababa.
- ODPPB, 1999. *Introduction to participatory project design, monitoring & evaluation and Reporting: A training material for zonal project staff*. Finfinne.
- Pearce, D., Edward, B., Anil, M., 1990. *Sustainable development*. England, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

- Schemale, M., 1996. *The role of local organization in third world development*. USA, Asgate Publishing Ltd.
- Tadale Hagos, 1999. *The role of multilateral assistance in Ethiopian education*. MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Tamrat Bekele, 1999. *The status of public primary schools physical plant in Addis Ababa*. MA Thesis. Addis Ababa University.
- TGE, 1994. *Transitional Government of Ethiopia Education Policy*. Addis Ababa.
- Tilak, J. B. G., 1998. *Education and its relation to economic growth, poverty and income distribution: Past evidence and future analysis*. World Bank discussion paper
- Vinod, T., Mansoor, D., Ashok, D., Daniel, K., Nalin, K., Ramon, L., Yan, W., 2000. *The Quality of Growth*. World Bank, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Will, C., 1996. *The potential for donor mediation in NGO- state relations; An Ethiopian case study*. Institute of Development Studies, UK, Brighton.
- Wills, F., G., a. o. 's S., 1993/94. *NGO-Government relations: A Source of Life or a Kiss of Death*. In NGOs and development, Reading materials, ISS. Papers, No. 46.
- World Bank, 2000/2001. *Attacking Poverty*. USA, Oxford University Press.

ANNEXES

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
POST-GRADUATE STUDY PROGRAM

INSTRUMENT ONE: - Questions to be administered by enumerators.

General Instruction for Filling the Questionnaire

These questions are prepared for pure academic Research purposes. Please write the respondents' choice number(s) in the box provided at the end of the questions. For those questions provided with blank spaces, please write the respondents' own answers in clear and short terms.

1.1 Personal Information

- 1.1 Age of the respondent-----
- 1.2 Sex of the respondent-----
1. Male 2. Female
- 1.3 MARITAL STATUS -----
1. Married 2. Single 3. Widowed 4. Divorced
- 1.4 NUMBER OF CHILDREN -----
1. 1-4 2. 5-8 3. More than 9
- 1.5 Educational status -----
1. Kindergarten 2. First cycle primary 3. Second cycle primary
4. High school 5. Illiterate
- 1.6. Occupation -----
1. Government employee 2. Private employee 3. NGO employee
4. Self-employed
- 1.8. Religious affiliation-----
1. Muslim 2. Christian (Specify the sect to which you belong)-----

1.2 Questions related to Catholic school development

- 1.1. Do you know Meki Catholic Secretariat
1. Yes 2. No

1.2. If your answer is yes for question No 1.1, What are the major works of the organization in your Woreda?

1. Welfare service provision
2. Health care activities
3. Education and training
4. Relief and rehabilitation
5. Others specify

1.3. Did the organization (Meki Catholic Secretariat) build any school in your Kebele?

1. Yes
2. No

1.4. If yes, what is the level/ grade of the constructed school?

1. Kindergarten
2. First cycle primary
3. Second cycle primary
4. High school
5. Technical training center/ school

1.5. Who initiates the construction of the school?

1. The community
2. Meki Catholic Secretariat
3. The government departments
4. All in collaboration

1.6. Were you participated in the processes of school development/ construction?

1. Yes
2. No

1.7. If your answer is No, why? Specify your reason briefly -----

1.8. If your answer is yes for question No 1.6, At what stages were you participated in the school development?

1. During the problem identification
2. During site selection
3. During school construction
4. From the need assessment to school development

1.9. If you participate in school development, how did you begin to participate in?

1. Represented by the Kebele
2. Initiated by Meki Catholic Secretariat
3. Represented by Government departments
4. Assigned by Woreda Administration
5. Participate on your own willing

1.10. Did your community assign any person to participate in school development?

1. Yes 2. No

1.11. If you were participating in school development, what is the role of your participation?

1. Information sharing
2. Consultation with the implementers
3. Joint assessment and evaluation
4. Deciding on different aspects of school development
5. Others specify -----

1.12. If you were participating in school development, do you think that what you decided with other partners had been implemented with out distortion?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Partially

1.13. If your decisions had not been addressed in developing schools, what actions did you take in behalf of the partner you represent -----

1.14. Who approve the school constructed by Meki Catholic Secretariat in your area?

1. The community through their representatives and the Meki Catholic Secretariat
2. Meki Catholic and the government officials
3. The organization alone
4. All the above three groups in collaboration

1.15. Did your community accept the school plan?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Partially specify why -----

1.16. Did the beneficiary community agree with the process through which the school was constructed?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Lacks full agreement specify the reason -----

1.3. Questions Related To The Basic Need Addressing

1.1. Were there any schools in your vicinity before Catholic Secretariat built the school in your locality?

1. Yes 2. No

1.2. If the answer is yes, who built it?

1. Government 2. NGO 3. Private 4. Community 5. Others

1.2. If your answer is yes for question No 1.1,What is the grades level of the school?

1. Kindergarten 2. First primary 3. Second primary

4. High school 5. Technical Training

1.3. If there was no any school in your vicinity before Catholic built the current school, where did you used to send your children to learn?

1. Very far places where schools exist
2. You did not used to send your children to school
3. Others specify -----

1.4. If you were not sending your children to school, why you did not send them?

1. Because of economic problems
2. Due to absence of school in the near by places
3. You were not desire to teach them
4. Others specify -----

1.5. Was the absence of the school one of the major problems of the local community before the construction of school by Meki Catholic Secretariat?

1. Yes 2. No

1.6. If the answer is No, what should have been given priority? Specify them in order of importance

1. -----
2. -----
3. -----

1.7. If your answer is yes for question No 1.5, Who identified it as the main problem in the locality?

1. The community 2. The government officials
3. The Catholic Secretariat 4. The community and the Catholic Secretariat
5. All in collaboration

1.8. What grade levels schools were the major problems in the area?

1. Kindergarten 2. First primary 3. Second primary
4. High school 5. Technical training

1.9. What grade level school had the Catholic built in your locality/vicinity?

1. Kindergarten 2. First primary 3. Second primary

4. High school 5. Technical training

1.10. In relation to question No 1.9, did the built school address your community's real problem in the sector?

1. Yes 2. No

1.11. If your answer is No, what was the major problem in the level of school grades built by Catholic Secretariat? Specify -----

1.12. If the felt needs of the community were not properly addressed in school development, did the target community appeal to the organization and concerned government offices in the Woreda?

1. Yes 2. No

1.13. If the answer is No, why? Specify the reason -----

1.14. If the answer is yes for question No 1.12, what were their responses to the appeal? Please state it -----

1.15. If the development of the school is not an answer to your local community's real need, what do you suggest about the constructed school? Please list them in brief

1.-----

2.-----

1.4. Questions related to beneficiary contributions for school development

1.1. Did the community contribute anything for the construction of the school implemented by Catholic Secretariat?

1. Yes 2. No

1.2. If your answer is No, why did not they contribute

1. They were not asked to do so
2. They were unable to contribute due to the local problem /economic/
3. They were not interested in the school project

1.3. If the community had contributed to the school construction, what were their contributions?

1. Money 2. Labour 3. Materials (wood, stone) 4. All kinds

1.4. In the school development processes, did Meki Catholic Secretariat discuss how the local resource can be mobilized from the locality with the beneficiaries?

1. Yes 2. No

1.5. From where did the organization (Meki Catholic Secretariat) employ daily labourers when the school was built?

1. From the local population
2. From other unknown places
3. Gave to private contractors
4. Others specify -----

1.6.If the organization did not employ any local labour force, can we say that no local resources were utilized for school development?

1. Yes
2. No

1.7.If your answer is No, can you describe the types of local resources utilized for school development?----- please describe them in brief -----

1.8.How were they utilized? -----

1.5. Questions Related To Monitoring and Evaluation

1.1. Have you ever participated in the monitoring and evaluation of Meki Catholic Secretariat school development

1. Yes
2. No

1.2. If yes, who organized the monitoring and evaluation?

1. The government offices
2. The catholic secretariat

1.3. Who request the monitoring and evaluation?

1. By the initiation of both parts
2. By the request of the community
3. You do not know it

1.4. How often was the monitoring conducted?

1. Seldom
2. Quarterly
3. Bi- annually
4. Annually
5. Other specify -----

1.5. Who set the parameters for monitoring and evaluation?

1. The organization
2. The government
3. The government & the organization
- 4.Both incollaboration with community

5. I do not know

1.6. If the government officials and the organization set the monitoring and evaluation indicators, did they invite the community representatives for consent on the indicators?

1. Yes 2. No

1.7. If you have participated in monitoring and evaluation, did you agree with the set parameters for monitoring and evaluation?

1. Yes 2. No

1.8. If you participated in monitoring and evaluation, what were the major parameters focused on during the monitoring and evaluation processes?

1. Progress shown based on the time schedule

2. Effective utilization of resources

3. Adherence to plan of operation

4. The roles of stakeholders

• 5. Others specify -----

1.9. Are the results of monitoring and evaluation being implemented properly?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Partially

1.10. If your answer is No for question 1.9, what do you think is the main reason for not implementing the decisions passed by the monitoring and evaluation team?

1. Absence of follow up by concerned bodies

2. The organization refused the decision

3. Reluctance of the stakeholders in actuating their promise

4. Others (specify) -----

1.11. Did you participate in analyzing the results of the monitoring and evaluation in collaboration with government and Catholic Secretariat staffs after assessments are made?

1. Yes 2. No

1.12. If your answer is No, who analyzed the assessments?

1. The organization it self

2. The government officials

3. Both parties in collaborations

4. Both parties with the representatives of the community

1.6. If your answer is yes, in most cases, what scenario do they emphasize?

1. Future sustainability of school projects
2. Religious issues
3. Strengthening local capacity towards developing community's responsibility to take over the school operation
4. Other specify -----

1.7. What would be the sustainability of school operation if Catholic intervention will be terminated from the area?

1. The community will take over and continue providing the operation by allocating resources.
2. Appeal to government to takeover the operation
3. Others specify -----

1.8. Did the Catholic Secretariat provide capacity building training for the local community?

1. Yes
2. No

1.9. If your answer is yes, is there any person from the trainees currently working in the Catholic school?

1. Yes
2. No

1.10. Is your community contributing anything for school operations and maintenance currently?

1. Yes
2. No

1.11. If your answer is Yes, what are they contributing?

1. Money
2. Labour
4. Materials
5. Others specify-----

1.12. How often is the contribution?

1. In fixed regular base
2. Irregularly as required
3. Annually
4. Quarterly
5. Other specify -----

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
POST-GRADUATE PROGRAM

Instrument Two: -Discussion Questions to be managed by the Researcher

2.1 Check Lists of Questions for Meki Catholic Secretariat (MCS)

Project Staffs

- 1.1. Briefly state development History of the Ethiopian Catholic Secretariat and Meki Catholic Secretariat
- 1.2. What are the major sectors of development interventions of the Catholic Secretariat at the national regional and zonal level? Please fill them in the table provided below.

Instrument Two: - **Table 1** Please tick where the intervention appears at national, Regional and Zonal level

S/ No	Development intervention sectors			
	<i>Sectors of intervention</i>	<i>At national level</i>	<i>At regional level (Oromia)</i>	<i>At zonal level (East Shewa)</i>
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				

1.3. What are the major objectives of the Catholic development interventions?

1.4. Did your organization fulfill the requirements of the Ethiopian government at National and Federal levels?

- Registration for legal status
- Operational agreement with DPPC
- Project agreement with Regional Bureaux

1.5. Specify, the objectives of Catholic school development?

1.6. What are the major strategies of the organization in school development?

1.7. Is the organization addressing the prior needs of the community and stakeholders in school development?

1.8. How are the basic needs of all stakeholders (including community) have been identified?

1.9. What methodologies were employed to identify, prioritize and actuate the felt needs of the community and relevant stakeholders?

1.10. Did the community participate in project identification, prioritize, design, plan, site selection and implementation?

1.11. How was the participation of community mobilized?

- Through work shops
- Conferences
- Regular meetings
- Others

1.12. To what extents the community participated in the organization's school development?

- Consultation
- Information sharing
- Decision making
- Initiating actions

1.13. Did your organization face any problem in involving the community in need identification, prioritization, design, plan, site selection and implementation?

1.14. If any (in relation to question No 7.13), how did the organization manage such problems?

Is there any contribution made by the community for school development? If yes, What are they

1.15. In what aspects did co-signatories participate in your school projects?

- Need identification
- Prioritization
- Design
- * Operation
- * Site selection
- * Plan
- * Implementation

1.16. What were the major roles of Line Departments in school development projects?

- Providing technical support
- Take part directly in the development of school by
 - Allocating resources
 - Supervising, monitoring and evaluation.
 - Others

1.17. How did you observe the involvement's stakeholders (including the community) in the process of school development?

- Sufficient
- More than enough
- Others
- * Weak
- * Excessively involved

1.18. Had your school projects ever been evaluated by stakeholders? If ever, how did you find the evaluation (Report – fair) Who set the parameters of evaluation and monitoring? Have you had any problem with monitoring and evaluation procedures and parameters

- * Procedures
- * Parameters

1.19. Did the community participate in such monitoring and evaluation?

To what extent

1.20. Who analyzed the findings?

- Community and co-signatories
- Government LDS (officials)

1.21. Did you face any problem in implementing the findings of the monitoring and evaluation? If any

1.22. How you observed the viability of your developed schools to the problems of education in the area?

- Feelings of the community about the schools

- Compromising conditions
- Based on NGO guidelines and government regulations

1.5 What is your stand regarding the authorization of DPPC/DPPB as a focal point of coordinating NGOs, and technical LDS for tripartite agreements?

- Concerning DPPC/DPPB as authorizing body
- Technical LDS

1.6 Educational statistics of Catholic Schools. Please fill the following table.

Bellow.

Instrument Two : - Table 2

S/ No		Distribution of schools				
		<i>Number of Kindergarten</i>	Number of First primary	<i>Secondary primary</i>	<i>Number of High school</i>	<i>Technical training</i>
1.	Tigray					
2.	Afar					
3.	Amahara					
4.	Oromia					
5.	Somali					
6.	Ben. Gumuz					
7.	Gambella					
8.	SNNPR					
9.	Harari					
10.	Addis Ababa					
11.	Dire Dawa					
	Total					

Number of teacher, students and supportive workers by region for Catholic schools

Instrument Two: - Table 3

S/ NO	Region	Number of teachers			Number of students			Number of supportive workers *			Remark
		1 st primary	2 nd primary	High school	1 st primary	2 nd primar	High school	1 st primar	2 nd primary	High school	
1.	Tigray										
2.	Afar										
3.	Amahara										
4.	Oromia										
5.	Somali										
6.	Ben. Gumuz										
7.	Gambella										
8.	SNNPR										
9.	Harari										
10.	Addis Ababa										
11.	Dire Dawa										
	Total										

* Identify workers and teachers of foreign nationalities by putting or writing

Number of expatriate in remark column

Instrument Two: - Table 4. Number of Catholic Schools in East Showa zone by Woreda and school levels

S/ N	Woredas	School distribution in different woredas				
		Kindergarten	Elementary	Junior secndry	High school	Technical tratr
1.	Adama					
2.	Lume					
3.	A/ Negelle					
4.	Fantale					
5.	Akaki					
6.	Bosat					
7.	Gimbichu					
8.	Siraro					
9.	A/ Tullu J.K					
10.	Shashemanne					
11.	Ada`a					
12.	Dugda Bora					
	Total					

Number of students, teachers and supportive worker by woreda for Catholic Schools in Eastern Showa

Instrument Two: - Table 5

S/ NO	Region	Number of teachers			Number of students			Number of supportive workers *			Rem
		1 st primary	2 nd primary	High school	1 st primary	2 nd primary	High school	1 st primary	2 nd primary	High school	
1.	Adama										
2.	Lume										
3.	A/ Negelle										
4.	Fantale										
5.	Akaki										
6.	Bosat										
7.	Gimbichu										
8.	Siraro										
9.	A/TulluJ.K										
10.	Shasheman										
11.	Ada`a										
12.											
	Total										

* Identify National and expatriate workers/ teachers by writing number of expatriate for Non-national workers in remark column.

1.7 How many expatriate employees do your organization has in over all activities?

In Ethiopia -----

* Male-----

* Female-----

In East showa -----

* Male-----

* Female-----

1.8 What do you think about the cost implication of employing expatriate workers?

1.9 Number of Teachers, Students, and Supportive Workers by Region for Catholic Schools.

Instrument Two: - Table 6

S/No	Region	Number of teachers	Number of Students	Number of supportive workers *	Remark
1	Tigray				
2	Afar				
3	Amhara				
4	Oromia				
5	Somali				
6	Ben. Gumuz				
7	Gambella				
8	SNNPR				
9	Harari				
10	Addis Ababa				
11	Dire Dawa				
	Total				

* Please identify workers and teachers of foreign nationalities by putting or writing the Number of expatriates in remark column for each Region.

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
POST-GRADUATE PROGRAM

INSTRUMENT THREE: - DISCUSSION QUESTIONS TO BE ADMINISTERED BY THE RESEARCHER

Government Offices (LDs) Interviewing Questions Check Lists

3.1. Check Lists for ODPPB/ZDPPD Interviewing

1.1. Has Ethiopian Catholic/ Meki Catholic Secretariat secured: -

1. Legal Registration from the Ministry of Justice?
2. Operational Agreement with DPPC?
3. Project Agreement with Regional Line Bureaus?

1.2. Were the school projects identified based on the felt needs of the community and the stakeholders?

1.3. How was the priority of needs set?

1. By socio-economic survey
2. Through need assessments
3. By using methodologies like: -
 - * Participatory Rural Appraisal
 - * Beneficiary Assessments
 - * Rapid Rural Appraisal
 - * Others

1.4. What were the roles of communities in need identification, design, plan, site selection and implementation?

1.5. Did all concerned stakeholders participate properly in real sense or pass decisions on pre-determined plans?

1.6. Did all LDs participate in project preparation, design and implementation based on NPDPM guidelines and government rules & regulations?

1.7. Did all stakeholders participate per their agreement?-----Why?

1.8. Was there complain raised by the stakeholders and solved according to shared decision-making procedures.

- 1.9. What were the main problems ODPPB faced in coordinating Catholic Secretariat and LDs
- 1.10. Had school projects monitored and evaluated according to NGO guidelines and project agreements
- 1.11. How were indicators of monitoring and evaluation prepared?
- During evaluation and monitoring
 - By participating community members with other stakeholders
 - Only by co-signatories
- 1.12. After monitoring and evaluation assessments, do all parties including the beneficiary communities analyze the findings and pass shared decision-making
- 1.13. How does your Bureau/LDs follow up whether the common decisions are being implemented
- 1.14. How did you observe the collaboration of Catholic Secretariat with community and government organization/LDs according to: -
- NGO guidelines
 - Project Agreement
 - Project Document
15. Are you receiving any report from the Catholic Secretariat?
- How often (Duration)
 - What types of reports
16. How do you observe the reports in comparison with: -
- Planned works
 - Project Agreements
 - Policy guidelines and country regulations
17. Are there particular problems between the NGO (MCS) & ODPPB/ZPPD and LD. If any, what are they?
18. How could you solve the problems (refer question No. 17 above)?
19. Are there particular problems raised by Catholic Secretariat regarding technical LDs to ODPPB? ----- . If any, what are they

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
POST-GRADUATE PROGRAM

INSTRUMENT THREE: - DISCUSSION QUESTIONS TO BE ADMINISTERED BY THE RESEARCHER

3.2. Check Lists of Questions for Interviewing Education Bureau/Departments

1. Number of schools in Eastern Shewa Zone by Woreda private, government and NGOs. To be filled in the table provided.

Instrument Three: -Table 1

S/ N	Woreda	Government Schools		Non-government Schools (NGOs)		Private Schools		Remark
		First primary schools	Second primary- high school	First primary schools	Second primary- high Schoo	First primary schools	Second primary- high Schoo	
1	Adama							
2	Ada'a							
3	Akaki							
4	A/Negelle							
5	Adami T.J.k							
6	Bosat							
7	Fantalle							
8	Siraro							
9	Lume							
10	Shashemn							
11	Gimbichu							
12	D/Bora							
	East Shewa							

2. Does Oromia Education Bureau (OEB) sign project agreement with Catholic Secretariat?

Declaration

I declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any University; and all sources of materials used for the thesis are duly acknowledged.

Name: Adem Rabo

Signature:  _____

Date: July 2, 2002

Place: Addis Ababa

