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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The study, ‘Evaluation Practices in Literacy Programmes in Kenya: A Situational Analysis’ was carried out in 10 purposively selected adult literacy organizations in October 2005. The study collected data from those involved in the actual implementation of literacy programmes at the grassroots level as well as those in charge of policy formulation. Questionnaires and in-depth interviews were used to collect data from the respondents.

The study established that:

- Adult literacy providers in Kenya practiced evaluation of their programmes. However, the scope of evaluation was not uniform as each organization designed its own evaluation mechanism.

- Most of the evaluation mechanisms were internally designed by employees of these organizations. However, some organizations engaged consultants in the development of evaluation mechanisms.

- The organizations received support for their evaluation activities from different sources, mainly the government through the DAE, Non Governmental Organizations and Faith Based Organizations.

- Universities did not contribute much to the evaluation process as only three of the ten organizations collaborated with the universities in the evaluation process.

- Evaluators from these organizations were given some training. The training was either in-house or entrusted on consultants.

The evaluation results were used for a number of purposes, the major ones being decision-making, programme improvement and accountability. Evaluation was of benefit to learners, tutors, managers, sponsors and other stakeholders. The most popular evaluation approach was the objective focused one.

The organizations faced problems when it came to analyzing the evaluation data they had collected. This is an indicator of the need for enhanced capacity building in this area. The results of evaluation were presented through a variety of channels, e.g. Annual reports, Newspaper articles, Newsletters, Conferences etc.

Majority of the organizations felt that their evaluation was weakened by the lack of a national evaluation benchmark. This resulted to lack of uniformity of the evaluation process since each organization designed its own evaluation system.

BTL, which was covered in the case study, had developed the most effective evaluation framework called ‘Management Information Reporting System (MIRS).

The study concluded that Adult Literacy providers in Kenya acknowledged the important role that evaluation was supposed to play in their programmes. However, in spite of their efforts to implement evaluation systems in their programmes, success was hampered by
lack of adequate capacity in evaluation as well lack of a guiding national evaluation framework.

The study came up with the following major recommendations:

- There is an urgent need for capacity building in the whole evaluation process. The personnel need to be trained especially on instrument development, data collection and analysis.
- DAE should spearhead the development of a national evaluation guideline to guide the process. Each of the organizations would then adapt this national evaluation guideline to their unique circumstances.
- DAE, in liaison with KIE, should evaluate the existing myriad Adult Literacy Curricula with a view to developing a national curricula but adaptable to different environments.
- Literacy providers should engage the relevant specialists when designing an evaluation system.
- The DAE should hasten the development of the National Qualification Framework for Adult Literacy learners. The framework should be equivalent to the one used in the formal education system.
CHAPTER ONE

Background and Methodology

1.01 National Background
Kenya, which is a developing country, is located in East Africa. The country is bordered by five countries and the Indian Ocean to the Southeast. The country whose area is 582,648 square kilometres lies along the Equator, which divides it into two halves. About 70% of the country is Arid and Semi Arid (ASAL) while the remaining 30 % forms the high potential areas. About 70% of the population is settled in the high potential areas while the remaining 30% occupy the vast ASAL regions. Kenya’s current population is about 33 million, with about 20 million of these being below the age of 18 years.

1.02 Development of Education in post-independence Kenya
Upon attaining its independence from its former colonial masters in 1963, Kenya identified ignorance, poverty and disease as the major obstacles to development. Education was premised to play a key role in fighting the three. During the colonial era, education was provided to just a chosen few. Consequently, the Kenyan government was faced with a huge social demand for education from both the young and the old after independence. As a result, education has continued to claim the lion’s share (on average 40%) of the county’s national recurrent budget since independence. Kenya currently has about 18,000 primary schools, 3,300 secondary schools and 16 universities (public and private) with enrolment standing at 7 million, 1.3 million and 180,000 respectively.

Currently, the Kenyan government is in the 3rd year of its Free Primary Education (FPE) programme, which it re-launched in 2003. The abolition of user fees under the FPE programme has led to an upsurge in enrolment of about 1.5 million children in public primary schools bringing the total enrolment to 7 million.

1.03 Planning, Managing and Implementing of Literacy Programmes in Kenya
Adult literacy programmes have been in existence since independence in Kenya. These programmes are run by both the government and other stakeholders. There are two government bodies responsible for adult education in Kenya. These are the Board of Adult Education (BAE) and the Department of Adult Education (DAE).

BAE was established in 1966 through an Act of Parliament and mandated to:
- Advise and report to the minister on any matters and developments relating to adult education
- Co-ordinate the work of adult education in various ministries and Non Governmental Organizations
- Identify and assess needs for new developments in adult education

At inception, the BAE had no organizational structure at the grassroots level and the implementation of specific tasks and functions were to be undertaken by the co-operating government bodies and NGOs under the guidance of the secretariat. To address the above shortcomings of the BAE, the government established the Department of Adult Education (DAE) in 1979 through a presidential directive. The DAE acts as the implementing agency of the BAE. The specific objectives of DAE are to:
• Eradicate illiteracy among youth and adults by providing them with basic communication and numeracy skills;
• Sustain and promote multiple literacies through post-literacy and continuing education programmes;
• Provide education to out-of-school youth and adults through non-formal education approaches;
• Promote acquisition of relevant knowledge, attitude and skills among adults in order to facilitate adoption of new technologies and production skills;
• Promote self-confidence, values and positive behaviour towards society through general adult education programmes;
• Collate, store and disseminate data on adult literacy levels.

The DAE has an extensive structure running from the headquarters down to the grassroots level where it is represented by literacy teachers. The mission of the department is to eradicate illiteracy and promote lifelong learning among adults and out–of-school youth in order to create a well-informed human resource capable of impacting positively on the country’s development.

However, the provision of Adult Education in Kenya is not a preserve of the government. In deed, Adult Education is also provided by a wide spectrum of organizations which include Non Governmental Organizations (NGO), Faith Based Organizations (FBO), Community Based Organizations (CBO), the civil society and private organizations. However, though the DAE is a provider at the grassroots level, the BAE Act at the same time mandates it to co-ordinate all adult education programmes in order to harmonize provision and prevent duplication of effort by the various providers.

1.04 Status of Adult Literacy in Kenya
Despite the concerted efforts to promote adult literacy by the government, NGOs, FBOs, CBOs and other stakeholders, Kenya still has to grapple with large numbers of illiterate and semi-literate citizens. It is estimated that 4.2 million adult Kenyans are illiterate, two thirds of that number being women (Republic of Kenya & UNESCO, 2004).

There are a number of major factors that have led to this big number of illiterates in Kenya. These are:

1. Lack of access to formal education
2. Low retention rates by the formal education system
3. A high poverty index in the country

Prior to the re-introduction of Free Primary education in Kenya in 2003, close to 3 million children of school going age were out of school as they could not raise the user fees required under the then cost sharing system. However, though FPE led to an upsurge in enrolment of about 1.5 million children, the country is not yet out of the woods. A report by UNESCO observes that FPE is threatened by high drop out rates due to a number of factors ranging from poverty to hostile school environments (UNESCO, 2005). About 56% of the Kenyan population were living below the poverty line in
Poverty impacts on enrolment and retention in schools thus enhancing illiteracy in the country as children from poor households are prone to activities like child labour in order to supplement the family income.

Enhancing adult literacy in Kenya is in line with several international commitments to education and human development and notably Education for All (EFA goal 3 on youth and adult learning; goal 4 on literacy) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG). If Kenya is to meet these internationally set goals by 2015 as envisioned, then there is a need to rededicate efforts to adult literacy like it is currently happening with Free Primary Education.

1.05 Need for Evaluation Mechanisms for Literacy Programmes

Evaluation has been used in education for a long time. The Tyler model, which advocated for an objectives based approach to educational evaluation, has dominated the field for almost half a century (Worthen B. R & Sanders J. R. 1987). Tyler viewed evaluation as a process of comparing performance data with clearly specified objectives.

Evaluation has also elicited different views from different scholars. According to Nevo (1995), evaluation in education has also come to be viewed by different scholars as:
- Providing information for decision makers;
- The systematic investigation of the worth or merit of some object
- An act of collecting systematic information regarding the nature and quality of educational objects.

Ogula (2002), on the other hand, views evaluation as the systematic collection, analysis, interpretation and presentation of data about the nature, value and effectiveness of the entity being evaluated with a view to facilitating the decision making process.

After taking into consideration the above views about evaluation from different scholars, we could surmise that evaluation is normally geared towards generating some information which could then be used to effect changes in the programme through informed decisions. In education, for example, evaluation could generate information on learning outcomes, teacher effectiveness, relevance of curriculum, efficiency of the programme in terms of production of graduates as well as utilization of resources etc. It is against this background that one appreciates the need for the development of effective evaluation mechanisms for educational programmes.

1.06 Problem Statement

In Kenya, the adult education sector has not received as much support and attention from the government as has the formal education sector. Whereas there are a number of bodies charged with monitoring and evaluating the performance of the formal education system, the same cannot be said of the Adult Education sector. There is, therefore, a need to develop and put into place effective evaluation mechanisms for the Adult Education sector. This study, therefore, sought to undertake a situational analysis of the evaluation mechanisms in the Adult Education sector in Kenya, with the aim of identifying the gaps so that effective mechanisms can be developed.
1.07 Methodology
The study used the survey design. Survey studies are conducted to determine the status quo and are concerned with the gathering of facts rather than the manipulation of variables.

1.08 Study Population and Sampling procedure
The study population was all organizations dealing with adult literacy in the country. However, purposive sampling was used to select 10 of the 17 major literacy providers in the country for the study. Of the ten organizations, one was used for the case study.

1.09 Instruments
Data was collected through questionnaires and an in-depth Interview schedule. There were two sets of questionnaires: one for the implementers of literacy programmes and another one for policy makers. Data for the case study was collected using an interview schedule.

1.10 Data Collection
Data was collected by the research assistants who directly administered the instruments to literacy providers in the field. The principal researcher conducted the in-depth interview for the case study.

1.11 Data Analysis and Interpretation
Qualitative data which were generated from the open-ended questions were organized into themes and tabulated.

CHAPTER 2
2.01 Analysis of Evaluation Practices of Literacy Programmes

The study covered 10 major literacy providers in the country. The participating organizations are listed in the Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Started</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undugu Society of Kenya</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist Mission Literacy Programme</td>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy and Evangelism</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Adult Education</td>
<td>Govt.</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepping Stones and Reflect (STAR)- Action Aid Kenya</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy Programme (Catholic Secretariat)</td>
<td>FBO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Pentecostal Fellowship of Kenya (FPFK)</td>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy for All (LIFA)</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCC-PCEA Rungiri</td>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible Translation &amp; Literacy***</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Used for Case Study

From the above table, it is clear that the oldest literacy programmes dates back to 1973 while the youngest one was started in 2002. Four of these providers are Faith Based Organizations, three are NGOs, and one is a CBO while another one is a government department. The total enrolment was 124,732 learners. The majority of the learners, 81,185, representing 65% were women while the number of men was 43,547 (35%). This is in tandem with the national literacy trends in that of the 4.1 illiterate Kenyans, 61 percent are women. The learners were put into two major categories: Basic Literacy and Post Literacy learners. This is in recognition of the fact that there are some learners in need of basic literacy skills while others have basic literacy but require life skills in line with the concept of functional literacy.

2.02 Objectives of Literacy Programme

The study also sought to establish the objective of the literacy programmes. It emerged that the different providers had different objectives though some themes were recurring. The objectives are as presented in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide Literacy and numeracy skills</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Self reliance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop conflict resolution skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop materials in local language for adults</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help community identify their problem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To guide on relationships to access power</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enable learners with pastoral knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote knowledge on primary health care, nutrition and HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above, it emerges that provision of basic literacy is still an overriding objective as indicated by seven of the nine providers. This is inevitable in a country with 4.1 million illiterate people. Functional literacy is also a major objective as brought out in the other responses. Functional Literacy seeks to not only offer literacy skills but also equip the participants with requisite skills which would enable them attain self reliance in several aspects, develop social skills as well as be able to identify and tackle problems facing the community.

The study also sought to establish the reach of the literacy programmes. Six of the nine providers had a national reach while three had their programmes restricted to district level.

2.03 Evaluation System
All the nine organizations had an evaluation system. However, the scope of evaluation was not uniform. Eight of the organizations had a rather broad understanding of evaluation. However, in the remaining one organization, evaluation was understood in the narrow scope of learners’ assessment which was undertaken by the teachers.

It was also essential to establish who was responsible for designing the evaluation system. The responses were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees of Organization</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Consultants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees of Organization in collaboration with government agency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above reveals that a majority of the evaluation systems were internally designed.

2.04 Internal versus External evaluation
It was also necessary to establish the type of evaluation that was carried out. One evaluation dichotomy is the internal versus external evaluation. The former is usually an in-house activity by members of the organization while the latter entails engaging people from outside the organization to undertake the activity.

All the nine organizations practiced internal evaluation. On the other hand, four of the organizations engaged external evaluators from consultant firms while only three organizations engaged consultants from universities. It also emerged that the other literacy providers also relied on DAE personnel for external evaluation. Since each of the two methods, i.e. internal and external evaluation has got its strong and weak points, it is advisable to marry the two (Worthen R. B. & Sanders R.J.1987).
2.05 Role of different bodies in evaluation process
Evaluation is usually a complex activity which calls for collaboration among a number of bodies/organs. The study, therefore, sought to establish the role played by different bodies in the evaluation of the literacy programmes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Role of Government in the evaluation process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of Evaluation Personnel</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of evaluation materials and equipment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Guidelines on evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It emerged that the government through the DAE supported organizations in their evaluation activities. This was through providing evaluation personnel and material support e.g. tests and vehicles. It emerged that some of the teachers working on literacy programmes in some of these organizations and who were also involved in the internal evaluation process were seconded there by the government.

Non Governmental Organizations also made a contribution to the evaluation process. Some of the roles played by the NGOs in the evaluation process were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Role of NGOs in the evaluation process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of Evaluation materials</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting evaluation standards</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating the evaluation process</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of training curriculum</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of technical personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the fact that a number of the literacy programmes were funded by NGOs, it is inevitable that they had a role to play in the evaluation process. To these NGOs, evaluation of the literacy programmes was one way of ensuring accountability of the funds as well as assessing whether the set objectives were being met. However, universities/research organization and the private sector played a very minimal role in the evaluation process of literacy programmes. Only three of the nine organizations (representing only 33%) engaged the universities in their evaluation activities. Similarly, only one of the nine organizations collaborated with the private sector in the evaluation activities.

Faith Based Organization also played a role in the evaluation process. Two of the organizations reported that FBOs, and specifically NCCK, Catholic Secretariat and the Hindu Council had formed a collaborative network which facilitated exchange of information and ideas on various aspects of Adult Education including evaluation. One literacy provider received workshop support from an FBO.
2.06 Training of Evaluation team
Training is essential if a given team is to undertake a given exercise effectively. The study revealed that evaluators from all the nine organizations were given some training. The providers of training varied from one organization to the other and the analysis revealed that:
- Some organizations hired consultants from universities and consulting firms;
- A number of the organizations depended on the DAE for training of their evaluators;
- Other organizations relied on in-house training where they tapped on the expertise of seasoned employees.

2.07 Support given to evaluation team
Evaluation is usually an expensive activity and one that many organizations fail to factor in their budgets. It was important, therefore, to establish what kind of support the evaluation teams received and the source. There were four major sources of support to the evaluation team. These were:
1. NGOs;
2. FBOs;
3. Government, and;
4. Donors.
It should be pointed out that support to the evaluation teams came from within and without the organizations. These organizations factored evaluation of their literacy programmes in their budget estimates. Furthermore, they mobilized additional evaluation resources from their mother organizations as well as other external sources. The government, through the DAE also gave support to three of the literacy providers. Donors who contributed to the evaluation process included the Norwegian government and Children-in- Need, an International NGO. The support extended to the evaluation team from the different sources fell into three categories, namely:
- Evaluation materials;
- Financial support, and;
- Logistics e.g. transport & meals.

2.08 Focus of evaluation
Evaluation covers a broad spectrum. Therefore, it was imperative for the study to break the wide scope into three manageable components within the Adult Education context. Consequently, questions were asked as to what was evaluated in terms of learners, curriculum and impact.

Table 6
Focus of learner evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquired skills</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural change</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation of the programme</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learners are expected to have undergone some transformation at the end of the learning exercise. Thus, the evaluation undertaken by these organizations was geared towards
identifying some noticeable changes in the learners. Learners were expected to not only acquire both academic and life skills but also to utilize them in improving their lifestyles. Some expectations were that learners would be able to: reduce domestic problems, engage in conflict resolution, attain better health and improve their standards of living.

Table 7
Focus of Curriculum evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to learners’ needs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaknesses/gaps</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its effectiveness as a teacher’s guide</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The curriculum is a key ingredient in the teaching-learning process as it to a large extent determines what will be taught. As one respondent stated, a curriculum needs to suit the needs of the learners. For instance, those leading a pastoralist lifestyle require an adult education curriculum which differs from those whose occupation is farming. Thus, an adult education curriculum must be culturally sensitive. Evaluation enabled the literacy providers to assess whether the curriculum was addressing the needs of the learners and the wider community.

Table 8
Focus of Impact evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude and behaviour change</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased literacy &amp; numeracy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of programme with respect to gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learners’ mastery of literacy and numeracy, enhanced positive attitude and behaviour change with respect to social constructs like gender were some of the impacts that were assessed by evaluation.

2.09 Use of Evaluation Results
Evaluation should not be viewed as an end to itself. In deed, evaluation is meant to serve the decision making needs of the program (Bhola, 1982). It was important, therefore, to establish how these literacy providers used the evaluation results. In any organization, evaluation is used by the management to serve several purposes. In this study, the results of evaluation were used for several management functions as outlined below.

Table 9
Use of evaluation for decision making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and effecting changes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sourcing for Funding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess viability of the programmes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Seven of the respondents were of the view that the results of evaluation played a big role in the planning process of the organizations. The results assisted the management in making informed decisions before effecting any changes in the programme. The results were also vital when it came to budgeting and sourcing for funds.

**Table 10**

**Use of evaluation for programme development/improvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of programme</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and effecting changes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme diversification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation results enabled the management of the literacy programmes to assess, amongst others, the effectiveness as well as the viability of the programme. They also assisted in planning for and effecting changes meant to improve the programme.

**Table 11**

**Use of evaluation for accountability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing transparency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and effecting changes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sourcing for funds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the funding of Adult Education programmes is to a large extent dependent on the goodwill of benefactors, transparency and accountability in the utilization of resources is vital. Evaluation results, therefore, played a key role in enhancing the accountability process. The results of evaluation revealed to the donors whether their resources were utilized for the objectives that they were set to. This was important for the continued funding of the project.

**Table 12:**

**Use of evaluation for programme outcome and impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and effecting Changes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme improvement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing behaviour change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing micro-activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation results revealed whether the goals of the adult literacy project were met or not. If negative, then the results paved way for necessary remedial action in subsequent programmes in order to realize the set objectives.
2.10 Other uses of evaluation results

Other reported uses of evaluation results were:

- **Progress monitoring**: If the results showed poor progress, then the management would be able to plan and effect the necessary changes.
- **Forming networks with other organizations**: Exchange of information is healthy for overall development of adult literacy.
- **Diversification of the programme**: This was realized in two of the organizations.

2.11 Evaluation Approaches

The study also sought to identify the evaluation approaches that were employed and the reasons. Each organization employed a number of evaluation approaches as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective focused</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management focused</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner focused</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant focused</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The objective focused approach to evaluation was the most favoured with eight of the nine organizations practicing it. The reason why it was widely used is that the organizations felt the need to constantly keep checking whether they were still on the right track. The learner focused approach was the second most favoured approach having generated five responses. It was followed in the third position by participant focused approach which was geared towards making the evaluation process all inclusive in order to promote acceptability of the programme. The last one was the management focused approach with three responses.

However, the respondents were unable to give elaborate reasons why they choose any of the above approaches.

2.12 Frequency of evaluation

For six of the organizations, evaluation was carried out as an ongoing activity (i.e. formative evaluation). Three organizations carried out both on-going and end of programme (Summative) evaluation. On the other hand, one organization focused on only end of programme evaluation.
The frequency of the evaluation ranged from monthly to annual as outlined in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-annual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.13 Techniques/ tools employed for data collection
A number of instruments were used to collect evaluation data. These were:
- Questionnaires,
- Interview guide,
- Observation schedule,
- Focus group discussion,
- Document analysis, and
- Material assessment.

2.14 Methods employed for Data Analysis
Once data has been collected, the next step is the analysis. One organization stated that data was analyzed by consultants. Another organization pointed out that their data was analyzed at their national office in Nairobi, the capital city of Kenya. On the other hand, seven of the organizations stated that they analyzed their data through open discussions. This latter admission was interesting as it made one wonder how this data was actually analyzed. Data analysis is a highly specialized and delicate activity which requires the input of a few skilled individuals rather than a large group in an open discussion. One could therefore posit that there was a weakness in data analysis.

2.15 Problems associated with data analysis
The respondents were also asked to state the problems they encountered when analyzing data. The identified problems were:
- Difficulties qualifying people's perceptions (4 respondents).
- Exercise cumbersome and time consuming (3 respondents)
- Wrong and inconsistent information (3 respondents)
- Lack of skilled data analysts (3 respondents)

The above responses suggest that the problem started at an earlier stage, most probably during the development of data collection instruments. If the instruments are ill designed, then it follows that the data that will be collected will be marred by inconsistencies.

2.16 Presentation of evaluation results
Evaluation reports were presented through a number of channels. These were:
- Annual reports,
- Newspaper articles,
- Newsletters,
• Websites,
• Conferences,
• Sharing meetings, and
• Training events.

2.17 How the results of evaluation were used
It was also important to establish how the results of the evaluation were used. As mentioned earlier, evaluation serves several purposes. As such, its results have a variety of consumers as outlined below.

Learners: They benefited from evaluation results by having an improved learning environment. When the proposed changes were implemented learners derived both direct and in direct benefits, e.g. simplification of learning materials.

Tutors: Evaluation results helped the tutors to carry out some self-evaluation of their teaching. If the results of the self evaluation were negative, tutors would be in a position to take remedial action like refresher courses.

Management: There were two major uses of research results by the management. One was the allocation of resources and the other was improvement on programme management.

Sponsors: They relied on evaluation results mainly for two reasons: Making funding decisions and for programme auditing.

Government: Evaluation results were used by the government for three purposes, namely: determining literacy levels for action to be taken, policy planning and funding purposes.

Other stakeholders: Evaluation results also played a vital role in creating partnership among various stakeholders.

2.18 Cost of the evaluation programme
The cost of evaluation for the literacy programmes ranged from kshs. 100,000 to kshs. 3,000,000. However, for those organizations where evaluation was in-built into the daily programme activities, it was not possible to estimate the cost.

2.19 Strengths of the evaluation
The providers were also asked to identify the major strengths of the evaluation. The responses were that:
• It gave a picture of progress & improvement
• It helped improve literacy programmes
• It contributed to the decision making process.
2.20 Weaknesses of evaluation
Similarly, the providers were also asked to identify the major weaknesses of this evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a national evaluation benchmark</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too expensive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No government support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbersome &amp; time consuming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seven of the nine organizations felt that lack of a national evaluation benchmark weakened their evaluation. This was because the organizations were unable to measure the success of their programmes against that of other organizations.
CHAPTER 3

3.01 Analysis of Policy environment

This section addresses itself to policy issues. Therefore, the instrument was administered to those in charge of drafting policy in the covered organizations.

To start, the study sought to establish if there existed national norms for literacy achievement and curriculum. It emerged that there was no concurrence on the existence of national norms for literacy achievement and curriculum. While three of the organizations stated the norms were there, the other six organizations stated that they were not aware of any national norms in literacy achievement and curriculum. The six further stated that each of their literacy field stations designed its own curriculum as well as the appropriate evaluation mechanism.

On the other hand, it emerged that the three organizations which acknowledged the existence of national norms for literacy achievement, curriculum and evaluation were not talking of the same thing. Literacy and Evangelism, an FBO, was responsible for developing its own norms for literacy achievement and curriculum which it shared with another FBO, Free Pentecostal Fellowship of Kenya (FPFK). The norms guided the two in their programmes throughout the country.

The DAE, on the other hand, stated that it had developed a national draft literacy curriculum. It posited that its national draft literacy curriculum guided its programmes countrywide and was adaptable to the local needs of different local communities. This draft literacy curriculum by DAE was pegged to level 5 of the formal primary school education.

However, it was clear that there was no national curriculum that was followed by the different providers. One would have expected the DAE, being the government body charged with enhancing adult literacy, to be at the forefront in promoting the adoption of the draft national literacy curricula by the other providers but that was not the case. This would have ensured the uniformity of standards in provision and evaluation of adult literacy in the country as the different players in the sector would be reading from the same script.

The study also sought to establish whether there were other evaluation practices that existed in the country. Five of the organizations pointed out that they did not know of any other evaluation practice in the country. The other four averred that they believed that the DAE, Kenya Adult Education Association and the Ministry of Education Science and Technology had evaluation practices but they did not have the details. Therefore, one can conclude that there is a dearth in the sharing of information in the sector.
3.02 Comparison of Monitoring/Evaluation in Adult Literacy Programmes and Formal Education

Though the goals of the Adult Literacy Programme may slightly differ from those of Formal Education, the two complement each other in many ways. It was therefore necessary to explore whether there was linkage between the two. Six of the respondents felt that there was no linkage between the two while three observed that there was linkage. The study sought to explore the types of linkages between the two and the respondents reported that:

- Some learners in the literacy programme were presented to the formal education system for evaluation at the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE) level;
- The literacy proficiency test certificate issued by the DAE is equivalent to primary grade five in the formal education system.
- Some respondents felt that the secondment of government teachers to their organizations provided a link with formal education practices.

It emerged that the adult literacy programme was dependent on the formal education system for the certification of its learners.

Unlike the Adult Literacy Programme, the formal education system has a well established monitoring and evaluation system for the various educational variables. The following comparisons illustrate the differences in evaluation that exist between the two.

3.021 Curriculum evaluation:

a) The Kenya Institute of Education, a statutory body, is charged with the duty of developing the curriculum for the formal education sector in Kenya. Towards this end, KIE continually undertakes research as well as curriculum evaluation. All learners in the formal education sector at a given level use the same curriculum as developed by KIE.

b) The picture is quite different in the Adult Literacy Sector where each provider develops his/her own curriculum. Thus learners never get to use the same curriculum as it all depends on the literacy provider.

3.023 Learner evaluation:

a) The Kenya National Examinations Council is another statutory body whose role is to evaluate students. KNEC gives certificates of academic merit at the end of a given education cycle, e.g. The Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE) at the end of the primary school cycle.

b) In the Adult Literacy Sector, there are no standardized learner evaluation tools. Each provider issues his/her own certificates of merit. The only semblance of linkage between the two systems is when learners in the Adult Literacy Programme are presented for the KCPE examination as private candidates.
3.024 Teacher Evaluation:

a) In the formal education system, there is pre-service and post service teacher evaluation. The pre-service evaluation is ensured by the mandatory teacher training for a given level and the interview prior to employment. On the other hand, the Quality Assurance Department of the Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MOEST) conducts the post service evaluation of teachers and gives the necessary professional support like in-service courses.

b) In the Adult Literacy Sector, there are no set standards and the teachers are rarely trained. The DAE does not have the capacity to either undertake teacher evaluation or offer teacher support services like its counterpart, (i.e. the Quality Assurance Department) in MOEST.

3.03 Decisions related to literacy programmes

Education is an activity that generates great interest from various quarters in the society. Furthermore, provision of education is a complex and an expensive undertaking. Consequently, decisions on educational issues should not be unilateral but should be all inclusive. The study, therefore, sought to capture the respondents’ understanding of the input of the different players and stakeholders in the decision making process in literacy programmes.

a) **Planners**: They make key decisions related to designing goals of programme, conducting Needs Assessment Surveys, policy development, allocation of resources, providing programme guidelines and executing evaluation.

b) **Administrators**: They make key decisions related to quality control, resource mobilization, community mobilization and programme implementation.

c) **Sponsors**: They play a key role in making decisions related to funding, Provision of learning facilities and materials, fostering collaboration, monitoring and evaluation.

d) **Policy-makers**: They play a key role in making decisions related to formulation of Policies and guidelines, putting literacy on national development agenda, executing evaluation

e) **Curriculum developers**: They make key decisions related to scope and content of curriculum as well as in setting literacy standards.

f) **Facilitators**: They make key decisions related to evaluation and training of teachers, development of training manuals, Coordination of programme implementation, setting of implementation rules and Provision of facilities.
g) **Grassroots-level coordinators:** They play a key role in making decisions related to quality assurance, programme feedback, learner mobilization and community sensitization.

h) **Participants:** They also make key decisions related to feedback for programme improvement, continuity of programme and community mobilization strategies.
CHAPTER 4
CASE STUDY
Use of Evaluation Results and its Influence on Policy and Practice: A Case of the Adult Literacy Program for Minority Language Groups

4.01 Background
The Adult Literacy Programme for Minority Language Groups was started in Kenya in 1981 by an NGO called Bible Translation and Literacy (BTL). The programme has a national scope as it covers several linguistic communities spread all over the country. The programme targets minority languages which have not been written before and develops a workable alphabet in collaboration with local language committees. The development of the alphabet is followed by the translation of the bible into that language, an exercise that goes hand in hand with the Adult Literacy Programme. The reason is that having translated the bible in a given minority language, then it is only logical that the people should be empowered to read it.

BTL’s Adult Literacy Programme has an annual enrolment of about 2,000 learners. Currently, BTL is running projects in 11 districts. These are:

- Boni - Lamu district
- Borana, Daasanach and Rendille - Marsabit district
- Digo and Duruma - Kwale district
- Endo - Marakwet district
- Giryama - Kilifi district
- Pokomo and Orma - Tana River district
- Sabaot - Mount Elgon District
- Suba-Suba district
- Tharaka- Tharaka district
- Samburu- Laikipia district
- Ilchamus- Baringo district

4.02 Objectives
The mission of BTL in literacy is to facilitate social and economic development through the provision of literacy skills. In order to achieve this goal, BTL has a number of set objectives, namely:

1. Develop languages for the small language groups
2. Develop literature in the new language
3. Initiate a sustainable literacy programme
4. Use the literacy skills for social, economic and spiritual development

After coding the language of a given linguistic group and initiating literacy in the community, BTL encourages the development of varied literature in the language. This is
realized through the writing and translation of other materials on themes pertinent to the needs of the community, e.g. health, agriculture etc. Closely related to the Adult Literacy Programme is another BTL initiative for promotion of Mother Tongue Education (MTE) in lower primary schools. Once the bible has been translated into a given language, BTL does not stop there but develops reading materials in mother tongue for use in lower primary teaching. These materials also assist the adult learners in improving their literacy skills.

4.03 Evaluation
BTL gives serious attention to evaluation in its adult literacy programme. There are three stages of evaluation:

1. Pre-programme evaluation
2. On-going evaluation
3. Post-programme evaluation

4.031 Pre-programme & post-programme evaluation
Pre-programme evaluation involves undertaking a literacy survey to determine the unique needs of a given linguistic community. This is in appreciation of the fact that the different linguistic groups have got different lifestyles. While some lead a nomadic life others are farmers who are settled in one place.

Post-programme evaluation, on the other hand, is conducted at the end of the programme. This is usually conducted by consultants and representatives of the funding bodies. Summative evaluation is geared towards verifying whether the objectives of the project were met.

4.032 On-going evaluation
BTL admits that though its Adult Literacy Programme started way back in 1981, it did not record phenomenal success for a number of years as it was not eliciting the expected interest from members of the host communities. As a result, BTL undertook a Literacy Evaluation Survey in 1996. The survey identified several weaknesses which led to an overhaul of the project. The staffing of the programme was beefed up. However, what marked the turning point of the Adult Literacy Programme after this survey was the development of an in-built evaluation mechanism dubbed the Management Information Reporting System (MIRS) in 1997 which has proved to be quite effective. Indeed, after implementing this evaluation system, BTL has won the International Literacy Day Award in Kenya for 3 consecutive years before it suspended its participation in the event so as to give some other literacy providers a chance. This evaluation system was developed jointly by BTL staff and consultants from the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL).

4.033 Management Information Reporting System (MIRS)
The MIRS is an in-built evaluation system meant to generate information at each and every stage of programme implementation. The information generated assists the management in the decision making process. The MIRS uses a number of instruments to
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collect information. These are: Questionnaires, Interview Guide, Observation Schedule and Focus Group Discussion.

BTL has a strict policy that requires information on every single activity to be recorded using the relevant instrument. For example, when a literacy teacher starts teaching a new group of learners, he/she is expected to record and report each and every development. Similarly, if a member of BTL literacy staff visits a field station, he/she is expected to record the purpose of the visit as well as what was achieved.

4.034 Channel of Communication

BTL employs a two way channel of communication which allows the exchange of information, on the one hand, between the head office and the grassroots level and, on the other hand, between the head office and the donors. The following figure illustrates the evaluation channel for relaying evaluation information.

Figure 1: Channel for Relaying Evaluation Information
Ordinarily, the evaluation process starts at the grassroots level with the literacy worker who records information using the prescribed instrument. This information is then passed on to the project leader who files a monthly report. The project leader compiles information from different literacy workers and then forwards the information to the regional manager (the country is divided into regions). The regional manager then forwards the information to the national coordinator at the head office. Once received at the head office, the information is analyzed after which a decision on its dissemination and utilization is made. The head office is responsible for the compilation of the annual report. Similarly, when the head office wishes to initiate some evaluation, the same process is followed.

Through this in-built MIRS evaluation system, BTL is able to sense when things are not working out well so that appropriate intervention can be taken. For instance, two years
ago, the system identified and reported a weakness in BTL’s Basic Adult Literacy Programme. The problem was that BTL was finding it difficult to sustain adult learners in basic literacy classes. The adults started their literacy lessons well but their enthusiasm died before very long. Through the MIRS evaluation system, BTL learnt that the adults were not interested in just being taught literacy without relating it to their daily lives. There was a need to provide functional literacy sensitive to the local needs. In order to meet this need from the learners, BTL has developed a strategy of forging partnership with development agencies at the grassroots level and especially CBOs with programmes in health, agriculture, education etc. This collaboration with CBO has enabled literacy learners to kill two birds with one stone. On the one hand, they learn literacy and on the other hand they acquire practical skills relevant to their daily lives in diverse areas like agriculture, health, business etc. BTL sees great potential in such partnerships for it can be able to focus on its core function of providing literacy while the collaborating organizations provide a functional context. BTL reckons that this partnership provides a cost effective way of promoting literacy.

4.04 Collaboration between BTL and other Stakeholders

BTL works in close collaboration with other stakeholders in education. For instance, it collaborates with the Kenya Institute of Education (KIE) in the development of literacy materials in the various languages. KIE is the body charged with the development of curriculum for basic education in Kenya. Consequently, after BTL develops literacy materials especially for its Mother Tongue Education (MTE) project, KIE vets them before giving them a stamp of approval. Once approved, teachers and learners out there can utilize them confidently.

BTL also has close ties with the DAE, the body charged with coordination of adult education in the country. BTL shares its annual evaluation report with the DAE. However, BTL is of the view that DAE needs to be empowered so as to be in a position to play its coordinating role effectively. DAE should also explore ways of developing a standardized evaluation mechanism for Adult Literacy Programmes. Once such a programme is in place, literacy providers in the country would be able to draw from it and devise evaluation systems to fit their own unique circumstances.

BTL also shares its evaluation results with its international consultant, Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL). By so doing, BTL contributes to the development of literacy on a global platform since its success is shared and replicated in other countries. Locally, BTL shares its results with other literacy providers during literacy forums like the International Literacy Day.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.01 Conclusion
The study established that Adult Literacy providers in Kenya acknowledged the important role that evaluation was supposed to play in their programmes. However, in spite of their efforts to implement evaluation systems in their programmes, success for the majority of the providers was limited due to their lack of adequate capacity in evaluation as well lack of a guiding national evaluation framework.

5.02 Recommendations
If the evaluation problems facing adult literacy programmes are to be dealt with, there is a need to take appropriate action at various levels. The study has proposed the following recommendations:
Recommendation 1
As a result of the important role played by evaluation in any organization, it is necessary to ensure that due diligence is observed in the development of the evaluation system and instruments. Consequently, it is imperative to seek expert advice rather than making it a closed door affair. Literacy providers should, therefore, be advised to engage the relevant specialists so as to come up with an effective evaluation system.

Recommendation 2
There is a need to cultivate collaboration between literacy providers and universities/research organizations. Universities have accumulated a lot of research experience which should be used to inform not only the evaluation process but other aspects of adult literacy programme as well.

Recommendation 3
There is need to give more emphasis on training. The context of literacy programmes in Kenya may not allow for full time evaluators. Rather, it is the same people doing other duties in the programme who will engage in evaluation when the need arises. Bhola (1982) advises that short training is preferable to long training. He also calls for training at home within the context of the program rather than outside.

Recommendation 4
There is an urgent need for capacity building in the whole evaluation process. The personnel need to be trained especially on instrument development, data collection and analysis. Any errors in these three critical stages would render the whole evaluation process a futile exercise as the results so obtained would be misleading.

Recommendation 5
a) Organizations should establish in-built-evaluation mechanisms. Training of staff members on how to conduct evaluations may be expensive to start with but would prove cost effective in the long run.
b) Organizations could pull resources (human, financial and material) for evaluation purposes.
c) There is a need to develop national evaluation guidelines to guide the process. Each of the organizations would then adapt this national evaluation guideline to their unique circumstances.

Recommendation 6
It emerged that the different adult literacy providers were yearning for a focal point of reference in terms of an adult literacy curriculum and an evaluation mechanism. The buck stops at the door of the DAE. The BAE Act (1967) mandates it with the role of coordinating adult literacy programmes in the country. However, if the DAE is to discharge this role effectively, its capacity needs to be enhanced.

Recommendation 7
a) The DAE in liaison with KIE should evaluate the existing myriad Adult Literacy Curricula with a view to developing a national curricula but adaptable to different environments.

b) The DAE should hasten the development of the National Qualification Framework for Adult Literacy learners. The framework should be equivalent to the one used in the formal education system.

References


