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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Social Assessment of GEQIP 2, was commissioned by the Ministry of Education (MoE) with the purpose of assessing the potential impact of GEQIP Phase 2’s proposed project components on the more vulnerable and disadvantaged groups and on the emerging regions in Ethiopia and, identify strategies for mitigating risk and adverse impacts.

Institutional and Social Background to Equitable Education: Vulnerability and access to education. Vulnerability and lack of access to education are highly complex and context-related. Whilst, they do not always overlap, children who are vulnerable are also likely to find access to quality education more difficult. Key factors shaping a child’s vulnerability to dropping out, repeating or never going to school include: poverty and food insecurity, gender, rural-urban and regional disparities. The overriding issues of equity and inclusion, recognised by the GoE, are that of differing levels of welfare for a number of vulnerable and disadvantaged groups and across the regions. Key factors shaping a child’s vulnerability to dropping out, repeating or never going to school include: poverty and food insecurity, gender disparities, rural-urban and regional differences. The GOE recognizes four emerging regions, which comprise of 10% of the population. The GOE recognizes four emerging regions, which comprise of 10% of the population, that experience difficulties in accessing quality education. In addition, the GoE recognises a number of disadvantaged groups excluded from educational opportunities: child labourers, pastoralists, orphans and vulnerable children and children with special needs. These groups suffer from entrenched and significant unequal access to education. However, a focus on disadvantaged and vulnerable groups may mean that the inequalities between individuals within groups are overlooked. Vertical inequalities within groups (e.g. groups of adolescent girls) are often larger than horizontal inequalities between groups (e.g. rural-urban populations). Existing data collection and monitoring systems have to be expanded to consider fully the range of vertical differences within the vulnerable and disadvantaged groups. This will be needed in future, to support better targeting of limited resources and programmes which can fully address the diverse range of opportunities and barriers, to quality education, across vulnerable and disadvantaged groups and populations.

Enabling Background for GEQIP Phase 2
Constitutional rights, policies and programmes in Ethiopia strongly support and promote the equitable inclusion of regions and vulnerable groups lagging behind in access to quality education. The GoE has moved on a range of fronts (laws, policies and programmes) to address both the supply and demand side constraints affecting enrolment, repetition and drop-out.

GEQIP Phase I included an explicit focus on gender. Attention was paid to the selection of female teachers for training courses and all data was disaggregated. EMIS data shows the following national achievements with respect to female participation in primary and secondary education since GEQIP Phase 1 was launched in 2009: the proportion of female teachers has increased from 33% to 34%; girls primary completion rate has increased from 45% to 52% at grade 8; girls’ drop out has decreased from 19% to 15% and 17,000 more girls passed the grade 10 examination.

GEQIP Phase I included support to Alternative Basic Education Centres which are designed as low cost alternatives to formal schools and reach vulnerable and disadvantaged children, especially in the emerging regions. ABECs use locally recruited facilitators to deliver the curriculum in a flexible way. Net enrolment rates in the two most under-served regions (Afar and Somali Regions) have increased by 5% and 13% since GEQIP Phase I was launched. However, challenges remain with respect to the capacity of the emerging regions to implement reforms. With respect to the provision of support for Children with Special needs, GEQIP Phase I did not include this as an explicit focus. EMIS data indicates that enrolment has declined slightly (from 47,000 to 43,000) but data is incomplete. The GEQIP Comprehensive Evaluation reports that there is scarcely any provision for students with special needs at school level.

GEQIP Phase I contributed to the building of institutional capacity both as a result of using government systems and by including an explicit capacity building component. Phase I has been...
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relatively successful at building capacity at federal, regional and school levels, but there has been limited progress in the Woredas.

**GEQIP Phase 2: Building on the Achievements of Phase 1**

GEQIP Phase 2 has responded to lessons learnt under GEQIP Phase 1 and emphasises the needs of:

a) regions, communities and groups that lag behind in access and equity compared to national averages and;

b) children with special needs who have limited access to the education system. The cross-cutting themes, under GEQIP Phase 1, remain central to the programme:

- attention to drop-out and repetition in school improvement programmes, teacher and leadership training;
- Emphasis on gender equity across the whole of the programme that goes beyond gender parity in enrolment to gender equality in: access to educational resources; participation in learning and teaching opportunities and gender equity in the application of school rules and regulations.

GEQIP Phase 2 comprises six integrated components:

- **Component 1**: Curriculum, textbooks and assessment to improve the quality and relevance of the curriculum; maintain and increase availability of textbooks and supplementary reading materials; and develop a robust national assessment and examination system and a school inspectorate. The introduction of braille textbooks is also proposed.
- **Component 2**: Teacher Development to improve the quality of teaching through pre-service teacher education, in-service teacher training, Continuous Professional Development and professional licensing and re-licensing.
- **Component 3**: School improvement to strengthen school planning for improved teaching and learning conditions and outcomes, and to fund the improvement plans through per capita school grant provided on the basis of enrolment to all government primary and secondary schools. There is provision for additional school grants based on the remoteness and size of the school and the number of special needs children enrolled.
- **Component 4**: Capacity building for planning and management including strengthening the Education Management Information System (EMIS). Implementation of school report cards is targeted at improving the planning and decision making at the school level and making it more evidence based. There will also be additional support for planning in developing regions.
- **Component 5**: Information and Communications Technology (ICT) for learning to provide a foundation for equitable, quality learning and teaching in secondary schools. This is a new area of work for GEQIP and reflects the GoE's commitment to developing a more strategic approach to the use of ICT in Schools. This Component will tailor interventions for isolated and poorer communities in emerging regions to provide equitable access to quality education.
- **Component 6**: Programme coordination and evaluation to continue the GEQIP 1 emphasis on effective coordination, monitoring and evaluation, and add, as a third subcomponent, an emphasis on improved communications.

GEQIP Phase 2 also includes specific sub-components to strengthen communication between REB and WEBs and school communities and the general public on whose support to a significant extent GEQIP depends.

**Stakeholder Perceptions of Inclusive and Equitable Quality Education**

Rapid participatory stakeholder consultations in selected woredas in Afar, Gambella, SNNPR and Oramia focused on stakeholder perceptions in relation to the: quality of education, ICT and Communication and School-community linkages. The full findings are presented in a separate annexe.

**The Quality of Education**

In all regions, significant improvements in textbook availability were perceived, but in Oramia and SNPPR, it was observed that the increase did not meet the demand. There was also appreciation of the benefits of multi-grade teaching as it was felt this had improved standards. In Gambella and Afar, concerns were expressed about the lack of teachers able to teach in the local language, or adapt their
methods to the local culture. This included, at primary level, not teaching in the local language, lack of positive reinforcement of pastoralist lifestyles and livelihood choices, and following a curriculum which ignored pastoralism as a legitimate way of life. This, in the assessment of the communities, contributed to both a lack of respect and a lack of trust in the quality of the teaching. In all areas parents and children felt mobile schools and ABECs were of poor quality. However, in contradiction, they also wanted ABECs to be expanded so that schools could be closer to households. Parents were concerned that teaching materials did not include positive messages and images about pastoralism. The perception that there is lack of appropriate teaching materials for pastoralist children fed community fears that formal education would support children to reject their culture and identity as pastoralists. For girls and boys local language textbooks were seen as valuable. In all four regions, special needs education was perceived to be non-existent.

**ICT and Communication**

**Information Flows between Schools and Communities:** In all four regions, parents and children were concerned about the lack of information exchange between schools and communities. Poor information exchange was also perceived as evidence of lack of transparency and accountability of the school management and the WEB.

**Use of ICT:** In rural areas across the four regions, there was little knowledge of what ICT in schools could contribute to the quality of education. In urban areas, the reverse was true. Parents and Children wanted ICT in schools but, where there was provision, were frustrated by the lack of equipment, maintenance and teachers qualified to use ICT. These findings on ICT and communications support existing data about the reach of different communication channels and mechanisms. Poor, vulnerable and underserved people, across all regions typically have the lowest access to and use of ICTs and are relatively disadvantaged in terms of digital and information inclusion. The emerging regions are additionally disadvantaged and appear to have the weakest access to information.

**School – Community Linkages**

**Parent/Guardian participation in school grants and management:** In all four regions, parents in PTAs and children in schools reported that school grants had made an appreciable difference to the quality of education. In rural areas parental involvement in SIP or the PTA was perceived as low. Household distance from the schools in rural areas, was cited as a reason why many parents were not participating in SIP or the PTA. Parents and children in all four regions reported that parents did not take part in decision-making and have low understanding of what was meant by quality education. They did, however, say that parents were contributing to improving school infrastructure in cash or kind. In all four regions, women’s participation in SIP and PTA meetings is low and more so in rural areas. The participation of women from poorer section of the communities appears almost non-existent.

**Pastoralist participation in School decision-making:** Low participation of pastoralist parents/guardians in SIP or the PTA was reported in all four regions. This was especially the case in rural areas, where parents may be excluded because of a lack of education and social and political connections. **Risks and Challenges to GEQIP Phase 2 Implementation**

Findings from the sector review and stakeholder consultations identified the following risks and challenges.

**Component 1:** Curriculum, textbooks and assessment – **Risks and Challenges**

- Provision for continued improvement of teaching materials and aids should address how to reflect the culture and identity of pastoralists communities, thereby mitigating factors that could potentially contribute to community dissatisfaction and undermining learning;
- Information gaps in relation to the proposal for translating textbooks into Braille. The evidence presented in the PAD, that it addresses the priority need for improving the quality of SNE, is not conclusive.
- Measures for addressing the potential disadvantage that Pastoralist students and other linguistic minorities who lack fluency (oral and written) in Amharic in upper cycle primary and secondary
and the impacts this has on their attainment levels need further strengthening.

**Component 2: Teacher Development – Risks and Challenges**
- Processes and Strategies for developing understanding, awareness and respect as well as building competences to address the diverse needs of pastoralist and highly vulnerable children need to be developed in GEQIP II design

**Component 3: School improvement to strengthen school planning – Risks and Challenges**
- Existing gaps in guidelines and mechanisms for promoting the active participation of women and underserved groups in PTA/PSTA SIP and SG processes should be addressed during GEQIP II design.
- Print and electronic based media campaigns may not sufficiently meet their purpose in emerging regions (Somali and Afar) because of low coverage (electronic) and literacy rates, especially for women.
- Guidelines for Information campaigns should address the context-specific barriers for adults and children in accessing information about schooling, improvements in quality etc. in emerging regions.

**Component 4: Capacity building for planning and management – Risks and Challenges**
- Capacity building measures should be designed to mainstream the range of capacities Woreda and school staff will need to improve equity and inclusion.

**Component 5: Information and Communications Technology (ICT) for learning – Risk and Challenges**
- Information Gap around the roles of ICT and communication strategies to reach and improve the quality of learning for disadvantaged and vulnerable groups and emerging regions. The piloting of ICT devices in emerging regions may not be enough to generate the evidence needed to expand into other areas given the wide-range of disparities between regions and populations.

**Component 6: Programme coordination and evaluation – Risks and Challenges**
- Information Gaps in the EMIS system - EMIS data collection system should be expanded to track the full range of equity and inclusion issues MOE wishes to address during GEQIP Phase 2 Present communication strategies are not likely to be very effective in pastoralist communities, with women and with vulnerable groups. Further investigation is needed in order to develop better targeted and appropriate strategies with these groups during GEQIP Phase 2

**Recommendations**
The recommendations, presented below, address the specific equity and inclusion gaps within each of the components of GEQIP Phase 2.
### Table 1: Summary of Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 1: Curriculum, textbooks and assessment</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Pastoralist &amp; underserved group access to appropriate and positive quality of teaching materials. During GEQIP phase 2 review the current textbooks and teaching materials used in Emerging Regions and in areas where there are high populations of pastoralist groups in terms of quality, cultural sensitivity, and adaptation to the socio-economic circumstances of the population. A priority should be given to promoting positive images and materials into the text books, teaching materials and supplementary reading materials used in pastoralist areas particularly for use in primary education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Consistency across the regions in implementing the National Special Needs Education Programme Strategy. This will go a long way in improving equity and inclusion of special needs children into education. CPD, Licensing and the inspectorate can all play a part in ensuring the strategy is consistently applied across the regions as well as monitoring progress through the current mechanisms. The Seed Funding for the proposed Centre of excellence can earmark funds for addressing special needs issues (e.g. cost-effectiveness of different SN teaching aids/materials, vertical inequalities in types of SN and range of support).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ More information and analysis on regional disparities in types of special needs and vertical/gendered inequalities within the population of special needs children is needed. During Phase 2 consider:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ commissioning a feasibility study of the cost-effectiveness of different SN teaching aids and resources in improving learning outcomes and,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Through the proposed centre of excellence or through other means collate and analyse and disseminate the data emerging from the School grants programmes, the pilots, seed funding and the challenge funds in relation to SNE and,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ by the end of GEQIP 2 produce a comprehensive and cost-effective strategy for addressing learning and teaching resources for SNE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 2: Teacher Development</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Consider introducing into the curriculum of CTEs and syllabi of CPEs, practice-based skills development modules on addressing vertical disparities within groups of vulnerable and disadvantaged children. These modules should be included in the development of the generic standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ The induction programme for teachers (CPEs) broadened to include mandatory sections on understanding and addressing vertical disparities and the in-school and out-of-school needs of children with multiple vulnerabilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 3: School improvement to strengthen school planning</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Revision of criteria and guidelines for SIP and SG (both standard and simplified), under GEQIP 2 in terms of the incentives etc. should include a focus on mechanisms and incentives for widening participation and addressing the specific needs of disadvantaged and highly vulnerable children. Specifically, consider targets for the inclusion of women and disadvantaged groups within SIP planning processes and ensuring that pastoralist/agro-pastoralist adults are properly represented on SMC and PTAs. In addition, the move towards strengthening Woreda capacities opens up opportunities for more creative use of School report cards and in any social audit pilots to encourage wider participation. These are mechanisms that are known entry points for encouraging active participation of underserved groups including women, in all forms of basic service provision (Gaventa and McGee; 2006). The revision of guidelines should also include sections which outline the complaint mechanisms and grievance procedures which are monitorable both at the school level (SIP/PTA and the SMC) and by the WEB. At REB and WEB levels learning from and applying the experiences of the social accountability component of PBS to the implementation of the school report cards should be encouraged.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Given the current stigma associated with Special needs and disabilities within the wider community, information campaigns and awareness-raising may be needed in conjunction with the use of incentives within the School Grant programme to encourage SIPs to see the benefits of improving the quality of special needs education for both the student and the wider school community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 4: Capacity building for planning and management</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ In the development of the proposed capacity building framework at Woreda level include components and an agreed set of monitorable inclusion and equity competences. These competences should be linked to the targets and outcomes within the results framework to ensure they focus on the operational capacities needed to address equity and inclusion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Include explicit equity and inclusion criteria within the Eligibility Criteria and proposal guidelines for the Federal and regional level training fund on planning for quality management. Ensure that proposed courses, trainings and study tours are assessed against specific equity and inclusion criteria and will support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
planning for equitable quality improvement. Some consideration should be given to weighting proposals that progress capacity development in strategic planning for a) inclusive education and b) addressing equity gaps (i.e. disparities in attainment and completion) in quality management in both formal and alternative routes to education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 5: Information and Communications Technology (ICT) for learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ ToRs and scope of work for the review of both the MoE and national technical support services should include attention to identifying the technical skills and capacities need to address the socio-cultural dimensions of ICT provision with respect to inclusive quality education (gender, special needs; socio-economic differences etc.) Specialist technical support may be needed to be brought in to CEICT to facilitate the process and draw up the ToRs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Over the lifetime of GEQIP phase 2, develop an evidence-base on differential usage, needs and constraints for take-up of ICT for quality-based education with a particular emphasis on gender, income and regional disparities and vertical disparities within vulnerable and disadvantaged population groups. The CEICT should be responsible for the data collection, collation and analysis. The evidence can be developed from the proposed pilots, the review of school net, and the results from implemented proposals of the challenge fund. A review of the available evidence as part of the proposed mid-term assessment of the ICT component should also reveal what other measures (e.g. specially commissioned studies to address information gaps will be needed before scaling-up in the second half of Phase 2. Additionally, the evidence base will be essential part of the process for developing the proposed national ICT in Education Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 6: Programme coordination and evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Within the current and established systems of planning, monitoring and evaluation and in particular training and capacity building activities, include where appropriate the impacts of affirmative actions on learning outcomes, inclusion etc. This will both: contribute to the positive culture of quality management that GEQIP phase 2 hopes to foster and, strengthen the evidence base for the effectiveness of affirmative action in supporting quality improvements. In doing so GEQIP is also contributing to promoting an enabling environment in which women and school staff from disadvantaged groups feel encouraged and supported in taking up training and mentoring opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ To ensure that all communication strategies and information dissemination processes are tailored to the wide-ranging context-specific communication needs means capacity building for communication (6.3.2) will require the consultancy support to focus particular attention to Woreda and community capacity building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ To track the impacts of the external support, GEQIP Phase 2, half annual and annual performance reports should include a section on the outcomes of locally generated communication strategies on school and Woreda GEQIP phase 2 implementation targets. This information can be used by REB and WEB level as part of their information coordination and capacity building efforts. There are also opportunities to link capacity building for communication into the broader capacity building measures, for teachers, leaders and managers under component 4. Over the lifetime of GEQIP phase 2, where appropriate to content, and as implementation results emerge, training materials and support on inclusive and gender sensitive communication methods and techniques can be strengthened.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Introduction

As a part of the preparation of phase 2, the Ministry of Education in Ethiopia has commissioned a targeted and focused Social Assessment. The Social Assessment contributes to actions by the MoE to ensure implementation of GEQIP 2 is inclusive and equitable for all children in Ethiopia.

Purpose of the social assessment is to assess the potential impact of GEQIP Phase 2 Components on the vulnerable and disadvantaged groups in Ethiopia and, identify strategies for mitigating risk and adverse impacts.

1.1 Objectives of the Social Assessment

There are three main objectives to the social assessment:

- Describe and analyse the socio-economic characteristics of the more vulnerable and disadvantaged groups and the emerging regions who will be affected by GEQIP 2;
- Conduct rapid and focused stakeholder consultations in selected areas of Ethiopia, with vulnerable and disadvantaged groups; and
- Provide practical recommendations for dealing with the challenges and risks identified.

The social factors affecting equity and access to quality education were considered well documented by the GEQIP Phase 1 social assessment and follow-up studies. Consequently, the focus for the present social assessment was to build on the findings of Phase 1 social assessment and address outstanding data gaps in relation to:

- Disparities in equitable access to quality education: the needs of, opportunities for, and barriers against, improving learning outcomes of vulnerable and hard-to-reach girls and boys in the emerging regions and amongst pastoralist and agro-pastoralist populations as well as disadvantaged groups across the entire country;
- The use of ICT to improve quality of learning and progress towards equitable access to quality education;
- Enhancing Community - School linkages Involvement to strengthen participation of Parents/guardians (voice) of disadvantaged groups and monitoring (accountability) within both formal schools, ABECs and mobile schools in improving access to quality education for disadvantaged and vulnerable children and in the emerging regions.

1.2 Social Assessment Methodology

The process of designing GEQIP Phase 2 began in June 2012 and the social assessment is an integral part of this process. The GEQIP Phase 2 design process has been characterised by extensive free, informed and in-depth consultations with all levels of stakeholders including: parents, teachers, and government officials at Woreda, regional and national offices. The social assessment methodology continues the participatory design approach taken by the MoE.

There were two main components to the methodology (see inception report for full details):

- Review and synthesis of existing data sources in relation to the key social and institutional issues affecting vulnerable and disadvantaged girls and boys broadly and specifically children from pastoralist and agro-pastoralist populations within emerging regions and;
- Rapid participatory stakeholder consultations in 4 emerging regions and selected Woredas focused on the key issues in relation to the three main themes. The key consultation instrument was Focus Group Discussions using semi-structured interviewing in combination with a simple participatory analysis tool. A separate check list of question areas was prepared for the Woreda level discussions and the community/schools discussions.

Separate FDGs were held with school management and PTAs, parents not active in PTAs, boys and girls both attending schools and drop-outs. In each Woreda, a FGD was held with Government stakeholders involved in progressing quality education. A total of 43 FDGs were conducted across the
4 regions involving 320 people: 31 Women, 88 men, 127 girls and 80 boys. (A separate report contains all the regional reports and the breakdown of the sample size/focus group discussions.)

**Regions and Woredas Consulted**

Consultation on the goals and outcomes of this project and the overall education program is a key aspect of this Social Assessment. Gambella, SSNPR, Oromia and Afar regions were selected for stakeholder consultations at the Woreda, school and community level which gave a purposive sample of regions with significant populations of disadvantaged and vulnerable populations (pastoralists and agro-pastoralists) and higher percentages of out-of-school children. In each region two Woredas were selected to enable: a) some degree of comparative analysis within a region and b) to ensure that the three methodological foci were addressed within each region. Somali was not surveyed this time because it participated in the 2010 study. It has a large population of pastoralists and agro-pastoralists and has significant disparities. The results of the consultation in Somali Region is provided in the Social Assessment document of GEQIP Phase 1 and this is annexed to this Report. Table 1 below sets out the regions and Woredas consulted during this Social Assessment.

**Table 1: Consulted Regions and Woredas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Woreda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gambella:</strong> A fieldwork location in the Phase 1 SA. It is an emerging region where there are significant disparities in levels of access to education between the resettled population and pastoralist. There was also evidence of local level innovation and good practices in progressing equity in access for vulnerable groups which was explored in terms of capacities, levels of community involvement and use of ICT.</td>
<td>Abobo: previously surveyed; good experience of primary and secondary education for pastoralist students. Gambella Town: new field site and urban area which gave access to migrant children; urban drop-outs from pastoralist/agro-pastoralist communities and school boarders from remote communities living with families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SSNPR:</strong> Also a fieldwork location in the Phase 1 SA. Highly diverse population with over 50 different ethnic groups. Disparities in equitable access between rural and urban communities and between settled and pastoralist communities.</td>
<td>Hamar and BenaTsemay: Both are remote pastoralist communities in south Omo with alternative routes to education (ABECs) hostel programmes for pastoralist children; early marriage and high levels of girl drop outs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oromia:</strong> was not surveyed in the 2011 study. It has a large population of pastoralists and agro-pastoralists and has significant disparities in access to quality education between and pastoralist and non-pastoralist communities with high levels of child marriage and low I educational attainment for girls.</td>
<td>Teltele: Remote pastoralist community in Borena using ABECs and supported by NGO partners. Yabelo: Remote pastoralist community in Borena where formal education is available and efforts have been made to promote female leadership in education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Afar:</strong> Afar was also not surveyed in the 2011 study. It has the highest percentage of OOS in Ethiopia and is pastoralist dominated emerging region with high levels of ABECs and mobile schools in relation to the rest of Ethiopia.</td>
<td>BureMedaytu: Remote pastoralist area; mobile schools operating within the Woreda. AwashFentale: A peri-urban Woreda; well established links with pastoralist community groups and use of ICT already piloted. Primary schools are closer to secondary schools than is usual in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somali</strong> was not surveyed this time because it participated in the 2010 study. It has a large population of pastoralists and agro-pastoralists and has significant disparities in access to quality education between and pastoralist and non-pastoralist communities with high levels of child marriage and low educational attainment for girls. The entire Social Assessment Study from 2011 and its Annexes have already been publically disclosed and are available at the Ethiopia Ministry of Education website at <a href="http://info.moe.gov.et/gndr.shtml">http://info.moe.gov.et/gndr.shtml</a>.</td>
<td>Tawbare: in the Jiiga zone and Debel: in Shinile Zone--both rural and urban areas were sampled, as well as schools and ABECs without external support and those receiving support from NGOs and the national School Feeding Programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Outline of the Report

Following this section, Section 2 outlines the institutional and social context for improving access to quality education for regions and populations that are lagging behind. Section 3 reviews the progress made, under GEQIP phase 1 and the extent to which the equity and inclusion lessons have been incorporated into the GEQIP Phase 2 design. Section 4 presents the key messages from the stakeholder consultations. Finally, Section 5, identifies gaps in GEQIP phase 2 with respect to equity and inclusion and outlines a series of recommendation aimed at strengthening implementation.

2 The Institutional and Social Background to Equitable Access to Education

Education is a key development strategy for Ethiopia. There has been impressive progress with respect to equity and access over the last decade. By 2011/12 primary enrolment reached almost 17 million (GER 95%). The number of out of school primary children dropped from 6.5 million to around 3 million between 1999 and 2011. Enrolment of girls has shown a steady increase with the gender parity index now standing at 0.95 in primary. First cycle secondary enrollment trends show significant increases (GER - from 17.1% in 2001/02 to 36.9% overall and 34.6% for girls in 2011/12) and although second cycle secondary enrolment is low (GER of 8.8%) it is increasing (UNESCO, 2012).

The Growth and Transformation Plan (2010 – 2015) reaffirmed GoE’s continued commitment to equitable access to basic education. Quality of education is fundamental to its drive to reach middle income status by 2025. It aims for almost full primary enrolment (98% for both boys and girls) and an increase in lower secondary education GER from 38% in 2009/10 to 62% by 2015 (MoFED, 2010). However, there are challenges. Better resourced schools are generally located in urban areas of more developed regions. The 4 emerging regions which comprise of10% of the population experience difficulties in accessing education. The poorest children are less likely to access quality educational services than the wealthiest (GoE, 2013). The overriding issues of equity and inclusion, recognised by the GoE, are that of differing levels of welfare for a number of vulnerable and disadvantaged groups and across the regions.

2.1 Characteristics of Vulnerability and access to Quality Education

Vulnerability and lack of access to education are highly complex and context-related. Whilst, they do not always overlap, children who are vulnerable are also likely to find access to quality education more difficult. Key factors shaping a child’s vulnerability to dropping out, repeating or never going to school include: poverty and food insecurity, gender, rural-urban and regional disparities.

**Poverty and Food Insecurity:** Household poverty is a major factor affecting the enrolment of children in schools. NER for primary schooling is 25% for children of families that belong to lowest wealth quintile. This increases to 68% for children of households of highest wealth quintile. Similarly, NER rises from 4% among secondary school attendees in the lowest wealth quintile to 38% among the highest wealth quintile (MoE, 2013). Household wealth, cognitive social capital, adult education and land ownership all have a positive impact on whether the children start school at appropriate age. There is a deficit of these assets in poor households. Households and families are unable to provide children with clothing, educational materials, food and other items. Coping strategies manifest themselves in a high demand for child labor to contribute to household work and to earn an income causing them to be absent, have insufficient time for study, or drop out of school altogether (Jennings et al 2011:19).

**Gender Disparities:** Boys have more access to education than girls do, especially at secondary levels. Drop-out levels amongst girls are high. In 2009, only 41% of girls remained in the last grade of primary education and only 30% enrolled in secondary education (UNESCO, 2012). Girls living in rural areas are particularly disadvantaged. Of the 3 million children out of school in 2011, 60% or 1.8 million were girls (MoE and UNICEF, 2012). A lower rate of female participation in school is strongly associated with economic factors and early marriage. Reasons for leaving school differ between boys and girls and by whether they live in urban or rural areas. Boys identify poverty and
girls identify early marriage as reasons that forced them to leave school. (Population council/UNFPA 2010; Jennings et al, 2011). Socio-cultural factors such as parental attitudes to girls education, household responsibilities, fear of gender based violence, and low self-esteem; predominance of male teachers; and inadequate sanitation and other schools facilities all affect girls’ access to, and completion of, education (Jennings 2011, Population Council/UNFPA 2010).

**Urban-Rural Differences:** Primary school gross enrolment rates in urban areas are double the rate of rural areas. Primary school girls, especially in rural areas, experience significant problems in accessing education. The out of school rate for girls is 16% compared to 10% for boys (Ethiopia DHS data 2011). Distance from school is a key factor for this, especially in accessing secondary school. A quarter of the school population lives more than 4km from a school (EMIS 2010), and poorer, disadvantaged children in rural areas often further (Jennings et al. 2011). In a context where only a small proportion of rural households are within a 10 km radius of a secondary school (Jennings et al. 2011), the option for poor households being able to fund children, particularly girls, to stay in towns to attend secondary schools is minimal. When they stay with relatives there is a risk of employment and sexual exploitation and many are not given sufficient time to go to school.

**Regional Disparities:** Disparities in income, access to basic services and distance from schools largely account for the regional differences (MoE 2012 and 2013). Relatively better off urban regions like Addis Ababa have an NER of 94% compared to only 76% and 72.5% in the rural emerging regions of Benshangul-Gumuz and Gambella (EMIS 2011). Primary GER in Somali and Afar is 75% and 44% respectively while the national average is 95% for the year 2011/12 (EMIS 2011/12). Drop-out rates vary considerably across the regions. Between 2006/07 and 2009/10 the average drop-out rates across grades 1-8 in rural areas was double that of urban areas. Whilst the overall rural drop-out rates are declining, drop-out rates in pastoralist areas remain high particularly in Grade 1. In Afar, the grade 1 drop-out rate was 36% - far above the national average of 22% (Jennings and Poppe, 2012).

**2.2 Nations, Nationalities and Peoples, Pastoralists, and National Minorities**

The Ethiopian Constitution recognizes the presence and rights of many ethnic groups, including historically disadvantaged and vulnerable groups. These include Nations, Nationalities and Peoples, pastoralists, and national minorities.

Article 39 of the Ethiopian Constitution recognizes the rights of groups identified as “Nations, Nationalities and Peoples”. They are defined as “a group of people who have or share a large measure of common culture or similar customs, mutual intelligibility of language, belief in a common or related identities, a common psychological make-up, and who inhabit an identifiable, predominantly contiguous territory.” This represents some 75 out of the 80 groups who are members of the House of Federation, which is the second chamber of the Ethiopian legislature. The Constitution recognizes the rights of these Nations, Nationalities and Peoples to: self-determination, including the right to secession; speak, write and develop their own languages; express, develop and promote their cultures; preserve their history; and, self-government, which includes the right to establish institutions of government in the territory that it inhabits and equitable representation in state and Federal governments. The vast majority of the project participants and beneficiaries belong to this group.

The Ethiopian Constitution also recognizes the rights of pastoralist groups (Articles 40 and 41). This includes the right to “free land for grazing and cultivation as well as the right not to be displaced from their own lands” and the right to “receive fair prices for their products, that would lead to improvement in their conditions of life and to enable them to obtain an equitable share of the national wealth commensurate with their contribution. This objective shall guide the State in the formulation of economic, social and development policies.” Pastoralist regions/areas recognized by the government are: Afar; Somali; Borena Zone and Fentele Wereda (Oromia); South Omo Zone, Bench-Maji Zone, and parts of Decha Wereda in Keffa Zone (SNNPR); and, Nuer Zone (Gambella).

The pastoralists comprise approximately 12-15 million people that belong to 29 groups of Nations,
Nationalities and Peoples. Whilst government policies have strengthened and resource allocations increased over the last decade, pastoralist areas are still amongst the least served with basic services. Education indicators for pastoralist areas are among the lowest in the country: lowest literacy rates, highest dropout rates and furthest distance from schools. (Jennings et al., 2011). Formal education is seen in some pastoralist households as a threat to the future contribution of children to the household and to the pastoralist way of life. Pastoralist girls access to education is also constrained by perceptions of parents that schooling compromises girls’ reputation, makes them less compliant which, in turn, reduces their worth as marriage partners (Brocklesby et al. 2011).

The Constitution also recognizes another group called “national minorities”. Article 54 (1) states that: “Members of the House [of Peoples Representatives], on the basis of population and special representation of minority Nationalities and Peoples, shall not exceed 550; of these, minority Nationalities and Peoples shall have at least 20 seats.” These groups have less than 100,000 members and most live in the ‘Developing Regional States’.

Owing to their limited access to socioeconomic development and underserved status over the decades, the Ethiopian government has designated four of the country’s regions, namely: Afar, Somali, Benishangul-Gumz, and Gambella as Developing Regional States (DRS). In this respect, Article 89 (2) of the Ethiopian Constitution stipulates: ‘The Government has the obligation to ensure that all Ethiopians get equal opportunity to improve their economic situations and to promote equitable distribution of wealth among them’. Article 89 (4) in particular states: ‘Nations, Nationalities and Peoples least advantaged in economic and social development shall receive special assistance’.

In connection with institutional framework designed to ensure equity between regions, the government has set up the Ministry of Federal Affairs (MoFA). The responsibilities of this Ministry include promoting equitable development, with emphasis on delivering special support to the developing regions. The main purpose of the especial support is to address the inequalities that have existed between the regions over the decades, thereby hastening equitable growth and development. Federal Special Support Board, which consists of relevant sector ministries including the MoA, was reorganized in March 2011. The MoFA acts as Vice Chair and secretariat of the board. A Technical Committee (TC) composed of sector ministries constituting the Board was also set up under the MoFA to monitor and report the implementation of special support plans. As its main aim, the Board coordinates the affirmative support provided to the developing regions by the different organs of the federal government, and ensures the effectiveness of the implementation process.

In addition, the Equitable Development Directorate General has been set up within the MoFA, with directorates put in place to operate under it for the respective developing regions. Among many other activities, the Directorate General coordinates and directs case teams to collect, organize and analyze data in relation to the gaps in capacity building, social and economic development, good governance, gender and environmental development in the regions in need of special support.

The project covers the whole territory of Ethiopia and given that the Ethiopian Constitution recognizes the presence of the above different socio-cultural groups, including historically disadvantaged and underserved communities, pastoralists, and minorities, as well as their rights to socio-economic equity and justice which also meets the OP4.10 criteria. This social assessment is complemented by extensive consultation process with project beneficiaries and project affected peoples, including identified vulnerable and historically underserved groups, meeting the OP 4.10 criteria, to seek broad support for the project from these groups.

1Pastoralist Forum Ethiopia, http://www.pfe-ethiopia.org/about.html
2 PASDEP (2005 -2010), the previous five year poverty reduction plan to GTP promoted more targeted assistance to underserved areas – the emerging regions and pastoralist/agro-pastoralist areas (MOFED 2010).
2.3 Other Groups

The GoE also recognises a number of disadvantaged groups with difficulties to access educational opportunities: child labourers, orphans and vulnerable children and children with special needs. These groups suffer from entrenched and significant unequal access to education (MoE 2010).

**Vulnerable children**: Vulnerable groups of children include: children who migrate alone to towns, HIV and AIDS affected children, orphans, street workers, children affected by trafficking internally and across borders, and children exploited sexually. They are to be found mainly in urban areas and are more likely than other children to be engaged in employment. (Jennings et al.) The exact figures for the numbers of these children attending school or dropping out is difficult to ascertain as data is incomplete or missing (MoE and UNICEF 2012). The EMIS, for example, does not collect data on orphans, or profiles on drop-outs and out-of-school children (Jennings et al. 2011, MoE and UNICEF, 2012).

**Child Labourers**: Child labour is a major constraint to education. Many children are working from a young age as farm help or domestic workers. A household’s need for child labour is a major cause of late arrival at school, absenteeism and dropout from school at all levels. Child labour activities are influenced by family economic status and demand children to work within the home or outside the home for income generation, abuse of girls brought to the cities, attractions of working in the Middle East (Jennings et al 2011; MoE and UNICEF, 2012).

**Children with special needs**: The MoE estimated there are between 1.7 and 3.4 million children with special needs (MoE 2006). Despite government policy of inclusive education, they remain amongst the most disadvantaged children, in Ethiopia (MoE and UNICEF, 2012). Only 2.5% of special needs children are enrolled in school (MoE 2006) with more enrolled in urban primary schools (4.6%) than in rural ones (2.3%) (EMIS 2012). On average, there are more boys than girls with special needs in all grades reflecting the tendency for parents to keep girls with special needs at home (Jennings and Poppe, 2012). Very few schools have tailored provision or classrooms for special needs children and some regions -Afar; Dire Dawa, Gambella and Harari -have none at all (Pfaffe et al., 2012). To a large extent provision and support is left to NGOs and religious groups (Jennings et al., 2011; Jennings and Poppe, 2012).

**Vulnerability: implications for equitable quality education**: A focus on vulnerable groups may mean that the inequalities between individuals within groups are overlooked. (Crawford, 2011). **Vertical inequalities within groups** (e.g. groups of adolescent girls) are often larger than **horizontal inequalities** between groups (e.g. rural-urban populations). A focus on vertical differences within groups means policies and programs can begin to understand the range of difference and heterogeneity amongst people who are poor and vulnerable and better target support services to those in need.

Focus on vulnerable groups also overlooks the fact that many extremely vulnerable individuals are part of more than one group experiencing Multiple Vulnerabilities: e.g. a pastoralist adolescent girl orphan or a migrant street-living drop-out boy have experiences, vulnerabilities and needs that reflect their whole identity and life experiences. Those multiple vulnerabilities compound a person’s access to social services such as education. Rural migrant girls living as domestic workers for example, are profoundly disconnected from peer networks and are least likely to access basic services or other avenues of support and information which could lead to exclusion within the education system.

Several Reviews (Jennings et al. 2001; MoE and UNICEF, 2012, Jennings and Poppe, 2012,) have suggested that existing data collection and monitoring systems within Ethiopia’s education system have yet to consider fully the range of vertical differences within vulnerable and disadvantaged groups. This will be needed in future, to support better targeting of limited resources as well as

---

3 A level of over 10% should be expected if special needs children within the total population, international data estimates, 10-20% of any school-aged population have special education needs (WB and WHO 2010)

---
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programmes which can fully address the diverse range of opportunities and barriers, to quality education, across vulnerable and disadvantaged groups.

Moreover, there is growing evidence, in education globally, to suggest that horizontal equity between groups may best be achieved by improving vertical equity within groups. This is not just to close the enrolment gap; equity in educational attainment is also improved (MoE et al., 2013; Lewin et al. 2011). Since the goals of ESDP IV, GTP and beyond are to diminish the extremes of underperformance and improve the quality of education for all, in future, addressing vertical differences within groups may be the more strategic choice.

2.3 The Legal and Policy Context for Equitable Access to Quality Education

Constitutional rights, policies and programmes in Ethiopia strongly support and promote the equitable inclusion of regions and social groups lagging behind in access to quality education.

Constitutional Rights to Education

The Right to Education For All is enshrined within the Constitution of Ethiopia which provides for a range of fundamental rights for its citizens including: the right to equal and effective protection without discrimination (Article 25) as well as special attention to the rights of Women (Article 35) guaranteeing affirmative action to address inequality and discrimination and to the equal rights of nations and nationalities within the Ethiopian state (Article 39). Article 90 outlines principles of state policy in relation to education. To the extent the country’s resources permit, all Ethiopians are guaranteed access to education in a manner that is free from any religious influence, political partisanship or cultural prejudices. (Article 90: Social Objectives of Constitution of Ethiopia 1994)⁴. Article 36, Rights of Children also protects children against harassment and violence in schools and other institutions responsible for the care of children. Additionally, Article 39 – the Rights of Nations, Nationalities and Article 41 – Economic, Social and Cultural Rights - protects the rights of ethnic groups within Ethiopia in terms of their use of the mother tongue; protection of culture and identity and equal representation in State and Federal government. Ethiopia as a signatory of the African Charter on Human Rights has committed to protecting the rights of all peoples to progress social, cultural and economic development of their choice in conformity with their identity (Articles 20 and 21)⁵. Article 41 (5) provides for the conditions of equal opportunities and full participation of people with disabilities and those living with HIV/AIDS. Ethiopia is also a signatory to CEDAW⁶, CRC⁷ and the CRPD⁸ and is strongly committed to the rights-based MDGs and the Education for All Goals (MoE 2010. MoFed 2010).

To meet the obligation to ensure all citizens can fulfil their right to education means meeting the Human Rights Standards for service provision. In the human rights documentation, these standards (the “4As”) appear in relation to all basic services (health, education, shelter, water, sanitation etc.). Although they are detailed differently for each service, they provide a useful general measure for all services

The Rights Standards for Education are based on the requirement that educational services must be available and safe, accessible and affordable, of acceptable quality, and adaptable and culturally sensitive.

These Rights Standards are implicit within the robust legal and policy framework developed by Ethiopia to address inequalities in access to education; both from the demand-side and the supply-
side. In addition the high priority that GoE gives to education is reflected in consistently high shares (around 25%) of government expenditure on the sector.

2.4 National Policy Framework for Education Provision

Equity and inclusion have been embedded in education sector policy since 1994 when the Education and Training Policy, in fulfillment of constitutional obligations, introduced the right to free primary school education and placed emphasis on reaching children out of school, reducing gender disparities in educational opportunities and targeting enrolment gaps between regions and populations in Ethiopia. In addition, consecutive five year Education Sector Development Programmes (the first one covering the period 1997 – 2002 followed by 3 subsequent ESDPs) have outlined a clear policy direction, including a heightened focus on quality, equity and access.

Both the GTP and the current ESDP IV are focusing on equity, access and quality challenges focusing on out of school, vulnerable and disadvantaged children. GoE also recognizes the challenges faced by girls and has laid out strategies both in ESDP IV and in the National Girls Education Strategy (2010) that seek to promote girls participation. There are two aspects to the ESDP IV strategy addressing both the demand and supply side of equitable provision of quality services:

- **Attention to Equity** - Ethiopia has used education investments to close the gap between enrolments in rural and urban areas, between boys and girls, and between more developed and emerging regions. Priority has been given to reducing the distance between schools and students’ homes, particularly in second cycle primary to improve availability, access and affordability. This includes the use of an innovative alternative basic education model to enable scaled up access for pastoralist communities, especially in Afar and Somali Regions (see box 3).

The specific measures include:

- Making primary education compulsory as a boost to equitable access;
- providing special financial assistance and targeted support to vulnerable groups and those living in pastoralist and agro-pastoralist areas through scholarships and school feeding and other support programmes;
- Multi-grade classes is also being promoted as a means of integrating and maintaining children in low population areas in school;
- Continued expansion, begun under ESDP III, of alternative education provision as a commitment to adapting education delivery to the specific needs of disadvantaged groups such as pastoralist populations.–
- A small number of secondary boarding schools are being established in the emerging regions.
- a commitment to increase the number of women in leadership positions through affirmative action training and mentoring as well as a commitment to increase the number of teachers (at secondary and primary) from emerging regions and disadvantage groups.

- **Consolidating, further expanding and improving the quality of education services**. Ethiopia has now put in place most of the building blocks for quality improvement, including:

  - **Expanded and well managed teaching force**: Ethiopia has invested heavily in teachers – a key resource in any effort to provide and improve education opportunities. There are now more than 300,000 primary teachers – 80,000 more than there were five years ago – and these teachers are better trained and qualified. In an independent survey of Woredas conducted in 2011, 73% of parents interviewed said that teachers are always available for work and the government has put in place a system of continuous professional development to enable teachers to keep up to date (REF). The investment in teachers has also contributed to a reduction in the pupil teacher ratio, which is significantly associated with reduced drop out rates in Ethiopia (Jennings and Poppe 2012).
Alternative Basic Education Centres were instituted in 2006 to provide opportunities for out of school children to participate in the education system, first at the primary level and then, if possible, to open up possibilities for secondary and higher education. ABECs have been established in all regions except Harari. The strategy is a transitional measure by the GoE: the aim is to upgrade all ABECs, over time, to become formal schools. ABECs are expected to adopt a flexible approach to the communities they serve; responding to the livelihood demands, cultural and religious norms and household priorities so that opportunities for a child to attend school are optimized. ABECs may have shorter days – to accommodate child labour, for example, or close on Fridays to respect religious practices. Coordination between ABECs and formal schools varies across the regions but is beginning to operate in most areas.

Source: MoE Alternative Basic Education Strategy 2006 (see Table 3)

- A decentralized implementation structure – Ethiopia has implemented a decentralized governance system that give more responsibility to lower levels to allocate finance and plan for improvements in service delivery. This includes year on year increases in funding flows to Woredas via un-earmarked block grants (supported by the Protection of Basic Services Grant since 2005). Woredas then allocate these funds to the basic service sector, and typically education receives over 50% of this funding. Woredas are also responsible for hiring and firing teachers and for monitoring and supervising schools.

- Accountability of schools to communities – Ethiopia has used a school improvement programme to trigger increased involvement of communities in school planning, monitoring, and financing (see Box 4). Close to 98% of schools have in place a medium term plan that has benefited from inputs from the local community. Communities also provide significant additional resources to schools, both in cash and in kind, to fund improvements in the school environment. (Pfaffe et al. 2012).

**Box 2: GEQIP School Grant Programme**

The School Grant Program is designed to support the allocation of capitation grants to schools. It is intended to support non salary recurrent expenditure at the school level to improve the quality of education at ABECs and Government and Public primary and secondary schools in Ethiopia. Parents and community members, through PTAs, have a vital role to play in deciding how the School Grant will be used to improve the quality of education children receive, and in performance monitoring.

Each school or ABEC uses their grant to implement their School Improvement Plan (SIP) and improve their school performance, with a special focus on improving the quality of education. School Grant funds was disbursed to all schools and ABECs once in the first year, i.e. 2001 (2008/09) school year, and twice a year in the following school years, i.e. around August/September and January/February for the next five years, and possibly longer.

The grant cannot be used for: ‘new classrooms or buildings, teacher salaries & per diems, PTA member payments TVs and DVD players, fuel or weapons’


**Cross cutting issues:** There are also a number of cross cutting issues addressed in ESDP IV

- Gender equity: this includes indicator disaggregation; ensuring curriculum and instructional materials are gender sensitive; attention to gender in teacher selection and placement; gender issues included in the school planning process; pro-active selection of women for capacity building activities; inclusion of gender in monitoring and evaluation activities.

- Special needs and inclusive education: This includes attention to special needs in the development of instructional materials; development of teacher training materials with due attention to inclusive pedagogy; incentives for the retention of children with special needs through the school improvement programme; strengthened tracking of enrolment of children with special needs through EMIS.

- Developing the emerging regions: Special support for teacher training, capacity building and increased school grants for the four emerging regions. Boarding Schools, low-cost accommodation and mobile schools are being introduced, where not available, and strengthened.
in areas where already in operation.

Mechanisms for addressing demand side issues which prevent students taking up educational opportunities are also being rolled out and include tutorial support to reduce drop-out; school feeding programmes, material and financial support and scholarships for Pastoralists and vulnerable boys and girls. In addition, ESDP IV recognises the role improved health and nutrition plays in supporting improved learning outcomes. School health and nutrition concerns are mainstreamed through the curriculum and school improvement components.

2.5 Re-enforcing Laws and Policies

There are a number of re-enforcing and overarching laws and policies protecting the rights and entitlements of disadvantaged groups and emerging regions.

Laws: The legal framework has a number of laws protecting the rights of women and children. These include provisions to oblige guardians to protect the health, education and social development of the child as well as setting the legal age for marriage at 18 for all adults as a safeguard against early marriage (Family Code 2000). There are also provisions prohibiting exploitation and child labour. The Revised Criminal Code is a key law for protecting Girls and women from sexual assault, abuse, abduction and early marriages – all factors contributing to girls dropping out from school. Proclamation No. 676/2010 ratified the UN CRPD providing protection for the equal opportunities and full participation of people with disabilities and/or living with HIV/Aids.

Supporting Policies: Attention to the cross-cutting issues, in the ESDPs has been supported by a range of additional policies (outlined in Table 2) which have been specifically designed to address the social constraints affecting educational access of hard-to-reach and underserved communities.

Table 2: Policies supporting Equitable Inclusion in Quality Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Provisions</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National strategy for Alternative Basic Education</td>
<td>Aim: develop a well-planned, organised and coordinated alternative basic education system to provide opportunities for out of school children. Target group: Children 7 -14. Strategies are highlighted in the policy for addressing demand side concerns such as cultural barriers, elimination of child labour and the protection of the rights of the child, and ensuring water resources and separate latrines are available.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline for implementing ABE (1-4) in pastoral and agro-pastoralist communities</td>
<td>Aim: to ensure access to ABEC for children living in pastoral and agro-pastoralist communities. Strategies include training of ABEC facilitators, provision of courses in the socio-economic and cultural realities of pastoralist areas in the CTEs and building capacities of supervisors.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy for Promoting primary and Secondary Education in Pastoralist areas</td>
<td>Aim: Expanding and extending education services in pastoralist areas through the provision of ABECs, mobile schools, and boarding schools targeting primary and lower secondary children.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Special Needs Education Programme Strategy</td>
<td>Aim: To extent education opportunities to children living with disabilities at all levels of the education system. Target: The 90% plus children with disabilities not receiving full</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Labour law Proclamation No.3777/2003 article 89 prohibits employment of children below 14 and children between 14-18 subject to safeguards and conditions
10 The revised Criminal Code of Ethiopia (2005) contains articles on early marriage and abduction, female genital mutilation, abolishes physical punishment and improves sentencing for Rape and sexual assault.
Box 3 below outlines the range of policies aimed at protecting and promoting the well-being, life chances and education opportunities of disadvantaged groups and emerging regions. Elimination of regional and gender disparities in enrolment rates is given priority in all these documents, with specific attention to reducing drop-out and repetition rates. For example, the Ethiopian National Plan of Action for Children has provisions for supporting poor and vulnerable children through feeding, health care and educational materials in order to ensure access to education. However, implementation is not uniform with significant disparities between regions. One impediment is capacities for coordination between the different sectors responsible for implementing these policies are low. (Teferra and Gebremedhin, 2010; Jennings et al, 2011; Tesemma, 2012; MoE and UNICEF 2012).

**Box 3: Key Policies Supporting Access and Equity in Education**

- National Action Plan of action for Children
- Orphans and vulnerable Child national Action Plan
- National Youth Plan
- Action Plan on the sexual Abuse and Exploitation of Children
- National Plan of Action of persons with Disabilities 2012 - 2021
- National Food Security strategy
- Health Policy
- HIV/AIDS Policy and Strategy
- Nutrition Strategy
- The Developmental Social Welfare Policy

*Source: MoE and UNICEF 2012*

**Complementary Programmes supporting equity, inclusion and quality:** GEQIP is designed to be complementary to the Promotion of Basic Services Programme, now in its second phase, which provides direct financing to regional and Woreda governments to provide basic services. Over 50% of the decentralised block grant is spent on education, mainly teacher salaries. PBS remains GoE’s preferred modality for equitably scaling up access to basic services, but GEQIP is regarded as critical in the medium term for ensuring complementary resources are available for quality related expenditures. There are also a number of donor supported programmes outside of the pooled GEQIP fund, which support and reinforce the GoE’s overall general education quality improvement
objectives. The most significant of these are:

- **Improving Quality in Primary Education Programme** (2009-2014) funded by USAID and focused on early grade reading, including investing in assessments of reading proficiency in the early grades and in development of materials and training to support teachers.

- Support to the MoE by UNICEF promoting better quality facilities, teaching and coordination with respect to child friendly schools, ABECs and early childhood education.

- The DFID **Girls Education challenge fund** supporting MoE to reach and bring 50,000 underserved girls into full-time education in targeted areas in Afar, Oromia and Amhara regions.

- **DFID Girls Hub Ethiopia**\(^{11}\) which has recently developed a comprehensive strategy for reaching and including hard to reach underserved girls in efforts to increase the number of girls who have completed primary and transitioned to secondary education.

There are also a number of International NGOs working with GoE to improve the quality of education. These include Save the Children (focusing on ABEC), Link community Development (school improvement planning), and Concern (reaching underserved children). The Peace and Development programme\(^{12}\) headed by a consortium of NGOs (UK, Mercy Corps and Islamic Relief) works in the Somali region to support GoE objectives to strengthen the basic service provision of health, education and water.

This review of the enabling environment indicates that there is a strong and positive development framework supporting GEQIP meet its programmatic goals. The GoE has moved on a range of fronts - laws, policies and programmes, and financing- to address both the supply and demand side constraints affecting access to quality education for vulnerable and disadvantaged groups and emerging regions.

3  **GEQIP Phase 2: Addressing Equity and Inclusion in Quality Education**

GEQIP Phase 2 is designed to improve learning conditions and achievement for over 20 million primary and secondary school students over four years between 2013 – 2017. It consists of USD 550 million financial support to six components (see table 3 below). This section reviews the equity and inclusion achievements during phase 1. It also assesses the extent to which GEQIP phase 2 has been built on these achievements and applied the lessons learnt.

3.1  **GCEQIP Phase 1: Progress towards Equitable and Inclusive Education**

**Gender Equity and Inclusion**

GEQIP Phase I included an explicit focus on gender. Attention was paid to the selection of female teachers for training courses and all data was disaggregated. EMIS 2011/12 data shows the following national achievements with respect to female participation in primary and secondary education since GEQIP I was launched in 2009:

- the proportion of female teachers has increased slightly from 33% to 34%;
- girls primary completion rate has increased from 45% to 52% at grade 8;
- girls’ drop out has decreased from 19% to 15%
- 17,000 more girls passed the grade 10 examination

However, women remained severely underrepresented in leadership and management positions (2010 National Gender Strategy). Only 8.4% of the teachers in Colleges of Teacher Education (CTE) for example are female. (EMIS 2012).

---

\(^{11}\) Crawford, S. (2013) Every Last Girl Strategy Girl Hub Ethiopia

8. Funded by DFID-E, initially as a pilot testing modalities for an enhanced support to education in Ethiopia’s Somali Region; now scaled up to cover all basic services.
**Vulnerable and disadvantaged Groups**

GEQIP Phase I included support to Alternative basic Education Centres in the emerging regions. Net enrolment rates in the two of the emerging regions (Afar and Somali Regions) have increased by 5% and 13% since GEQIP Phase I was launched. However, challenges remain with respect to the quality of the education provided and the capacity of these regions to implement reforms (Jennings et al. 2011; Pfaffe et al. 2012). There are also wide disparities in the number of women facilitators in ABECs. In Afar for example only 9% of facilitators are women compared to 63% in Addis Ababa (EMIS 2012). Poor quality of teaching is a particular concern in the ABECs. Qualifications of facilitators in pastoralist areas were markedly lower than in other areas (Jennings and Poppe 2012).

GEQIP Phase I did not include provision of support for Children with Special needs with explicit focus. EMIS data (2011/2012) indicates that enrolment has declined slightly (from 47,000 to 43,000) but data is incomplete. The MoE is not solely responsible for collecting data on the numbers of children with special needs: types of disabilities, gender, age, ethnic differences and regional variations in numbers etc. This is the responsibility of the Central Statistical Agency (collation of data from across ministries, census, welfare monitoring surveys etc.). Moreover, the MoE faces challenges in planning and programming because of the dearth of national disability/special needs data nationally and across regions. Numbers of special needs children are at best estimates and are not disaggregated by type, location and only partially by gender (Tesemma, 2012). The GEQIP Phase 1 Comprehensive Evaluation reports that there is scarcely any provision for students with special needs at school level. Very few schools have tailored provision or classrooms for special needs children. Some regions – Afar, Dire Dawa, Gambella and Harari- have none at all(Pfaffe et al., 2012). However, the curriculum and training resources under the leadership and management programme are currently being revised and strengthened with regard to SNE13. The impacts of Phase 2 on children with special needs will need to be monitored closely.

**Institutional capacity-building impact**

GEQIP Phase I contributed to the building of institutional capacity both as a result of using government systems and by including an explicit capacity building component (Management, Administration, and Planning MAP14). In terms of building capacities to support equitable and inclusive quality education, Phase I was relatively successful at building capacity at federal, regional and school levels, but there was limited progress in Woredas, especially in the emerging regions (Pfaffe et al). Reviews of school-community linkages, under GEQIP 1 also identified the need for more inclusive SIP/SG processes, (Jennings et al. 2011) as well as stronger communication with school communities, and the general public(Pfaffe et al. 2012; MoE, 2012).

### 3.2 Integrating Lessons Learnt into the Design of GEQIP Phase 2

GEQIP Phase 2 builds on the achievements of Phase 1; sustain the gains made and address the outstanding challenges with regard to disparities in access to quality education, particularly for girls; low learning outcomes, high repetition and drop-out rates and the emerging regions. The cross-cutting themes, under GEQIP Phase 2, remain central to the programme:

- attention to drop-out and repetition in school improvement programmes, teacher and leadership training;
- emphasis on gender equity across the whole of the programme that go beyond gender parity in enrolment to gender equality in: access to educational resources; participation in learning and teaching opportunities and gender equity in the application of school rules and regulations.

---

13 British Council Pers Comm. The British Council is working with the MoE to revise Teacher and School leaders curriculum.

14 A capacity needs assessment was conducted during the first year of GEQIP Phase I implementation, which made a number of recommendations as to areas where capacity building efforts should be directed.
In addition, it supports equitable access to quality education through encouraging attention to school health and nutrition in school development plans, teacher training, and curriculum development.

In terms of improving equity and access, GEQIP Phase 2 has responded to lessons learnt under GEQIP Phase 1 and emphasises the needs of: a) regions, communities, and groups that lag behind in access and equity compared to national averages, and; b) children with special needs who remain outside the education system.

Table 4 below highlights the provisions made to integrate the lessons learnt from GEQIP Phase 2 relating to equity and inclusion.

### Table 4: GEQIP Phase 2 design responses to GEQIP phase 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEQIP Phase 2 component</th>
<th>Design Responses to GEQIP 1 Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component 1:</td>
<td>Translation of textbooks into Braille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion of supplementary reading and teaching materials in local languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decentralising provision of translated (local languages) curriculum and teaching materials to the regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthening capacities of School inspectorate at Regional and Woreda levels include focus on SIP/SG effectiveness, equity and inclusion issues in inspecting/assessing school performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2:</td>
<td>Development of teacher training material with due attention to inclusive pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affirmative action for the inclusion of more women in teaching profession and in capacity building activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special attention to teacher training in the emerging regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 3:</td>
<td>Enhanced School Grants and additional incentives to disadvantaged schools – the emerging regions and those with low retention and achievement rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simplified SG guidelines and SIP Framework for rural, isolated and smaller schools and ABECs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revision of School grant guidelines to address ways schools and communities can enhance student learning. Guidelines will be developed in local languages using pictures, and clear understandable language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of social accountability of school grants to strengthen community voice and accountability of school management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information campaigns for parents and communities to widen understanding and active participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 4:</td>
<td>Capacity building for the emerging regions through the special support directorate in all aspects of policy analysis, school management, and planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woreda level capacity building training in planning, management, use and application of EMIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthen EMIS at all levels – from MoE down to schools and including strengthened tracking of gender and enrolment of children with special needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affirmative action to ensure women leaders, manager etc. can actively participate in capacity building activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closer collaboration with PBS III to incorporate and use regional household data to support equitable and inclusive quality education provision. Includes an Independent evaluation of EMIS comparing data collected with other sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of school report cards nationwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 5:</td>
<td>This is a new Component which aims to provide a foundation for equitable quality learning and teaching in secondary schools through</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technology (ICT) for learning to provide a foundation for equitable, quality learning and teaching in secondary schools. **the use of ICT**: Equity between rural and urban schools will be considered in the choice of appropriate ICT given the varying levels of infrastructure and energy supply,

- Stakeholder revision of national policy and agency for ICT in general education
- CEICT as the national institutional base for ICT will work towards developing a national agency for ICT in general education, including within it, a resource and centre for assistive technology for learners with special needs, subject to review
- Improving ICT technical support services for regions, Woredas and schools
- Identifying and developing ICT devices for emerging regions
- Use of a challenge fund to promote innovation and attention to equity and inclusion issues

**Component 6:**
Programme Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Communication (PCMEC)

Programme coordination and evaluation to continue the GEQIP 1 emphasis on effective coordination, monitoring and evaluation

A new sub-component focusing on improved communications.

- Capacity building for communication at MoE, REB and WEB levels;
- Improved information dissemination and campaigns through print, radio and electronic media especially in disadvantaged areas of low enrolment and retention
- Information campaigns aimed at increasing ownership of GEQIP and ensuring wider participation of stakeholders especially parents and communities
- Evaluation of the SIP/SG to understand the reach, utilisation and impact of SG and SIPs including training and inter-linkage between SG/SIPs

4 Stakeholder Perceptions of Inclusive and Equitable Quality Education

This section analyses the key messages from the stakeholder consultations with respect to: the quality of education in their area, extent to which quality education is available to all, application of ICT and communication, and the perceptions of school-community linkages. A separate annex presents the full consultation findings from each of the four regions visited.

4.1 The Quality of Education

In all regions, parents of school attending children and children mentioned that there had been significant improvements in textbook availability but in Oromia, it was observed that the increase did not meet the demand. There was also appreciation of the benefits of multi-grade teaching as it was felt this had improved standards. In Gambella and Afar, Parents and children expressed concerns about the lack of teachers able to teach in the local language, or adapt their methods to the local culture. The fact that teachers did not fully understand local cultural and social norms was perceived as creating tensions between teachers and students. This included, at primary level, not teaching in the local language, lack of positive reinforcement of pastoralist lifestyles and livelihood choices, and following a curriculum which ignored pastoralism as a legitimate way of life.

This contributed to both a lack of respect and a lack of trust in the quality of the teaching. In all areas, there had been an increase in the numbers of girls going to school. The incentives (Oil, bursaries, and materials) were appreciated by parents and girls. The girls valued the extra tutorial support and girls clubs. However, in SNNPR, Gambella and Oromia boys expressed their frustration that girls were being given preferential treatment. They did not understand why they were not given extra tutorial support. In all areas parents and children felt mobile schools and ABECs were of poor quality and not “attractive”. However, in contradiction they also wanted ABEs to be expanded so that schools could be closer to households.

**Teaching Materials and Resources:** In Gambella, Oromia and SNNPR parents were concerned that teaching materials did not include positive messages and images about pastoralist communities. The
lack of appropriate teaching materials for pastoralist children fed community fears that formal education would support children to reject their culture and identity as a pastoralist. This finding is similar to that of a previous study (Brocklesby et al, 2010) which also highlighted community fears that formal education would undermine cultural and social cohesion within pastoralist communities. For girls and boys local language textbooks were seen as valuable. In Gambella, children wanted local language teaching to continue into secondary schools as they felt disadvantaged by being taught in Amharic without sufficient language support to catch up with Amharic speakers.

**Teaching capacities:** Woreda Officials in SNNPR highlighted the limited resources they had for on-the-job training and capacity building for teachers, which in turn contributed to high levels of dissatisfaction and attrition of the teaching staff. In Gambella and SNNPR, the lack of incentives for teachers in the remote areas coupled with under- and delayed payments were also cited as reasons for the difficulties in recruiting and retaining teachers. The lack of teachers was perceived to affect the levels of support and attention a teacher could give to classes. Children and parents in all areas complained that classes were too big. In Oramia, for example, a class of 120 was cited as evidence that quality education was difficult to achieve in their area.

**Barriers to quality education:** In all four regions, parents and children highlighted access issues as the main barrier to quality of education (e.g. extra costs, lack of safe boarding for secondary school students, distance from school etc.). In Oramia, parents suggested that it was impossible to talk about the quality of education until schools were safe, affordable and accessible. In SNNPR girls and boys mentioned high levels of sexual abuse and harassment of girls as a major barrier to them remaining in school. In all regions, early marriage (girls), child labour (boys and girls) and lack of parental support and understanding of the benefits of education (all) were cited as critical demand-side barriers to participation.

**Inclusion of Special Needs Children:** The findings from the stakeholder consultations reflect the situation for children with disabilities and special needs nationally. In all four regions, special needs education was perceived to be non-existent. None of the parents or children knew of any special provision or support for children with special needs even if, as was the case in Gambella, there was special needs support in school. On the demand side, stigma, shame and also lack of information about the opportunities open to special needs children were cited by parents and children as reasons why special needs children were not sent to school.

4.2 ICT and Communication

**Information Flows between Schools and Communities:** In all four regions, parents and children were concerned about the lack of information exchange between schools and communities. Community meetings, monthly school meeting and the annual school-parent meetings were the main formal mechanisms for information exchange, but poor and vulnerable parents, pastoralist parents and those in rural areas were unlikely to attend. In rural areas, children said that their parents knew little about what was going on in school and what they could do to support better quality education. Girls in particular thought this was affecting girls’ chances to stay in school because it made it harder to change attitudes and raise awareness about the benefits of education for girls. Poor information exchange was also perceived as evidence of lack of transparency and accountability of the school management and the WEB. In all rural areas and in peri-urban Gambella town, for example, parents expressed concerns about not being informed about changes occurring in the school and the lack of transparency in teacher selection or removal from the school. In Afar and Oramia, parents felt that they lacked adequate information to judge the quality of education in the schools.

**Use of ICT:** In rural areas across the four regions, FDG participants have little knowledge of what ICT in schools would involve and how it might help with the quality of education. In urban areas, the reverse was true. Parents and children wanted ICT in schools but, where there was provision, were frustrated by the lack of equipment, poor maintenance and teachers qualified to use ICT.

These findings on ICT and communications resonate with existing data from elsewhere about the
reach of different communication channels and mechanisms. Poor, vulnerable and underserved people, across all regions typically have the lowest access to and use of ICTs and are relatively disadvantaged in terms of digital and information inclusion (see Tambulasi 2009). In a recent survey (Ward and Ayalew) mobile phones (72%) were cited as the most frequently used ICT, followed by radio (59%) and television (36%)(Ward and Ayalew 2011). However, since the data was not disaggregated by wealth quintile, the statistics for mobile phone use may reflect survey cohorts that are relatively better off and technologically empowered.

An earlier survey (PMC, 2005) highlighted that there is a strong correlation between educational attainment and radio listening, with females (15-45+ years) educated to secondary level (88%) being more than twice as likely to listen to radio than non-literate or informally educated women (35%) (15-45+years). The emerging regions are additionally disadvantaged and appear to have the weakest access to information. The Ward and Ayalew, (2011) survey also indicates access to information through print, radio and television in the emerging regions is very low. These regions have by far the lowest access to television, while Gambella also has low access to radio relative to all other regions. In Gambella, for example very few of the respondents listened to radio, only 8% listen every day, compared with 30% in Dire Dawa, the next lowest statistic (Ward and Ayalew, 2011). In Somali and Afar, while a higher percentage of people listen to radio, they are more likely to listen to international than to local Ethiopian radio channels (Ward and Ayalew, 2011). In the Somali and Afar region the dominant source of information is word of mouth. In addition, the emerging regions have the lowest access to newspapers in all regions or administrative cities (Ward and Ayalew, 2011).

4.3 School – Community Linkages

Role of Parent/Guardian in school grants and management: In all four regions, parents in PTAs and children in schools reported that school grants had made an appreciable difference to the quality of education. Woreda officials felt community-school linkages had improved because of the SIP and SG activities. This view was partly shared by parents active in PTAs and FDG participants in urban areas. In Gambella Town, for example, the Woreda officials and the PTA noted that SIP decision-making was largely by School leaders and parents who had migrated into the Woreda from other areas. In rural areas parental involvement in SIP or the PTA was perceived as low. Household distance from the schools, in rural areas, was cited as a reason why many parents not participating, in SIP or PTA. Distinctions were made between participation in activities associated with the school grant, for example, contributing to school funds or helping clear school yards, and participating in decision-making about the quality of school provision and learning. Parents and children in all four regions reported that parents did not take part in decision-making and have low understanding of what was meant by quality education. They did however say that parents were contributing to improving school infrastructure in cash or kind.

Pastoralist participation in School decision-making: In all four regions, FDG participants highlighted the low participation of pastoralist parents/guardians in school matters such as SIP or the PTA. There was no pastoralist parents involved in SIP committees in Gambella Town Woreda and in SNNPR. In Afar and Gambella, parents pointed out that better educated and better connected parents were selected to be on the PTA and to participate in SIP. This inevitably meant, especially in rural areas, where education levels were low, and pastoralists lacked the power, connections and information to participate meaningfully, that pastoralist parents, especially women were excluded.

Women’s Active Participation in SIP: In all four regions, women’s participation in SIP meetings is low and more so in rural areas. The participation of poor, vulnerable and disadvantaged women appeared almost non-existent. Men dominate the PTAs which in turn lead, in conjunction with the SMC, SIP planning and decision-making. Very few women are active in the PTAs and in Yabello.

---

15In Somali Region, 96% of respondents cited word-of-mouth is the most important information source followed by 52% for radio and only 17% for television. In Afar region, 90% of respondents cited word-of-mouth as the most important information source, followed by 77% for radio and 40% for television (Ward and Ayalew 2011)
Oromia, no women were involved in the PTA. In all areas, FDG participants linked women’s low participation rates to social norms and traditional culture. However, it was also noted, by parents and children, that no measures had been taken by the school or the Woreda to facilitate or encourage women’s involvement in SIP. Information about SIP or school grants, for example, was disseminated generally via students or through community meetings, where women, particularly poor women are also under-represented. Women’s lack of power and voice in the household and their under-representation in public fora, in general and, in school management processes specifically, are known barriers to active participation (UNFPA, 2008; Jennings et al., 2011). In response, efforts have been made in PBS, the complementary programme to GEQIP as well as partner NGOs in pastoralist regions, to encourage women’s active participation in decision-making. It was surprising that FGD participants were not aware of these activities or perceived any change in women’s participation since the implementation of the school grant.

5. Recommendations

GEQIP Phase 2 is at its centre a quality-focused program and is designed to work in a complementary way with government efforts to improve access that are defined in ESDP IV. The recommendations made related to:

- Addressing the risks and challenges in relation to disadvantaged and vulnerable groups and populations identified by the social assessment and,
- Identifying, by components actions during implementation which can reduce these risk and challenges.

5.1 Potential Implementation risks and challenges

The table below identifies potential risks and challenges that the GEQIP Design should address in terms of progressing equity and inclusion objectives for the underserved regions and groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Potential Risks and Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 1</strong>: Curriculum, textbooks and assessment&lt;br&gt;Provision for continued improvement of teaching materials and aids should address how to reflect the culture and identity of pastoralists communities, thereby mitigating factors that could potentially contribute to community dissatisfaction and undermining learning;&lt;br&gt;Information gaps in relation to the proposal for translating text books into Braille. The evidence presented in the PAD, that it addresses the priority need for improving the quality in SNE is not conclusive;&lt;br&gt;Measures for addressing the potential disadvantage that Pastoralist students and other linguistic minorities who lack fluency (oral and written) in Amharic in upper cycle primary and secondary and the impacts this has on their attainment levels need further strengthening.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 2</strong>: Teacher Development&lt;br&gt;Processes and strategies for developing awareness and respect as well as building competencies to address the diverse needs of pastoralist and highly vulnerable children need to be addressed in the GEQIP Phase 2 design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 3</strong>: School improvement to strengthen school planning&lt;br&gt;During the revision of the SIP guidelines clear guidelines for complaint mechanisms or guidelines for dealing with parental or student grievances or complaints should be developed;&lt;br&gt;Gaps in the guidelines and mechanisms for promoting the active participation of women and disadvantaged groups in PTA/PSTA SIP and SG processes need to be addressed;&lt;br&gt;Print and electronic based media campaigns need to be designed to fit for the purpose in emerging regions (Somali and Afar) because of low coverage (electronic) and literacy rates especially among women;&lt;br&gt;Guidelines for Information campaigns need to address the context-specific barriers for adults and children to accesses information about schooling, improvements in quality etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Component 4: Capacity building for planning and management

- Capacity building programs should be designed fully to address the range of capacities Woreda staff and schools will need to ensure equity and inclusion issues are fully mainstreamed.

### Component 5: Information and Communications Technology (ICT) for learning

- There is information gap around the roles of ICT and communication strategies to reach and improve the quality of learning for disadvantaged and vulnerable groups and emerging regions. The piloting of ICT devices in emerging regions may not be enough to generate the evidence needed to expand into other areas given the disparities between regions and populations.

### Component 6: Programme coordination and evaluation

- EMIS system - currently does not track the full range of equity and inclusion issues it wishes to address during GEQIP phase 2
- Present communication strategies are not likely to be very effective in pastoralist communities, with women and with vulnerable groups. Further investigation is needed in order to develop better targeted and appropriate strategies with these groups.

### 5.2 Recommendations for GEQIP Phase 2 Implementation

The recommendations address the specific equity and inclusion Gaps within each of the components of GEQIP Phase 2. Additionally, GEQIP Phase 2 would benefit from enhancing the enabling environment for addressing the constraints of disadvantaged and vulnerable groups and individuals in accessing inclusive and equitable quality education in two ways:

- Specific and targeted measures addressing vertical inequities and disparities in access within vulnerable and disadvantaged groups on both the demand and supply-side and,
- Revising and strengthening the EMIS to include data on ethnicity, distance from schools, orphans and other highly vulnerable children, range of special needs etc.

However, these sector-wide priorities are beyond the immediate scope of GEQIP Phase 2 and will need to be addressed elsewhere within ESDP IV and subsequent sector-wide plans.

### Component Recommendations

**Component 1: Curriculum, textbooks and assessment**

- **Pastoralist & underserved group access to appropriate and positive quality of teaching materials.** During GEQIP phase 2, review the current textbooks and teaching materials used in Emerging Regions and in areas where there are high populations of pastoralist groups in terms of quality, cultural sensitivity; and adaptation to the socio-economic circumstances of the population. A priority should be given to promoting positive images and materials into the text books, teaching materials and supplementary reading materials used in pastoralist areas particularly for use in primary education.

- **Consistency across the regions in implementing the National Special Needs Education Programme Strategy.** This will go a long way in improving equity and inclusion of special needs children into education. CPD, Licensing and the inspectorate can all play a part in ensuring the strategy is consistently applied across the regions as well as monitoring progress through the current mechanisms. The Seed Funding for the proposed Centre of excellence can earmark funds for addressing special needs issues (e.g. cost-effectiveness of different SN teaching aids/materials, vertical inequalities in types of SN and range of support).

- **More information and analysis on regional disparities in types of special needs and vertical/gendered inequalities within the population of special needs children is needed.** During Phase 2 consider
  - commissioning a feasibility study of the cost-effectiveness of different SN teaching aids and resources in improving learning outcomes and,
  - Through the proposed centre of excellence or through other means collate and analyse and disseminate the data emerging from the School grants programmes, the pilots, seed funding and the challenge funds in relation to SNE and,
by the end of GEQIP 2 produce a comprehensive and cost-effective strategy for addressing learning and teaching resources for SNE.

Component 2: Teacher Development

- Consider introducing into the curriculum of CTEs and syllabi of CPEs, practice-based skills development modules on addressing vertical disparities within groups of vulnerable and disadvantaged children. These modules should be linked into the development of the generic standards.

- The induction programme for teachers (CPEs) broadened to include mandatory sections on understanding and addressing vertical disparities and the in-school and out-of-school needs of children with multiple vulnerabilities.

Component 3: School improvement to strengthen school planning

- Revision of criteria and guidelines for SIP and SG (both standard and simplified). GEQIP 2 should include a focus on mechanisms and incentives for widening participation and addressing the specific needs of disadvantaged and highly vulnerable children. Specifically, considering targets for the inclusion of women and members of disadvantaged groups within SIP planning processes and ensuring that pastoralist/agro-pastoralist adults are properly represented on SMC and PTAs. In addition, the move towards strengthening Woreda capacities opens up opportunities for more creative use of School report cards and in any social audit pilots to encourage wider participation. These are mechanisms that are known entry points for encouraging active participation of disadvantaged groups including women, in all forms of basic service provision (Gaventa and McGee; 2006). The revision of guidelines should also include sections which outline the complaint mechanisms and grievance procedures which are monitorable both at the school level (SIP/PTA and the SMC) and by the WEB. At REB and WEB levels learning from and applying the experiences of the social accountability component of PBS to the implementation of the school report cards should be encouraged.

- Given the current stigma associated with Special needs and disabilities within the wider community, information campaigns and awareness-raising may be needed in conjunction with the use of incentives within the School Grant programme to encourage SIPs to see the benefits of improving the quality of special needs education for both the student and the wider school community.

Component 4: Capacity building for planning and management

- In the development of the proposed capacity building framework at Woreda level include components and an agreed set of monitorable inclusion and equity competences. These competences should be linked to the targets and outcomes within the results framework to ensure they focus on the operational capacities needed to address equity and inclusion.

- Include explicit equity and inclusion criteria within the Eligibility Criteria and proposal guidelines for the Federal and regional level training fund on planning for quality management. Ensure that proposed courses, trainings and study tours are assessed against specific equity and inclusion criteria and will support planning for equitable quality improvement. Ideally, some consideration should be given to weighting proposals that progress capacity development in strategic planning for a) inclusive education and b) addressing equity gaps in quality management in both formal and alternative routes to education.

Component 5: Information and Communications Technology (ICT) for learning
ToRs and scope of work for the review of both the MoE and national technical support services should include attention to identifying the technical skills and capacities needed to address the socio-cultural dimensions of ICT provision. With respect to inclusive quality education Specialists technical support may be needed to be brought in to CEICT to facilitate the process and draw up the ToRs.

Over the lifetime of GEQIP phase 2, develop an evidence-base on differential usage, needs and constraints for take-up of ICT for quality-based education with a particular emphasis on gender, income and regional disparities and vertical disparities within vulnerable and disadvantaged population groups. The CEICT should be responsible for the data collection, collation and analysis. The evidence can be developed from the proposed pilots, the review of school net, and the results from implemented proposals of the challenge fund. A review of the available evidence as part of the proposed mid-term assessment of the ICT component should also reveal what other measures (e.g. specially commissioned studies to address information gaps will be needed before scaling-up in the second half of Phase 2.

Component 6: Programme coordination and evaluation

Within the present systems of planning, monitoring and evaluation and in particular training and capacity building activities, include where appropriate the impacts of affirmative actions on learning outcomes, inclusion etc. This will contribute to the positive culture of quality management that GEQIP phase 2 hopes to foster and strengthen the evidence base for the effectiveness of affirmative action in supporting quality improvements. In doing so GEQIP 2 will contribute to promoting an enabling environment in which women and school staff from disadvantaged groups feel encouraged and supported in taking up training and mentoring opportunities.

To ensure that all communication strategies and information dissemination processes are tailored to the wide-ranging context-specific communication needs means capacity building for communication (6.3.2) will require the consultancy support to focus particular attention to Woreda and community capacity building.

To track the impacts of the external support, GEQIP Phase 2, half annual and annual performance reports should include a section on the outcomes of locally generated communication strategies on school and Woreda GEQIP phase 2 implementation targets. This information can be used by REB and WEB level as part of their information coordination and capacity building efforts. There are also opportunities to link capacity building for communication into the broader capacity building measures, for teachers, leaders and managers under component 4. Over the lifetime of GEQIP phase 2, where appropriate to content, and as implementation results emerge, training materials and support on inclusive and gender sensitive communication methods and techniques can be strengthened.
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PREFACE
As a part of the preparation of phase 2, the Ministry of Education in Ethiopia commissioned a targeted and focused Social Assessment. This Social Assessment contributes to actions by the MoE to ensure implementation of GEQIP 2 is inclusive and equitable for all children in Ethiopia.

The purpose of the social assessment is to assess the potential impact of GEQIP 2’s proposed project components on the more vulnerable and disadvantaged groups and regions in Ethiopia and, identify strategies for mitigating risk and adverse impacts.

Contained within these annexes are the Regional reports of key messages from the stakeholder consultations held with woreda officials and community members (School staff, parents and children) in four selected regions in Ethiopia. The stakeholder consultations focused on stakeholder perceptions in relation to the: quality of education, ICT and Communication and School-community linkages. Separate Focus group Discussion Groups (FDG) were held with school management and PTAs, parents not active in PTAs, boys and girls both attending schools and drop-outs. In each Woreda, a FDG was held with Government stakeholders involved in progressing quality education. A total of 43 FDGs were conducted across the 4 regions involving 320 people: 31 Women, 88 men, 127 girls and 80 boys.

The Social Assessment of the General Education Quality Improvement Programme Phase 2 was written by Mary Ann Brocklesby in conjunction with YNN International Consultants Ltd. Research staff from YNN international collected and analysed the regional data and prepared the regional reports provided in a separate Annexe. Solomon Shiferaw, Director EMIS, planning and resource mobilisation Directorate, Ministry of Education; Joseph Bastian, consultant to the Ethiopian Ministry of Education and Chris Berry, UK Department for International Development oversaw the preparation of the social assessment.

The Social Assessment was carried out with the support of UK AID Department for International Development.
## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABE</td>
<td>Alternative Basic Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Groups Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEQIP</td>
<td>General Education Quality Improvement Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoE</td>
<td>Government of Ethiopia (Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Parent Teacher Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REB</td>
<td>Regional Education Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGP</td>
<td>School Grant Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>School Improvement Programme/Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC</td>
<td>School Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNE</td>
<td>Special Needs Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples’ Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEB</td>
<td>Woreda Education Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEO</td>
<td>Woreda Education Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annexe 1: Afar Regional Report

Prepared by Alemakef Tassew
June 2013

1. Introduction

The social assessment of the impact of the proposed interventions in GEQIP II on vulnerable and disadvantaged groups, (in particular the Pastoralists, agro-pastoralists and underserved groups) in Ethiopia, comprise three components:

- Review, analysis and synthesis of existing data sources in relation to the key social and institutional issues affecting poor, vulnerable and underserved girls and boys broadly and children from Pastoralists, agro-pastoralists and underserved groups specifically;
- Participatory stakeholder consultations in 4 emerging regions and selected woredas and
- Operational guidance and recommendations to support GEQIP fulfill its access, equity and overall social objectives.

This regional level report addresses the objectives, methodology, field sites and sample size selection in relation to carrying out component 2: the stakeholder consultations. The stakeholder consultation was rapid participatory and qualitative process aimed at capturing stakeholder perceptions and opinions. They were not comprehensive survey of the issues affecting equity in, and access to, quality education. The social factors affecting equity and access to quality education are considered well –documented in the existing literature (e.g. the 2011 social assessment (SA) and subsequent surveys; the UNICEF out of school study – 2012 and the GEQIP phase 1 Comprehensive evaluation study).

The stakeholder consultations at woreda level were carried from June 03-07, 2013. Two woredas, one very remote and the other relatively accessible woreda namely Bure Mudayitu and Awash Fentale woreda were selected. Bure Mudayitu woreda is the remote woreda where infrastructures are very poor.

2. Purpose and Objectives of the Stakeholder Consultations:

The purpose of the stakeholder consultations is to support the process of free, informed and prior consultation carried out during the preparation of GEQIP II phase, through purposive and targeted consultations with pastoralist communities and key stakeholders in Afar region.

There are three main objectives to the Stakeholder Consultations:

1. Follow-up the capacity needs and constraints of Woreda stakeholders, communities and schools in progressing equity and access to education for disadvantaged and underserved children, particularly in the emerging regions with Pastoralists. agro-pastoralists and underserved groups;
2. Follow up and explore community perceptions of the use of ICT to improve quality of learning and progress equitable access to education (information flows between schools, children and their communities) and;
3. Explore the scope for enhanced participation (voice) and monitoring (accountability) of girls, boys and their communities, (within both formal schools and alternative routes to quality education - ABEC and mobile schools), in progressing access to quality education for disadvantaged and underserved children.

3. Methodology
The field consultations were done by using a rapid participatory qualitative assessment of key issues relating to the 3 objectives of the SA. Primary information has been collected from different stakeholders through focus group discussion method using different participatory tools.

3.1 Focus Group Discussions

The key assessment instrument used was Focus Group Discussions (FGD) using semi-structured checklist in combination with a simple participatory analysis tool. Two FGD guidelines have been utilized for both the Woreda level discussions and the Community/schools level discussions. In the two woreda a total of 11 FGD was carried out with representatives from both formal and ABE schools as well as woreda and community representative. In Bure Mudayitu active representatives from ABE schools were communicated whereas in Awash Fentale representatives from the community which are in active were communicated. The selections of the community were carried out in consultation with woreda education office and the research assistance.

In each group a minimum of 5 and maximum of 10 individuals were involved and participated in the discussion. To facilitate the FGD translators were hired from each woreda. Their assistances were very helpful in translation and locating key participants especially disadvantaged and vulnerable groups in the society. All FGD expect the one carried out with woreda officials were carried out independently for both sexes to ensure privacy and to freely explain their concern affecting the provision of quality education.

Woreda Level Stakeholders Consultation

The consultations for Woreda-level key actors was focused on exploring the skills and capacities needed to: a) plan for, and progress, quality education provision for underserved and disadvantaged girls and boys (equity and access); b) respond to the voices and demands of excluded, underserved and hard-to-reach girls and boys within the communities under their control and d) support and utilise ICT in schools and to improve information flows between education providers and service users (children and their parents and guardians). More over a participatory tool, spokes, was used to analyze current capacities, constraints and improvement opportunities in relation to these three topics identified above.

Consultation with different members of community

A semi structured FGD guideline and ‘Bricks and Termites’ tool has been used to compile information from community members. As shown in Table below participants of the FGDs were drawn from In-school boys and girls, Out of school girls and boys, active PTA members and inactive community members. A total of 11 FGDs were held with different community members in both woredas. In these community consultation 8 women, 27 girls, 27 men and 26 boys and a total of 88 individuals have been participated. Detailed breakdown of the FGD participants by gender, ethnicity and age is attached as Annex.

| Table 1: List of FGDs Conducted in Afar |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----|
| **Consultation type** | **Bure Mudayitu** | **Awash Fenetale** | **Total** |
| Woreda level consultation | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Community consultation | | | |
| • In-school Boys | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| • In-school girls | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| • Out of school girls | 1 | 1 | 2 |
3.2 Limitations, or Challenges Faced During the Consultations

During these consultations meeting the team has not encountered major difficulties, but a few challenges such as timing of the field work itself, duration on the field can be mentioned. During the field work there was national examination for all high school throughout the country and as a result it were not appropriate to conduct the FGD with high school students and school community. Moreover the date and time allocated for the field work was not sufficient. As we all know the selected woreda are remote areas where the majority of the communities are pastoralist. Finding and locating individuals was not an easy task and create some burden and difficulties to the researcher and it’s assistant.

3.3 Background Context of Afar Region

The Afar Regional State is one of the nine regional states of Ethiopia, and is the homeland of the Afar people. Its new capital as of 2007 capital is the recently constructed city of Semera, which lies on the paved Awash–Asseb highway. The Afar Depression, also known under the outdated name Danakil Depression, is part of the Great Rift Valley of Ethiopia, and is located in the north of the region. It has the lowest point in Ethiopia and one of the lowest in Africa. The southern part of the region consists of the valley of the Awash River, which empties into a string of lakes along the Ethiopian-Djibouti border. Other notable landmarks include the Awash and Yangudi Rassa National Parks.

Regional Demographic Characteristics

Based on the 2007 Census conducted by the Central Statistical Agency of Ethiopia (CSA), the Afar Regional State has a total population of 1,390,273, consisting of 775,117 men and 615,156 women; urban inhabitants number 185,135 or 13.32% of the population, a further 409,123 or 29.43% were pastoralists. With an estimated area of 96,707 square kilometres, this region has an estimated density of 14.38 people per square kilometer. For the entire region 247,255 households were counted, which results in an average for the Region of 5.6 persons to a household, with urban households having on average 4 and rural households 6 people. Ethnic groups include Afar (90.03%), Amhara (5.22%), Argobba (1.55%) Tigrinny people (1.15%), Oromo (0.61%), Welayta (0.59%), and Hadiya (0.18%). 95.3% of the population is Muslim and 4.7% is Christian (3.9% Orthodox Christian, 0.7% P’ent’ay, and 0.1% Catholics). Afar is predominantly (89.96%) spoken in the region and is the working language of the state. Other languages with a significant number of speakers in the state include Amharic (6.83%), Tigrinny (1.06%), Argobba (0.79%), Wolaitigna (0.43%), and Oromifa (0.4%).

Table: Total population by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Both Sex</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country Level</td>
<td>73,918,505.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>37,296,657.0</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>36,621,848.0</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>1,411,092.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>786,338.0</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>624,754.0</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bure Mudayitu</td>
<td>31,786.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>18,121.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>13,665.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social Assessment of GEQIP Phase 2 Ethiopia
Values for other reported common indicators of the standard of living for the Afar Regional State as of 2005 include the following: 67.3% of the inhabitants fall into the lowest wealth quintile; adult literacy for men is 27% and for women 15.6%. According to the education statistics data from MoE the total school age population is 272,637 boys and 199,772 girls. The net enrolment ratio in the region is about 14% and 12 % for male and female which is one the lowest in the country. In Afar region a total of 7 KG, 265 ABE, 347 Primary and 9 High School are found.

### Table 3: Regional total school age and enrolment population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 1-4</th>
<th>School age</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Enrollment Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185,211</td>
<td>136,436</td>
<td>321,647</td>
<td>61,589</td>
<td>38,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-8 Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45,061</td>
<td>32,411</td>
<td>77,472</td>
<td>3,271</td>
<td>1,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12 Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42,365</td>
<td>30,925</td>
<td>73,290</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3.3 Bure Mudayitu Woreda

**Bure Mudaytu** is one of the woredas in the Afar Region of Ethiopia. Part of the Administrative Zone 3, Bure Mudaytu stretches along a narrow band covering the marshy lowlands along the Awash River, with the Administrative Zone 5 to the west and Gewane to the east. The administrative center of this woreda is Debel. Based on the 2007 Census conducted by the Central Statistical Agency of Ethiopia (CSA), this woreda has a total population of 31,794, of whom 18,128 are men and 13,666 women; with an area of 702.09 square kilometers, Bure Mudaytu has a population density of 45.28. Although there are no urban inhabitants, 6,542 or 20.58% are pastoralists. A total of 5,519 households were counted in this woreda, which results in an average of 5.8 persons to a household, and 5,688 housing units. 97.3% of the population said they were Muslim, and 1.63% were Orthodox Christians. According to the wored education office the woreda has a total of eleven ABE and nine Primary schools. There is no high school in the woreda.

### 3.3.4 Awash Fenetale Woreda

**Awash Fenetale** is one of the woredas in the Afar Region of Ethiopia. Part of the Administrative Zone 3, Awash Fenetale is bordered on the south by the Oromia Region, on the west by the Amhara Region, on the north by Dulecha, and on the east by Amibara. Towns in Awash Fenetale include Awash Sebat Kilo and Sabure. Based on the 2007 Census conducted by the Central Statistical Agency of Ethiopia (CSA), this woreda has a total population of 29,780, of whom 15,475 are men and 14,305 women; with an area of 1,046.41 square kilometers, Awash Fenetale has a population density of 28.46. While 16,849 or 56.58% are urban inhabitants, a further 1,695 or 5.69% are pastoralists. A total of 7,421 households were counted in this woreda, which results in an average of 4.0 persons to a household, and 7,751 housing units. 68.26% of the population said they were Muslim, 25.75% were Orthodox Christians, and 5.21% were Protestants. In the woreda there are nine Primary School (First and
Second Cycle (1-8), and one high school. Moreover eight ABE centres provide service for pastoralist boys and girls.

### 3.4 Organisations working to support Girls and boys enrol and stay in school within each woreda

In both Awash Fentale and Bure Mudayitu woreda few governmental and nongovernmental organizations are working to support disadvantaged and vulnerable boys and girls to get quality education. Moreover there are also fewer NGO’s such as UNICEF, save the children (WASH program), world learning and the like closely working with woreda education office to support boys and girls to attend the school. In fact the support provided by UNICEF to retain girls in the school can be mentioned as a great support. UNICEF in both woredas provides food and oil for girls attending 80% of the class in each month. In most cases this contributed a lot to retain girls in the school.

### 3.5 Factors Affecting Regional School Attendance

A number factor can be raised for factors affecting the attendance school for boys and girls in the region. Among the main reason weak awareness of the community in the region, backwardness in basic infrastructure (School, health facility, road and other network infrastructure, limited resources financial, human and material) can be mentioned. On top of those factors poor economic condition of the community also contributed much in affecting the provision of quality education for both boys and girls. All most all of the community in the region are pastoralist moving from place to place in search of water and food their cattle’s and their own. As result the probability of school children to attend their class throughout the year is very low. Moreover the poor awareness of the community such as harmful traditional practices such as early marriage, circumcision and others can also be mentioned as a key issues affecting school attendance in the region. In Afar region family labour (working as a daily labourer to support the economic problem their parents) also prevents both boys and girls not attending the school.
4. **Main Findings of Stakeholders Assessment**

4.1 **Stakeholders’ abilities to progress to support equitable Access to Quality Education for disadvantaged and vulnerable children.**

**Woreda Level**

At woreda level, though there are some limitations, the capacity to support and provide quality education is not bad. The woreda education offices take different measures to provide quality education for disadvantaged and vulnerable groups. Nonetheless, a number of limitations such as educated man power, finance, materials and other infrastructure shortages undermine their efforts to achieve the designed objective.

Even though the woreda education office take different action to enroll and retain children in schools, due to various traditional factors and poor infrastructure the enrolment ratio in the woredas are very low. In one class the number students are not more than 15 or 20. Especially in Bure mudayitu and Awash rural kebeles the number is even less than the aforementioned one.

According to the discussion made with woreda education offices a number traditional cultural influence such as early marriage, circumcision and preferring girls for labour affects the girls to attend education in the woredas. The poor economic condition of the community due to harsh climatic condition is also the other factor affecting girls and boys attendance in schools. Due to shortage of water the community moves from place to place. This movement forced boys and girls to left out school. The numbers of satellite/ mobile school in the two woredas are not enough to respond to the problem. In Bure Mudayitu woreda there is no secondary school and as result after completing 8th grade the students are forced to leave out school. The parents are not financially capable to support their children to go to other woreda to attend secondary school. The other problem affecting quality education in the woredas are absences providing education by using local language. In the region as a whole and in the selected woredas the education is given by using Amharic language. The woreda official raises this as a major problem affecting the provision of quality education and suggests it as a critical issue to be considered.

In most of the woredas schools are located far apart from the village of the students and, therefore, the community fear sending students to school, in relation with security issue. Moreover the road and other communication infrastructure of the woredas are very poor and limited and there is no transportation facility. In such occasion the family resists to send their children mainly the girls to school. Financial limitation is the other problem mentioned in each woreda as a bottle neck in the sector. There serious budget shortage in the two woreda to achieve designed goal to improve the quality of education. The budget allocated for education in the woredas is very limited which cannot able to full fill the necessary equipment and resources. There is also not enough budget to provide short and long term training for teachers and educational leaders at woreda level. Materials available in the school are not sufficient enough. There is no enough class room, latrine, and drinking water in the school...etc.

**Community level**

The attitude of pastoralist community in both woredas towards education is still poor. This awareness and attitude of the community is also the other factor affecting girls and boys education in the area. Little has been done to avert this condition. Still girls are forced to marry at their early age. Nobody protect them against such practices. The clan and community leaders still decided on the fate of girls. Harmful traditional influences such as early marriage circumcision and dependant on girls labour are the major factors preventing most girls from attending school. However the urban people in Awash Fenatle woreda has better awareness about education and their involvement in ensuring the provision of quality education for all is relatively good.
Boys and Girls

The role of students’ (boys and Girls) in the two woredas is very low in contributing towards quality education. As per our discussion their involvement in school activity is low. However in recent years their involvement is increasing from time to time through different school clubs. Some of these clubs are Environmental club, WASH club and Girls club which is working on family plan and gender issue...etc. Through those clubs the students are organized and exercise some role towards the provision of quality education. The role of mini media in the school is also something to be mentioned in this regard. In Awash Fenatle woreda even some School children’s responded that they are consulted to express their view regarding the education system in their school.

4.2 Use of ICT to support learning and increased access to education

The role ICT in supporting the provision of quality education in the two woreda is very limited due to poor ICT infrastructures and poor network coverage. Especially in Bure Mudayitu woreda both at woreda office and school level availability of ICT infrastructure is very poor. At woreda level few computers are found but not functional during the field visits. The manpower to operate the equipments in the wored is also limited. At school level there is no such facility. Therefore the students in this woreda have no access to ICT infrastructure. No radio education, no plasma, no computer, no internet...etc. However in Awash fenatle woreda there are ICT infrastructure in Awash town both public and private owned. At woreda offices the ICT infrastructure are available and used by the staff. At school level even though their accessibility is very limited to students particularly to elementary school children in the high school it is accessible to both students and teachers. But during the field visits the high school was closed due to national examination and discussion was not conducted with high school students about the service. In Awash town there are privately owned internet services providers where students can browse and find necessary information to support their class room lesson. Even though the facilities are there the culture of students for using the ICT services is very poor as explained by their teachers and woreda education officers.

Relatively the urban communities both men and women uses ICT more frequently than the rural community. The rural communities are more of pastoralist and their knowhow about ICT infrastructure is very low. In the school (Awash primary school) the use of ITC like radio for mini media and tape recorder and others is almost same between boys and girls.

4.3 Community participation in supporting improvements in Equitable Access to Quality Education

The participation and involvement of the community is key in the provision of quality education. Without community participation it is unthinkable to ensure and achieve the provision of quality education for all. In this regard the community was asked during the FGD weather they are consulted and involved in the efforts to provide quality education. Accordingly even though their involvement is limited they are contributing their share to ensure quality education. There are PTA’s in all schools visited. The PTA’s are working with the schools. The PTA members are participated on SIP preparation and approving purchase request from school grant and the like. In addition the PTA also hears and suggest on annual plan performance. In urban areas of Awash Fentale woreda the PTA members also participated on the preparation of annual planning of the school. Particularly in Awash Fenatle woreda on regular basis representative from all groups make field assessment to ensure the provision of quality education. The school has the responsibility to provide monthly report to the woreda education offices and on few bases to the community.
4. Suggestions for Improvements

Table 4: Summary of improvement suggestions from stakeholder groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Suggested by Whom</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Constructions of boarding school</td>
<td>➢ Both male and female students</td>
<td>It is from all participants and explained as follows. Due to the unavailability of boarding school when the parents move from one place to the other, the students forced to quiet their education, but if boarding school could be there, it might reduce this problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Woreda officials (Both sex)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Constructions of more ABE and formal school</td>
<td>➢ Woreda officials and community representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Woreda officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improving infrastructures condition of the region</td>
<td>➢ In and out school Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Woreda officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teaching by using local language</td>
<td>➢ Woreda officials and teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Girls in the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Better budget allocation for education sector</td>
<td>➢ Girls in the school</td>
<td>The woreda officials believe that if the current financial problem of the schools solved all problems related to school attendance and quality issue would have been solved too. Most girls in the school and outside the school believe that by involving more women as a teacher in the school would have change the attitude of the people towards girls education and suggest it as one solution to solve the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Involving more women teacher as a role model</td>
<td>➢ Girls in the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1: Number of Participants in Focus Group Discussions by Gender and Age in the woreda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Woreda Awash Fentale</th>
<th>Woreda Bure Mudayitu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Number of Participants in Focus Group Discussions by Gender and ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants by Gender and ethnicity</th>
<th>Woreda Awash</th>
<th>Woreda Bure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historically disadvantaged groups Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settled population Female</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historically disadvantaged groups Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settled population Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Breakdown of FDGs with Girls and Boys by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age category</th>
<th>Woreda Awash</th>
<th>Woreda Bure</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls under 15</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls over 15</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys under 15</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys over 15</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Breakdown of FDGs with Girls and Boys by background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Woreda Awash</th>
<th>Woreda Bure</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls in school</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls out of school</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys in school</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys out of school</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boys</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annexe 2: Gambella Regional Report
Report Prepared by: Semere Kaleab

1. Introduction

The social assessment of the impact of the proposed interventions in GEQIP II on vulnerable and disadvantaged groups, (in particular the socio-cultural groups, including historically disadvantaged and underserved communities, pastoralists, and minorities) in Ethiopia, comprise three components:

- Review, analysis and synthesis of existing data sources in relation to the key social and institutional issues affecting poor, vulnerable and underserved girls and boys broadly and children from socio-cultural groups, such as the historically disadvantaged and underserved communities, pastoralists, and minorities populations specifically;
- Participatory stakeholder consultations in 4 emerging regions and selected woredas and
- Operational guidance and recommendations to support GEQIP fulfill its access, equity and overall social objectives.

This regional level report addresses the objectives, methodology, field sites and sample size selection in relation to carrying out component 2: the stakeholder consultations. The stakeholder consultation was rapid participatory and qualitative process aimed at capturing stakeholder perceptions and opinions. In Gambella stakeholders’ consultations at woreda level were carried out from June 03-07, 2013. The consultation was made in Gambela and Abobo woredas. These two were purposively selected as the majority of the community is pastoralist and as they have different ethnic groups living in them. In these woredas government has been working to improve access of pastoralist boys and girls education through expansion of ABEC. On the other hand early marriage and low perception towards education have been the main challenges for provision of quality education in the woredas.

2. Purpose of the stakeholders’ consultations

The purpose of the stakeholder consultations is to support the process of free, informed and prior consultation, carried out during the preparation of GEQIP II, through purposive and targeted consultations with pastoralist communities and key stakeholders within selected regions. There are three main objectives to the Stakeholder Consultations:

1. Follow-up the capacity needs and constraints of Woreda stakeholders, communities and schools in progressing equity and access to education for disadvantaged and underserved children, particularly in the emerging regions with socio-cultural groups and populations;
2. Follow up and explore community perceptions of the use of ICT to improve quality of learning and progress equitable access to education (information flows between schools, children and their communities) and;
3. Explore the scope for enhanced participation (voice) and monitoring (accountability) of girls, boys and their communities, (within both formal schools and alternative routes to quality education - ABEC and mobile schools), in progressing access to quality education for disadvantaged and underserved children.
3. **Methodology**

The field consultations were done using a rapid participatory qualitative assessment of key issues relating to the 3 objectives of the SA. Primary information has been collected from different stakeholders through focus group discussion method using different participatory tools.

3.1 **Focus group discussions**

To undertake the social assessment 10 FGDs were conducted in the selected two woredas. In conducting these FGDs the study team used two types of participatory tools; spokes for woreda stakeholders consultation and ‘Bricks and Termites’ for community consultation.

**Woreda level stakeholders consultation**

The study team has conducted woreda level stakeholders in both Gambela and Abobo woredas. To facilitate the data collection process the study team used semi structured FGD guideline and participatory tool called spokes. The participants on these consultations were officials and experts from different sector offices of the woreda as well as representatives of NGO. (The list of participants is attached in the Annex).

**Consultation with different members of community**

A semi structured FGD guideline and ‘Bricks and Termites’ tool has been used to compile information from community members. As shown in Table 1 participants of the FGDs were drawn from In-school boys and girls, Out of school girls, active PTA members and inactive community members. A total of 8 FGDs were held with different community members in both woredas.

**Table 1. List of FGDs conducted Gambella**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation type</th>
<th>Gambela</th>
<th>Abobo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woreda level consultation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In-school Boys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Out of school Boys</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In-school girls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Out of school girls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Active PTA members</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non active Community members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these community consultation 9 women, 27 girls, 18 men and 14 boys had participated. Detailed breakdown the FGD participants by gender, ethnicity and age is attached as Annex.

3.2 **Limitation of the SA**

The first limitation we encountered was the high Bureaucracy in the Gambella region to get permission to do the study. The time limitation was another issue the short time given for the collection of data.
added with the bureaucracy has made it hard to get all the available data that could have been more useful.

Secondly, the language limitation was another problem. With the exception of the FDGs conducted with the woredas and Parent teacher associations all FDGs were conducted by translators. The lack of first-hand information another problem faced in the consultation.

The other challenge has been low awareness of the community about GEQIP and other education interventions. Out of school girls and non-active community members have no sufficient information on the points mentioned. With this regard their contribution towards generating relevant information was minimal.

3.3 Background information of Gambella region and sample woredas

Gambela region has 307,096 who are 159787 men and 147309 women living in its 29782.82 square kilometres area. In ethnic composition the region has three major ethnic groups consisting 46.6% Nuers, 21.16% Anuak, 4% Mezneger (CSA, 2007). According to 2012/12 educational abstract released by MoE, the school age (7-16) population of the region is around 95,035.

Educational facility distribution of the region shows that there are 229 primary (1-8) and 26 high schools. Out of these only eight schools have access for electricity and one school has access for internet service.

Gambella city

Gambella is a city and separate woreda Located in Anuak Zone and the capital of the Gambela Region. Based on the 2007 Census conducted by CSA, Gambela has a total population of 39,022, of whom 20,790 are men and 18,232 women. Based on the information from Gambella city education office, the city has four high schools, five primary schools and ten privately owned schools that run from KG to grade 8. There are 10,317 primary students (Grade 1-8) out of whom 4,929 are females. There are 1,455 male and 987 females that attend grade 9 and 10. Total number of students that attend grade 11 and 12 are 776 out of whom females are 169.

There are three local and international NGOs that provide support to improve quality of education in the woreda. The NGOs had provided support by engaging in construction of ABEC, provision of educational materials, construction of latrines in schools, expansion of classrooms and sponsoring students who could not afford to cover their cost of education. Furthermore, they are working to enhance the community awareness and understanding about education.

Abobo woreda

Based on the 2007 Census conducted by the CSA, this woreda has a total population of 15,741, of whom 8,184 are men and 7,557 women. A total of 3,867 households were counted in this woreda, which results in an average of 4.1 persons to a household. In the woreda there are 18 formal education facilities, 1 high school and 17 primary education centres. There are three ABE centres in the woreda.

The total number of students in primary schools (Grade 1-8) is 5,253. Out of these 2,479 are girls. At high school level there are 510 students of whom 262 are boys and 248 girls.
Currently, there are three NGOs that are providing support to improve quality of education in the woreda by engaging in, provision of educational materials and building the capacity and awareness of the community.
4. Main findings of the Stakeholder Consultations

4.1 Stakeholders’ abilities to support equitable Access to Quality Education for disadvantaged and vulnerable children

Woreda level

In both woredas visited the woredas have common abilities to promote equitable education for disadvantaged students. They have tried their best to promote education facilities. In both woredas the regional government has tried it’s best to increase the provision of education but the lack of awareness and harmful cultures like early marriage have slowed the rate of progress.

With regard to children with special needs there are no activities that have been done to increase awareness or teach children with special needs in the visited woredas. There are no schools for special need children in the whole region. One school (Ras Gobena) school has started to teach 14 students with special needs in one class which could be considered as a good start.

The participation of other NGOs is decisive in regions with low capabilities. In Gambella region the USAID and LFW (Learning for the World) have participated in helping vulnerable and disadvantaged students continue their education by providing handout money and providing text books respectively.

Community level

The attitude and perception of the pastoralist community about role of education is poor and traditional. In both woredas, parents prefer to engage their children in household activities rather than educate them. According to our discussion with different community members the factors that prevent boys and girls from attending schools are; high workload, low economic capacity to cover schooling expense and poor awareness of the community about importance of education. On the other hand the practice of early mirage had critically affected girls’ enrolment to schools.

In every focus group discussion and interviews we did with every stake holders we received responses that show parents don’t have initiative to participate in school matters. Even parents in the parent teacher association do not come to meetings. For example the attendance sheet shows that most around 70% of the time only two; parents are available at the meetings. Particularly teachers complain about the matter, as they feel like all the responsibilities have fallen on their shoulder. Teachers have gone to extreme of holding their students report cards to meet their parents.

Boys and Girls

All the participants on our discussions have said that they do not have any influence in improving quality of education as their voice are unheard. The school management committee and the woreda did not consult them on any matter.

With regard to girls, they have stated that they do not have any say in the school affairs. The girls have stated that with low awareness towards education and discrimination towards women, their involvements in decisions were almost none. Domestic labour and early marriage are their biggest challenges for continuing their education.
4.2 Use of ICT to support learning and increased access to education

The use of ICT is directly linked to the availability of the service. In Gambela region the internet network is weak and even to use this network there is lack of service providers. In the Gambela woreda only Ras Gobena School has an ICT room. The sample school we chose in the woreda (Dalckoch) did not even have computers. In the other woreda (Abobo) the alternative school did not have that luxury. In the woreda level consultation participants said that it was ideal to use the ICT service to teach pastoralist students when their families move from place to place in particular seasons. But even in the woreda education office we observed that there is lack of skills towards IT technologies.

In the community, most people are not skilled and aware to use ICT services. The other parents who come from pastoralist areas are illiterate. Even teachers are not using internet service as they should because of lack of skills. The woreda education office has tried to tackle this problem by giving summer trainings for teachers.

Now days, some students has started to use internet with their phones. With increasing number of mobile users it is thought that the use of ICT will develop. The students mentioned if they could get internet access they could use it to download reference books. The teachers on the other hand pointed out that it could be very easy for them to improve their capacity if the internet service was better.

4.3 Community participation in supporting improvements in Equitable Access to Quality Education

Communities have significant role in supporting provision of quality education by engaging in different ways. According to the respondents, the involvement of communities is at a very low level. Even parents in the city of Gambella do not participate in the school affairs as they have low perception towards education.

On the other hand, the involvement of the pastoralist communities in school improvement activities is worse. The pastoralists have a greater need for labour than education. In the FDG we conducted with out-of-school boys in Abobo participants have stated that they dropped out and started work because they have to feed their family. In areas where a being member of safety net programs is seen as a middle income level, school is perceived as luxury. Thus short term use of family labour is more important than long term return of education. Besides, their concept and awareness about quality education are not in equal terms with urbanites as they have no equal information access mechanisms.
5. **Suggestions for Improvement**  

Table 2: Summary of improvement suggestions from stakeholder groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Suggested by Whom</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Increasing awareness in the community                   | • Woreda FDG participants  
• Girls in school and out of school  
• PTA members  
• Non active parents  
• Boys in school  
• Boys out of school | because there is a very low perception towards school and is the base of all problems (early marriage, domestic work for girls, lack of participation by parents) |
| More committed teachers                                 | • Girls in school  
• Boys in school  
• PTA members |                                                                                                                                 |
| Building of more classes, libraries and laboratories    | • Non active parents | Schools have a high ratio of students’ class rate.                                                                                     |
| Schools for special need students                       | • Woreda stakeholders  
• PTA members | There should be a school for special need.                                                                                              |
| Assign more local teachers                              | • Girls in school  
• Boys in school  
• PTA members | Provision of education by local language improves students understanding                                                             |
| ICT materials like computers and skilled teachers       | • Woreda FDG participants  
• Girls in school and out of school  
• PTA members  
• Non active parents  
• Boys in school  
• Boys out of school |                                                                                                                                 |
| Seasonal meeting between parents and teachers to supervise the activity of students. | • Girls in school and out of school  
• PTA members  
• Non active parents |                                                                                                                                 |
| Partners and other companies should sponsor students    | • Boys in school  
• Boys out of school |                                                                                                                                 |
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Table 1: Number of Participants in Focus Group Discussions by Gender and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woreda</th>
<th>Woreda</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gambela</td>
<td>Abobo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Girls</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Number of Participants in Focus Group Discussions by Gender and ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woreda</th>
<th>Woreda</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gambela</td>
<td>Abobo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historically disadvantaged groups</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settled population</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historically disadvantaged groups</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settled population</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>F 18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M 17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Breakdown of FDGs with Girls and Boys by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woreda</th>
<th>Woreda</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gambela</td>
<td>Abobo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls under 15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls over 15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys under 15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys over 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>Girls 15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>boys 7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Breakdown of FDGs with Girls and Boys by background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woreda</th>
<th>Woreda</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gambela</td>
<td>Abobo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls in school</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls out of school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys in school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys out of school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>Girls 8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Report Prepared by Abinet Kebede

1. Introduction

The social assessment of the impact of the proposed interventions in GEQIP II on vulnerable and disadvantaged groups, (in particular pastoralists, agro-pastoralists and underserved groups) in Ethiopia, comprise three components:

- Review, analysis and synthesis of existing data sources in relation to the key social and institutional issues affecting poor, vulnerable and underserved girls and boys broadly and children from socio-cultural groups, such as the historically disadvantaged and underserved communities, pastoralists, and minorities populations specifically;
- Participatory stakeholder consultations in 4 emerging regions and selected woredas and
- Operational guidance and recommendations to support GEQIP fulfil its access, equity and overall social objectives.

This regional level report addresses the objectives, methodology, field sites and sample size selection in relation to carrying out component 2: the stakeholder consultations. The stakeholder consultation was rapid participatory and qualitative process aimed at capturing stakeholder perceptions and opinions.

In SNNPR, stakeholders’ consultations at woreda level were carried out from May 27-31, 2013. The consultation was made Bena Tsemay and Hamer woredas. These two were purposively selected as the majority of the community is pastoralist. In these woredas government has been working to improve access of pastoralist boys and girls education through expansion of ABEC and establishment of hostels. On the other hand early marriage and high dropout has been the main challenge for provision of quality education the woredas.

1.1 Purpose of the stakeholders’ consultation

The purpose of the stakeholder consultations is to support the process of free, informed and prior consultation, carried out during the preparation of GEQIP II, through purposive and targeted consultations with pastoralist communities and key stakeholders within selected regions.

There are three main objectives to the Stakeholder Consultations:
1. Follow-up the capacity needs and constraints of Woreda stakeholders, communities and schools in progressing equity and access to education for disadvantaged and underserved children, particularly in the emerging regions with socio-cultural groups, including historically disadvantaged and underserved communities, pastoralists, and minorities populations;
2. Follow up and explore community perceptions of the use of ICT to improve quality of learning and progress equitable access to education (information flows between schools, children and their communities) and;
3. Explore the scope for enhanced participation (voice) and monitoring (accountability) of girls, boys and their communities, (within both formal schools and alternative routes to quality education - ABEC and mobile schools), in progressing access to quality education for disadvantaged and underserved children.

2. Methodology
The field consultations were done by using a rapid participatory qualitative assessment of key issues relating to the 3 objectives of the SA. Primary information has been collected from different stakeholders through focus group discussion method using different participatory tools.

2.1 Focus group discussions
To undertake the social assessment 10 FGDs were conducted in the selected two woredas. In conducting these FGDs the study team used two types of participatory tools; spokes for woreda stakeholders consultation and ‘Bricks and Termites’ for community consultation.

Woreda level stakeholders consultation
The study team has conducted woreda level stakeholders in both Bena Tsemay and Hamer woredas. To facilitate the data collection process the study team used semi structured FGD guideline and participatory tool called spokes. The participants on these consultations were officials and experts from different sector offices of the woreda as well as representatives of NGO. (The list of participants is attached in the Annex).

Consultations with different members of community
A semi structured FGD guideline and ‘Bricks and Termites’ tools has been used to compile information from community members. As shown in Table 1 participants of the FGDs were drawn from In-school boys and girls, Out of school girls, active PTA members and inactive community members. A total of 8 FGDs were held with different community members in both woredas.

Table 1. List of FGDs conducted SNNPR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation type</th>
<th>Bena Tsemay</th>
<th>Hamer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woreda level consultation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In-school Boys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In-school girls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Out of school girls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Active PTA members</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non active Community members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these community consultation 12 women, 29 girls, 19 men and 16 boys had participated. Detailed breakdown the FGD participants by gender, ethnicity and age is attached as Annex.

2.3 Limitations of the Stakeholder Consultations
The period given for conducting the data collection has been very short. Due to this the study team was unable to conduct FGD with out of school boys. The other challenge has been low awareness of the community about GEQIP and other education interventions. Out of school girls and non-active community members have no sufficient information on the points mentioned. With this regard their contribution towards generating relevant information was minimal.

3. Background information of SNNPR region and sample woredas
South Nations Nationalities & People Regional State (SNNPRS) is one among the nine regional states of Ethiopia. The total area of the region is estimated 118,000 km². According to the 2007 Census
conducted by the Central Statistical Agency of Ethiopia (CSA), the SNNPR has an estimated total population of 14,929,548, of whom 7,425,918 were men and 7,503,630 women. 13,433,991 or 89.98% of the population are estimated to be rural inhabitants. The population is concentrated mostly in eastern, northern and central parts while the western and southern part of the Region is sparsely populated.

Adult literacy in SNNPR for men is 57% and for women, 22.4% which is greater than the nationwide average of 42% for male and 18% for female in 2009. Another access education indicator is Net Enrolment Ration. According to the national statistics the total NER in SNNPR in 2011/2012 is 91% with 94.9% for male and 86.9% for female. This is again greater that the national average where the total NER is 85.4% with 86.8% for male and 83.9% for female. This means for every 100 boys enrolled in primary education, there are approximately 92 girls only. In general education sector in SNNPR perform better than the country average but there is still gender gap.

**Bena Tsemay woreda**

According to Bena Tsemay woreda education office, there are 11 first cycle (Grade 1-4), 10 primary (Grade 1-8), 1 secondary and 1 kindergarten schools in the woreda. In addition to these formal schools, there are 31 ABE centres in the woreda to provide education for pastoral boys and girls. Currently 169 teachers are found in the woreda. When we assess the qualification of those teachers, 20 have first degree, 84 have diploma and the remaining 65 have certificates. Numbers of female teachers that qualify in first degree, diploma and certificate levels are 2, 37 and 39, respectively.

There are four local and international NGOs that provide support to improve quality of education in the woreda. The NGOs had provided support by engaging in construction of ABEC, provision of educational materials, construction of latrines in schools and expansion of classrooms. Furthermore, they are working to enhance the community awareness and understanding about education.

To improve educational access for disadvantaged and marginalized boys and girls, the government has established a hostel that provides shelter, food and education. Besides to this, WFP is conducting school feeding program to increase participation of pastoralists in schools. According to the woreda education office, there are 5079 students (from Grade 1-10) attending classes in different schools. Out of these 2477 are female.

**Hamer woreda**

The woreda has 9 first cycle (Grade 1-4), 12 primary (1-8) and 1 primary secondary school. There 151 teachers in the woreda who teaches in those 22 formal education centres. Out of these 16 have first degree, 32 diplomas and 103 certificates. The number of female teachers is 66. On the other hand there are 39 ABEC that provide education service for pastoralist community. 68 male and 23 female teachers provide service in these centres.

Currently, 2 NGOs are providing support to improve quality of education in the woreda by engaging in construction and expansion of schools, provision of educational materials and building capacity and awareness of the community. The government has also established hostel to assist pastoralist children access for education. At the moment the hostel is providing service for 208 boys and 55 girls. In addition to these 11 schools provide school feeding to promote pastoralist education.

4. **Main findings of the Stakeholder Consultations**

---


4.1 Stakeholders’ abilities to support equitable Access to Quality Education for disadvantaged and vulnerable children

**Woreda level**
The respective woreda education offices and concerned stakeholders have been exerting different efforts to improve quality of education. The woreda education has been promoting expansion of ABE centers in pastoralist areas to make education more accessible for pastoralist boys and girls. Furthermore, through pastoral development program hostels were built in both Bena Tsemay and Hamer woreda to promote education in the area. The hostels provide shelter, food and quality education for boys and girls. In addition to these WFP is conducting school feeding program in selected schools.

Though these efforts have been exerted by different stakeholders, enrolment of school aged children is still lower. On the other hand attention given for education of children with special needs is almost none. In both woredas there were no centers and teachers that provide education service for special needs. From the consultation in Hamer woreda, we learnt that even at woreda level there are no trained expert that make follow up for these group of children.

Though efforts are made by government to facilitate education access of pastoralist groups through ABEC, availability in distribution of formal schools in the woreda is low. At woreda level there is only one high school in Bena Tsemay and Hamer woredas. Most of the parents can’t afford to send their children to urban areas by covering school expenses.

The other problem which had affected provision of quality education in the sample woredas is lack of trained manpower. From the discussion held with woreda stakeholders and students, in both woredas there is high turnover of teachers. As there are no sufficient teachers in schools there are times where teachers are forced to teach other subjects that are out of their specialization. The woreda has no mechanism to provide especial benefits and incentives to maintain teachers. As a result teachers are leaving their work. This had caused workload on the remaining teachers and, hence, teachers’ involvement in other activities had become limited. Most of the teachers are not in a position to make follow up of for students and provide support for those with a special need. Due to limited financial resources, the woredas were not able to provide continuous capacity building and on job trainings for the teachers. These created poor work initiatives among teachers and is affecting the quality of education.

**Community level**
The attitude and perception of the pastoralist community about role of education is poor and traditional. In both woredas, parents prefer to engage their children in household activities rather than educate them. According to our discussion with different community members the factors that prevent boys and girls from attending schools are; high workload, low economic capacity to cover schooling expense and poor awareness of the community about importance of education. On the other hand the practice of early marriage had critically affected girls’ enrolment to schools. Parents force girls to marry in early years as they receive higher dowry from the process.

In contrast to these, the people living around urban areas have better understanding and support for the education system. The community’s attitude and perception about boys and girls education is more or less balanced. The community has been also supporting the woreda education offices in tackling different obstacles that get in the way of providing quality education.

**Boys and Girls**
The contribution of boys and girls towards improving education quality was minimal as they have no that much influence on the community. From the consultation we held with boys group, their involvement in planning and other aspects of school improvement activities are limited. According to the boys, the school management has not involved them to take part in consultations before making decisions.

In the case of girls the same is true. Besides marginalization in decision making process, girls are the highest victims of traditional and backward norms of the community. In both woredas early marriage is common practice and girls are forced to marry at a young age. Most of the time parents decide on the timing of marriage and the girls has no power to oppose the decision. The presence of sexual abuses around school areas has discouraged girls involvement in schools. The voice of females in general and girl in particular are unheard due to the biased attitude of the community towards females’ roles in decision making processes.

### 4.2 Use of ICT to support learning and increased access to education

The role ICT in supporting the provision of quality education in the two woreda is very limited due to poor ICT infrastructures and poor network coverage. From the consultations held we learnt that ICT services were available only in high schools. Even in the high schools students and teachers are not getting full service as there are no skilled manpower and functional equipment. In Bena Tsemay the plasma education system is not functional in the past two years. On top of these both woredas don’t have a reliable 24 hour power supply, which creates high interruption of the service in the high schools.

Likewise most of the kebeles in both woredas have no power supply and network coverage. Due to this the community access for ICT services like radio, TV, internet and telecommunication is very low. As a result most the community members we consulted were not familiar for ICT services and its role in providing quality education.

To make pastoralist communities beneficiary of ICT services, government and development partners need to work first on improving infrastructural development of the areas. Unless network coverage and power supply conditions are improved in those woredas, it is not possible to think ICT as a means to provide education access for pastoral communities in the region.

### 4.3 Community participation in supporting improvements in Equitable Access to Quality Education

Communities have significant role in supporting provision of quality education by engaging in different ways. Realizing this, the FGD participants were requested to reveal in what ways the community has been engaged in the sample woredas to support provision of quality education. According to the respondents, the involvement and contribution of urban community is by far different from that of the rural pastoralist communities.

The residents of urban areas that are found in Dimeka town of Hamer and Key Afer of Bena Tsemay woreda had active participation on various activities that are implemented to improve education quality. The urban community has developed sense of ownership and actively participate in consultative discussion held to improve education of the area. According to the discussants, the community took part responsibility in participating annual education planning, follow up and evaluation of students and teachers, monitoring of school activities and engage in building the capacity of schools. Despite gender biases, they send their children (boys and girls) to school. Furthermore, they provide financial and material supports when the schools organize different
events. As a result most the schools in the urban areas have better educational materials and provide relatively better education for students.

On the other hand, the involvements of the pastoralist communities on school improvement activities are limited. The community has a low understanding about importance of education and its impact on their livelihood. Due to this, their desire and interest to participate in such issues are very low. As most of these communities live in rural areas where they have no access for various infrastructures their priority is overcoming the immediate problems they encounter. Thus short term use of family labour is more important than long term return of education. Besides, their concept and awareness about quality education are not in equal terms with urbanites as they have no equal information access mechanisms.

5. Suggestions for Improvement

The table given below provides the summary of suggestion points given by different stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Suggested by</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, Awareness creation for the community</td>
<td>Woreda stakeholders, In-school boys and girls, Out of school girls, PTAs</td>
<td>Unless the attitude of the community about education is changed it will be difficult to meet the objective of provision of quality education by investing on hard ware’s only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Construction of new schools</td>
<td>Woreda stakeholders, In-school boys and girls, PTAs</td>
<td>To increase accessibility of education for pastoralist children, it would be nice if new schools are constructed in nearby areas for the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Assigning trained manpower and provision of continuous capacity building activity for teachers</td>
<td>Woreda stakeholders, In-school boys and girls, PTAs</td>
<td>To ensure quality education at all levels’ assigning trained manpower is necessary. In addition to this to enhance teachers skills provision of trainings are relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Discourage traditional norms that hinder girls education</td>
<td>Woreda stakeholders, In-school boys and girls, Out of school girls, PTAs</td>
<td>Continuous activity needs to be done by government and community to tackle factors that limit girls involvement in education like early marriage, sexual abuse around schools etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 strengthening of programs that promote school participation</td>
<td>In-school boys and girls, Out of school girls, PTAs</td>
<td>Conducting of school feeding programs and expansion of hostels enables disadvantaged children to have opportunity for school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex A:

#### Table 1: Number of Participants in Focus Group Discussions by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bena Tsemay</th>
<th>Hamer</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 2: Number of Participants in Focus Group Discussions by Gender and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bena Tsemay</th>
<th>Hamer</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historically disadvantaged groups Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settled population Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historically disadvantaged groups Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settled population Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3: Breakdown of FDGs with Girls and Boys by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bena Tsemay</th>
<th>Hamer</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls under 15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls over 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys under 15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys over 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 4: Breakdown of FDGs with Girls and Boys by background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bena Tsemay</th>
<th>Hamer</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls in school</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls out of school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys in school</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social Assessment of GEQIP Phase 2 Ethiopia
Annexe 4: Oramia Regional Report

Report prepared by Tamirat Adamu

1. Introduction
The social assessment of the impact of the proposed interventions in GEQIP II on vulnerable and disadvantaged groups, (in particular pastoralists; agro-pastoralists and underserved groups) in Ethiopia, comprise three components:

- Review, analysis and synthesis of existing data sources in relation to the key social and institutional issues affecting poor, vulnerable and underserved girls and boys broadly and children from socio-cultural groups, including historically disadvantaged and underserved communities, pastoralists, and minorities specifically;
- Participatory stakeholder consultations in 4 emerging regions and selected woredas and
- Operational guidance and recommendations to support GEQIP fulfill its access, equity and overall social objectives.

This regional level report addresses the objectives, methodology, field sites and sample size selection in relation to carrying out component 2: the stakeholder consultations. The stakeholder consultation was rapid participatory and qualitative process aimed at capturing stakeholder perceptions and opinions.

In OROMIA, stakeholders’ consultations at woreda level were carried out from May 27-31, 2013. The consultation was made Teltelle and Yabello woredas. These two were purposively selected as the majority of the community is pastoralist. In these woredas government has been working to improve access of pastoralist boys and girls education through expansion of ABEC and establishment of hostels. On the other hand early mirage and high dropout has been the main challenge for provision of quality education the woredas.

1.1 Purpose of the stakeholders’ consultation
The purpose of the stakeholder consultations is to support the process of free, informed and prior consultation, carried out during the preparation of GEQIP II, through purposive and targeted consultations with pastoralist communities and key stakeholders within selected regions.

There are three main objectives to the Stakeholder Consultations:

1. Follow-up the capacity needs and constraints of Woreda stakeholders, communities and schools in progressing equity and access to education for disadvantaged and underserved children, particularly in the emerging regions with ethnic and socio-cultural groups and minorities;
2. Follow up and explore community perceptions of the use of ICT to improve quality of learning and progress equitable access to education (information flows between schools, children and their communities) and;
3. Explore the scope for enhanced participation (voice) and monitoring (accountability) of girls, boys and their communities, (within both formal schools and alternative routes to quality education - ABEC and mobile schools), in progressing access to quality education for disadvantaged and underserved children.

1.2 Methodology

Data was gathered by consulting different part of school communities and Woreda stakeholders. Those are in and out of school boys and girls, vulnerable and disadvantage groups, participant from Woreda stakeholder’s office and part from School Parent Teacher Association. Generally, 11 FGDs were conducted in the selected two woredas. In conducting these FGDs the study team used two types of participatory tools; spokes for woreda stakeholders consultation and ‘Bricks and Termites’ for community consultation. List of consulted stake holders Summarized in table below.

Table 1: List of FGDs conducted in Oromia region Yabello and Teltelle Woreda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation type</th>
<th>Yabello</th>
<th>Teltelle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woreda level consultation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In-school Boys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In-school girls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Out of school girls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Out of school Boys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Active PTA members</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non active Community members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Constraints

Limitation of time seen as major challenge faced during field trip. This constraint increased burden to have extra time with Consultant in order to make deep assessment. The other challenge is getting participant from Woreda stake holders due to engagement on regular jobs.

2 Background Context to Oramia Region - Borana Zone

Borana is one of the Administrative Zones of Oromia National Regional State. Pastoralists and agro-pastoralists communities occupy nearly 85 percent out of the estimated land area of 50,000 km². Borena Zone categorized in to fourteen administrative Woreda. Among these Yabello and Teltelle Woreda are the one with total Population 169,949 of people according to data gain from these Woredas Administration offices. In these Woreda 27745 students has been attending their academic in 79 formal and 79 satellites and 53 ABE school. Let’s see Both Woreda Separately.

2.1 Teltelle Woreda

There are 40 primary schools (Grade 1-8), one secondary in the Woreda. Additionall 8 ABE (Alternative Basic Education) and 27 Satellite schools are offering educational service.
In Teltelle Woreda 10 schools has been getting special support from different nongovernmental organizations. This Support includes Cash Money, Ration or meal and stationery. Among Ngo’s which supporting these schools GAYO, GOAL AND WFP are the major one. Exceptionally, WFP is conducting school feeding program to increase participation of pastoralists in schools.

2.2 Yabello Woreda

There are 6475 boys  6842 girls  totally 13317 students have been attending in 38 formal 52 satellite and 42 Alternative Basic Education schools according to recent organized data gained from Yabello Woreda educational Office. In number, 38 formal 59 satellite schools are there in Yabello Woreda. Out of this, 25 schools have been getting special support from different nongovernmental organizations. This Support provides for helpless girls to increase participation and decrease under enrolment. This support includes Cash Money, Ration or meal and stationery. Among Ngo’s who has been supporting these schools GAYO, GOAL AND WFP. These Ngo’s have been implementing different program in selected kebeles. Among their program developing community awareness toward sending children to school, capacitating in life skills, providing humanitarian service. Generally, Both Woreda Population Size, number of schools providing educational service with number of attendant shown as bellow,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No of Population</th>
<th>No Schools</th>
<th>No of student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teltelle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35,103</td>
<td>36116</td>
<td>71219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yabello</td>
<td>49582</td>
<td>49148</td>
<td>98730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Main findings of the Stakeholder Consultations

3.1 Stakeholders’ abilities to Support Equitable Access to Quality Education for Disadvantaged and Vulnerable children

Woreda level

Until recently, pastoralists and agro-pastoralists community in Borana have been marginalized in terms of socio-economic development like all communities living in peripheral areas. Pastoralist boys and girls are among disadvantages in terms of offering formal educational opportunities. Very few school age girls and boys are able to attend school. There are a number of reasons for such low enrolment, according to in and out of school boys and girls FGD participant from both Woredas. Among these reasons cultural baize towards girls’ and boys’ education is the main. The other challenge is impact of drought and famine happens in the area exposed economic capacity of community for series poverty. However, to challenge these difficulties there are a number of
developmental programmes implementing in both Woreda by government and NGO’s to eradicate poverty and assure sustainable development. Educational expansion categorized among these programmes with series concentration. According to FGD participant from both Woreda stakeholders still there are many challenges regarding education expansion.

Government policy is seen as another challenge for school expansion. A stakeholder from Teltelle Woreda education office reported that the population number seen as basic requirement to open school in a community Village. However, the life style of pastoral community is dispersed and scattered. Due to these limited requirement and scattered population of the community, students compelled to go too far in order to attend school. Therefore, quite challenging this inconvenience they prefer dropout. They also agreed that no special concern from government in expanding infrastructures, changing community behaviour, delivering school materials, recruiting teachers, assuring educational quality and helping vulnerable as well as toward pastoral communities’ poverty reduction Ato Megersa Abeba from Teltelle Woreda said that “Forget about kebele administration there, still in our woreda town there is no electric light service and drinking water, Community is still backward, there are insufficient teachers and school materials”.

However, it’s irrefutable that many things been implementing for better life of pastoral community livelihood. Among them expanding education seen as a major one. Education is essential if pastoralists or their children are to exit from pastoral into formal sector employment, to which many aspire. But educational services and literacy rates are among lowest in both Woreda. The non-formal schools, including mobile schools, should be scaled-up urgently to improve access to education. However, the scaling up of non-formal education creates an increased demand for both human and financial resources and these needs to be addressed by the government. At the same time there is a need to sensitize and mobilize communities to ensure that children regularly attend Schools.

**Community**

Most of Yabello and Teltelle Woreda Communities livelihood based on animal and animal Product. Their living style is nomadic to seek graze for their animal depending on weather. All FGD participants agreed that movable life style as major challenge for many years to expand education in Woreda level. Culturally, baized Community attitude also seen as the other difficulties underlined for low literacy rate of community member by those Participants. According to consulted member of parent teacher association in Teltelle Woreda for other parents going to school means leaving the Borana culture and tradition and becoming enemy. They underline that sending children to school is like bringing the bull and the heifer together in view of some part of community members. Unlike other parents, they felt that a girl who has not gone to school lacks life skills (negotiating skills) and is more at risk of pregnancy before marriage. In addition “fear on the part of parents to send their children to school due to the long distance between home and school. For many families sending their children for schooling to distant places is an additional burden that they could not afford” said Ato Dida galgalo FGD participant from Dida Yabello kebele.

Some of Community members consulted from both Woreda told that their involvement toward expansion and assuring quality of education is inert. This is due to Opinion; Community involvement in expansion of education is only by labour Contribution. It means that the other financial problems solved on behalf of government. However, Community participate on some school related activities such as fencing to protect school compound from thief and animals, toilet Plough, financial contribution to employ alternative basic education teachers and school security. Community directly and indirectly involve through parent teacher association in monitoring quality of education and school property. According to Participant from Dida Yabelo, School management and committee on behalf of families together have responsibility in drafting and presenting annual plan. Community participates by approving and implementing drafted annual school plan. Most of school activity is
monitored by school committee. This is starting from preparing school annual plan with school management and doing for the implementation as well as reporting for community. School Committee takes actions on school communities those acts against rule and regulation depending on book called ‘Blue Print’. This book is considered as school rules and regulation as well as punishment guide. Financial technical case audited by Woreda professionals.

**Boys and Girls**

In school boys and girls participation to improving quality of education for vulnerable and disadvantage is inactive. According to Teltelle Woreda FGD participant report their involvement undertakes only in providing advice for those drop outs, psychological and moral support. However, in school activity student involve in assurance of educational quality. Student from both Woreda address that there is insufficient teachers, texts books, laboratory equipment and difficulties of curriculum difficulties. Those participants addressed some among many reasons that stops boys and girls from school attending. According to their opinion there is parent’s tension between appreciating the importance and value of education in bringing new livelihood opportunities and fears that attending school will expose girls particularly, to the risk of sex before marriage. The other perception raised by participant is Cultural perception that “NO NEED TO SEND FIRST BORN MALE CHILD TO SCHOOL” it mean if the first born of the parent become male Family do not want to send to school because of all parents property after death possess to him. Economic problem, house work load like keeping livestock and addiction which always occurred on boys (chewing ‘chat’ and drinking ‘Areke’ or local alcohol) is the other reason stops from attending school. Teltelle Woreda in school boys consulted addressed that depart made after Prematurity marriage to back home when life becomes difficult to challenge seen as the other reason that makes boys to go to school. It is undeniable that a number of schools, mostly first cycle elementary schools have been built in recent years. However, there is insufficient number of schools with both Woredas total population. Poverty, limited resources, little alternative sources of income and livelihoods, lack of knowledge and expertise, and the absence of appropriate public policies and financing, increase vulnerability and decrease people’s capacity to send their children to school.

**NGO**

To expand educational service and decrease literacy rate, Nongovernmental Organization has been contributing many in Both Teltele and Yabello Woreda. Among these organizations, World Food Program, UNICEF, Goal Ethiopia, Care, Gayo Pastoral Development Initiative and UNDP are the one. These Contributors offer special support only for girl students such as Residence, Cash money, Oil for Girls who attend school 80% per month, stationery, meal and animal to increase girl’s participation in and decrease under enrolment. These NGO’s have been implementing many programs that change community life style. Both Teletelle and yabello Woreda stakeholders witnessed that change appears on life of Community that breaks community start experiencing modernity. Possible to say there is radical change toward girl student school attendant comparing with some previous years data. Also they develop personal confidence developed, that assist them to challenge community influence. Pastoralist changing their life style from mobile to settled and started performing things that help them to develop their economical capacity such as fattening livestock as well as develops life skills such as personal hygiene, using kitchen and toilet.

**SCHOOLS**

All of the schools in community village have their own contribution to expand education in addition to offering academic services. School communities participate by internalizing community awareness.
toward vulnerable, early marriage, and wrong cultural attitude for education. Woreda stakeholders also addressed that schools provide stationeries and collect five birr per individual from students those get oil, to increase support takers number and decrease under enrollment. Those participants also told that assuring quality of education as other duties perform by schools. Ato Abayneh Tamiru from Teltelle Woreda education office said that method of offering education is student centered. Student class setting formed in 1-5, this help student to increase class activity, develop confidence and to teach each other. There is special class arrangement for girls those of their class score unattractive. Ato Abayneh also addressed that there are 12 educational clubs that support to develop student academic capacity in 22 regular schools. Among these clubs; Anti HIV/AIDS, Community policing, Minemidia, Sport, right of children, language, red cross, anti addiction, environmental protection, and academic. Pastoralist girls today started directly voice their concerns to those who make decisions over their lives. They have been overcoming previous idea that tend to be regard, and regard themselves, as the custodians of cultural values and beliefs.

3.1.5 **Information Communication Technology (ICT)**

Both Yabello and Teltelle Woreda Stakeholders agreed that Information Communication technology (ICT) used only by high school student and some of Woreda town dwellers. ICT uses to deliver quality education with equal to other schools located in urban and approaches Community to civilization. They also raised fact that ICT use as additional reference for teachers, students and all community for new invention. ICT Develops learning Interest narrows the gap between pastoralists students. Create competition between students and give equal opportunity to prepare them for national exam. But, expansion of ICT in both Woredas restricted only in Woreda towns. This is due to lack of infrastructure expansion like electrification, internet and telecommunication.

4. **Suggestions for Improvement**

The table given below provides the summary of suggestion points given by different stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Suggested by Whom</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of teachers</td>
<td>--Woreda Stakeholders -In school Boys and girls</td>
<td>Some teachers offer more than one subject due to lack of teachers, must takes into consideration by concerned government officials’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient text book</td>
<td>--In school Boys and girls -Community Members</td>
<td>There is Lack of Student text book in school, so it’s better if delivered by government’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laboratory materials</td>
<td>-In school Boys and girls -Woreda stakeholders</td>
<td>Equipment like laboratory materials support to teach student practically what they learn theoretically. However, there is lack of these materials in all schools’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Formal and satellite School Expansion</td>
<td>-Woreda stakeholders -In school boys and girls -Out of school boys and girls -Community members</td>
<td>Expanding schools adjacent to community villages decrees dropouts and increase participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ICT and Infrastructure Expansion</td>
<td>- Woreda stake holders</td>
<td>ICT provides as additional reference for teachers and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Transference</td>
<td>-Community member -In school boys and girls</td>
<td>Teachers those Respected, accepted and have good teaching Capacity transfer without any convinced problem to other place or woreda office. There is no transparency in teachers transference ‘</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Teachers Motivational Incentive

--Woreda Stakeholders

Woreda Geographical setting and weather needs hardship, so it’s better if some Motivational Incentive Package may prepared to stay teachers’

### Expanding self-help program

--Community member
- In-school boys and girls
- Out school Boys and girl

It is better Developing self-help system in community to support each other rather than seeking aid

### Fixed asset that generate income

- Out of school boys and girls
- Woreda stakeholders

Those of helpless needs aid from government and NGOs. To solve their economic problem permanently Developing fixed assets which generate income seems better option

### Employing Pastoral Student

- In school boys and girls
- Community Members

Employing pastoral children’s those complete their academic class may pressurize and motivate other community to send their children to school

---

### Annexe A:

**Table 1: Number of Participants in Focus Group Discussions by Gender and Age in Teltelle and Yabello**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teltelle Woreda</th>
<th>Yabello Woreda</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Number of Participants in Focus Group Discussions by Gender and Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teltelle Woreda</th>
<th>Yabello Woreda</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historically disadvantaged groups Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settled population Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historically disadvantaged groups Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settled population Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Breakdown of FDGs with Girls and Boys by age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teltelle Woreda</th>
<th>Yabello Woreda</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Breakdown of FDGs with Girls and Boys by background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teltele Woreda</th>
<th>Yabello Woreda</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls in school</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls out of school</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys in school</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys out of school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annexe 5: Thematic Question Areas and Participatory Tools

A: Woreda Level

We used the Spokes tool to explore the capacities, challenges and opportunities of Woreda Stakeholders to progress equitable access to quality education for all vulnerable and disadvantaged girls and boys.

Key Question: What are the range of different things needed to ensure that vulnerable and disadvantaged girls and boys can benefit from good quality, affordable and accessible education?

Within every FDG, once we have established “what the different things needed for “good quality education for vulnerable and disadvantaged girls” are, we can begin to arrange them as symbols around the outside of a circle and form them together as a “Spokes Wheel”. We can then ask participants to mark where they are currently on each of the things they identified. This will help us explore with them questions like:

Stakeholders’ abilities to Progress Equitable Access to Quality Education

1. In this Woreda what has helped schools reach and educate disadvantaged girls and boys? Why and how?
2. What stopped teachers and/or schools from getting more resources or better information or better training? etc. to help them reach and include vulnerable and disadvantaged girls and boys?
3. Has it been easier (or harder) over time to get hold of for example, resources, training; information etc. and keep this thing which is helping progress good quality education for vulnerable and disadvantaged girls and boys?
4. What do people feel about managing GEQIP 2 in their woreda so that every girl and boy benefits? Will it be easier or harder in future? What skills and capacities do they think they have built up which will help them support equitable access to education for a) girls; b) boys c) pastoralist groups and d) special needs? What other skills and capacities do they need to develop for each of the spokes, if any?
Use of ICT to Support Learning and Increased Access to Education

(In schools; out of school and to get information to hard-to-reach groups) If not identified in the spokes questions ask separately at the end of discussion and ask why they did not identify ICT as a thing which support quality education for boys and girls?
5. Who uses ICT in the school and community? Who does not?
6. If ICT used in School? How is ICT used and do you think it is helping improve education? How?
7. How could it be used to support pastoralist children and all girls stay in school?
8. How could it been used to support children in secondary schools?

Community Participation in Supporting Improvements in Equitable Access to Quality Education

9. How do girls and boys influence the different things identified in spokes? Are some boys and girls left out? Who? Could participation of girls and boys be improved? How?
10. How do communities influence decision-making around the different things identified in the spokes e.g. Planning; selection of teachers, content of textbooks; school improvements? In what ways? Could this be improved? How?
11. Is this true for all people within their community? Who is involved and participating - Women and men? Older or younger people? Who has the most chance of influencing what happens in schools and in the education of girls and boys? Who has the least? What has changed over time? Why? What could be done to strengthen community participation?
12. Are Communities involved in monitoring changes in schools and education around the different spokes identified? If so how? What could change? How could schools woreda ed. officials be more accountable?

B. Community/School/Children

Stakeholders’ abilities to progress Equitable Access to Quality Education

1. What stops vulnerable and disadvantaged girls from attending school? In what ways are girls helped to overcome the barriers –by the school, by their community By government; by others? What issues get the most attention why? What gets the least attention? Why?
2. What stops disadvantaged and vulnerable boys from attending school? In what ways are these boys helped to overcome the barriers –by the school, by the community; by government; by others?
3. What has been done, if anything, to adapt the school, to the particular needs of a) pastoralist girls and b) pastoralist boys (e.g. teaching methods; textbooks; clubs; term times etc) to the culture and livelihood patterns of the community? Who by? What could be done differently by: a) communities and b) schools to support pastoralist girls and boys staying in school?
4. What has been done to support girls and boys with special needs? Who by? Have there been improvements? If so what and how has it helped? If not why not and what is needed?
5. Has the quality of education improved over the last 5 years, if so how and why? If not what needs to change?

Use of ICT to Support Learning and Increased Access to Education

(In schools; out of school and to get information to hard-to-reach groups)
6. Who uses ICT in the school and community? Who does not?
7. If ICT used in School? How is ICT used and do you think it is helping improve education?
8. How could it be used to support pastoralist girls and boys stay in school?
9. How could it be used to support pastoralist children in secondary schools?
Community Participation in Supporting Improvements in Equitable Access to Quality Education

10. How are you involved in helping the school improve the quality of education for disadvantaged and vulnerable girls and boys in your community – if not involved why not? What is stopping your involvement?

11. In what ways have you been consulted? Have your suggestions and ideas for improvement been listened to and acted on by the school and/woreda officials? If not why not?

12. In what ways are school improvements, and quality of education monitored? How is the community involved? Who is left out?

13. How do parents/guardians learn about what is going on in school and the support it can give to educate disadvantaged and vulnerable girls and boys in the community? Who gets to hear about what is going on? Who does not? What could be done to make it easier for girls, boys and their communities to access information?

14. Are you able to complain about what happens in school or with programmes connected with the school (e.g. SIP or SIG). How and what happens when complaints are made?

15. What can be done to improve pastoralist’s participation in supporting quality education?
C. **Explanation of Bricks and Termites** (used in FDGs with community members)

**(OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES)**
The tool is used in conjunction with the prompt questions. FDG participants identify the key issues in terms of opportunities and challenges in relation to each of the questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bricks</th>
<th>Termites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sheena Crawford and Mary Ann Brocklesby CR2 Social Development

D. **Explanation of Spokes** (used in FDGs with Woreda stakeholders)

**Method**
Spokes is a very simple activity which can be used to explore any number of different themes and topics. Following discussion on a topic, characteristics of an issue are agreed upon and symbols for these are arranged around the outside of a circle. These are then joined to a central point by lines drawn on the ground, or by sticks etc., to form a wheel. The centre represents “us”, or “now”, and the symbols around the edge of the wheel represent things we want to achieve. Participants are asked to discuss together and mark along each spoke where they think they are now, in relation to the things they want to achieve. It is important that participants do not try to give percentage values to the distances they are marking. The marks should show the value in spatial terms and show also the achievement of one issue relative to another. Participants generally find this a very accessible tool which gives them plenty of space to think and discuss with each other, whilst keeping their focus on the issues under discussion. The example below shows a spokes wheel relating to goals around partnership and where participants felt they had reached in terms of achieving those goals:
Spokes allows for comparison between what we want to achieve or the ultimate goal of our activities, (the edge of the circle) and where we are now (the markers). A second set of markers can be used to show what the situation was like 5 years ago or even longer. In this way we are gaining people’s opinions on what has changed over time, and the nature of that change. It also allows people to compare visually, and discuss, which characteristics they think are the most important.

Mary Ann Brocklesby/Sheena Crawford CR2 Social Development Ltd. 2007.
Annex 2
GEQIP Phase 2: Social Assessment

Stakeholder Consultations Report

By: Abinet Kebede
June 2013
Contents
1. Introduction ......................................................................................................................... 79
2. Objectives of the stakeholders’ consultation ................................................................. 79
3. Methodology ...................................................................................................................... 80
  3.1. Selection of the Regions and Woredas ................................................................ 80
  3.2. Woreda and Community Consultations ................................................................. 81
  3.3. Limitations to the Field Work ............................................................................... 81
4. Main findings of Stakeholders’ Consultations ............................................................... 82
  4.1. Quality Education for Disadvantaged and Vulnerable Children ....................... 82
  4.2. Use of ICT to support learning and increased access to education ....................... 84
  4.3. Community participation in supporting improvements in Equitable Access to Quality Education
5. Conclusion and Recommendations ............................................................................... 86
  5.1. Conclusion ................................................................................................................ 86
  5.2. Recommendations .................................................................................................. 87
Annex 1: Checklists and Tools ............................................................................................ 88
  Woreda Stakeholders Consultations checklist ................................................................. 88
Annex 2: Summary of FGD participants ............................................................................ 90
1. Introduction

As a part of the preparation of GEQIP Phase 2, the Ministry of Education in Ethiopia commissioned a targeted and focused Social Assessment of the impact of the project’s proposed interventions on vulnerable and disadvantaged groups, (in particular underserved populations) in Ethiopia. The social assessment comprises three components:

- Review, analysis and synthesis of existing data sources in relation to the key social and institutional issues affecting poor, vulnerable and underserved girls and boys broadly and children from socio-cultural groups, including historically disadvantaged and underserved communities, pastoralists, and minorities populations specifically;
- Participatory stakeholder consultations in 4 regions and selected woredas and
- Operational guidance and recommendations to support GEQIP fulfil its access, equity and overall social objectives.

This report presents the summary findings of the participatory stakeholder consultations which took place over 5 days between the 3rd and 10th of June 2013.

2. Objectives of the stakeholders’ consultation

There were three main objectives to the Stakeholder Consultations. To:

1. Follow-up the capacity needs and constraints of Woreda stakeholders, communities and schools in progressing equity and access to education for disadvantaged and underserved children, particularly in the emerging regions with socio-cultural groups, including historically disadvantaged and underserved communities, pastoralists, and minorities populations;
2. Follow up and explore community perceptions of the use of ICT to improve quality of learning and progress equitable access to education (information flows between schools, children and their communities) and;
3. Explore the scope for enhanced participation of underserved parents/guardians (voice) and monitoring (accountability) of girls, boys and their communities, (within both formal schools and alternative routes to quality education - ABEC and mobile schools), in progressing access to quality education for disadvantaged and underserved children.
3. Methodology

Rapid participatory stakeholder consultations were held with community members and government officials in 4 regions and selected Woredas. Discussions focused on the key issues in relation to the three main objectives. The key consultation instrument was Focus Group Discussions using semi-structuring interviewing in combination with a simple participatory analysis tool. A separate check list of question areas was prepared for the Woreda level discussions and the Community/schools discussions.

3.1. Selection of the Regions and Woredas

The following criteria, agreed with the MoE and development partners, were used to select, Afar and Gambella (emerging regions), Oromia and SNNPR.

- A focus on the emerging regions and on socio-cultural groups, such as historically disadvantaged and underserved communities, pastoralists, and minorities
- Locations with high levels of alternative routes to education (ABECs and mobile schools)
- Priority to previously surveyed regions woredas and communities in order to follow-up on previous discussions, fill data gaps and track people’s perceptions of change (if any);
- Locations with high levels of vulnerable groups that are particularly at risk of dropping out from school or not attending school at all.
- Locations in which there are significant barriers to progressing and sustaining girls’ access to education (e.g. discriminatory social norms; child marriage; gender based violence; economic constraints)

The four regions selected have large populations of pastoralists/agro-pastoralists as well as low levels of educational attainment and significant barriers to progressing the provision of quality general education.

Two woredas were purposively selected from each region to enable: a) some degree of comparative analysis within a region and; b) to ensure that all the objectives for the consultations are addressed within each region. The following factors were also taken into consideration:

- Large populations of vulnerable and underserved communities (pastoralist, agro-pastoralist, ethnic minorities) within the woreda,
- Low levels of access to formal education and
- Gender inequalities in accessing education services
- ABECs or mobile schools in the woreda so that in each region communities using alternative roots to education for their children could be consulted.

The eight woredas selected for the stakeholder consultations are summarized in the table given below.

Table 1: List of Woredas selected for the Stakeholder consultations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Selected Woreda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>BureMedayitu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awash Fentaleul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambella</td>
<td>Abobo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gambella Woreda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>BeneTsemay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hamer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromia</td>
<td>Teltele</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2. Woreda and Community Consultations

An FDG was held in each of the selected Woredas with government officials, within education and partner sectors (e.g. Youth bureau) as well as Representatives from NGOs working in schools. A simple participatory tool – *spokes* – was used in conjunction with a list of prepared question areas (See Annex 6.1). At the community level, FDGs were held with in-school boys and girls, out of school boys and girls, active PTA members and community members, not involved actively in school improvement plans or PTAs. A different tool – Bricks and Termites- and a complementary set of question areas were used in the community discussions. A total of 42 FGDs were held across the four regions: Table 2 below gives the breakdown. Annex 6.3 provides a detailed breakdown of the FGD participants by age, gender and ethnicity.

### Table 2. List of Stakeholder Consultations in the 4 regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation type</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woreda level consultation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In-school Boys</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In-school girls</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Out of school Boys</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Out of school girls</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Active PTA members</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non PTA Community members</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. Limitations to the Field Work

The timeframe for the period stakeholder consultations was extremely limited. No consultations were conducted at the Regional level, therefore. The short notice also made it difficult to ensure that the full range of woreda stakeholders, including NGO representatives, were for consultation. Moreover, in some woredas it was very challenging to locate all discussants from concerned sector offices in short notices. Specifically, because, most NGOs offices are located at regional or zonal headquarters and not at the woreda level, NGOs were largely absent from discussions.

Reaching community members was also challenging. Community Members, not involved in school activities and out-of-school children had very little information about GEQIP or other school programmes and activities. This meant that they were unable to comfortably contribute opinions on subjects that they themselves felt they knew little about. Out-of-school children were particularly difficult to locate, because many, especially boys had left the area or they were scattered across the woreda and hard to reach in such a short period of time.
4. Main findings of Stakeholders’ Consultations

4.1. Quality Education for Disadvantaged and Vulnerable Children

In assessing stakeholders’ ability the potential roles and contributions of different institutions and community members towards improving provision of quality education has been analysed.

Woreda level

All the selected woredas were located in remote areas where the majority of the residents are either pastoralists or agro-pastoralists. The infrastructural development of the woredas in general and educational facilities in particular, is poor. Thus, educational coverage and provision of quality education has been low. But in the past six and seven years the respective woreda education offices and other development partners have worked to improve quality of education. Access to education for pastoralist children has been improved through the expansion of formal schools and the wide promotion of alternative routes to education – ABECs and mobile schools. In SNNPR, through the pastoral development programme, hostels have been built, to promote secondary education access for vulnerable pastoralist boys and girls. All the Woreda offices, have also, in collaboration with development partners, supported greater access to education for girls and pastoralist through activities such as school feeding program, provision of oil and educational material support.

The woreda education offices have been contributing towards improvement of education by building the capacity of teachers. For example, in Gambel l a woreda, the education office opened opportunities for more than 10 teachers to attend summer classes and upgrade their qualifications.

Stakeholders at woreda level concluded that, though there are limitations, there is the capacity to support and provide quality education. However, they face significant challenges because of lack of trained teachers and support staff, finance, materials and infrastructure.

At the school level, the capacity of actors to provide quality education is challenging. Lack of finance resources and poor infrastructure were the most common problems cited, in all the visited woredas. In particular, the high turnover of teachers and the lack of trained teachers in schools have compromised the provision of quality education. The majority of the schools visited have no mechanisms to provide especial benefits and incentives to support teacher retention. This has contributed towards low morale amongst teachers and in turn, is affecting the quality of education.

In Afar and Gambella, the majority of teachers are from neighbouring regions. In consequence the students are not taught in their mother-tongue. This has created a communication gap between the teachers and students and has negatively affected the teaching-learning process. The materials that serve as text are not in line with the livelihood of the community. To promote education in these areas, the local authorities need to prepare texts that reflect culture and norms of the pastoralist and agro-pastoralist.
**Community level**

The attitudes and perceptions of the pastoralist community about the role of education are shaped by traditional values. In most of the woredas, children are burdened with household and livelihood responsibilities which prevent school attendance. Girls and boys consulted, highlighted: high workload, low economic capacity to cover schooling expenses and poor awareness of the community about the importance of education as the key factors affecting their access to education. They also said that their parents feared that education would lead their children out of Pastoralism and give them a negative view of pastoralism. These fears were fuelling their unwillingness to send their children to school.

For girls, early marriage was the main barrier to continuing education. Parents force girls to marry early because dowry payments are higher for the family. On marriage, most girls are forced to quit school. Since early marriage is the preferred option within communities, for girls, there is little incentive to send them to school.

In urban areas, the situation is different. There is greater awareness and support for education for both girls and boys. Communities in urban areas are also more active in supporting schools and woreda offices in school improvement planning processes in order to improve the quality of education for children. Urban communities in Gambella and SNNP regions state absence of gender preference in sending children to schools. Woreda stakeholders and PTA members state the participation of girls and boys in schools is balanced as they send their children despite gender preference. In Awash Fenatle woreda of Afar region, the urban community has better awareness about education and is contributing in the effort to eradicate harmful traditional influences such as early marriage and circumcision.

**Boys and Girls**

Boys and girls, in general, have little influence in community affairs. The same is true for their involvement in school consultations and decision-making processes. In all the communities and schools consulted, children’s involvement in planning and other aspects of school improvement activities was limited. Boys said that, the school management did not consult them or involved them in decision-making relating to the school.

The same was true for girls. In all the visited woredas, Girls and their mothers, or other adult women, were marginalized from decision-making processes. Adult males within the family make decisions on the fate of the girls rather than girls themselves. In most of these communities, strong social norms discriminating against girls are disempowering girls from meaningful participation in activities which could support better educational opportunities. According to the informants, early marriage, widespread sexual abuse and harassment are major barriers to girls going to, and staying in, school.

These factors will need to be addressed and schools will need to take initiatives to involve girls and boys equally in the decision-making processes. Without efforts to empower girls and boys to raise their voices for quality education, it is highly unlikely that students (boys and girls) can meaningfully participate in improving the provision of quality education for vulnerable and marginalized boys and girls.
Special needs education

In the woredas visited, except one school in Gambella town, there are no education centres that provide special needs education. The attention given to SEN children amongst all stakeholders is very low. The schools do not have the resources, educational material or skilled teachers to provide education for these groups of children.

4.2. Use of ICT to support learning and increased access to education

The use of ICT in supporting provision of quality education is directly associated with availability of the service. From the consultations we learnt that ICT services were available only in high schools and in urban areas. Even in the high schools students and teachers do not get reliable service due to poor quality of the service. According to 2011/12 education statistics annual abstract, the number of schools that have internet access were 4 in Afar and only one in Gambella region. Thus, the use of ICT to support quality learning processes in pastoralist woredas is very low.

In most of pastoral woredas and rural kebeles there is no power supply and network coverage. Due to this the community access for ICT services like radio, TV, internet and telecommunication is also very low. As a result most the community members were not familiar for ICT services and its role in providing quality education. Unless network coverage and power supply conditions are improved in those woredas, it is not possible to think that ICT can be used to improve the quality of education in pastoralist communities.

4.3. Community participation in supporting improvements in Equitable Access to Quality Education

Communities have significant role in supporting provision of quality education by engaging in different ways. However, the capacity of communities to participate meaningfully in school improvement processes is highly dependent on their access to information about school activities and their level of awareness about the importance of education.

In Afar region, PTA members stated that they had been always working with the schools and provided support during SIP (School Improvement Plans) preparation. The PTA also engaged in approving purchase request from school grant funds. In addition, they have been involved in the evaluation of the annual performance and preparation of SIP and other annual school activities. In Gambella region PTA members stated that they are engaged in consultations that are intended to improve education quality and evaluation of teachers’ performance.

In Oromia, the community, through the PTA, is directly and indirectly involved in monitoring quality of education and school property. In Yabello woreda the community has participated in different activities like fencing to protect the school compound from thieves and animals, toilet construction, financial contributions to employ alternative basic education teachers and school security.

In SNNPR, residents in the urban areas actively participated in various activities to improve education quality. According to the discussants from Hamer and Bena Tsemay woredas, the community took part responsibility in annual education planning, follow up and evaluation of students and teachers, monitoring of school activities and also engage in building the capacity of schools. Furthermore, through
the PTA, the community in Demeka and Key Afar towns provides financial and material support when the schools organizes different events.

However, the PTA and SIP processes were dominated by better educated and largely non-pastoralist men. The involvement of pastoralist communities, in general, and pastoralist women in particular, in school improvement activities was limited in all woredas visited. The pastoralist communities had limited access to information about school activities or about how education could positively support their livelihoods and lifestyle. This has meant that their desire and interest to participate in improving the quality of schooling is very low. In Gambella and SNNPR few parents attend consultative meetings organized by schools. Women, especially, rarely attend or participate in PTAs and other discussions.

Despite these limitations, according to woreda stakeholders and PTA members, the engagement of the community in the school monitoring activities has contributed a lot to the provision of quality education. Their active participation has induced a sense of ownership among the participating community members and has been supportive for school management.
5. Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1. Conclusion

At the woreda level stakeholders’ ability to support equitable access to Quality Education for disadvantaged and vulnerable children had been improved as education access for pastoralist boys and girls had been expanding through formal education as well as alternative basic education. But limitations such as lack of trained manpower, finance, materials and infrastructural supports are undermining their efforts. Despite the limitations, most of the woredas believe to have the capacity to support and provide quality education for vulnerable and marginalized children.

At the community level, lack of access to information about schools and education is sustaining traditional and negative attitudes about the role and value of education amongst pastoralist communities. In most of woredas boys and girls have responsibility to provide labour in household activities. Unless continuous community awareness activities, targeted specifically at pastoralist communities, are carried out during implementation of GEQIP phase 2, the ability and willingness of the communities to provide support for equitable access education for vulnerable and disadvantaged children will be low.

Girls and boys have limited opportunities to affect the attitudes of their communities. They were not given the opportunity to participate in school decision-making processes. To enhance the contribution of boys and girls in provision of quality education during GEQIP II, schools need to involve students (boys and girls) in consultation, planning and evaluation processes. The other critical point GEQIP II need to emphasize is on how to improve education access for children with special needs. In most of the sampled woredas there are no schools and trained teachers to meet this demand.

Most of the schools in the pastoral areas and the community have no access to ICT services. Access for ICT services like radio, TV, internet and telecommunication is almost non-existent in most of pastoral woredas. As a result most the community members were not familiar with ICT services and its role in providing quality education. Unless network coverage and power supply conditions are improved in those woredas, it is not possible to think ICT as a means to provide education access for pastoralist communities.

Community participation has improved over the last 5 years. The findings from stakeholder consultations show that PTA has been providing more support for teaching-learning processes. The community has been providing support to schools by participating in annual education planning, follow up and evaluation of students and teachers, monitoring of school activities and engage in building the capacity of schools. However, poor, underserved community members, especially women, are largely excluded from the PTA and SIP processes.
5.2. Recommendations

Suggestions and recommendations were forwarded by participants of the stakeholder consultations on actions that need to be taken for provision of equitable access to quality Education for disadvantaged and vulnerable children in pastoralist areas. The recommendations forwarded by different stakeholders give due emphasis for access rather than quality. The community was not in position to discuss and suggest on quality of education as most of the sampled woredas have no sufficient facilities in nearby areas. Besides, their awareness and understanding of educational quality is very limited as their exposures and experiences were minimal.

- Expansion of formal and ABE centres in the woredas- availability of education centres at kebeles are very low. If new schools are opened around the pastoralist areas it increases access of education service for pastoralist boys and girls.
- Strengthening programs that support pastoralist education- government and partners need to strengthen their support to for the woredas to promote education in disadvantaged and marginalised areas. On the demand-side: expansion of hostels, school feeding program are important provisions. On the supply-side: materials and resources which reflect pastoralist life and provide positive images for children is important. Capacity building activities for implementers also needs to be strengthened for pastoralist woredas.
- Improving infrastructural development in woreda-basic infrastructural development like roads, schools and telecom services need to be made available in pastoralist areas to reduce high workload on children, which is the main factor for low enrolment in schools.
- Awareness creation for community- parallel with the expansion of education centres it is necessary to undertake awareness creation activity for the community. Unless perception and attitude of the community is changed it is not possible to improve education access of pastoralist children in general and underserved and vulnerable in particular.
- Provision of education in local languages- discussants in Afar and Gambella region mentioned to use local languages for children's education.
- Building teachers’ capacity- to ensure quality education at all levels’ assigning trained manpower is necessary. In addition to this to enhance teachers’ skill provision of trainings and continuous capacity building activities need to be undertaken.
Annex 1: Checklists and Tools

**Woreda Stakeholders Consultations checklist**

**Key Question:** What are the range of different things needed to ensure that vulnerable and disadvantaged girls and boys can benefit from good quality, affordable and accessible education?

Within every FDG, once we have established “what the different things needed for “good quality education for vulnerable and disadvantaged girls” are, we can begin to arrange them as symbols around the outside of a circle and form them together as a “Spokes Wheel”. We can then ask participants to mark where they are currently on each of the things they identified. This will help us explore with them questions like:

**Stakeholders’ abilities to Progress Equitable Access to Quality Education**

1. In this Woreda what has helped schools reach and educate disadvantaged girls and boys? Why and how?
2. What stopped teachers and/or schools from getting more resources or better information or better training? etc. to help them reach and include vulnerable and disadvantaged girls and boys?
3. Has it been easier (or harder) over time to get hold of, for example, resources, training; information etc. and keep this thing which is helping progress good quality education for vulnerable and disadvantaged girls and boys?
4. What skills and capacities do they think they have built up which will help them support equitable access to education for a) girls; b) boys c) pastoralist groups and d) special needs? What other skills and capacities do they need to develop for each of the spokes, if any? What do people feel about managing GEQIP 2 in their Woreda so that every girl and boy benefits? Will it be easier or harder in future?

**Use of ICT to Support Learning and Increased Access to Education**

(In schools; out of school and to get information to hard-to-reach groups) If not identified in the spokes questions ask separately at the end of discussion and ask why they did not identify ICT as a thing which support quality education for boys and girls?

5. Who uses ICT in the school and community? Who does not?
6. If ICT used in School? How is ICT used and do you think it is helping improve education? How?
7. How could it be used to support pastoralist children and all girls stay in school?
8. How could it be used to support children in secondary schools?

**Community Participation in Supporting Improvements in Equitable Access to Quality Education**

9. How do girls and boys influence the different things identified in spokes? Are some boys and girls left out? Who? Could participation of girls and boys be improved? How?
10. How do communities influence decision-making around the different things identified in the spokes e.g. Planning; selection of teachers, content of textbooks; school improvements? In what ways? Could this be improved? How?
11. Is this true for all people within their community? Who is involved and participating - Women and men? Older or younger people? Who has the most chance of influencing what happens in schools and in the education of girls and boys? Who has the least? What has changed over time? Why? What could be done to strengthen community participation?
Are Communities involved in monitoring changes in schools and education around the different spokes identified? If so how? What could change? How could schools woreda ed. officials be more accountable?

**Stakeholder Consultations checklist for Schools; Parents/Guardians and Children**

**Stakeholders’ abilities to progress Equitable Access to Quality Education**

1. What stops vulnerable and disadvantaged girls from attending school? In what ways are girls helped to overcome the barriers –by the school, by their community; by government; by others? What issues get the most attention why? What gets the least attention? Why?
2. What stops disadvantaged and vulnerable boys from attending school? In what ways are these boys helped to overcome the barriers –by the school, by the community; by government; by others?
3. What is done to support girls and boys with special needs? Who by? Have there been improvements? If yes what and how has it helped? If not why not and what is needed?
4. Has the quality of education improved if so how and why? If not what needs to change?
5. What has been done, if anything, to adapt the school, to the particular needs of a) pastoralist girls and b)pastoralist boys (e.g. teaching methods; textbooks; clubs; term times etc) to the culture and livelihood patterns of the community? Who by? What could be done differently by: a) communities and b) schools to support pastoralist girls and boys staying in school?

**Use of ICT to Support Learning and Increased Access to Education**

(In schools; out of school and to get information to hard-to-reach groups)

6. Who uses ICT in the school and community? Who does not?
7. If ICT used in School? How is ICT used and do you think it is helping improve education?
8. How could it be used to support pastoralist girls and boys stay in school?
9. How could it be used to support pastoralist children in secondary schools?

**Community Participation in Supporting Improvements in Equitable Access to Quality Education**

10. How are you involved in helping the school improve the quality of education for disadvantaged and vulnerable girls and boys in your community – if not involved why not? What is stopping your involvement?
11. In what ways have you been consulted? Have your suggestions and ideas for improvement been listened to and acted on by the school and/woreda officials? If not why not?
12. In what ways are school improvements, and quality of education monitored? How is the community involved? Who is left out?
13. How do parents/guardians learn about what is going on in school and the support it can give to educate disadvantaged and vulnerable girls and boys in the community? Who gets to hear about what is going on? Who does not? What could be done to make it easier for girls, boys and their communities to access information?
14. Are you able to complain about what happens in school or with programmes connected with the school (e.g. SIP or SIG). How and what happens when complaints are made?
15. What can be done to improve pastoralist’s participation in supporting quality education?
Annex 2: Summary of FGD participants

Table 1: Number of Participants in Focus Group Discussions by Gender and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Gambela</th>
<th>Oromia</th>
<th>SNNP</th>
<th>Afar</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambela</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNP</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Number of Participants in Focus Group Discussions by Gender and ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Gambela</th>
<th>Oromia</th>
<th>SNNP</th>
<th>Afar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historically disadvantaged groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settled population Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historically disadvantaged groups</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Breakdown of FDGs with Girls and Boys by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Gambela</th>
<th>Oromia</th>
<th>SNNP</th>
<th>Afar</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls under 15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls over 15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys under 15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys over 15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Breakdown of FDGs with Girls and Boys by background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Gambela</th>
<th>Oromia</th>
<th>SNNP</th>
<th>Afar</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls in school</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls out of school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys in school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys out of school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>