



**Association for the Development of Education in Africa**

**Biennale on Education in Africa  
(Libreville, Gabon, March 27-31, 2006)**

**Effective Literacy Programs**

**Parallel Session A-3  
Stimulating Environments for  
Engaging in Literacy**

---

**State-of-the art of the Outsourcing  
Strategy of Literacy Programs**

---

*by  
Amadou Wade Diagne  
Binta Rassouloula Aw Sall*

**Working Document  
DRAFT**

**PLEASE DO NOT DISSEMINATE**

**DOC A-3.3**

This document was prepared by ADEA for its Biennial Meeting at Libreville, Gabon, March 27-31, 2006. The views and opinions expressed in this volume are those of the author and should not be attributed to ADEA, to its members or affiliated organizations or to any individual acting on behalf of ADEA.

The document is a working document still in the stages of production. It has been prepared to serve as a basis for discussions at the ADEA Biennial Meeting and should not be disseminated for other purposes at this stage.

## **Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA)**

### **International Institute for Educational Planning**

7-9 rue Eugène Delacroix

75116 Paris, France

Tel: + 33 1 45 03 77 57

Fax: + 33 1 45 03 39 65

E-mail : [adea@iiep.unesco.org](mailto:adea@iiep.unesco.org)

Website : [www.ADEAnet.org](http://www.ADEAnet.org)

# Table of Contents

<b>List of Tables</b>	4
<b>Acronyms and Abbreviations.</b>	5
<b>Executive Summary</b>	8
<b>1. The Emergence of the ‘Outsourcing’ Strategy</b>	10
1.2. The Concept of “Faire Faire”	12
1.2.1. Definition	12
1.2.2. Fundamentals	12
1.2.3. The Development Context	13
1.2.4. Why involve Civil Society	13
<b>2. Lessons Learned through Implementation</b>	14
2.1. Institutional Aspects	14
2.1.1. The Political Sphere	14
2.1.2. The Technical Sphere: A Difficult Birth	16
2.1.3. The Partnership Sphere	16
2.1.4. The Financial Sphere	19
2.2. Partnerships	20
2.3. Decentralization	21
2.4. Technical Aspects	21
2.4.1. The Demand-Driven Approach	21
2.4.2. The Development of a Literate Environment	22
2.4.3. Monitoring and Evaluation	23
2.5. Capacity-Building	24
2.5.1. Insufficiently Developed Capacities among Service Providers	24
2.5.2. The Support Structure: Still Fragile	24
2.5.3. Lacking and Under-Qualified Personnel in the Decentralized Areas	24
2.6. Financing Literacy	25
2.6.1. The Case of Senegal	25
2.6.2. The Case of Burkina Faso	25
2.7. Fighting Illiteracy: The Results	26
2.7.1. In Senegal	26
2.7.2. In Burkina Faso	27
2.8. The Concept’s Influence on Other Sectors	27
2.9. Outcomes of Implementation	28
<b>3. The Main Lines of a New Iteration</b>	34
3.1. A Repositioning of Communities	34
3.2. Harmonization with Local Development	34
3.3. A Strategy of Variable Geometry	34
3.4. Reviewing the Supply Strategy	34
3.5. Anchoring Interventions in Existing Social Structures	34
3.6. Additional Points	35

## List of Tables

Table 1. The Organization of Partnerships.....	18
Table 2. Strengths and Weaknesses of Follow-up in Senegal.....	23
Table 3. Funds Committed and Received, January 2003-July 2004.....	26
Table 4. Enlisted Participants, 1994-2002 (Source: DALN).....	26
Table 5. Performance of Facilitators in the PAPF, 1997-2002 (Source: DALN).....	27
Table 6. Success Rates in Initial Literacy (IL).....	27
Table 7. Synthesis of the Lessons Learned.....	30-33

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

<b>ADEA</b>	Association for the Development of Education in Africa
<b>AFDS</b>	<i>Agence du Fonds de Développement Social</i> [Social development funds agency]
<b>AGETIP</b>	<i>Agence d'Exécution des Travaux d'Intérêt Public</i> [Contract-Managing Agency]
<b>APENF</b>	<i>Association pour la Promotion de l'Education Non-Formelle</i> [Association for the promotion of non-formal education]
<b>ARED</b>	Associates in Research and Education for Development
<b>A3F</b>	<i>Apprentissage du Français Fondamental et Fonctionnel</i> [Learning of basic and functional French]
<b>BPE</b>	Bureau des Projets Education [Education projects office]
<b>BREDA</b>	<i>Bureau Régional pour l'Education en Afrique</i> [UNESCO's Regional Bureau for Education in Africa in Dakar, Senegal]
<b>CAPAL</b>	<i>Comité d'Appui aux Activités de Promotion de l'Alphabétisation</i> [Support committee for literacy promotion]
<b>CCA-ONG</b>	<i>Comité de Coordination des Activités des ONG actives au Mali</i> [Steering committee for NGOs operating in Mali]
<b>CCEB-BF</b>	<i>Cadre de Concertation des ONG/associations actives en Education au Burkina Faso</i> [Steering committee for educational NGOs and associations operating in Burkina Faso]
<b>CEB</b>	<i>Circonscription d'Education de Base</i> [Basic education catchment area]
<b>CEDEAO</b>	<i>Communauté Economique des Etats de l'Afrique de l'Ouest</i> [Economic community of West African states]
<b>CHIPA</b>	<i>Conseil d'Harmonisation des Projets d'Alphabétisation</i> [Council for the harmonization of literacy projects]
<b>CIDA</b>	Canadian International Development Agency
<b>CNCAT</b>	<i>Comité National de Concertation et d'Appui Technique</i> [National committee for steering and technical support]
<b>CNEA</b>	<i>Comité National d'Elimination de l'Analphabetisme</i> [National committee for the elimination of illiteracy]
<b>CNRE</b>	<i>Centre National de Ressources Educationnelles</i> [National center for educational resources]
<b>CNF</b>	<i>Comité National de Financement</i> [National financing committee]
<b>CPF</b>	<i>Comité Provincial de Financement</i> [Provincial financing committee]
<b>CRF</b>	<i>Comité Régional de Financement</i> [Regional financing committee]
<b>CNR-ENF</b>	<i>Centre National de Ressources – Education Non-Formelle</i> [National resource center for non-formal education]
<b>CEBNF</b>	<i>Centre d'Education de Base Non-Formelle</i> [Center for basic non-formal education]
<b>CONGACI</b>	<i>Collectif des ONG Actives en Côte d'Ivoire</i> [Steering committee for NGOs operating in the Ivory Coast]
<b>DALN</b>	<i>Direction de l'Alphabétisation et des Langues Nationales</i> [Directorate for literacy and national languages]
<b>DDEN</b>	<i>Délégation Départementale de l'Education Nationale</i> [Departmental delegation of national education]
<b>DGAENF</b>	<i>Direction Générale de l'Alphabétisation et de l'Education Non-Formelle</i> [General directorate for literacy and non-formal education]
<b>DGCRIEF</b>	<i>Direction Générale du Centre de Recherche, d'Innovations Educatives et de Formation</i> [General directorate of the center for research, educational innovation, and training]
<b>DLCA</b>	<i>Direction de la Lutte Contre l'Analphabetisme</i> [Directorate for the fight against illiteracy]
<b>DNEB</b>	<i>Direction Nationale de l'Education de Base</i> [National directorate for basic education]
<b>DPLN</b>	<i>Direction de la Promotion des Langues Nationales</i> [Directorate for the promotion of

	national languages]
<b>DPEBA</b>	<i>Délégation Provinciale de l'Education de Base et de l'Alphabétisation</i> [Provincial delegation for basic education and literacy]
<b>DREBA</b>	<i>Délégation Régionale de l'Education de Base et de l'Alphabétisation</i> [Regional delegation for basic education and literacy]
<b>DRE</b>	<i>Direction Régionale de l'Education</i> [Regional directorate for education]
<b>ECB</b>	<i>Ecole Communautaire de Base</i> [Community primary school]
<b>EGEF</b>	<i>Etats Généraux de l'Education et de la Formation</i> [General congress on education and training]
<b>EPA</b>	<i>Etablissement Public à caractère Administratif</i> [Public institution of an administrative nature]
<b>EFA</b>	Education For All
<b>FTS</b>	<i>Formations Techniques Spécifiques</i> [Specific technical training pathways]
<b>FONAENF</b>	<i>Fonds pour l'Alphabétisation et l'Education Non-Formelle</i> [Fund for literacy and non-formal education]
<b>IA</b>	<i>Inspection d'Académie</i> [Academic inspectorate]
<b>IDA</b>	International Development Association
<b>IDEN</b>	<i>Inspection Départementale de l'Education Nationale</i> [Departmental inspectorate of national education]
<b>IL</b>	Initial Literacy
<b>INA</b>	<i>Institut National d'Alphabétisation</i> [National literacy institute]
<b>INEBNF</b>	<i>Institut National d'Education de Base Non-Formelle</i> [National institute for non-formal basic education]
<b>MEBA</b>	<i>Ministère de l'Education de Base et de l'Alphabétisation</i> [Ministry for basic education and literacy]
<b>NEPAD</b>	New Partnership for African Development
<b>NFE</b>	Non-Formal Education
<b>NGO</b>	Non-Governmental Organization
<b>PAPA</b>	<i>Projet d'Appui au Plan d'Action Education Non-Formelle</i> [Literacy Support Program]
<b>PAPF</b>	<i>Projet Alphabétisation Priorité Femmes</i> [Women's Literacy Project]
<b>PADEN</b>	<i>Projet d'Alphabétisation des Elus et Notables Locaux</i> [Literacy project for local elected officials and notables]
<b>PAIS</b>	<i>Programme d'Alphabétisation Intensive du Sénégal</i> [Senegalese intensive literacy program]
<b>PDDEB</b>	<i>Programme Décennal de Développement de l'Education de Base</i> [Decennial basic education development program]
<b>PDEF</b>	<i>Programme Décennal de l'Education et de la Formation</i> [Decennial education and training program]
<b>PDIS</b>	<i>Programme de Développement Intégré de la Santé</i> [Integrated health development program]
<b>PENF</b>	<i>Partenariat pour l'Education Non-Formelle</i> [Partnership for non-formal education]
<b>PLCP</b>	<i>Projet de Lutte Contre la Pauvreté</i> [Poverty reduction project]
<b>PAMISEC</b>	<i>Projet d'Appui à la Mise à l'Essai du Curriculum</i> [Support initiative for curricular testing]
<b>PNIR</b>	<i>Programme National des Infrastructures Rurales</i> [National program for rural infrastructure]
<b>RIOF</b>	<i>Réseau Intégré des Organisations Féminines</i> [Integrated network of womens' organizations]
<b>SA</b>	<i>Service d'Alphabétisation</i> [Literacy service]
<b>SAEP</b>	<i>Service d'Alphabétisation et d'Education Permanente</i> [Literacy and lifelong education service]
<b>SCNCDEF</b>	<i>Sous-Comité National de Concertation pour le Développement de l'Education Non-Formelle</i> [National steering sub-committee for the development of non-formal

	education]
<b>SEAENF</b>	<i>Secrétariat d'Etat à l'alphabétisation et à l'Education Non-Formelle</i> [State secretariat for literacy and non-formal education]
<b>TFP</b>	Technical and Financial Partners
<b>UNESCO</b>	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

## Executive Summary

1. The ‘faire-faire’ (outsourcing) strategy’ is one of decentralization, namely a deliberate and organized delegation of the conception and implementation of programs; the latter address grassroots educational needs, expressed by known stakeholders who are recognized as able to implement the programs within the framework set by the State.

2. This strategy came to the fore and was developed in a context where:

- i) Previous approaches had shown their limits (at times unsatisfactory results, absence of insight into the data, questionable information provided by stakeholders who were judge as well as party, inadequate supply in relation to demand, recurrent illiteracy...).
- ii) The need for a more effective and participatory approach was clear (requirements of funding bodies for good governance, emergence of new actors from civil society, calls for more significant involvement at the community level, development of different management approaches in sectors other than education with attractive results, etc).
- iii) Non-formal education in general (and adult education in particular) has been identified as a strategy through which to address disparities in access to basic social services, and as a vector of accelerated universal education.

3. The above strategy was first implemented in 1995 in Senegal, and later in other African countries such as Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire and Niger. Ten years on, it seems important to assess it in order to identify its strengths and shortcomings, and to reorient it as necessary.

4. The interviews held with various stakeholders (political figures and technical specialists, technical assistance and funding partners, various operators etc.) and document analyses showed that even though progress has been made, many shortcomings hinder the proper implementation of the ‘faire faire’ strategy. These shortcomings are visible at the institutional, partnership, financial, capacity-building, and human levels.

5. The main advances of the strategy are as follows:

It serves a fast-changing sector, which is currently adjusting to both the rising stakes of Education For All (EFA) and a growing range of strategic partnership options.

A notable improvement in the level of resources allocated to non-formal education, featuring an unprecedented commitment of the State and its technical and financial partners (TFPs).

The establishment of innovative financial networks, such as the Fund for Literacy and Non-formal education (FONAENF) in Burkina Faso and the National Resource Centers for Non-formal education (NRC-NFE) in Mali and Senegal, which consolidate the progress made while coping with the multiple challenges related to their status, organization, and prerogatives.

A firm and lasting commitment of the TFPs in the sub-sector, despite some difficulties with regard to the identification and allocation of resources.

A notable increase of enrolments, with a continually improving success rate.

Important efforts to improve programmatic quality through the refinement of curricula, record-keeping systems, follow-up, and editorial policy guidelines; this although some actions remain in the processing stage.



A stronger command of the NFE sub-sector, made possible through the availability of thorough studies (of impact, capacity-building, etc.) and with the help of deeply committed stakeholders (such as the APENF and CCEB).

6. Certain shortcomings do persist, however:

The unfinished re-organizations within national Ministries in charge of the education sector have consequences on the working order of their departments and of central and peripheral services.

The political will to give greater decision-making authority to NFE financing bodies (such as the FONAENF and CNR-ENF) is lacking.

The weak mobilization of additional resources.

The delayed communication and capacity-building strategies of certain stakeholders affect implementation, and negatively impact the credibility of the strategy and the quality of its results.

Dysfunctional communication, a currently timid engagement in the partnership as illustrated by irregular national meetings, and a lack of agreement on key topics such as unit costs, subsidies for emerging stakeholders, program quality, and the technical requirements for extensions given the objectives of EFA.

7. The study therefore suggests the following:

The holding of a partnership ‘re-foundation meeting’, in order to study the concerns raised by the adoption of the ‘faire faire’ strategy.

To solidify the consent and commitment of governments in relation to the strategy.

The completion of institutional re-organizations within the Ministries in charge of literacy, including measures for regulation and arbitration.

The implementation of a capacity-building and training strategy with regard to the various stakeholders.

Carrying on the adoption and implementation of the new curriculum, the follow-up and certification system, and the creation of resource centers.

Taking into account the organization and staffing of financial bodies (e.g. CNR-ENF and FONAENF) in the raising of additional funds.

The repositioning of communities within the process, thereby completing decentralization.

Integrating literacy into local development plans for the sake of a cross-cutting, inter-sectoral approach.

Taking into account the effects of Brain Drain.

# 1. The ‘Outsourcing’ Concept and its Context of Emergence and Development

## 1.1. The Emergence of the ‘Outsourcing’ Strategy

8. In the 1980s and 1990s the non-formal education sector in the countries of the Sahel was characterized by high illiteracy, uneven growth, a disregard for its potential, a lack of recognition for programs of quality, and a notable dispersion of the efforts of various actors. This state of affairs could be explained along the following analytical lines:

- (i) **The lack of a national, federal program to fight illiteracy.** Despite the presence of certain structures operating in the non-formal sector, a general policy was rarely defined in order to outline a logical and consistent interventional framework.
- (ii) **The existence of significant burdens,** among which a large institutional apparatus for the management of small programs; insufficient planning, coordination, and follow-up capacities in the relevant partnerships; the poor technical skills of available human resources, due to a lack of training in adult education; difficulties in collecting reliable data; the scarcity of the means allocated to the sector in national budgets; the low quality of the learning outcomes registered to date; and the absence of precise and consistent post-literacy policies or programs.
- (iii) **Several options for coordination,** depending on the country and within each country:
  - **No. 1: the *laissez-faire* approach:** various literacy programs coexist on the ground without coordination from any ministry; even where guidelines exist, these are seldom known or followed.
  - **No. 2: the project approach:** this consists mainly of formulating autonomous projects in response to specific sector needs, or as an accompaniment to development programs. Projects are independently conceived and implemented by ministerial departments or civil society organizations, without reference to a global policy perspective.
  - **No. 3: the program approach:** in this case, the Government defines a general policy with its partners, who can find their bearings in both an agreed action plan and a strategic framework for actions, coordination, and optimization.
- (iv) **The absence of an agreed regulatory framework for the sector,** despite the large volume of investment by national and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) across very different fields.
- (v) **The standardization** of programs into a ‘one-program-fits-all’ model in which programs are conceptualized centrally, with little attention to the needs expressed by communities with regard to their daily activities; with a heavily intellectual content orientation that emphasizes isolated instrumental knowledge at the expense of day-to-day life (reading and arithmetic); and with a standardized format for program delivery.
- (vi) **The absence of insight into the results:** given the fact that the orientation, execution, and assessment phases are often concentrated in the hands of a sole promoter (be it State, NGO, project, or private sector, it has not always been possible to obtain reliable information on program data and particularly on program success, as the promoters were both judge and party.
- (vii) **Recurrent illiteracy:** the combined effect of programs’ standardization and low profiles are most probably the cause of their low efficiency and poor results. Participants bear witness to their repeated involvement in training sessions without ever developing lasting skills.
- (viii) **The State’s technical and financial fatigue:** budgetary constraints caused by the structural adjustment programs implemented since the 1980s hinder the development of the social and education sectors, particularly through decreasing investment. This situation will lead to inequitable access to basic education, a lack of teachers, and low enrolment in adult literacy programs.

- (ix) **A strong wind of decentralization.** The emergence of outsourcing remains strongly linked to the decentralization which was imposed as a condition of financial assistance to the South, “where the State is asked to partially step aside and make room for private initiatives, regardless of whether they come from the population, NGOs, or businesses”. Decentralization calls into question the State’s central role in the context of “strengthening the economic conditionality to development aid through the implementation of adjustment policies in the 1980s.’
- (x) **A renewed commitment to Education For All (EFA):** the literacy and basic education policy of the government fits into the framework of the Jomtien Conference in 1990, which advocated EFA.
- (xi) **A supportive international environment,** characterized by the interest of international organizations in supporting the social sector. Indeed, United Nations agencies and more recently the International Monetary Fund and The World Bank pay increasing attention to the “social compensation aspects of adjustment, targeting the most vulnerable groups and focused on employment, food, health, or education”.

*The ‘outsourcing’ strategy was established because:*

- i) Previous approaches had shown their limits (at times unsatisfactory results, absence of insight into the data, questionable information provided by stakeholders who were judge as well as jury, inadequate supply in relation to demand, recurring illiteracy).
- ii) The need for a more effective and participatory approach was clear (requirements by funding bodies of good governance, emergence of new actors from civil society, claims for more significant involvement at the community level, development of different management approaches in sectors other than education with attractive results, etc.).
- iii) Non-formal education in general (and adult education in particular) has been identified as a strategy through which to address disparities in access to basic social services, and as a vector of accelerated universal education.

## 1.2. The Concept of “Faire Faire”

### 1.2.1. Definition

9. The strategy consists in making each partner play his or her own part, and where there is a clear comparative advantage according to the principle of ‘each doing what he does best’. This construct shows the following characteristics, recognized as essential by all stakeholders:

Separation between the orientation, follow-up, and assessment functions of the Ministry on the one hand, and the operational functions of literacy groups.

Contractual bases for those literacy missions to be performed with public funds made available by the Ministry.

Equal access to funds for all service providers whose proposals are consistent with a set of eligibility criteria that all partners acknowledge to be appropriate.

Impartiality and transparency of the funding allocation system.

Prompt payment for services rendered by providers, who in most cases have limited funds of their own and limited resources.

10. **What the ‘delegation strategy’ is not:**

It does not imply being pushed around or *laisser-faire*.

It does not either imply letting oneself go.

It is not a lifting of responsibility from State organs.

It does not consist in a disengagement of the State with regard to its obligation of providing minimal education to all its citizens.

11. **What it is:**

The ‘faire faire’ strategy is one of decentralization, namely a deliberate and organized delegation of the conception and implementation of programs; the latter address an educational need on the ground, expressed by known stakeholders who are recognized as able to implement it within the framework set by the State.

The strategy is an agreed, accepted, and sensible distribution of roles and responsibilities in adult education, carried out according to terms and guidelines set out in a handbook or to flexible, negotiated procedures.

It is also a way for the administration to play its role as a policy-maker, regulator, evaluator, source of assistance.

### 1.2.2. Fundamentals

12. The basic principles of the strategy are the following:

**Harmonization of the interventions:** all activities that play a part in the achievement of literacy objectives should fit within a consistent framework, set with the participation of all stakeholders; a framework for exchanges, coordination, and suggestions should be created at all levels; for instance, the Comité d’Appui aux Activités d’Alphabétisation (CAPAL), a committee supporting literacy activities in Chad thus needs to open and make use of local outlets.

**Decentralization** is about enhancing the responsibility of communities and civil society organizations at all stages in the process of conceiving and implementing policy.

**Dispersal:** peripheral departments of the Ministry shall need enhanced competencies: these include planning, management, information, monitoring and evaluation, coordination etc.

**Partnerships and participation:** hierarchical relationships should give way to a partnership-based approach, which gives precedence to the conscious, willing participation of all stakeholders.

**Transparency and equity:** the system should ensure equitable access to the resources available, on the basis of set criteria and according to a mechanism based on transparency.

### 1.2.3. The Development Context

13. The following favorable conditions allowed for the emergence and development of the 'outsourcing' strategy:

The presence of NGOs and community organizations going to back to the years 1970-1985, and the claim to greater community involvement.

The principles of good governance increasingly render results-based management a condition of access to donor funding.

The international community is more and more committed to EFA.

### 1.2.4. Why Involve Civil Society?

14. In some countries, subcontracting NGOs is the prevailing government policy regarding the implementation of literacy programs. Senegal is one example; other countries such as Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea, Mali, Morocco, and Niger have also taken this course. Several other West African countries may amend their policies in order to fully or partially subcontract NGOs.

15. There are several arguments in favor of a policy of close collaboration with NGOs and other associations:

A partnership could raise more financial and human resources in favor of literacy.

NGOs have significant experience, from which partnerships could benefit.

In accommodating a diversity of service providers, NGOs could provide literacy with the flexibility needed to consider local conditions.

Involving communities and their organizations is a means of ensuring much-needed support for literacy at the local level.

The development of a national association of NGOs and community organizations could provide the Government with the reactions and comments of independent interest groups.

16. Collaboration depends on the existence of common goals and mutual trust. These prerequisites tend to reinforce each other as Government becomes more receptive to a pluralist civil society.

---

Lauglo, J., 2001. *Engaging with Adults: The Case for Increased Support to Adult Basic Education in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

## 2. Lessons Learned through Implementation

### 2.1. Institutional Aspects

17. Effective delegation presupposes the existence of four support frameworks:

- 1- **A political framework:** a clear sectoral policy, enjoying consensus at the highest levels.
- 2- **A framework for dialogue** that is participatory and consensus-driven, where unity of thought can be achieved and nurtured.
- 3- **An updated financial framework:** a body capable of handling transfers efficiently and of receiving funds from all contributors (State, public or private, domestic and international).
- 4- An updated and efficient **technical support framework:** a specialized national institute and/or strong technical leadership.

#### 2.1.1. The Political Sphere

##### 18. An Inconclusive Institutional Evolution

In Burkina Faso, the following advances can be noted at the sector level (see also Bayala, Benoît, Diagne, and Napon, 2004. *Evaluation de la stratégie du «faire faire» au Burkina Faso*):

*The implementation of a consistent and comprehensive management framework* through the creation of a ministerial *cabinet* in charge of the sector, the establishment of a resource center, and the reorganization of technical service provision through the general directorate for literacy and non-formal education (DGAENF), the directorate for research and innovation in literacy (DRINA), and the basic education catchments themselves (CEB).

*The initiation of a national program to implement the non-formal education development plan, with the support of a private management body (the Fund for Literacy and Non-formal education or FONAENF)* whose actions are completed by those of other technical and financial partners and NGOs in the field.

19. Despite this progress certain problems persist, such as the *institutional instability* relating to the status of the above *cabinet*, its staff, and its unfinished reorganization. The *cabinet* lacks a communications and problem-solving strategy to address the major changes brought about by the adoption of the 'faire faire' strategy. Indeed from 2000 to 2002, there was a shift from a state secretariat for literacy and non-formal education (SEAENF) to a delegated *cabinet* for literacy and non-formal education within the Ministry of basic education and literacy (MEBA), an office without any autonomy or executive power. This situation partly explains why the Assistant Minister appears to lack control over the sector.

20. In addition, the various re-iterations of the MEBA organizational chart have only further undermined the sector's institutional strength. The creation in 2002 of the DGAENF, and the transformation of the INA into the DRINA, caused a blockage in the implementation of literacy activities as each structure wanted to lead the work. This situation led to overlap in the execution of both political and technical programming.

21. A similar situation was encountered in Senegal with chronic instability at the political level. Indeed, the literacy sector went through five assistant ministers or full ministers from 1993 to the present, with the following particularity: one minister did remain in office for five years and was able to develop a vision for the future, a plan, and projects with ensuing support from the Government and its partners; however no other minister remained in office for more than two years. To this were added frequent changes in the division of State services, and the creation or merger of entities that did not always have time to develop (such as the Directorate for the promotion of national languages) or thrive institutionally for lack of a regulatory framework (such as the National Resource Center, the Academy of Languages, and the Office of Planning, Coordination and Evaluation attached to the *Cabinet*).

22. In Mali, the Government took the following institutional measures:

The National Directorate for Basic Education (DNEB), which is in charge of literacy, was reorganized in order to enhance its principal responsibility of providing leadership in the non-formal education sector.

The national resource center for non-formal education (CNR-ENF), which enjoys the same prominence and rank as the DNEB in the ministry's organizational chart, now acts as a technical and financial executor of the plan.

23. Jurisdictional conflicts, and problems related to precedence and positioning, continue to weaken the operation of the sector for lack of political arbitration and dialogue.

### **Inconsistent Sector Management**

24. Areas of progress should be noted in relation to management:

- The existence of a shared development plan for NFE, of a development plan for education in general, and of a yearly plan for each project/program.
- The elaboration of planning mechanisms at the level of the MEBA executive office, technical departments, and decentralized structures.
- The elaboration of a mechanism for the coordination and regulation of partnerships (in the case of State/TFP partnerships), and of debriefing and planning workshops.
- Effective coordination of partner interventions.
- Consensus on the need for a programmatic approach with one technical and financial executor (or executing agent).

25. Nevertheless certain problems persist:

Poor mastery of information (lacking indicators for the non-formal sector, unreliable data, weak data collection and analysis strategies.).

Insufficient and under-skilled personnel at all levels.

Relative invisibility of the non-formal sector at the decentralized level: in the new organizational chart in Burkina Faso for instance, literacy departments have been replaced by Offices; thus the Office (*bureau*) for Literacy is now part of a primary education department, headed by a manager from the formal sector with no experience in literacy.

The absence of a functioning platform for dialogue (irregular meetings, lacking follow-up...) partly accounts for the limited success in mastering an agenda and harmonizing various programmatic and costing approaches.

In Senegal there have also been difficulties with regard to the implementation of a program-based approach, unlike Burkina Faso where a multi-donor fund makes use of a common handbook for all participants.

## **2.1.2. The Technical Sphere: A Difficult Birth**

26. Given the steady interest expressed by the Government of Senegal regarding non-formal education, an assistant minister in charge of literacy was appointed in 1989. Several changes have taken place since, with an assistant minister in charge of literacy and the promotion of national languages (1993-1995), to an assistant minister in charge of basic education and the promotion of national languages (1995-2000), and finally to an assistant minister in charge of literacy, technical education, and professional training (as of April 2000). This evolution may present the advantages of better visibility for the sector, and of allowing for management that is more closely aligned to the objectives of the exercise in the first place.

27. Throughout these political and institutional metamorphoses dictated by technical or political need, the directorate for literacy remained stable in its mission and institutional grounding. Given the scale of the tasks, the complexity of the innovations and the current state of its organization and human resources, and the need for coherence between its new missions and organization in a context of advanced decentralization as is now the case, the directorate assumes central responsibility for the coordination and management of non-formal programming at all levels. The directorate emphasizes the monitoring of the sector's progress through a database of actions and results, follow-up and evaluation, the production of directories (didactic material, facilitators aides, and books on national languages...), the formulation of an editorial policy for national languages, and the elaboration of a non-formal basic education curriculum.

28. Another directorate - the directorate for the promotion of national languages (DPLN) - was set up in support of a more energetic national languages policy, in a more institutionalized setting. However, this directorate was short-lived: it was put on hold first and then resuscitated for a short but productive period, only to be subsumed into a new directorate called the Directorate for Literacy and National Languages (DALN) under the pretext of a more rational organization of State educational services.

## **2.1.3. The Partnership Sphere**

### **2.1.3.1. Organization**

29. In Senegal, a national committee for steering and technical support (CNCAT) was set up within the national committee for the elimination of illiteracy (CNEA); the latter went through a period of lethargy in the wake of problems within the World Literacy Program carried out under the aegis of UNESCO.

30. In Chad, a new partnership system entitled the support committee for literacy promotion (CAPAL) will pursue the following objectives:

- Participation in the formulation of national education policy.
- Mobilization of all partners in order to implement action plans.



- Examination of implementation results, and generation of corrective measures as necessary.
- Validation of regulatory texts and procedural handbooks.

31. These goals can be reduced to functions of dialogue, coordination, exchange, participation, and advice in support of Government decision-making and good governance more generally.

32. In Mali, a permanent framework for dialogue between the State and its civil society partners has been erected: it is the National Steering Sub-committee for the Development of Non-formal education, the SCNCDEF.

**Table 1. The Organization of Partnerships**

<b>LEVEL</b>	<b>ADMINISTRATIVE AREA</b>	<b>CIVIL SOCIETY AREA</b>	<b>PARTNERSHIP AREA</b>
NATIONAL	Ministry of Education with the following particularities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assistant minister offices (Senegal, Burkina Faso, Chad)</li> <li>- Dedicated Ministries</li> <li>- Existence of several full ministries, including those in charge of basic education and literacy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Senegal:</b> National coordination of literacy facilitators (CNOAS)</li> <li>- <b>Burkina Faso:</b> Association for the promotion of non- formal education (APENF) and Steering Committee for educational NGOs and associations operating in Burkina Faso (CCEB-BF)</li> <li>- <b>Mali:</b> Steering committee for NGOs operating in Mali (CCA-ONG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Senegal:</b> National committee for dialogue and technical support (CNCAT)</li> <li>- <b>Burkina Faso:</b> Steering sub-committee for non-formal planning</li> <li>- <b>Chad:</b> Support committee for literacy development in Chad (CAPAL)</li> </ul>
REGIONAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional educational directorates</li> <li>- Academic inspectorates (IA)</li> </ul>	Regional committee for the coordination of facilitators (Senegal)	Regional support committee for literacy promotion activities (Chad)
DEPARTMENTAL	- Departmental inspectorates (IDEN) or provincial delegations	Departmental committee for the coordination of facilitators	Departmental support committee for literacy promotion activities
LOCAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Literacy and lifelong education services in Chad</li> <li>- Basic education catchments (CEB) in Burkina Faso</li> </ul>	Local committee for the coordination of facilitators	Local support committee for literacy promotion activities

33. In Burkina Faso for instance, in the partnership domain the following progress should be taken into account:

- The existence of episodic, substantive political dialogue on orientations, strategies, and so on through various forums and seminars.
- The implementation of a partnership approach which has allowed for a mobilization of all sector stakeholders in support of literacy.
- The favorable reception of the policy and of an action plan conceived on a participatory basis.

34. With regard to problems encountered in the partnership context, one may cite the following:

- A weakening of the political dialogue, on account of the inoperative steering committees of almost all countries.
- Problems related to the erection of a proper framework, in which service providers can interface with the Government and TFPs, in some countries including Chad, Morocco, and Cote d'Ivoire... It sometimes appears that the State and the TFPs are taking the decisions exclusively.

#### 2.1.3.2. The Organization of Service Providers

35. Literacy facilitators and service providers are the engines of the sector. They will need to be involved in all operations, as the programmatic success largely depends on their commitment, skills, and professionalism. Experience has also shown that their relationship with administrative structures always carries some degree of skepticism, mistrust, and even defiance.

36. In addition, given the diversity of their statutes (NGO, association, development business, private practice, growers' associations, etc.) there is no suitable umbrella to regroup them and manage their participation and representation.

37. In Senegal, service providers have established a National Coordination of literacy facilitators (CNOAS). While in Senegal the Government supported the inauguration of this body by virtue of the unsuitability of existing structures, in Mali the implementation of the delegation strategy relied on existing organizations. Thus the steering committee for NGOs operating in Mali (CCA-ONG) brings together 85 national and international NGOs.

38. In Burkina Faso, the only existing steering committee for NGOs in basic education (CCEB-BF), which represents service providers from both formal and non-formal education, is not open to more recent arrivals on the scene.

#### 2.1.4. The Financial Sphere

39. In Senegal, the national center for educational resources (CNRE) was established as a pillar of the partnerships among and between sector stakeholders (ministries, civil society organizations, private sector, local associations, communities). It is a privileged locale for dialogue, information, documentation, training, and technical support; it is also the seat of activities related to fund-raising, capacity-building, and the development of efficient and lasting partnerships among the

parties involved. The CNRE is also expected to act as a technical and financial executive agency for the non-formal basic education program.

40. In Burkina Faso, discontent has been noted in relation to the ‘Association’ status of the Fund for Literacy and Non-formal education (FONAENF), which has drawn the displeasure of MEBA authorities. The MEBA seeks better representation within the various FONAENF bodies (national funding committee, administrative board, etc.). The FONAENF in its current form is, in the view of MEBA, controlled by the TFPs. In practice, the real issue is a **tug-of-war** between the *wish to control resources* and the *attempt to secure resources* otherwise gathered and used only on the basis of results.

41. In short, FONAENF is seen by institutional actors as a ‘TFP Foundation’ due to the following:

- The State’s surrender regarding its establishment (the state secretariat for literacy and non-formal education, SEAENF, never wanted such an association but eventually gave in).
- Uncertainties regarding the State’s will to diligently manage the funds.
- The weak presence of the State in key positions (Chairman of the administrative board, Director of the fund, and Presidency of the national financing committee)
- The co-opting of powerful service providers on the fund’s administration board, who are allies of the TFPs.
- An absence of parallel structures in that the DREBA and DPEBA preside over the CPF and CRF where the TFPs are absent, whereas at the national level the CNF eludes the DGAENF and thus the State (the DGAENF does not preside over the CNF).

## 2.2. Partnerships

42. In the case of Senegal, several steering committees have been formed. They are the basis of partnerships, and their dynamism largely underpins the success of the ‘Faire Faire’ strategy. These committees include CNEA, CNCAT, CHIPA, and steering committees.

**(i) *The National Committee for the Elimination of Illiteracy (CNEA)***

Established in 1986, CNEA is an inter-ministerial body for orientation, decision, and execution; it is mandated to monitor the achievement of national literacy policy goals.

**(ii) *The National Committee for Coordination and Technical support (CNCAT)***

Established in 1996 as a technical branch of CNEA, CNCAT’s vocation is to facilitate exchange between the various stakeholders, to centralize, apply, and disseminate the results of literacy-related research and studies, and to provide technical support.

**(iii) *The Council for the harmonization of literacy projects (CHIPA)***

CHIPA provides an appropriate framework for the facilitation of communication, exchange, and synergy between projects.

**(iv) *Steering committees***

These bodies periodically assess the progress of various projects, and provide remedial assistance and orientation under the direction of the Ministry.

43. Finally and to close the circle, a **National Center for Educational Resources (CNRE)** serves as a place for encounters, exchange, communication, training, and technical support for all stakeholders in non-formal basic education.

## 2.3. Decentralization

44. In the case of Senegal and in implementing the ‘Faire Faire’ strategy, nine areas of activity were decentralized to the local level, including education. The transfer of responsibility consisted in conferring to the local administration all that is supposedly better positioned for than the State: education, literacy, the promotion of national languages, and professional training.

## 2.4. Technical Aspects

### 2.4.1. The Demand-Driven Approach

#### 2.4.1.1. The Case of Burkina Faso

45. In Burkina Faso, the National Literacy Institute (INA) has developed a three-stage literacy program:

- An initial training stage focuses on acquiring instrumental skills (reading, writing, and arithmetic).
- An additional basic training stage focuses on basic education, that is to say the acquisition of skills related to social and cultural activities (health, citizenship, environmental protection...).
- A more specific technical training stage, which must allow for the acquisition of professional technical skills and the development of autonomy in lifelong education.

46. This program is carried out on an intensive basis from January to May every year, for over 50 days at an average of six hours per day.

47. For lack of funds only the first two stages are carried out, thereby compromising any development of technical skills such as those necessary for income-generation. Yet the non-formal education development plan, as the decennial program, targets poverty reduction by focusing on priority areas and on the most disadvantaged; it does this with a view to improving the quality of life through improved means of income-generation.

48. An analysis of innovative practices in the field of literacy, and of the suggestions made by the service providers and resource persons interviewed during surveys, suggests a need to reorganize the three literacy stages into two learning cycles:

- (i) **A literacy/basic training cycle**, comprised of two learning levels of 300 hours each;
- (ii) **An *à la carte* training cycle**, which is in effect an optional training cycle. This allows literate learners immediate access to one of three further training programs offered.

#### 2.4.1.2. The Case of Senegal

49. In Senegal, an agenda was drawn up regarding curricular development for literacy and for Community Primary Basic Education schools (ECB) with two particular concerns:

- The need to provide quality basic education, which would open doors to the many possibilities for further study and development studies that equity and social justice demand. This is what explains the presence of classical instrumental skills in the curriculum (reading, writing, arithmetic, command of the French language).
- The need to add meaning to education by boldly inserting entrepreneurship as a highway to social, economic, psychological, and cultural autonomy for the target audience. A pedagogical approach combines theory and practice, intellectual growth based on facts and experience, and practical learning activities untainted by productivity considerations (entrepreneurship thus includes field investigations, manual labor, creation and management of economic interest groups, project management, basic accounting and marketing techniques.).

#### 2.4.2. The Development of a Literate Environment

50. As one may expect the literate environment in the countries under scrutiny (see Cécé and Diagne, 2005. *Rapport d'évaluation du projet de InWEnt Project 'Production de matériel de lecture et d'apprentissage en langues nationales, 2002-2005*) is rather poor, for various reasons including:

Illiteracy and low levels of formal education.

The poverty is such that literate persons do not always have the means to buy schoolbooks and newspapers, and therefore the NGOs' and other projects' dissemination strategies are based on free access rather than cost recovery.

For various cultural reasons, people read little (they are not used to do it, find it difficult to isolate themselves from the social group for this purpose, live in an oral civilization, etc.).

Publications in national languages have grown in quantity and quality in those countries featuring a system of subsidies, such as Senegal. In addition, the development of major literacy initiatives supported by TFPs (Côte d'Ivoire, Burkina Faso, Senegal, Niger) has allowed for the production of printed didactic material on a large scale.

In all the countries, publication distribution and dissemination networks operate with various degrees of success and often outside regular channels. Community networks and the commercial circuit for literacy providers associated with independent distributors (and their substantial discounts) have shown the best results.

There has been some resistance to the use of national languages, as for instance in Mali where there are schools featuring very low attendance rates in the regional directorate for education (DRE) in Bamako, and “where a definite lack of interest among school authorities and parents is noted regarding *convergent pedagogy* in general, and the use of national languages in particular.” This is also true of Niger. Parents perceive French as a gateway to success and therefore resist the introduction of national languages by withdrawing their children from schools, or refusing to enroll them.

The adoption of a book policy has not always succeeded in promoting books in the national languages; in the case of Senegal where the Directorate for Literacy and the Promotion of National Languages (DPLN) produces a directory of publications in national languages, the National Directorate for Books has no idea regarding the specifics of the matter despite its stated intentions to give national languages pride of place in the national system.

## 2.4.3. Monitoring and Evaluation

### 2.4.3.1. The Case of Burkina Faso

51. Again, the installation of an effective monitoring and evaluation system is one of the pre-requisites for attaining the goals of quality, planning, information, and monitoring set in the national non-formal education development plan. Given its strategic importance in the decision-making process regarding literacy policies and projects, such a system should rely on the following principles and methodological lines:

A clear definition of the relevant indicators, made on the basis of stakeholder roles.

The creation of program databases at all levels, in order to facilitate follow-up and evaluation as well as management.

Taking into consideration all aspects of training (instrumental as well as development-related)

52. An analysis of realities on the ground points to the need for increased effort in addressing the current weaknesses of non-formal education. These weaknesses relate to:

An insufficient involvement on the part of center management committees in follow-up activities, a consequence of their members' illiteracy and the lack of adapted monitoring tools.

A logistical, material, and financial crisis limits the centers' potential certification, follow-up, and evaluation by decentralized MEBA services.

The skill deficit among literacy officers at the level of the CEBs and in the field of pedagogical follow-up, as the former have not mastered the transcription of the taught languages or the strategies for effective social communication.

The confusion of roles among the technical arms in the area of follow-up (CEB vs. SA).

Administrative slowness, which causes delays in the financing of follow-up and evaluation activities by the Education Projects Office (BEP).

The persistence of certification problems identified in the course of a capacity-building survey, and the disregard of implementation guidelines for the new certification strategy proposed in the same.

### 2.4.4.2. The Case of Senegal

53. The implementation of solutions to the problems encountered in the monitoring and evaluation activities had the following results in Senegal:

**Table 2. Strengths and Weaknesses of Monitoring and Evaluation in Senegal**

Strengths	Weaknesses
<p>1. Existence of a harmonized monitoring system</p> <p>2. Existence of a set of monitoring and evaluation tools for non- formal basic education programs. Improved supervision.</p> <p>3. Availability of sufficient data for databases (local and national).</p>	<p>1. Lack of monitoring personnel at the decentralized level (IA/IDEN), as compared to a massive increase in the number of facilitators and centers.</p> <p>2. Low-skilled personnel in charge of monitoring activities at the central and peripheral levels.</p> <p>3. Lacking material and logistical resources for local monitoring.</p> <p>4. Political hijacking of logistical apparatus.</p> <p>5. Delays in the decentralization of the monitoring and evaluation system.</p>

<p>4. Implementation of a literacy impact study.</p>	<p>6. Discontent of service providers and projects regarding the performance of the directorate for literacy.          7. Unsatisfactory planning, implementation delays, unused reports, work overload.          8. Weakness in the management of impact studies.</p>
--	--

## 2.5. Capacity-Building

### 2.5.1. Insufficiently Developed Capacities among Service Providers

54. With the exception of major service providers sponsored by bilateral and multilateral donor agencies, most literacy facilitators operate with small budgets, a small number of specialists, and small-scale programs for specific groups in limited geographical areas. Little is known regarding the efficiency of programs developed by the small providers, or whether they have the professional capacity to develop and operate larger projects.

### 2.5.2. The Support Structure: Still Fragile

55. Despite the effort made in the field, major issues remain, among which:

- The incapacity of small providers/facilitators to group in consortia, for lack of a management framework that allows for constructive dialogue.
- The absence of incentive measures encouraging established providers to export their know-how to other deficient locations and to provide technical support to the newer associations.
- The fear of small providers that they will be swallowed up by the major ones, and the tendency of the latter to limit the growth possibilities of the small operators in order to maintain their lead.
- The inexistence of a national strategy to enhance the literacy facilitators' assistance/support system, due to institutional uncertainty and to insufficient consideration of the non-formal education sector in the course of current institutional reforms.
- Limited collaboration and sharing of a democratic culture, without which organizational efforts become sterile.

### 2.5.3. Lacking and Under-Qualified Personnel in the Decentralized Areas

56. The question of the availability of literacy personnel in the decentralized areas is central. Depending on the country, there are on average one, two, or three officers in the field, most of whom are novices in the field and unmotivated for lack of incentives or face the rigid educational legislation which limits their career prospects.

57. In Chad for instance, there are now literacy sections in the Departmental Delegations of National Education (DDEN) with only one officer usually in charge. In the *sous-préfectures* there are literacy and lifelong education services (SAEP) composed of one officer and a staff of primary school teachers or teachers without any specific training in non-formal education who have often been arbitrarily appointed.

58. The material shortages these services are confronted with (there are very few offices with any logistical means at all) act as real limits on the capacity and work of their officers, particularly as they have no means of actually getting to the literacy centers.



## **2.6. Financing Literacy**

### **2.6.1. The Case of Senegal**

59. Non-formal education programming went through two distinct stages flowing from the sector's development and the interest of political authorities.

60. In a first stage (1989-1993), programs were funded either by the Government, specific projects in the field with a non-formal education dimension, or by development agencies.

61. In a second stage (1993-2000) that corresponds to the elaboration and implementation of a non-formal sector policy and 'delegation strategy', the financing of the government program was provided by the following:

State funds, through funding of Senegal's intensive literacy program (PAIS).

Major government projects in the education sector, with the literacy project targeting women (PAPF – US\$14 million from The World Bank), the support initiative for the Action Plan on Non-formal Education (PAPA – CAN\$15 million from CIDA), and the Literacy Project for Local Elected Officials and Notables (PADEN) and the Alpha Women Project (both GTZ).

Sector-wide projects including a literacy dimension, assigned to different technical ministries.

Activities carried out by NGOs and associations capable of mobilizing external and internal resources through their dynamism and networks.

In-kind or financial contributions from the communities, with an average value of 2,500 CFA francs.

62. As an example for the year 2000, literacy activities were financed with 4.68 billion CFA Francs contributed as follows:

Canadian Cooperation (CIDA) : 39 %

World Bank (IDA) : 47 %

German Cooperation (GTZ): 5 %

### **2.6.2. The Case of Burkina Faso**

63. The published Action Plan for non-formal education development shows an insufficient commitment from the national budget, which was also difficult to increase (cf. the evaluation of the 'Faire Faire' strategy in Burkina Faso). This state of affairs accounts for the debts owed to providers and facilitators, the closure of the permanent centers for functional literacy (CPAF), and exaggerated dependence on exterior funding.

64. The establishment of FONAENF was a beginning in addressing these concerns. The start of the fund's missions allowed for the mobilization of significant additional resources, as shown in a summary of funds committed and received from January 2003 to July 2004 (below):

**Table 3. Funds Committed and Received, January 2003-July 2004**

FUNDING SOURCES	Contributions Committed		Contributions Received	
	Amount in CFA Francs	%	Amount in CFA Francs	% of Amount Committed
<b>BURKINABÉ STATE</b>	804,000,000	15,19%	400,000,000	49,75%
<b>BPE/ Canadian Cooperation</b>	600,000,000	11,33%	100,140,196	16,69%
<b>BPE/ Dutch Cooperation</b>	1,200,000,000	22,67%	1,088,958,675	90,75%
<b>BPE/ Swedish Cooperation</b>	650,000,000	12,27%	227,253,730	34,96%
<b>BPE/ Danish Cooperation</b>	200,000,000	3,78%	0	0
<b>Swiss Cooperation</b>	600,000,000	11,33%	400,000,000	66,67%
<b>BPE/ Belgian Cooperation</b>	800,000,000	15,11%	0	0
<b>French Cooperation</b>	40,000,000	0,76%	22,154,200	55,39%
<b>World Bank</b>	400,000,000	7,56%	0	0
<b>PENF (Canada)</b>	0	0	58,913,780	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5,294,000,000</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2,297,420,581</b>	<b>43.40%</b>

## 2.7. Fighting Illiteracy: The Results

### 2.7.1. In Senegal

65. In 1988, the illiteracy rate in Senegal was among the highest in the world. It was estimated at around 68% of the population over six years of age, with a 59% rate for men and a 77% rate for women (as compared to an average of 65% for women in sub-Saharan Africa as a whole).

66. From 1994 to 2002, various literacy programs enrolled 1,501,881 learners, with an annual average of 166,876. Women represented 77.13 % of this total (or 1,158,441 people).

**Table 4. Enlisted Participants, 1994-2002 (Source: DALN)**

Program	Men	Women	Total
<b>1000Classes Project/PAIS</b>	98,414	260,817	359,231
<b>PAPF</b>	29,040	280,095	309,135
<b>PAPA</b>	42,967	225,976	268,943
<b>PADEN</b>	10,891	2,844	13,735
<b>Alpha Women</b>	473	8,687	9,160
<b>Other Programs</b>	161,654	380,022	541,677
<b>Total</b>	<b>343,439</b>	<b>1,158,441</b>	<b>1,501,881</b>
<b>%</b>	<b>22.87</b>	<b>77.13</b>	<b>100</b>

67. With regard to quality, the providers' performances within the PAPF and at the end of a cycle from 1997 to 2002 were evaluated as follows:

**Table 5. Performance of Facilitators in the PAPF, 1997-2002 (Source: DALN)**

Disciplines	Campaigns					
	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002/3 (PIEA)
Reading	55.7%	54.2%	57.3%	75.2%	69,10%	51,8%
Writing	28.25%	33.6%	43.8%	63.3%	55,42%	38,7%
Arithmetic	5.7%	18.7%	28.5%	44.1%	43,31%	22,7%

### 2.7.2. In Burkina Faso

68. In 2002/2003, FONAEF received 197 petitions from 33 provinces. Their analysis led to the financing of 91 projects.

69. The table below shows the results for 2002/2003, provided by the DGAENF for the whole country, and for 2003/2004 provided by FONAEF. These are the only available data for a comparison of results.

**Table 6. Success Rates in Initial Literacy (IL)**

Types of Training	Success Rate (of evaluated total)			Attrition Rate*		
	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men	Total
FONAEF Funding in 2003/2004	<b>72.00%</b>	<b>80.00%</b>	<b>75.00%</b>	<b>40.00%</b>	<b>35.00%</b>	<b>38.00%</b>
National Average	<b>62.28%</b>	<b>76.78%</b>	<b>68.66%</b>	<b>46.05 %</b>	<b>36.71%</b>	<b>41.75%</b>

\*It is important to avoid confusion here between dropout and attrition rates. The first comes from the following formula:  $\frac{\text{evaluated}}{\text{enlisted}} \times 100$ . The second, the attrition rate, includes both dropouts and instances of academic failure; it is obtained through the following formula:  $\frac{\text{successful}}{\text{enlisted}} \times 100$ .

## 2.8. The Concept's Influence on Other Sectors

70. In Senegal by way of example, the following sectors have adopted the 'Faire Faire' strategy for their own use:

The Ministry of Health, within its integrated health development program (PDIS).

The Ministry of Planning, within its social development funds agency (AFDS) which manages certain aspects of the fight against poverty.

The Ministry of Family and Social Action, within its poverty reduction project (PLCP) supported by the African Development Bank.

The Early Childhood Development Agency, in piloting community models in the field of early childhood education.

All projects of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fishing, and Farming (including the Djourbel agro-forestry project, the animal breeding support project, the rural development support project, etc.).

## 2.9. Outcomes of Implementation

### 71. AT THE POLITICAL LEVEL

(i) *A coherent vision and clear action plan in the field of literacy*

The establishment of ministerial departments, ministerial *cabinets*, or of a secretary of state for non-formal education shows governments' commitment to a consistent policy vision in this field.

(ii) *A renewed interest in non-formal education*

This sub-sector has always been ignored in the educational system of most African countries. The sustained financial support of development partners has contributed in large part to the increase of interest in it. NFE's repositioning in education policy, and the growing number of partners supporting its activities, are indicative.

(iii) *The partners' mobilization of sustained funding*

This is undoubtedly a major success. The significance of the funds invested in the sub-sector since the launch of action plans in Senegal in 1995 and Burkina Faso in 2000, and the diversity of partners who were once reticent to provide financial support, are proof of the achievement of sustained funding - also one of the goals of the 'Faire Faire' strategy.

(iv) *Support to the strengthening and mobilization of civil society*

If in Senegal the State has contributed liberally to the rapid emergence of an organized class of service providers who worked previously on the official periphery, in other countries such as Mali, Cote d'Ivoire and Burkina Faso the authorities rely on existing field organizations (CCA-ONG, CONGACI, CCEB-BF).

(v) *Difficulty harmonizing interventional methods and costs*

Despite the efforts made to harmonize and standardize practices and interventions, difficulties do persist at the level of the financing partners (regarding unit costs, the nature of the programs) in Senegal; on the other hand this issue has been addressed in Burkina Faso, for instance through the associative structure of the new Fund.

(vi) *A decentralization process that is far from complete*

The 'Faire Faire' strategy is in essence a decentralized form of educational provision. It speaks perfectly to the needs of decentralization, which is unanimously recognized as necessary and irreversible. Education is a transferable skill. In spite of the measures taken to date to devolve greater responsibility to the grass roots, this responsibility is not as yet effectively exercised by local administrative bodies; this situation is grounded in:

Weak financial and technical capital at the local levels.

Ambiguities in the articulation between enlargement and decentralization.

An approach that puts service providers in center stage and relegates local administration to the back seat as observers.

A weak understanding of interventions at the local level.

Mutual distrust between the actors on the ground, who find it difficult to operate together on the basis of consultative decision-making.

Recurrent disregard for their institutional legitimacy.

### 72. AT THE PARTNERSHIP LEVEL

- **The rapid emergence of a class of providers** entrusted with carrying out interventions, and whose number in Senegal grew from under 100 in 1995 to over 500 in 2000.

The State had to satisfy one condition laid down by its financing partners, namely the existence of a civil society capable of acting on and negotiating the definition and management of policy. This gave

the 'Faire Faire' strategy its innovative character, but also created **the first sources of bias and drift in policy implementation**. The measures facilitating the emergence of facilitators also account for their massification, and proper management skills are not a given. It appears from the statistics that the policy has spawned a diversity of questionable structures.

- (i) *An organized partnership with frameworks for dialogue that are in place, but still not used properly.*
- (ii) *Ambiguities in the status of the stakeholders: the sustainability of the State-civil society partnership is being put to the test.*

Can the durability of the State-civil society partnership stand the test of time? There are indeed areas of tension and conflict at several levels in the relationship which it would be good to assess, given the financial and power-sharing stakes.

- (iii) *The place of the beneficiaries in the system*

The beneficiary organizations and communities have little access into the projects' technical and financial management. The focus is on the providers, to the detriment of the beneficiary communities themselves. The part of the latter is so far centered on organizational aspects related to the centers' operation: drawing and checking participant lists, appointment of facilitators, set up and operation of relay points, raising in-kind or financial contributions from learners for the construction of a center, ensuring regular attendance, putting in place a management structure...

(iv) *An accepted division of roles and responsibilities* by the different parties concerned. The prerogatives of each actor are complementary, and should not be in conflict.

### 73. AT THE TECHNICAL MANAGEMENT LEVEL

- (i) *A poorly adapted planning system*

We note among peripheral bodies their difficulty in mastering data on literacy, a neglected member of the education sector family that presents its own distinct features (targets, contents, training strategy).

- (ii) *A supply-driven strategy*

The Senegalese experience appears in many ways to be a supply-driven strategy (in other words, *how to offer educational services whose need is solicited and with little basis in an analysis of demand* for literacy services in the communities; in many cases this need is not expressed in communities, but merely created by providers who take continual advantage of their lucrative position of interface between the State and the communities).

- (iii) *The triple function of the providers*

In all the countries applying the strategy, the service provider acts as gauge of demand, project promoter, and executor all in one. Herein lays one of the greatest weaknesses of the system, as we know that controls of reliability are weak given the limited nature of decentralized technical services, and the lack of trained personnel, logistical means, and support from local academic authorities.

- (iv) *Significant financial support*

The sector which was long neglected within the educational system is now receiving significant financial support without necessarily being able to administer it properly; this can cause drifts into a 'gold rush' mentality or jockeying for control of resources.

- (v) *The procedures: between principle and practice*

The very coherent conceptual framework devised for the strategy is not always followed, for political reasons: delayed deposits in order to please a certain *clientèle*, bailing out of foundering or inexperienced facilitators, dividing up of assignments so that each gets 'a piece of the action', substitutions in the membership of technical analysis committees in order to better influence decisions, etc.

**Table 7. Synthesis of the Lessons Learned**

<b>DOMAIN</b>	<b>PROGRESS</b>	<b>PROBLEMS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<b>1- Organization</b>	<p>1-1 Implementation of coherent and comprehensive sector management, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Appointment of a Minister in charge of the sector.</li> <li>- Setting up a resource center.</li> <li>- Creation of an operational steering committee.</li> <li>- Reorganization of technical services through the DAEB, the DPLN and technical support group (CAT) in Senegal, or the creation of the DGAENF in Burkina Faso.</li> </ul> <p>1-2 Setting up major projects/programs to implement the action plan with the support of a private management structure or of an association acting as a financial executive agency.</p>	<p>1- Institutional instability regarding the status of the office (full Minister, Associate minister?), personnel (five Ministers and five DAEBs in 10 years), and technical directorates (DAEB, DPLN, and DALN in Senegal, INA, INEFNEB, DGCRIF, and DRINA in Burkina Faso).</p> <p>2- Legal issues regarding the unofficial status of some bodies and the absence of a stable and official organizational chart.</p> <p>3- Resistance, insecurity, and weakness at the information-sharing level with regard to structural and program innovations, and to the explanation, assignment, and acceptance of roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>4- Dissatisfaction regarding financial management and calls for an association.</p>	<p>Three conditions for policy success:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Strong and permanent political support.</li> <li>➤ Stable sector organization (allocate time for the formulation and implementation of a clear vision).</li> <li>➤ Judicious selection of managers and technical personnel.</li> </ul>
<b>2- Steering</b>	<p>1- Existence of a national program, common action plans, and an annual plan for each project/program.</p> <p>2- Setting up planning mechanisms at the Ministerial (planning and strategic follow-up groups), technical directorate, and project levels.</p> <p>3- Setting up a coordination and regulatory mechanism</p>	<p>1- Poor command of basic data (absence of non-formal indicators, unreliable information, data collection and analysis strategies, human resources, methodology and processing of databases, contradictory sources</p>	<p>- Setting up a reliable database through pertinent techniques and the availability of sufficient, skilled personnel at all levels.</p> <p>- Setting up a single and autonomous agency for technical and financial execution.</p> <p>- Setting up a mechanism for governmental</p>

DOMAIN	PROGRESS	PROBLEMS	RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p>for the partners (steering committee, joint committee), for projects (steering committees), and for programs (harmonization of literacy project interventions).</p> <p>4- Effective geographical coordination of the partners' interventions.</p> <p>5- Agreement on the need for a program-based approach with an agency for technical and financial execution.</p> <p>6- Existence of a structure to coordinate research on languages (DPLN and Academy of Languages in Senegal).</p>	<p>of information).</p> <p>2- Difficulty in planning program operations including a clear and accepted distribution of roles.</p> <p>3- Absence of conflict arbitration.</p> <p>4- Steering mechanism is not functional (irregular meetings, lack of follow-up...).</p> <p>5- Poor command of the agenda of activities.</p> <p>6- Difficulties harmonizing the types, approaches, and costs of programs.</p> <p>7- Difficulties in implementing a programmatic approach (resource centers, handbook...).</p> <p>8- Weak coordination of research on languages.</p>	<p>interventions in the field of literacy (inter-sector).</p>
<b>3- Partnerships</b>	<p>1- Moments of productive political dialogue on orientation, strategies... (Colloquia, national workshops, forums on knowledge-sharing, partnership structures...).</p> <p>2- Partnership approach featuring the 'delegation strategy' adopted at the national and regional levels.</p> <p>3- Support to the emergence and development of appropriate civil society structures.</p> <p>4- Acceptance of the policy and action plan was realized with the participation of all the actors.</p>	<p>1- Uneven political dialogue (repeated and prolonged gaps) reflected in the non-operation of CNCAT for several years now in Senegal or of CAPAL in Chad.</p> <p>2- Issues related to the operation and the professionalism of service provider organizations.</p>	<p>- Re-foundation of the partnership approach (redefinition of scope, involvement, nature of the relationships, organization, regulatory mechanism...).</p> <p>- Enhanced professionalism of the service providers (organization, personnel...).</p>
<b>4- Funding</b>	<p>1- Availability of funds for the sector.</p>	<p>1- Weakness in the national mobilization</p>	<p>- Increase of the share of national resources</p>

DOMAIN	PROGRESS	PROBLEMS	RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p>2- Diversity of funding sources.</p> <p>3- Existence of support funds and resource centers.</p>	<p>of resources.</p> <p>2- Limited resources in some sub-sectors, relative to their importance and activities (literate environment, research...).</p> <p>3- Difficulty in raising and allocating funds within set deadlines.</p> <p>4- Disagreements regarding the status of national funds and the centers.</p>	<p>committed to program funding.</p> <p>- Diversification of national funding sources (local administration, private sector...)</p> <p>- Improved resource management.</p>
<p><b>5- Capacity-Building</b></p>	<p>1- Existence of a capacity enhancement plan for human and financial resources.</p> <p>2- Existence of a national team for action research and training and of a Canadian agency for the implementation of 'capacity-building and partnership development' in Senegal.</p> <p>3- Organization of training for personnel of the Ministry, decentralized services, service providers, administration, projects...</p> <p>4- Actual expertise in non-formal education (consultants, <i>cabinets</i> and offices...).</p> <p>5- Improved working conditions for the agents at both the central and peripheral levels of the Ministry.</p>	<p>1- Insufficient use of committed and available resources.</p> <p>2- Absence of steering with regard to the capacity-building plan (human resources department...).</p>	<p>- Definition of a national capacity-building strategy.</p> <p>- Setting up an implementation system for the above strategy.</p>
<p><b>6- Decentralization</b></p>	<p>1- Existence of legal (laws, decrees, delegation of powers...), institutional (regional councils), and technical structures enabling the decentralization of literacy in Senegal.</p> <p>2- Existence of a specific experimental program put in</p>	<p>1- Limited capacity of local administrative bodies regarding the management of literacy and the promotion of national languages (human resources, organization,</p>	<p>- Transfer jurisdiction over to the regional councils regarding the conception and implementation of regional non-formal education programs.</p> <p>- Integration of PAIS in the global literacy program.</p> <p>- Elaboration and</p>



DOMAIN	PROGRESS	PROBLEMS	RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p>place to implementing decentralization (the PAIS).</p> <p>3- A start to the decentralization of the selection process for non-formal education project requests and petitions.</p> <p>4- Growing involvement of regional councils in the effective enforcement of the law.</p> <p>5- Increased financial contributions and organizational involvement of the regional councils.</p>	<p>strategy...)</p> <p>2- Weaknesses at the implementation level in the decentralization of literacy and the promotion of national languages.</p> <p>3- Inexistence of an effective plan regarding the transfer of competencies.</p> <p>4- Delays in the availability of resources.</p> <p>5- Defective conception and operational problems regarding the use of PAIS.</p>	<p>implementation of a jurisdiction transfer mechanism.</p>
<b>7- Enlargement of the Network</b>	<p>1- Availability in peripheral areas of skilled personnel posted to the NFE sub-sector.</p> <p>2- Improved logistical capacity (availability of motorcycles, gas...).</p> <p>3- Non-formal education is now better taken into consideration.</p>	<p>1- Uninspired selection, and insufficient number, of personnel.</p> <p>2- Reticent acceptance of issues related to non-formal education and its strategies on the part of local academic authorities.</p> <p>3- Weak involvement of the local academic authorities.</p> <p>4- Insufficiently decentralized and documented monitoring.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stricter selection of personnel.</li> <li>- Setting up a literacy desk within the peripheral services that operates with skilled personnel.</li> <li>- Decongestion of the central services.</li> <li>- Taking measures towards improved management of NFE at the local level.</li> <li>- Human and financial resource management that follows a decentralizing trend.</li> </ul>
<b>8- Communication</b>	<p>1- Enhanced value of NFE and of the promotion national languages.</p> <p>2- Unanimous agreement on the importance of communication regarding policy and the action plan.</p> <p>3- Existence of a communications network, even if not effective in all countries.</p> <p>4- Existence of a communications plan.</p>	<p>1- Weak implementation of the communications plan.</p> <p>2- Insufficiency of communications resources.</p> <p>3- Insufficient consideration of non-formal sector communications in the education development program (involvement of the private sector, marginalized groups,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improved promotion of the sector's achievements.</li> <li>- Assignment of a representative of the State media to the CNRE.</li> <li>- Renegotiation of the share of the communications budget allotted to the non-formal sector.</li> </ul>

DOMAIN	PROGRESS	PROBLEMS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		local administration, communities...).	

## 3. The Main Lines of a New Iteration

### 3.1. A Repositioning of Communities

74. In order to increase the level of involvement of communities and their grasp of the interventions, the major challenge consists in changing the position of these groups in the process. To this end, the following measures could be considered:

- *Creating the conditions for the funds to follow the learners (and thus the communities) rather than the service providers:* this would require the identification of real demand and work on a contractual basis with the communities themselves.
- *Practical consideration of the groups' opinions:* opportunities for intervention should not only depend on the mere opinion of the local academic authority or the local administration, or on the will of the facilitator/provider, but should result from a decision taken jointly with the communities.
- *Transfer some of the management responsibility:* the setting up infrastructures and their management (center, library, acquisition of pedagogical materials, financing income-generating activities, and salaries) should be transferred to the local level, based on guidelines to be commonly agreed.

### 3.2. Harmonization with Local Development

75. Currently, most rural communities in Senegal have local development plans that enjoy the advantage of detailed diagnostic elements and priority lines of action. Literacy actions would only benefit from insertion into these new structures.

### 3.3. A Strategy of Variable Geometry

76. To remain consistent with one of the ground rules of the 'Faire Faire' strategy and to adapt actions to social, cultural, and economic realities on the ground, it would be beneficial to review certain elements of the strategy in the areas of its ideology, contents, and management norms.

### 3.4. Reviewing the Supply Strategy

77. Even if illiteracy is a handicap, it clearly exists alongside others which are often more acute and to which it must defer. Literacy actions cannot continue to 'act alone' as they do now. Hence the need to ground supply in actual need, and literacy actions should be positioned upstream, downstream, or at the conclusion of the process as the case may be, and according to local specificities.

### 3.5. Anchoring Interventions in Existing Social Structures

78. The formalization of local structures through the acquisition of legal status is one objective of the program and a condition for more sound contractual bases. This should give way to an effort to adapt management procedures to the organizational configuration of each locality. The procedures and the approach should be differentiated in order to embrace this dimension.

### 3.6. Additional Points

79. Certain specific issues deserve particular attention:

(i) ***The articulation of literacy programs with national strategies for poverty reduction and with the NEPAD:***

If ‘... poverty also means not being able to participate in decision-making, being excluded from power, not having the possibility of giving one’s opinion’ and if ‘... the poor are those we do not take into account simply because we cannot hear them’ then literacy, which is a means of economic, social, cultural, and psychological liberation, should constitute a cross-cutting strategy for poverty reduction.

80. What should be done is:

To show the ways in which NFE could and should decisively contribute to poverty reduction.

To emphasize its cross-cutting character.

To specify a coordination mechanism for the government and its partners’ action.

To include literacy components in all projects and programs.

To finance NFE through favorable arbitration.

To adopt an inter-sectoral approach.

(ii) ***The need to take into account the prickly brain drain issue:***

Not only is the current NFE sector not appealing (poor resources, absence of career opportunities, low remuneration...), its few staff members that are trained at great expense (scholarships abroad, costly internships, study visits...) have the tendency to subsequently migrate towards other more engaging sectors: it is thus difficult to find in the literacy directorates any skilled statisticians, evaluators, sociologists, or didactic staff.

(iii) ***The need to set up ‘non-formal education studies’ in francophone Western African universities***

The only source of higher training of this type in the Sahel region is located in Niamey; it is the *Centre de Formation des Cadres de l’Alphabétisation*, whose progress has not lived up to expectations.