



Association for the Development of Education in Africa

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

Effective Schools and Quality Improvement

**Parallel Session B-5
The Equity Imperative**

Complementary Education Programs in ADEA Countries

*by David Balwanz, Audrey-Marie Schuh Moore and
Joseph DeStefano
Education Quality Improvement Program (EQUIP)
United States Agency for International Development*

**Working Document
DRAFT**

PLEASE DO NOT DISSEMINATE

DOC B-5.1 +

This document was prepared by USAID's Education Quality Improvement Project for ADEA's Biennial Meeting (Libreville, Gabon, March 27-31, 2006).

The views and opinions expressed in this volume are those of the authors 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) – 2006

Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA)

International Institute for Educational Planning

7-9 rue Eugène Delacroix

75116 Paris, France

Tel.: +33(0)1 45 03 77 57

Fax: +33(0)1 45 03 39 65

adea@iiep.unesco.org

web site: www.ADEAnet.org



Contents

1. Introduction	5
2. Findings	6
3. Selection Methodology	8
3.1 A review of education models	8
3.2 A framework for complementary education.....	9
3.3 Process for Identifying Models in ADEA Countries	11
3.4 Research Challenges.....	11
4. Toward an Assessment of Quality	12
5. Conclusion.....	15

List of Tables

Table 2.1: Complementary Education Programs by ADEA Country

Table 4.1: Examples of Complementary Education Programs

1. Introduction

1. At the dawn of the twenty-first century, nearly all countries in sub-Saharan Africa have regions where GER is near to or over 100% and where the vast majority of the population is literate. Yet, other regions within these same countries display dismal education indicators, where efforts to improve the educational lot of the children seem frustrated by as many challenges as there are people.
2. Underserved regions/populations in ADEA countries are more likely rural than urban and may be isolated geographically. Populations in these regions generally exhibit a lower level of formal educational attainment than the general population and a higher than average incidence of poverty. Formal education in these areas is often not available. Achieving education for all in Africa means more effectively providing education in hard to reach regions in each country.
3. Amid the sector-wide change and governmental energy, characteristic of countries reaching toward access and quality goals, has been the quiet, yet insistent voice, of communities organizing, managing and participating in the provision of primary education in partnership with government and non-governmental organizations. Complementary education programs, which have been evolving over the past fifteen years, have provided effective schooling in many underserved areas.
4. Complementary education programs are designed specifically to extend the reach of formal public schooling in developing countries to better serve the most disadvantaged and/or remote areas.¹ Successful complementary programs leverage community interest, resources and management capabilities with the technical, development and administrative capabilities of international, local and governmental partners to create schools that increase the access, completion and learning of local children in underserved areas.
5. Research presented in this paper documents the existence in the vast majority of ADEA countries of complementary education programs that reach children in underserved areas who otherwise may not have access to basic education. The paper begins with research findings, follows with a section on the methodology used to identify complementary education programs and closes with a preliminary discussion on identifying quality indicators in complementary models.

¹ DeStefano, 2006.

2. Findings

6. To prepare for the 2006 ADEA Biennale meeting and discussion on Effective Schools, the EQUIP2 research team conducted a review of existing complementary education programs in sub-Saharan Africa. The review, which targeted each ADEA country, located documentation and research on 154 complementary education programs in 39 of the 48 ADEA countries. (see Table 2.1). Nearly all programs reach thousands of children in underserved areas on an annual basis. In total, the programs identified reach over 3.5 million children.

7. Several of these programs stand out because they account for a significant portion of children in a given country receiving primary education. Community schools in Mali and Togo reach 135,000 and 83,223 children, respectively, each representing nearly 10% of the country's primary school enrollments. Community Schools in Zambia reach 500,000 children; Nomadic Schools in Nigeria reach 200,000 children; and Village Based Schools in Malawi reach well over 300,000 children. Complementary programs account for the majority of primary education access in Somalia and Swaziland. In Ethiopia, two NGOs in partnership with the Ethiopian government have worked with over 1,600 communities to open community-based primary schools.

8. This preliminary finding does more than suggest the presence of programs that operate on the margins of the formal primary education system. Rather, it systematically documents the existence of complementary education programs that provide regional and sometimes nation-wide access, completion and learning opportunities to otherwise underserved populations.

Table 2.1 Complementary Education Programs by ADEA Country

Country	# of Programs Identified	# of schools	# of students served	# of children in primary school
Angola	2	53	34,000	1,068,613
Benin	1	1,217	-	1,151,496
Botswana	2	20	-	328,485
Burkina Faso	4	283	-	914,775
Burundi	4	-	303,439	805,988
Cameroon	3	900	-	2,724,719
Central African Rep.	1	23	1,000	410,155
Chad	3	1,037	135,800	1,011,262
Congo (Democratic Republic of)	4	-	13,800	3,972,948
Côte d'Ivoire	3	6	-	2,107,894
Djibouti	4	29	-	44,028
Equatorial Guinea	1	-	-	78,280
Eritrea	1	-	-	327,495
Ethiopia	13	2,045	38,740	7,109,299
Gabon	1	-	800	280,994
Gambia	3	21	-	159,204
Ghana	7	1,530	24,000	2,573,699
Guinea	7	1,346	960,000	996,373
Guinea-Bissau	4	-	-	148,476
Kenya	7	2	-	5,770,039
Liberia	2	115	3,600	494,280
Madagascar	2	260	-	2,403,724
Malawi	4	540	443,000	2,830,812
Mali	9	1,932	200,000	1,226,198
Mauritania	3	120	-	373,627
Mauritius	1	51	-	134,057
Niger	3	30	1,254	760,106
Nigeria	4	3,301	303,844	19,289,161
Senegal	4	331	9,900	1,192,306
Sierra Leone	6	114	19,250	547,687
Somalia	11	1,593	225,108	-
Sudan	7	707	91,000	2,854,627
Swaziland	2	509	29,000	211,201
Tanzania	6	41	381	4,815,593
Togo	4	967	83,223	975,886
Uganda	5	525	58,000	6,880,902
Zambia	3	2,704	500,000	1,609,521

3. Selection Methodology

3.1 A review of education models

9. One challenge faced by the research team was to construct a satisfactory definition for complementary models that allows for differentiation from alternative education, non-formal education, private school models, etc. A brief analysis and comparison of each model vis-à-vis our concept of complementary models and specific case study research helped the research team hone its concept of complementary education. A brief description of other models follows.

10. *Public Education* is managed by a Ministry of Education, which creates and operates the management and administrative structure of schools. Though often operating through decentralized structures, MOE staff direct teacher recruitment, development and placement, curriculum content, school location, etc. Financing of public education generally comes from the government.

11. *Alternative Primary Education* is generally considered an umbrella term for programs outside the formal system. APE programs can include *community schools*, *alternative schools*, and *non formal education* and may exhibit characteristics considered important to organizing NGOs or communities. Characteristics can include curricular additions (e.g. peace education, civic education, etc.), incorporation of different pedagogical practices, and a variety of school management models. Farrell and Mfum-Mensah suggest using the term alternative ‘as it seems the most generic’ and offer a preliminary methodology for classifying APE programs. The literature on alternative schools generally excludes private, for-profit models and many types of non-formal programs.²

12. *Non formal Education* can be differentiated from formal and informal education as “comprising out-of school and continuing education, on the job training, etc.”³ The ADEA Working Group on Non Formal Education (WGNFE) notes “it was created to explore the nature and impact of the many non-school and adult varieties of education.” Historically, NFE models and curricula have been used to raise class-consciousness or serve as an alternative to potentially disempowering public school structures and curricula.

13. *Private Schools* can be defined as schools run by private operators that are not a part of the public system and may or may not be organized as profit making entities. Latham offers a broad classification of private schools by suggesting the inclusion of

² Farrell, Joe and Obed Mfum-Mensah. A preliminary Analytical Framework for Comparative Analysis of Alternative Primary Education Programs in Developing Nations. OISE. March 2002. Prepared for CIES. Suggest a framework for a comparative understanding of Alternative Primary Education Programs in Developing countries. Also discussion on NFE.

³ Torres, Rosa-María. Amplifying and Diversifying Learning: Formal, Non-Formal and Informal Education Revisited. 2001. (UNESCO 1991: 17-18, qtd in Torres) The Torres document offers an outline of an extended paper under preparation, commissioned by the ADEA Working Group on Non-Formal Education for presentation at the session on “Mainstreaming NFE: Moving from the margin and going to scale” during the ADEA Biennale (Arusha, Tanzania, 7-11 October 2001).

Ramos, Flavia. NFE and Development. Notes prepared for a course at American University. 2005. Offers the Coombs & Ahmed [1974] definition where NFE is defined as any organized educational activity outside the established formal system - whether operating separately or as an important feature of some broader activity - that is intended to serve identifiable learning clientele and learning objectives.
http://www.adeanet.org/workgroups/en_wgnf.html [accessed January 19, 2006].

community, religious, 'spontaneous', and profit-making schools. Latham's definition does not specifically include NGOs as organizing or resource providing bodies, and it differentiates *community* from *spontaneous* schools. Community schools are defined as those receiving government subsidies that are normally registered with public authorities; spontaneous schools are defined as community supported and non-registered entities.⁴

14. A closer look at the above models and the case study analysis prepared by our research team helped us realize that previously articulated models offered a poor framework and incomplete set of tools for fully describing the activities exhibited by complementary programs. While the alternative education framework identifies many of the specific characteristics exhibited by complementary models, it does not offer the tools to differentiate complementary models from non-formal programs or place complementary models as actors and stakeholders engaged within a national policy context. In short, the alternative education definition is too general and broad to convey adequately the nature of complementary programs, and misses some important features of complementary models. The relationship between complementary models and *Community Schools*, which are often categorized under the alternative education framework, is discussed in section 3.4.

15. Complementary models are not non formal education. Complementary models offer instruction based on helping participants achieve basic competencies in a curricular structure closely aligned with public schools. Non-formal models often do not offer this range of instruction nor do they offer the more formal structure seen in complementary models. The strong link complementary models have to the government curriculum, and the general targeting of school-age youth of these programs suggest that these models may be better described as complimentary equivalents to formal public schools, than as non formal education programs.

16. Like the alternative education framework, the private education framework does not seem to offer the best tools to effectively describe complementary models, especially the often complex relationships between stakeholders and the targeting of the underserved. Though complementary models often leverage community resources to cover operational and maintenance needs, they are not profit making operations like many private schools.⁵

3.2 A framework for complementary education

17. In light of our understanding of other models and case study research, the research team began developing a framework and set of characteristics to help to systematically identify complementary education programs and differentiate complementary models from other models of schooling. DeStefano offers a framework noting "Complementary education programs are designed specifically to extend the reach of formal public schooling in developing countries to better serve the most disadvantaged and/or remote areas."⁶

⁴ Latham, Michael. A handbook on Private Sector Participation in Education. A review of possible ways and means. Council for British Teachers. 2002. Latham builds on work from Kitaev, 1999.

⁶ DeStefano, Joe, et. Al. Effective Schools for Disadvantaged and Underserved Populations. ADEA 2003. [p.5]. Complementary Education research and analysis owes much to earlier work by Farrell, Hartwell, Rugh. Earlier work helps elucidate complementary models and explain the emergence of these schooling models. Hartwell [2003] offers an analysis of Complementary Education program effectiveness that offers some ideas of characteristics of comp. ed programs. More specifically, Rugh and Bossert [1998] offer a table comparing BRAC schools from Formal Primary Schools organized by the government of Bangladesh.

18. Analysis of case study material for common characteristics saw the emergence of a package of common traits, the most significant of which are highlighted in the list below.

Characteristics of Complementary Education Programs

Target underserved areas and/or traditionally underrepresented populations
Offer structure and curriculum similar to that offered by public schools. Curriculum directly links to MOE curriculum; schools often exhibit grade promotion system and regular testing.

Teachers are recruited locally, have a lower level of qualifications than government teachers, and serve on a volunteer bases or for lower pay.

The Community (via a School Management Committee, PTA, or both, etc.) plays a significant role in one or many of the following: school management, administration, operation and finance.

Regular program support and ongoing training for teachers and school management committees is provided

Schools are highly responsive to local needs and context offering flexibility in the school year or daily schedule and frequently offering Mother tongue instruction

19. Satellite Schools in Burkina Faso and the Alternative Basic Education Karamoja program in Uganda offer instructive examples of complementary education models.

20. *Burkina-Faso – Satellite Schools:* Inspired by the BRAC model and aware of low level of access in rural communities, the Government of Burkina-Faso and UNICEF collaborated with rural communities to create satellite schools that offer grades 1-3. Since 1995, 230 satellite schools serving over 100,000 children have been created in villages where the nearest primary school is not within walking distance and where the community management committees have found space in which schools can operate, recruited and hired local teachers, and managed day-to-day operations of the schools. First year instruction is offered in the local language with a progressive move toward French over three years. The schools offer a low student teacher ratio (29:1) and a retention rate of 95%. Pupils graduating from satellite schools demonstrate a performance rate on math and literacy exams 1.5 to 2 times higher than peers in the conventional system.

21. *Uganda – Alternative Basic Education Karamoja:* The Alternative Basic Education for Karamoja (ABEK) program targets children in pastoral communities to bridge the gap between the formal public schools and the semi-nomadic pastoral lifestyle. ABEK schools are managed by school committees who identify school location, recruit, hire and manage local teachers, and work in partnership with district local governments of Kotido and Moroto. The daily schedule is flexible with school either beginning in the early morning or late at night so that children do not miss household chores. Teachers use a revised primary school curriculum that includes indigenous knowledge and relevant life skills. ABEK is anchored in the GoU national education policy and is a collaborative effort between Save the Children/Norway, the Ugandan MoES, UNICEF and the ABEK

Hartwell, Ash. Analytical matrix for comparing EQUIP2 research on complementary education programs. Unpublished. March 2003.

Rugh, Andrea and Angela Bossert. Involving Communities: Participation in the Delivery of Education Programs. Creative Associates International, Inc. 1998.

communities. In 2002, 23,262 children enrolled at over 150 ABEK centers (13,637 of whom are girls) and 1,427 ABEK students crossed over to the formal system.

3.3 Process for Identifying Models in ADEA Countries

22. The purpose of the desk review was to identify complementary education models presently existing in ADEA countries using the above set of characteristics.

23. The first phase of research involved a literature review of general and case-specific background material gathered from case study research and following leads from bibliographies and references relevant to ADEA countries. This phase drew on the research and documentation of community schools and ‘alternative’ schools, and included discussions with authors of these materials and actors in the NGO and donor community. Materials sourced were mainly published studies and literature reviews, draft conference papers, articles from academic journals and materials produced by multilateral and bilateral organizations. Many of the larger, better-known programs were identified through this process.

24. The second phase of research was mainly web-based and specifically targeted each of the forty-eight ADEA countries. This led to the identification of many less well-known programs, but also identified numerous programs that could not be classified as complementary models. The information sources accessed in this search included: policy briefs, journal articles, program reviews and evaluations, web-based program descriptions, promotional material, newspaper and magazine articles, country EFA plans, other government planning documents, and press releases.

25. Information on the complementary programs identified was compiled in a chart documenting the vital characteristics of the program and the supporting resources. Corroborating information was sought for programs for which there was little information or information of poor quality. To date, this research has identified 154 programs that could be classified as complementary models. Complementary programs exist in 39 of the 48 ADEA countries and reach over 3.5 million children.

3.4 Research Challenges

26. Two significant challenges in identifying models were (a) differentiating NGO/PVO lead initiatives driven through public school systems and (b) breaking through the language and discussion on ‘community schools’ to discern whether particular “community school” programs could be classified as complementary models.⁷ Research identified several NGO/PVO initiatives that extended schooling opportunities to marginalized populations and worked with School Management Committees, but often left unclear SMC responsibilities and the relationship between the community and the formal education system.⁸

27. The “community schools” literature also posed challenges. Though our team identified community schools as complementary models in nineteen (19) ADEA countries (this included countries in which several different community school programs exist),

⁷This paper builds on the former work in community schools, including Miller-Grandvaux and Yoder [2002], [A Literature Review of Community Schools in Africa](#) which presents data on 28 programs in 13 ADEA countries.

⁸An example of this comes from the UNICEF Girl Friendly Schools in Cameroon. The UNICEF Girl Friendly Schools initiative offers training, funding and community organizing to 900 government organized schools. Though PTAs 300 of these schools received significant support from UNICEF, it remained uncertain the extent of their managerial control vis-à-vis the government.

discerning the relationship between the community school, the public education system and other, often NGO/PVO stakeholders, was challenging. An example is *Dina* schools in Madagascar which are created on the basis of a formal contractual arrangement between the community and the government with the purpose of providing basic education at community schools. Do they use locally hired teachers? Do School Management Committees exert managerial or operational control? Do they target the underserved? There is still work to do here to fully understand whether a given community school program operates as a genuine complement to the formal public system, and whether it exhibits some of the basic characteristics which research is showing are contributing factors to effective schooling.

28. Emergency education programs, refugee schools, pastoral schools and the numerous variations on Islamic education (including Koranic schools and madrassahs) also offered classification challenges. Decisions were made on a case-by-case basis by noting whether programs exhibited the package of characteristics seen in complementary models. Excepting some programs linking madrassahs to public schools, madrassahs were generally left out of the cataloging process. This, in large part, is because the research team was unable to access sufficient information on madrassahs in ADEA countries.

4. Toward an Assessment of Quality

29. EQUIP2 case study research suggests that complementary models can support effective schools in underserved areas by providing children an opportunity to learn.⁹ The research further suggests that it may be possible to isolate critical areas impacted by complementary models that lead to the increase in school effectiveness. These areas are:

- Location and size of school
- Governance and decision-making
- Language of instruction and curriculum
- Teachers, teacher training and support

30. Of the 154 programs identified in the desk review, there is likely a wide range in program organization, management, delivery and quality. At present, there are few analytical tools that can be used to effectively differentiate complementary models from other models and few tools available to help policymakers ascertain their range of effectiveness demonstrated by complementary programs.

31. Based on our preliminary research, we would like to explore the development of such tools. The characteristics outlined in section 3.2 can serve as a starting point for defining complementary models against the relief of other primary education models and programs. Answering the questions listed below could serve as a starting point for creating an analytical tool that could be used to indicate the range of quality delivered by complementary models.

Are the schools located within walking distance of the target populations?

Do the schools have a community-based management structure that is able to effectively oversee the day-to-day operations of their schools; assuring student and

⁹ The body of EQUIP2 case study research is available in DeStefano, 2006.

teacher attendance, setting the calendar and schedule, collecting contributions, paying teachers, etc.?

What percentage of teachers are recruited locally and are part of the communities in which they serve?

Do teachers and SMCs participate in effective and relevant training and development opportunities?

Does the model follow a local-language based curriculum that often simplifies and focuses the national curriculum, is supported with materials and instructional strategies that, where possible, relate to the local/regional context and issues?

Does the program exhibit student-to-teacher ratios that allow all students an opportunity to learn?¹⁰

Are the schools formally recognized by the Government? Does the program have a collaborative relationship with the Ministry of Education?

32. Next steps include the more specific targeting of indicators that have a proven impact on school effectiveness and more fully developing a tool that can measure the extent to which indicators are expressed in each complementary program. Some programs may not offer regular training or support to teachers; others may have school management committees that function well on teacher management issues, but poorly on financial matters. We hope further research on the catalogue of complementary programs identified will offer insight into addressing these challenges.

33. Table 4.1 offers a sample of some complementary programs that meet the initial set of characteristics outlined in section 3.2. These programs could be assessed for quality once quality indicators are more fully developed. Elaborated descriptions of Village Based Schools in Malawi and Interactive Radio Instruction in Zambia appear below the table.

¹⁰ DeStefano, 10

Table 4.1 – Examples of Complementary Education Programs

Program	Relationship to Government	SMC Responsibilities	Outside facilitators
Burkina Faso: Satellite Schools	Considered part of the government system	SMCs build school, manage local teachers and daily operations	UNICEF provides resources/training
Ethiopia: BESO Schools	Schools part of the public system; offers administrative and training support; but not supervision	Manage daily operations; recruit and manage teachers; responsible for school grounds/finance	World Learning trains and supports SMCs
Malawi – Village Based Schools	MOEST facilitated complementary intervention; offers administrative oversight	SMCs recruit, train and manage paraprofessional teachers; run daily school operations	Save the Children/US trains/develops SMCs, provides materials
TOGO - Ecoles d'initiative locale (EDIL)/ Community Schools	EDILs can be registered with the Government, but do not have legal status	SMC drives the development, management and daily operation of the EDIL	Several NGOs involved offering varied support
Uganda: Alternative Basic Education Karamoja	Part of Govt' System/ policy to reach pastoral populations	SMCs identify school location, manage local teachers	Save the Children/ Norway provides resources/training
Zambia – Interactive Radio Instruction program	MOE provides policy support, staff resources, broadcasting support	Community provides space, facilitator and radio	EDC creates curriculum, facilitates MOE involvement

34. *Malawi – Village Based Schools:* Village Based Schools were borne out Ministry of Education efforts to revitalize and expand the capacity of School Management Committees with the hope of increasing the role of communities in improving school facilities and attendance rates. Save the Children/US facilitates relevant training to paraprofessional teachers, SMCs, and PTAs, offers an abbreviated version of the government curriculum, contributes material and financial resources and works in partnership with SMCs to supervise schools. SMCs are responsible for identifying, hiring and managing local teachers, facilitating school construction and parental involvement and offering general oversight. The VBS program started as a pilot of 24 schools in 1994 and is currently reaching over 300,000 children through 455 schools.¹¹

35. *Zambia – Interactive Radio Instruction:* The IRI program was introduced by the Zambia MOE in 2000 in an effort to deliver the basic primary curriculum to out of school youth. The initiative targets OVCs and requires participating communities to identify and support a volunteer mentor, open a learning center and provide a radio and/or board for the center. To create the actual programming, EDC, an NGO partner, works with trained teachers seconded by the MOE to the Educational Broadcasting Service (EBS) to write, script and produce IRI programs. After a program pilot in 2000 demonstrated that participating children attained considerable learning gains in language and mathematics, the MOE implemented the program in all nine of Zambia's provinces. The MOE provincial and district offices are

¹¹ Miller-Grandvaux, Yolande. USAID and Community Schools in Africa: The Vision, the Strategy, the Reality 2004.

responsible for monitoring IRI centers and in 2004, IRI programming reached 38,513 learners in 647 centers.¹²

36. The development and refinement of quality indicators would allow for assessment of the complementary programs reaching the large numbers of children mentioned in Section 2 (Findings), Table 4.1, and, more generally, of all programs identified in the desk review.

5. Conclusion

37. The present catalogue of programs offers evidence of the prolific nature of complementary education programs in ADEA countries. Further assessment of the programs would depend on the development of tools that would help assess the general quality offered by complementary models and make it possible for governments, funders and NGOs to do a better job developing and implementing quality complementary education programs. A more refined understanding of elements of complementary models that lead to effective schools could also assist governments in facilitating interventions in public schools that mimic successes seen in complementary models.

¹² EDC, Inc. Final Report: Zambia's Interactive Radio Instruction Program. December 2004.