

Workshop Report

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The workshop on Diversifying Educational Delivery Systems was a collaborative initiative of the:

- *Commonwealth Secretariat/ADEA Working Group on Non-formal Education* (WGNFE: see Appendix 2),
- *Royal Netherlands Embassy in Pretoria, South Africa,*
- *Education for Development in Reading (Efd) and*
- *Educational Research Network in East and Southern Africa (ERNESA).*

It was held in Gaborone, Botswana between the 23rd and 26th of June 1999, and it should contribute to the discussions and future programme of the WGNFE, ERNESA, the SADC Human Resources Development Unit (SADC/HRD), and other stakeholders. Thirty people from Botswana, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lesotho, Namibia, South Africa, the United Kingdom, USA, and Zambia participated.

The workshop was jointly funded by the ADEA Working Group on Non-Formal Education and the Royal Netherlands Embassy in South Africa.

1.1 Workshop Theme

Education is one of the key responsibilities of the State. The State is required to ensure the provision of education, which ideally should deliver equity, quality and relevance. If this is achieved, two key objectives will be met: first, the people, the human resources in the country, will have a sound foundation of *basic knowledge and skills* and second, it will contribute to what Cream Wright called *the perceived integrity of society*, which is the basis for commitment to society and consent within it. In other words, the basis for peace and prosperity.

At Jomtien in 1990, countries across the world endorsed the commitment to achieving Education for All, and the Framework for Action to meet the needs for *basic education*. This was generally interpreted as *conventional primary schooling*. But this has failed to provide all children and young people with a meaningful and effective basic education experience: not because it is not useful and effective, but precisely because it is not useful and effective *for all*.

Large numbers of pupils are prevented from entering school or forced to leave prematurely because of poverty, of ongoing work activities, social deprivation, cultural differences, and of the sheer irrelevancy of the schooling process. At the same time 'alternative' schemes struggle in the margins of our societies, and while they often prove that they can promote learning more effectively than schools, they also remain unrecognised and thus unsupported.

But this is not about changing from one alternative to another, or about which system or sector is best. The worldwide debate about Life-long Learning has challenged such “either/or” thinking on education. It has introduced greater recognition of multiple and diverse learning needs, multiple arrangements and technologies for 'creating learning experiences', and of the need for a system-wide framework for accreditation of learning outcomes. Consequently the boundaries between formal and non-formal education, contact and distance education, in-school and out-of-school education are rapidly becoming obsolete.

It is one of the current ironies of education policy debates that, while so much effort has been made to experiment with different approaches to education and with different modalities for its provision, so few of the insights gained have been widely adopted into the mainstream.

The challenge now is to determine which modes of provision can best satisfy which needs, and how the integrated diversity of educational provision can be managed.

1.2 Aims of the workshop

The four co-convenors, Cream Wright (COMSEC), Wim Hoppers (The Royal Netherlands Embassy), Roy Williams (Education for Development), and Mmantsetsa Marope (ERNESA) developed a Position Paper, which was circulated ahead of time, and which formed the basis for the discussions. These are the Aims of the Workshop as set out in the Position Paper (the full version of the Position Paper is attached in Appendix 1). The Aims were:

1. To initiate a process of bringing together the very considerable collective knowledge and experience in non-formal education in Africa, enabling this to contribute to systemic educational reform.
2. To provide a forum for taking stock of current ideas, policies, practices and management arrangements of non-conventional education provision, in relation to the overall demand for education, particularly in the ESA region.
3. To explore the desirability and the potential for interfacing, within the context of LLL, between different types of provisions, notably formal education, non-formal provisions, adult education and distance learning.
4. To develop proposals for action under the auspices of the WGNFE and / or other regional organisations such as SADC/HRD and ERNESA in the following areas:
 - Enhancement of the work program of the WGNFE and the potential fortification of the budding country working groups.
 - Further research on specific cases of non-conventional provisions for basic/ continuing education and training, with a particular focus on their interface with the formal system.

- Working out implications for policy development, planning and management of diverse demands for, and modalities of, education provision.
- Working out implications for strategic resource planning for the attainment of EFA
- Initiating advocacy and policy dialogue within the region on issues of interfacing and integrating diverse modes of educational provision.
- Co-ordinating dissemination of information on, and support for ongoing and new initiatives in interfacing non-formal and other forms of non-conventional education with the formal system.
- The establishment of a small appropriate mechanism to develop the network, and to facilitate and guide the above agendas.

2.0 PRESENTATIONS

A number of presentations were made on the first day, and at the beginning of the second day:

- *Issues in Policy and Provision of Non-Formal Basic Education in East and Southern Africa*: Tonic Maruatona.
- *Case Studies of Provision* from various countries: Jean Pease (Cape Town), Jenny Rabinowitz (Johannesburg), Puleme Lefoka (Lesotho), Elizabeth Mumba (Zambia) and Sebo Indabawa (Namibia).
- *The Learning Nation*: Justin Ellis.
- *Interfacing RFE and OL Provisions with Mainstream Education in the context of Emerging Conceptualisations*: Frank Youngman.
- *Reviewing Operational Dimensions of Linkages in Light of Emerging Practice*: Wim Hoppers.
- *Managing Integrated Diversity*: Roy Williams.

A number of issues arose out of these presentations. There was general agreement that the three key issues in education: equity, relevance and quality are not being adequately satisfied, and Education for All has not been achieved, partly because it has indeed been interpreted (with some exceptions) as *more of the same* – i.e. more conventional primary schooling, or *morning learning* as one might call it.

2.1 Equity

At the heart of the matter is the notion of *equity*. In various presentations reference was made to equity of provision, equity of achievement, equity of participation, equity of opportunity, and equity of outcomes.

From a non-formal educational perspective (which most of the workshop shared) *equity of standardised provision* is not good enough – in any educational sector. It does not work for everyone, and it effectively marginalises large numbers of people from formal education, and then from full participation in society and the economy. It is these marginalised learners that

the “non-formal” sector is expected to support. And even if *morning learning* is *efficient*, and graduates large numbers of school leavers, it is increasingly *ineffective* in providing those learners with the basis for employment, and preparation for life.

The lessons of the older Northern economies have become much clearer in the last decades of the century. Substantial structural unemployment is here to stay; the formal sector will never be able to absorb all the graduates from academic schools, and substantial numbers of pupils who are provided with reasonably good educational opportunities do not succeed – even in school. In the UK for instance, an alarmingly high proportion of children “in care” – i.e. who are the responsibility of the state for one reason or another – do not generally cope at school, or afterwards.

Provision of more (academic) *morning learning* will not solve the issue; it will just create more (unaffordable) schools. If learning opportunities are to achieve equity and relevance *for society and the economy*, they must be managed, funded, and judged, differently. From the point of view of society and the economy, as well as from the point of view of *all* the learners, equity must be defined as *equity of achievement, or outcomes*. Academic schooling must continue to play an important role, and it must continue to be available within life-long learning as an opportunity that everyone can take up if and when they are ready for it. But for most people the crucial outcomes of learning are employment and even self-employment rather than access to further academic training. This is particularly true for African economies, in which the informal sector has become a major economic sector, if not *the* major economic sector in terms of employment.

There is then a need for equity in education to be managed in terms of **equity of outcomes – and not only educational outcomes**.

One of the presenters elaborated in some detail on the links and interdependence between poverty, illiteracy, gender inequality and democratic participation, indicating that a broader and more integrated framework is necessary to address any one of these issues adequately. Equity of standardised educational *provision* does not sufficiently solve the problem of skills and knowledge, or the problem of the perceived integrity of society.

2.2 Flexibility and Responsiveness

These are key characteristics of non-formal education programmes which, partly because they often operate on the margins of education, have to relate differently to the needs of their learners. Their learners are not the *captive audiences* that one finds in schools. Both adults and out of school youth can vote with their feet.

Non-formal education can attest to the value of responding to learners’ needs – in other words, to be led by the *demands* of the learners and the contexts rather than the *supply* of the providers. It is better motivationally and methodologically, and leads to sustained and applied learning. The shift in emphasis from *demand* to *supply* is also in line with radical shifts in

most economies over the past ten years or so, in both the North and South.

Quite a few of the presenters referred to the impact of the global economy. Importantly, the global economy opens up opportunities (and threats) of rapidly changing trade, information, and investment. Within such a changing world, responsiveness to changing demand (and even consumer taste) has become more dominant and necessary. Few enterprises (apart from formal schooling) survive as *single-mode, supply-led* providers. Diversity, responsiveness and the ability to manage change are the characteristics of success in the global economy, and education needs to develop a suitable response to these demands.

2.3 Curriculum and Assessment Development

Many of the presenters raised issues of curriculum and assessment development. There are now quite a few countries, which have more than one curriculum. If equity and relevance are to be judged by outcomes (or output, rather than input) and if a diversity of learning opportunities is necessary to enable educators to be responsive to changing needs, curriculum and assessment development is essential.

This requires a change in the way you think about curricula and syllabi, and how the outcomes of those curricula will be assessed and valued. Some countries are developing different curricula and syllabi, and others, such as South Africa, are attempting to define common, fairly generic curricula which can be satisfied by following different *learning programs*. Nearly all the presenters emphasised the need for an integrated assessment system, providing a single overarching framework of some sort, with clearly articulated links (ladders and bridges) between the parts of the framework. This takes considerable effort and time. But without it, diversity is just another word for marginalisation. And the same fate awaits badly planned and managed *decentralisation*.

There is a need for a single system for accreditation. But it should build on the strengths of formal and non-formal education, not collapse them into *single-mode standardisation*. Diversity in the provision of learning means that accreditation has to include not only a diversity of accreditation bodies, but also the whole spectrum of accreditation, from the most formal to the most *informal*.

In practice this means that although every learning programme should feed into an accreditation framework, *not all learning has to be examined and certified*.

Diversity in assessment must include self-assessment where appropriate. It must also recognise that in the informal sector margins are very tight, and when people start-up in the informal sector, requirements for certification and formal articulation with accreditation frameworks are often both cumbersome and unaffordable. In other words, the learners' immediate need to start-up their commercial activity has to be balanced against their longer term need to articulate with accreditation and, later, with learning opportunities. There is a big difference between an assessment system based on the needs for administering accreditation, and one based on the needs for applied learning.

The question was asked throughout the workshop: What is formal about the formal system, and what is non-formal about the non-formal system? But if we are concerned with the learners' needs, and many of the learners' needs are to be realised in the *in-formal* sector, we need to integrate not only formal and non-formal assessment, but we also need to include *informal* assessment – the assessment of the market and the street – *Jua Kali assessment* if you like. And that gets determined by what people will pay for, not what an assessment committee decides. In addition, the various initiatives in apprenticeships, placements, and “learnerships” which are halfway between informal and formal learning need to be revised and revitalised. In earlier times attachments of some sort provided a major part of education and training. In one sense the value of non-formal education is that it questions the on-going value of specialist, single-mode, education-only institutions, and opens up opportunities for multi-mode institutions to once again become the norm.

2.4 Life-long Learning

Life-long learning, or better still, Life-long Learning Opportunities (or Open Learning) has, as we have said, introduced greater recognition of multiple and diverse learning needs, multiple arrangements and technologies for creating learning experiences, and of the need for a system-wide framework for accreditation of learning outcomes.

What it also does is to radically shift the emphasis from the question: “*what* needs to be provided in education?” to the question: “*when is what appropriate* in the provision of education?” The dominant discourse in education is formal schooling, which assumes that most (if not all) educational provision should be provided at the start of life, and the question is simply *what* needs to be provided. Life-long learning questions that – it questions both *what* is appropriate and *when*, and concludes that expenditure on education must be spread out across the entire life-span, and that childhood can no longer be seen as a period of *pre-service training* for the rest of life.

What it also implicitly does is to open up the crucial (political) question of the balance between *aspirations* and *needs*. In a situation in which learners only have one chance to learn the basics, and that chance is in their early years, they are forced to buy into a system that is premised on their aspirations, and not their needs. The *aspirations* of most people in both the North and South are for white-collar jobs and therefore for academic education. Their *needs*, as any set of economic statistics will show, are for many if not the majority of them not going to be met by that route. And failure within the formal education system can seriously and unnecessarily impede people's confidence to learn outside of academic education.

What life-long learning can do is to keep the door to academic education open for people who would like to keep alive their aspirations for those kinds of jobs in the longer term, but who need to learn other things to earn a living in the short term.

In other words a life-long learning system must not only provide diversity, it must also provide **the framework in which people are no longer forced to forgo their aspirations to satisfy their immediate needs**. And that is something that learners as well as politicians need to know, and need to be committed to, if *diversity* is not to mean the provision of *cul-de-sac* education, and if diversity is to be politically viable.

2.5 Managing Integrated Diversity

Many of the presenters spoke of the need to clearly identify learning outcomes. This is not necessarily the same as identifying the learners' needs, and it does not necessarily fall within the broad definition of *learner-centred* education. The question that has to be answered is: learning outcomes *for what, or even for whom*: for the economy, for the learners' needs, for the learners' aspirations, or for the educators' needs and interests? It is one thing to transcribe existing curricula and syllabi into *outcomes*, but it is quite something different to transform academic outcomes into economic and social ones.

One of the country presentations discussed in detail the additional requirement for responding both inclusively and differentially to these needs and outcomes. So equity and responsiveness to the needs of all learners must be balanced against the need to prepare them for the competitive and exclusive nature of a society increasingly dominated by commerce.

The shift in talking about *education* to talking about *learning* is also interesting. At one level it supports the move away from *supply-led* thinking to *demand-led* thinking. At another level it opens up the whole debate about *education* and *training*, and the claim that *education* should, and can, deliver broad moral and social teaching and learning, as well as the more mundane *skills & competencies*.

What this debate has to consider is whether education, just like religion before it, has to face up to the fact that many of the broader social and moral teachings in society have been usurped by the mass media. This does not mean that education must forego its broader mandate, but it should defer to the dominant media which *tell moral stories* with far more impact, and it should consider focusing more on doing what it does best, and what it has the budgets to achieve.

It is also possible for education to revisit the issue of the values it needs to promote. At a time when knowledge was still being rapidly developed, the value of knowledge and scientific method needed to be promoted as a value in education. What is needed now is the *application* of knowledge, which has a different emphasis, and deals with issues such as ecology rather than chemistry. *Science* itself is now starting to be seen as *potentially in conflict with values* – on issues such as nuclear arms and power, and genetic engineering. It is also worthwhile to examine the relative importance of values such as knowledge and science as against employment, productivity and venture capital and risk – all of which affect equity and prosperity, and probably more so than the pursuit of new knowledge.

There was consensus among the presenters of the need for a diversity of provision, and for an integrated system to manage it. The question that was asked by Wim Hoppers was:

How can we elaborate the vision of an integrated systemic approach to learning that was adopted in principle at Jomtien, by defining in some detail what it takes to develop an integrated system of learning that is fully inclusive, by offering a range of modalities to ensure that all have access to relevant education that equips them for life in their rapidly changing societies and helps them develop their potential?

Part of the solution lies in understanding the nature of the global economy, and the extent to which it opens up opportunities (and threats) of rapidly changing trade, information, and investment. Within such a changing world, responsiveness to changing demand (and even consumer taste) has become more dominant and necessary. Diversity, responsiveness and the ability to manage change are the characteristics of success in the global economy.

In addition, the AIDS pandemic threatens to devastate much of Africa, undermine the development of the economy, introduce even more instability and change, and make unprecedented demands on education, health and welfare.

Wim Hoppers outlined in some detail what is needed to develop a system to manage integrated diversity. Integration needs to be promoted at three levels: Systemic integration to promote links between sub-systems, Institutional integration to open up multi-mode opportunities for all providers, and Programmatic integration at micro-level to make use of the whole range of learning environments and opportunities.

There is also a need to systematically examine all the various modes of provision, including *morning schooling* and to map them out on a management grid against the full range of target groups. There is a lot of education, learning, and training that occurs outside of the typical Department of Education. It was pointed out that learning is a key part of many if not most government Departments. One suggestion was for a Cabinet Standing Commission on Life Long Learning.

There are some issues that need to be dealt with here. First of all, if integration means co-ordination of decentralised decision making, the mechanism for this needs to be thought through. Government Departments are not known for effective co-ordination as it is, and if the needs and contribution of the informal economy are to be taken seriously (as they must), the question arises as to whether it would not be better to place such a co-ordinating mechanism at arms length from government, which is understandably quite restricted in its focus to the fiscal environment.

This then raises the issues of *leverage*. If diversity is to be managed, but there are few integrated financial lines of reporting, other means have to be used. Partnerships are difficult and time consuming to construct, and competitive commercial factors often make it difficult to maintain them.

One possibility is the growing *regulatory* sector in many newly *open* and increasingly privatised economies, which use a mixture of competition, anti-monopolies legislation, and licensing to regulate competitive markets for goods as well as services. These kinds of changes have taken place in nearly all sectors of the economy in many countries, and state education is in many ways falling behind. It needs to consider the radical restructuring that has occurred in other sectors, and revisit its own vision and the way it is run. In many ways education is the bastion of the historical norm for the civil service, namely *bureaucratic administration*, which is well suited to stable, single-mode, low-risk provision of services. It needs to consider the shifts to *executive management* that have been made in other sectors (and to a minor extent in education), which is better suited to a dynamic, unstable and very competitive markets for services.

This shift, to executive management, requires considerable effort. It needs a new vision and strategy, requires considerable restructuring, and thorough and sustained retraining and ongoing support and mentoring. Education is no longer the exclusive preserve of the State, although the State still has to take political responsibility for it.

3.0 WORKSHOP GROUPS

The second half of the meeting was spent in three workshop groups, and a final plenary session. The groups were asked to discuss the following issues:

Conceptual

If we are to develop a framework for *Managing Integrated Diversity*:

- What are the key elements?
- How would it be different from “now”?
- How would resources be managed?
- How would you advocate the changes?

Structural

- How would the process be driven, including the need for a database, dialogue policy, planning and implementation?
- How can regional expertise be mobilised for the benefit of individual countries?
- How should the whole process be co-ordinated?

The Future

What is the agenda for the future? And what are the issues that need to be investigated and tested and supported, in order to improve the effectiveness and responsiveness of education for everyone?

3.1 Discussions & Report Back.

The workshop reports from the three working groups are attached in Appendix 15-17. The following were identified as the Key elements of an Integrated System:

- Learning in ways that are not formalised in school needs to be recognised as significant, legitimate, organised and also part of a larger system or network. This requires a different mindset.
- The state must ensure that basic education is achieved by all, whatever the means. The state must also accept responsibility for country measures.
- The basic minimum of educational outcomes that everyone should achieve should be well defined. This definition should not create fear that there is a lowering of standards. Indicators of the process and its qualities should also be stated since outcomes are not achieved by magic but by appropriate inputs and processes. The development needs of the country and community need to be considered as well as needs of the learners.
- In the process of defining the outcomes, philosophical and methodological underpinnings such as thinking skills, working effectively in groups, and taking increased responsibility for one's own learning need to be defined.
- Needs assessments and surveys of available and effective modes of delivery and learning need to be done periodically, and different learning programmes need to be worked out for different groups or communities of learners.
- Quality assurance and assessment need to be tackled systemically within a national framework for assessment/ accreditation. Regional harmonisation of key indicators in the short to medium term would be very useful, and harmonisation of assessment frameworks in the longer term is desirable. Different forms of assessment need to be explored, and articulated with each other. There should be recognition, coherence, articulation and mobility of qualifications. Information about the options and paths to learning that are available to different target groups should be collected, through databases for instance, and information about such options should be clearly communicated so that learners and their parents can make considered choices and share in the responsibility for making a success of learning.

- The need for integrating a diversity of modes of provision needs to inform teacher training.
- Institutional change is required. Acting with greater flexibility and creativity means capacity building and decentralisation of responsibility and funds to the nearest possible place where decisions are made. Educational institutions must therefore exercise business management skills.
- Recognition of the demand for lifelong learning (arising out of technological change, social movements, distrust of government, large corporations, and media, and desire for personal growth) should result in new partnerships for education, related to work and income generation (formal and informal), new social roles, and dangers to society such as HIV/AIDS.

Recognition and utilisation of local languages, and multi-lingualism is essential, particularly for the first few years or stages of learning.

3.2 Structures and plan of action for the future.

There should be a stock taking, nationally and in the sub-region. The ADEA working group and its partners should design a framework for research, and an instrument for data gathering. ERNESA should create a sub-regional database.

- There is a need for a co-ordinated and substantive program of research, in a number of areas:
 - Best practices, and how alternative programs satisfy particular needs in particular contexts.
 - Qualifications and assessment frameworks
 - Curriculum development.
 - Ways in which co-ordination and restructuring is taking place, in the way in which formal and non-formal education carry out financing, planning, support services, training, and monitoring and evaluation.
- Shifts in the administration and management of education in a number of countries which are dealing with similar issues.
- Countries that do not already have a national body looking at the full spectrum of organised learning should create such a body, ensuring that all sectors are represented in this body. It should be at arms-length from the State, although it should eventually aim to become an independent statutory body. Regulatory, licensing and other mechanisms need to be explored to ensure that it has authority and leverage in co-ordinating, if not directly managing, diversity of provision.
- There should be sub-regional networks that continue what this workshop has begun, under the auspices of ADEA.

- ERNESA should start an email list serve to continue the exchange of ideas and information. ERNESA should also make the aforementioned databases available through the Internet.
- Resources need to be mobilised.
- Greater efficiency in the whole education system.
- Decentralisation and persuasion of local education leaders.
- Levies on employers that can also be used for training in the informal sector.
- Partnership with extension programmes in agriculture, health, etc. to achieve synergies, generic training, joint use of facilities and staff.
- Partnership with the private sector for staff development, technological upgrading, personal development, etc.
- Partnership with cultural programmes.
- Conditionalities that might arise out of debt relief by the G7.
- Strategies need to be worked out with as many NGOs as possible to maximise impact.
- New ventures should place a high premium on quality rather than quantity so that success breeds success. Sustainability must be carefully planned so that projects are not just a flash in the pan.
- Challenge universities to be more involved with this innovative effort as part of their community service and outreach. Universities should see incentives – e.g. that they can serve more students through ODL with the same resources, and that they are marketing themselves as useful public education institutions. Our vision should become part of each University's strategic plan.

3.3 How can we advocate changes?

- There is a need for a political discourse on future scenarios, about how the need for life long learning, and how lifelong learning needs can be more efficiently met. Reference may be made to such issues as youth unemployment, HIV/AIDS, changes resulting from new gender roles, and other social movements, national qualifications, frameworks, etc.
- Opportunities for synergy could be pointed out, for instance through multi-purpose resource centres, co-ordination of work among NGOs and government and private sector organisations.
- Opportunities such as the proposed UN Adult Learners Week, International Literacy Day, should be adopted.
- The issues should be popularised through articles in the media; a popular book or video should be commissioned by an agency.
- Certain myths should be exposed – for instance that formal education leads to jobs – as these are further impoverishing the poor and increasing inequality.

- Increase the capacity of politicians and other educational leaders to manage change.

4.0 NATIONAL ACTION PLANS

Participants at the workshop committed themselves to a modest plan of action in order to ensure that the integrated agenda for action is put into practice. It was agreed that the integrated plan of action should focus on sustainability and capacity building and also have a long term vision. That is why it was essential to identify few priority areas to focus on in the integrated agenda for action in order to ensure that within the two priority areas excellent work is done and maximum impact is achieved both nationally and regionally. The participants concurred that the areas of focus would be stocktaking, documentation and monitoring models of good practice in NFE and how they can inform formal education and be made to scale. Participants also committed themselves to networking among themselves by establishing an email list server. Namibia offered itself as the secretariat of the listserver.

Botswana

Botswana has just established a national subcommittee on Non-formal education. The subcommittee is planning several activities which fit well within the resolutions made at this workshop. One of the first activities of this subcommittee is to organise a workshop to brief all stakeholders (policy makers, practitioners and researchers) on this particular workshop. The subcommittee is particularly concerned that the out of school education program excludes children and that is why it is giving priority to the inclusion of children in its program. The subcommittee is committed to the diversification of the qualifications framework and may solicit assistance from the WGNFE. The subcommittee plans to engage SADC in a discussion of life long education, especially at the level of policy dialogue, & policy analysis. The research agenda's focus is on the Provision and Impact of NFE on Botswana's Basic Education.

Kenya

Kenya's participants were determined to specially focus on outcome based education, particularly how to assess non formal education learning outcomes. They were also interested in undertaking a stocktaking exercise on the scope of diversity in the provision of non-formal education programs. An example was given of the out of school education program for nomadic children and youth who were taught by teachers who travelled with them. Kenya thought it essential to establish a working group on non-formal education, which would co-ordinate the partnerships involved in integrated diversity.

Lesotho

Lesotho has a working committee on NFE which is composed of government departments, NGOs and two units of the University focusing on NFE. Government has established a position for non-formal education and the mandate of the person responsible is to work towards the formulation of NFE policy as well as producing an NFE directory. It is hoped that once the national policy on NFE is in place, it will 'de-programme' curricula, the monitoring and the supervision of all the diverse NFE provisions.

Namibia

Namibia is in the process of a Presidential Commission on Education & Culture and one of its mandates is to re-structure education and develop an NFE policy and program which includes a Council to monitor the implementation of the plan. Namibia is committed to doing a needs analysis of the NFE requirements of learners across the spectrum and the University of Namibia is in the process of establishing a diploma program on adult education. Namibia is also undertaking research on out of school education under ERNESA, the University is committed to the documentation of good practice in the arena of NFE within the country.

South Africa

South Africa has an inter-ministerial committee on NFE and the National Youth Council too has a critical role to play in NFE. The co-ordination is inadequate because there is a lot of activity occurring in separate ministries. The government plan to establish an NFE subcommittee within the next three years.

Zambia

Zambia announced that they are in the process of organising a national Symposium on *Stocktaking in NFE within the Context of Integrated Diversity in Education*. The symposium is being planned for August 1999. Workshop participants were invited to the symposium because it would be a strategic way of strengthening the integrated agenda for action both nationally and regionally. Zambia already has a working group on NFE, which is in the process of setting up a secretariat.

Appendices

Appendix 1: *Position Paper*: basic discussion document for the workshop: co-convenors of the workshop.

Appendix 2: *ADEA Working Group on Non-formal Education*: information on the nature and activities in the region in the WGNFE.

Appendix 3: *Education and HIV/AIDS*: Paper for the EU/SADC Inter-ministerial Conference on HIV/AIDS in Malawi (1996): R. Williams et al. Tabled as background information.

Appendix 4: *Curriculum Development in Nonformal and Formal Education in South Africa 1992-97.*: R. Williams. Tabled as case study in a hybrid Formal/Non-formal educational programme.

Appendix 5: *NFE as a Challenge for the Diversification of Educational Provision in Zambia*: E. Mumba

Appendix 6: *The Learning Nation: Namibian Policy on Life Long Learning*: J. Ellis.

Appendix 7: *Non-formal Educational Provision in Namibia*: Sabo Indabawa.

Appendix 8: *Reviewing Operational Dimensions of Linkages in Light of Emerging Practice*: Wim Hoppers.

Appendix 9: *Issues in Policy and Provision of Non-Formal Basic Education in East and Southern Africa*: Tonic Maruatona

Appendix 10: *Interfacing RFE and OL Provisions with Mainstream Education in the context of Emerging Conceptualisations*: Frank Youngman

Appendix 11: *Managing Integrated Diversity*: Roy Williams

Appendix 12: *Non-formal Education in Lesotho: current status*: Puleme Lefoka

Appendix 13: *Non-formal Education in Kenya: A country paper*: Abidi Abdullah, Bernard Gachanja and Jedidah Mujidi

Appendix 14: *ASECA: Empowering Adult Learners*: Jenny Rabinowitz.

Appendix 15: Report back: Working Group 1.

Appendix 16: Report back: Working Group 2.

Appendix 17: Report back: Working Group 3.

References:

Education Now: Break the cycle of poverty: Oxfam 1999.

Appendix 1: Position Paper

DIVERSIFYING EDUCATION DELIVERY SYSTEMS: REVIVING DISCOURSE ON THE FORMAL / NON-FORMAL INTERFACE

Position Paper Prepared by

W. Hoppers, R. Williams, C. Wright and P.T.M. Marope

May 17th 1999

Preamble

This document constitutes the Terms of Reference for a regional workshop on the above topic, to be convened in Gaborone, Botswana between the 23rd and 26th of June 1999, bringing together a diverse set of senior actors involved in transformative work related to different subsets of basic education around the East- and Southern Africa region. The workshop is a collaborative initiative of the Educational Research Network in East- and Southern Africa (ERNESA), The Royal Netherlands Embassy in Pretoria, and Education for Development in Reading (EFD) and the Commonwealth Secretariat / ADEA Working Group on Non-formal Education (WGNFE). It is anticipated that the product of the workshop will inform, at least in part, the expanding work program of the WGNFE, ERNESA, The SADC Human Resources Development Unit (SADC/HRD), other stakeholders, and their potential future collaboration.

Introduction

It is one of the current ironies of education policy debates that, while so much effort has been made to experiment with different approaches to education and with different modalities for its provision, so few of the insights gained have been widely adopted into the mainstream. Education systems, especially those of western schooling, have proved to be particularly resistant to change, even when their shortcomings have become so obvious and ideas for reform are so near at hand.

The failure of the EFA—in the interpretation of (conventional) primary schooling for all—of providing all children and young people with a meaningful and effective basic education experience, forces us once again to have a hard look at what is going on under the name of 'education'. But this time the focus should not be on 'what is the alternative?' or 'which delivery system is more correct than the other?' Rather, in this time of the worldwide debate on 'life-long learning' (LLL), attention needs to focus on the increasing redundancy of the very idea of compartmentalization. In a context of greater recognition of multiple and diverse learning needs, multiple arrangements and technologies for 'creating learning experiences', and of need for a system-wide framework for accreditation of learning outcomes, the boundaries between formal and non-formal education, contact and distance education, in-school and out-of-school education are rapidly becoming obsolete.

Reasons of poverty, of ongoing work activities, social deprivation, cultural differences, and of sheer irrelevancy of the schooling process have prevented large numbers of children from entering school or forced them to leave prematurely. At the same time 'alternative' schemes struggle in the margins of our societies, and while they often prove that they can promote learning more efficiently and probably effectively than schools, they also remain unrecognised and thus unsupported.

The proposed workshop is an effort to stimulate a more grounded and systematic debate, related to an agenda for research and action, that takes an 'integrative' approach and thus starts 'activating' the interfaces between different education delivery systems and learning modalities. This is not to arrive at a compromise of uniformity, but rather at a recognition—in policy and in practice—of a wide diversity of education situations reflecting not only alternative modes of participation but also a greater variety of potential mixtures of such modes.

The Workshop

In order to stimulate critical reflection on the above issues, a three-day workshop is proposed, to bring together a group of education specialists, largely but not exclusively from the East and Southern African region, in a bid to consider:

The adequacy of the diversity of the supply of education services in meeting current and future needs and demands.

The quality, relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of current formal and non-formal education 'delivery systems'.

Linkages and interfacing between different delivery systems.

The re-conceptualisation of formal and non-formal education and the relationship between them.

Key ingredients for a broad systemic frame for different 'delivery systems'

The nature and degree of diversity within such a common framework.

On the basis of a new and evolving conceptualisation, to derive implication for policy development, planning and management for the effective promotion of quality EFA.

Implications for the future work programs of ERNESA, the SADC/HRD Unit, the ADEA/WGNFE, other stakeholders and their potential future collaboration.

The emphasis will be on provisions for basic education (incl. training) and continuing education and training.

The workshop would be co-convened by ERNESA, the Royal Netherlands Embassy in Pretoria, the Education for Development in Reading (UK) and the ADEA Working Group on Non-formal Education (WGNFE). It will be hosted by ERNESA in Gaborone, and will be held at the Grand Palm Hotel between the 23rd and the 26th of June 1999. About 35-40 persons, including policymakers, planners, managers, practitioners and researchers, will be invited to attend on their personal and not institutional capacities.

A small team drawn from the co-convenors will manage the event. The team will comprise of Mmantsetsa Marope of ERNESA, Wim Hoppers of The Royal Netherlands Embassy in Pretoria, Roy Williams of Efd, and Cream Wright of the Commonwealth Secretariat / WGNFE.

The workshop will be co-sponsored by the Commonwealth Secretariat /ADEA WGNFE and The Royal Netherlands Government.

Aims of the workshop

1. To initiate a process of bringing together the very considerable collective knowledge and experience in non-conventional education in Africa, enabling this to contribute to systemic educational reform.
2. To provide a forum for taking stock of current ideas, policies, practices and management arrangements of non-conventional education provision, in relation to overall demand for education, particularly in the ESA region.
3. To explore the desirability and the potential for interfacing, within the context of LLL, between different types of provisions, notably formal education, non-formal provisions, adult education and distance learning.
4. To develop proposals for action under the auspices of the WGNFE and / or other regional organisations such as SADC/HRD and ERNESA in the following areas:
 - Enhancement of the work program of the WGNFE and the potential fortification of the budding country working groups.
 - Further research on specific cases of non-conventional provisions for basic/ continuing education and training, with a particular focus on their interface with the formal system.
 - Working out implications for policy development, planning and management of diverse demands for and modalities of education provision.
 - Working out implications for strategic resource planning for the attainment of EFA
 - Initiating advocacy and policy dialogue within the region on issues of interfacing and integrating diverse modes of educational provision.
 - Co-ordinating dissemination of information on, and support for ongoing and new initiatives in interfacing non-formal and other forms of non-conventional education with the formal system.
 - The establishment of a small appropriate mechanism to develop the network, and to facilitate and guide the above agendas.

Appendix 2: ADEA Working Group on Non Formal Education

In order to contribute to the achievement of the goal of "Education for All in Africa, the Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA), established the Working Group (WG) on Non Formal Education (NFE) in 1996. The mission of the Working group is to support the Africa region countries in their goal of Education for All by providing a forum for:

- Developing the non-school and non-formal dimensions of education systems in Africa.
- Reinforcing the countries contribution to overall educational system performance.
- Perfecting the linkage & between education and society that they provide, and
- Developing new and constructive frameworks to strengthen the partnership between education ministries and the many direct providers and beneficiaries of non-formal education.

Immediately after the WG on Non Formal Education was established, it launched a series of research studies. The field studies focused on:

- Developing complementarities between formal and non-formal delivery systems in basic education.
- Identifying of effective patterns of public sector/ private sector partnership and collaboration in the promotion of non-formal education.
- Meeting the local training requirements of effective socio-economic decentralisation.

The studies were conducted in ways that would increase the research capacity of the Africa region through:

- Strengthening the personal and institutional capacity on the continent for policy and applied research topics of relevance to non-formal education.
- Contributing to the African-centred knowledge regarding current conditions and effective strategies in non-formal education. This includes the effective management development of NFE by the African countries themselves; and
- Involving practitioners in the conception, implementation and analysis of studies in participatory and action research modes.

All these studies were undertaken by teams of African researchers from the countries involved with the support of technical institutions located in Africa and/or in countries of the north.