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Executive Summary

This study has been prepared for the African Inter-Ministerial Conference on Literacy, which is due to be held in September 2007. The main purpose of the paper is to analyse the costs of a range of successful literacy programmes, run by government ministries and by international and national non-governmental organisations. The intention is to provide broad recommendations regarding the calculation of programme costs, to inform the planning for LIFE and the regional strategy for the UNLD.

Literature and Policy Review
In Chapter 2, we have discussed a range of factors are likely to affect programme outcomes and costs, and emphasised the desirable inputs to programmes will vary with context. Factors discussed include:

- Teaching methods, curriculum and length and timetabling of courses
- Facilitator characteristics, training, support and utilization
- Payment and Supervision of Facilitators
- Material resources (including books, equipment, venue and furniture, and storage and distribution of resources)

We have also considered the estimates relating to costing currently available, and some of the limitations that surround them.

New Empirical Cost Data from Nine Programmes
New cost data is presented in Chapter 3. Details of nine adult literacy programmes reputed to be successful have been obtained through a combination of web-searches, documentation received from the organisers in response to an open-ended e-mail questionnaire, and some telephone calls. The operational details of the programmes are briefly described, together with a presentation of their cost structures and our calculation of their unit costs. These unit costs vary very widely (at least five fold). Whilst there are very wide variations in these unit costs, we show how the contextual information that we have provided — regarding costing processes and operational details — explains much of the variation.

Discussion and Conclusion
The main conclusion presented in Chapter 4 is that there is a huge diversity in the modalities, objectives, and target audiences of the programmes, which goes a long way to explain the wide range in unit costs remarked upon by other authors. Recommendations are made for what kinds of factors should be taken into account when calculating unit costs; but we believe that it would be premature for any country to pre-define appropriate costing structures, and what is an acceptable range of unit costs, based on this information. Instead, we recommend that each country consider making an inventory of the large scale programmes that exist, or are being developed, as a preliminary to deciding whether or not it is appropriate to impose a costing framework or propose a specific range of unit costs.

In terms of an estimate of the minimum unit cost of making an adult literate, the evidence we have unearth suggests that the minimum cost is much more likely to lie in the region of US$100, than the minimum of US$50 currently stated in LIFE documentation.
1. Introduction

This study has been prepared for the African Inter-Ministerial Conference on Literacy, which is due to be held in September 2007. The main purpose of the paper is to analyse the costs of a range of successful literacy programmes, run by government ministries and international and national non-governmental organisations. The intention is to add to the limited amount of data on costs currently available, and provide broad recommendations regarding their calculation, to inform the planning for LIFE and the regional strategy for the UNLD.

The UNLD and LIFE context

The proposal for a United Nations Literacy Decade (UNLD), running from 2003 to 2012, was endorsed at the Dakar World Education Forum in 2000. It is seen as integral to achieving Education For All through the six goals of the Dakar Framework for Action (UN 2002).1 Within the UNLD, there is particular emphasis on adult literacy and developing a literate environment.

The Literacy Initiative for Empowerment: 2005-2015 (LIFE) was devised within the context of the UNLD and designed to ‘revitalize and accelerate literacy efforts’ in 35 countries with a literacy rate of below 50%, or a population of more than 10 million without literacy competencies (UNESCO 2006: 11).2 For a summary of the strategy, which aims to emphasise accountability, transparency and cost effectiveness, see UNESCO (2006).

The LIFE strategy uses the range of US$50 to US$100 as the estimated unit cost of making an adult literate (UNESCO 2006: 35), and recognises that many of the 35 LIFE countries experience severe resource constraints and will require supplementary financing from external sources. UNESCO plans to contribute seed funding of US$12,464,900 to both the UNLD and LIFE during 2006/07, and at least that amount again for every further two years of LIFE implementation. UNESCO will take a lead in encouraging further support from the international community, including private enterprise such as publishing firms that may provide financial or in-kind transfer of expertise.

The Costing Problem

A number of authors have drawn attention to the lack of information on costs in published evaluations and reports; and highlight that where there is information there are very wide ranges of quoted unit costs (e.g. Abadzi 2003a, GCE/ActionAid 2005, Oxenham et al 2002). Difficulties arise because the costs presented in published literature tend to be reported without details of how each programme operates, and without details of how the costs have been calculated. As a result, it is impossible to know whether like is being compared with like, in terms of programme type or approach to budgeting. This study attempts to increase the evidence base available on costs, by examining programme costs in the context of operational details and budgeting processes.

Both the UNLD and LIFE strategies focus a great deal on building the environment, infrastructure and institutions conducive to long-term literacy maintenance. Thus, in examining the new empirical data, particular attention has been

---

2 The 35 LIFE countries are: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, and Yemen.
paid to the inclusion or omission in budgets of development and management costs, as well as direct programme running costs.

**Report Outline**

In Chapter 2 we review the debates surrounding the impact of programme inputs on quality of outcomes, and consider their potential impact on costs. In the absence of a range of comparable evaluative studies that consider both the costs and outcomes of literacy programmes, this provides important context. Chapter 3 presents costing details for nine reputedly successful adult literacy programmes — obtained through a combination of web-searches, documentation received from the organisers in response to an open-ended e-mail questionnaire, and some telephone calls. Relatively detailed summaries of the programmes have been provided, to do justice to their variety, and so that costing details are not considered out of context. The discussion and conclusions are found in Chapter 4.
2. Literacy and Policy Review

2.1 Desirable inputs to adult literacy programmes

Any discussion of the costs of literacy programmes needs to take place in the light of factors that are thought to affect the quality and effectiveness of such programmes. A brief discussion of these factors and how they may affect costs follows. Of course, the relevance and impact of each factor will vary with the demographic at which a literacy programme is aimed, and the context in which a programme operates. For example, in some countries, the socio-economic situation may be such that the use of volunteer facilitators is viable, while in others it is not; in remote areas, a higher supervisor/facilitator ratio may be required because of longer travelling times; and so on. In other words, the desirable inputs or the ‘needs’ of each programme will vary with context, and this must always be born in mind when generalisations about costs are being made.

Integrating literacy and livelihoods

The extent to which combining literacy teaching with livelihoods training improves the outcomes of programmes is unclear. Oxenham et al’s (2002) documentary review found successful programmes using a variety of approaches to combining livelihoods and literacy, but concluded that those which integrate literacy skills with livelihood training from the start seem most promising. A comparison of programme attendance rates in Guinea, Kenya, Senegal and Uganda suggests that participants may prefer such combined courses (Abadzi 2003b: 66), and one benefit of combined programmes is that they demonstrate very clearly how new skills can be applied, and offer obvious potential for material gains. However, although interviews and focus group discussions with participants in combined programmes indicate that the majority feel more productive, confident and willing to seek new livelihood opportunities, data is unavailable on the comparative impacts of these contrasting programmes on productivity and standards of living (Oxenham et al 2002).

If a combined approach is chosen, livelihoods training must be rooted in the local economic and social context, and this context will change over time, so an initial and ongoing assessment of local needs and opportunities must be included in the development costs of any such programme. Another key factor relating to the implementation of such programmes, that will have a large impact on programme costs, relates to the choice of instructors used. The evidence suggest that providing ‘both livelihood specialists and literacy instructors is more prudent than relying on literacy instructors to undertake livelihood instruction’ (ibid: 3). It therefore seems sensible to expect that a quality integrated livelihoods and literacy programme will incur greater development costs, instructor costs, and materials/equipment costs than a quality literacy only programme.

Multilingualism / language of instruction

The majority of the sub-Saharan countries seeking to increase literacy rates in line with the Millennium Development Goals are multilingual, and it is generally accepted that there are cognitive, psychological and pedagogical advantages to learners acquiring basic reading and writing skills in their mother tongue before embarking on developing literacy skills in another language (Robinson 2005b; Ouane and Glanz 2005). Because language is recognized as integral to cultural identity, mother tongue education is also advocated as a human right (Abott 2000; UNESCO 2005). That said, there are cases where learning literacy skills in a minority language can be more difficult than doing so in dominant languages (Walter 2004 in UNESCO 2006), because of the nature of the language and/or the level of opportunity for using minority language skills in every-day life. In such cases, it may be preferable for literacy to begin in another familiar language rather than the mother tongue.

Participation in wider social, economic and political life often depends on acquiring literacy in an official national or regional language so, in coun-
tries where this is relevant, it is important that programmes offer this progression from mother tongue literacy to official language learning. However, as UNESCO (2005) points out, it is important to ensure that multilingual programmes provide adequate training and learning materials, and sufficient learning time in each language, and do not spread themselves too thinly.

No cost-benefit analyses of moving from a single-language adult literacy programme to a multilingual programme were available to the authors. We expect that developing and implementing a quality multilingual programme will be more expensive than doing the same in a single language — mother tongue literacy and second language phases of programmes need to be properly integrated (UIE 2004) and new materials and training for facilitators need to be developed specifically for each language. In some cases, a new alphabet may need to be devised. However, at the school level, mother tongue education leads to reductions in drop-out and repetition rates, and similar benefits are likely at the adult level.

Alidou et al (2005) suggest that developing mother tongue and bilingual education systems in sub-Saharan Africa may be less costly than is often presumed. A multilingual adult literacy programme should run in parallel to a multilingual primary education system, so the costs of language development, translation technology and dictionaries will be shared across the sectors. The costs of developing training programmes and (re)training literacy facilitators may be substantial but, from the medium term, training and support systems for a multilingual system may add little to ongoing costs. For programmes that utilize a significant supply of centrally produced materials (such as primers), initial translation and printing costs may also be substantial. Once again, however, longer term materials costs may not increase significantly.

**Teaching methods and curricula**

Initiatives to develop and evaluate literacy programmes have not always given teaching methods the attention they deserve. Abadzí (2003a), for example, reports that the World Bank paid little attention to instructional effectiveness within the literacy projects it funded during the 1990s.

Cognitive theory and active learning

Research into the way adults learn suggests that if literacy skills are to become permanent, learners need to be able to read quickly (about a word per 1-1.5 seconds with 95 percent accuracy). In summary, the instant word recognition pathway in the brain needs to be used rather than the slower word articulation and analysis pathways, and this is difficult to achieve in unschooled adults who lack particular neural networks (Abadzí 2003a).

Research into teaching methods based on cognitive theory was conducted in Burkina Faso, by comparing the use of phonological awareness training and rapid reading training with traditional methods. The study concluded that the new methods were more effective than the traditional approach. Phonological awareness training was most likely to be useful early in instruction, whereas rapid reading training was most likely to be beneficial after some skill in phonological awareness has been acquired (Abadzí 2003b).

Cognitive approaches to literacy teaching need to be tailored to individual languages, and their incorporation into literacy programmes will incur development costs, as methods are tested, materials generated and personnel trained. It is possible that teachers using such methods will require more training and initial supervision and, if so, this will be reflected in higher training costs.

Methods such as reading in pairs or small groups increase the amount of learner practice time, and the discussion of pictures and drama relating to texts can be used to enhance critical thinking skills and text comprehension. The Turkish Functional Literacy Programme (FALP, discussed later in this document) utilised such approaches and was developed in accordance with the phonological features of the Turkish language and explicitly recognizes the need for different instructional strategies for adults. In comparison with the ‘classical’ Ministry of Education Programme, it was found that participants completing the FALP showed more improvement in performance, and performed better in terms of word and letter recognition skills, as well as reading comprehension and writing proficiencies (Durgunlu et al 2003).
Context and learner expectations
The importance of ensuring that texts and activities are relevant to the lives of learners is recognised, as is the need to incorporate the use of some learner-generated and locally available literacy materials. However, it is important to note that learners have their own expectations of literacy programmes. Both the history and current context of an area are important determinants of the value learners attach to literacy and the expectations that surround literacy programmes. For example, while much research does emphasise the importance of making curricula relevant to the functional everyday needs of participants, ethnographic research into the Namibian National Literacy Programme found that learners frequently attached a symbolic rather than functional value to literacy (Papen 2005). The research linked this to the previous exclusion of learners from formal education during apartheid, and their need to achieve a previously unattainable goal, and found that it was crucial for learners ‘that the overall format of the classes remained in the spirit of schools and formal education’.

Certification and ceremonies
In some countries, such as South Africa, there may be provisions for adult literacy learners to take part in assessments that are part of the country’s national qualifications framework. The costs to the provider, of entering students for these assessments, may be relatively minor, but they need to be taken into account. Even when courses are not formally accredited, certificates and ceremonies of completion are often very important to students — they provide recognition and celebration of attainment, and help to generate motivation. Once again, although they are likely to form only a minor component of total costs, they need to be factored in to budget calculations.

Length and scheduling of programmes
We would expect the length of literacy programmes to vary according to a number of factors. The higher the level of literacy or language skills being aimed at, and the lower the level of prior schooling of learners, the longer we would expect the programme to need to be. The length of time needed to develop a particular level of proficiency will also vary according to the nature of the language and script in question (Abadzi 2003b) whether the language is the learners’ mother tongue, the teaching methods used, and exposure to literacy in everyday life.

It is important to keep these factors in mind, however, as a guide, in their study of 67 programmes GCE/ActionAid (2005) found that the average number of contact hours for initial literacy was 300 to 400 hours, and that programmes tended to run two or three times a week for several hours over two years. Oxenham et al (2002: 4) suggest that at least 360 hours of instruction and practice is required for basic literacy acquisition for the ‘average’ adult learner. However, few learners will manage to attend 100% of the classes, and this should be taken into account when establishing programme length. In his evaluation of the Capacity Enhancement for Lifelong Literacy (CELL) programme in Egypt, Oxenham (2005) suggests that 400 hours of supported learning may enable the average student to attain lifelong literacy in Arabic. However, given that the average student will not be able to attend more than 80% of the classes, he also suggests that programmes plan for 500 hours of class time.

With regard to the timetabling of classes, it is vital that programmes take into account the needs of learners, which may vary from group to group within any one country.

Facilitator characteristics, training and support/supervision
The literacy facilitator is of paramount importance to the quality or effectiveness of a literacy course. The importance of the educational background, community membership and gender of facilitators are often highlighted, but these are likely to have a limited impact on programme costs. Most important from the costing perspective, are the debates regarding facilitator training, supervision and pay or honoraria.

Training of trainers (of facilitators)
The quality of initial training that facilitators undergo is crucial, yet the training of trainers is rarely given explicit attention in the literature. In his comprehensive review of issues relating to training, Rogers (2005: 18) reports that ‘few
of those who train the literacy educators have themselves received any training for this task... there is virtually no follow-up to initial training of trainers or on-going development programmes'. Clearly, the provision of such training and support incurs costs. Although it may not be the direct responsibility of literacy providers, calculations of the total costs of running literacy programmes within any country need to take this into account.

**Facilitator training**

In terms of the amount of initial training received by literacy facilitators, the GCE/ActionAid (2005) study proposes a minimum benchmark of at least 14 days. Out of 67 programmes, the most commonly reported time for initial training was the equivalent of 3-4 weeks full-time. Some programmes do offer payments or expenses to facilitators for attending initial training (Rogers 2005). Whether this is considered desirable or necessary will vary with contextual factors such as the distances over which facilitators must travel for training, and whether they have another source of income.

The nature and costs of initial training will vary according to the instructional approach taken, and we have touched on these issues in our discussions of combined livelihoods and literacy approaches, multilingual programmes, and teaching methods. The more sophisticated the approaches being covered, the more time (and money) such training is likely to take up.

Initial training should be supplemented by ongoing support and periodic refresher sessions. In the GCE/ActionAid (2005) benchmark study, follow-up to initial training most commonly occurred once every three months, but many respondents felt that informal support structures between facilitators were more important. Respondents also emphasised that supervisory visits should focus on the development of facilitators through constructive feedback and advice, rather than formal assessment. As a result, the report recommends that those who are supervising have a background in training, or that training and supervisory roles are combined. Similar recommendations are made in recent evaluations of India’s Total Literacy Campaign and Botswana’s National Literacy Programme (Yagi 2006; UIE’s 2004).

**Facilitator support and supervision**

In order to fulfil their role, supervisors must be able to reach classes and dedicate enough time to each visit to ensure they are more than cursory inspections. The ratio of supervisors to learning groups will therefore vary with geography, and may vary according to the level of experience of facilitators (on the assumption that less experienced facilitators will need more supervision). Transport costs will also vary with local geography and must be taken into account. As a benchmark, GCE/ActionAid (2005) propose one trainer/supervisor to 15 learner groups (1 to 10 in remote areas) and a minimum of one support visit per month.

**Facilitator pay or honoraria**

While trainers and supervisors are usually paid for their work, facilitators are often volunteers, and receive only expenses (a stipend or honorarium). Currently, most literature argues that facilitators should be paid, in the interests of justice and quality, efficiency and sustainability. UNESCO (2005: 227) argues that a coherent policy on remuneration is needed at the national level: ‘one that allows for diversity but encourages payment of enough to live on’. Abadzi (2003a: 21) argues that the World Bank’s Human Development Network expects teacher salaries in formal education to be 3.5 times a country’s per capita income so, to sustain literacy programs, the same guidelines should apply to literacy teachers. GCE/ActionAid (2005) argues that facilitators should be paid at least the equivalent of the minimum wage of a primary school teacher for all hours worked (including time for training, preparation and follow-up).

The majority of programmes in sub-Saharan Africa fall well short of such ideals. Even if we assume that: 1) the additional costs incurred by increasing pay would be somewhat offset by reductions in the costs of recruitment and training, as facilitator turn-over rates decline; 2) that (better) paid facilitators are likely to animate more groups, which will also reduce recruitment and training costs; and 3) that programme quality improves as facilitators become more experienced and provide greater stability to learner groups, such a policy will surely lead to substantial increases in programme costs, even per successful learner.
Facilitator motivation depends on much more than pay. Yagi (2006) concluded that in the context of India’s Total Literacy Campaign, where all facilitators are volunteers, it was lack of recognition and appreciation by the authorities that made it difficult for facilitators to maintain their commitment. Facilitators for the FALP in Turkey receive a stipend but no pay, and the programme creators argue that the high quality of training and support offered enables them to work with volunteers (Durgunlu et al 2003). However, it should also be noted that the majority of their volunteers are young professionals, one assumes with another means of financial support. In other words, those already receiving a regular and adequate salary, or family support, are in a better position to volunteer.

This links to another question: whether school teachers should be encouraged to become literacy facilitators in addition to their existing role. When in receipt of a reliable and adequate salary, school teachers may be more able to offer their services on a voluntary basis than many other member of the community. However, high work loads and poor employment conditions may preclude their effective involvement (e.g. Okech and Torres 2005) and there is also evidence to suggest it may be counter-productive, given the different ways in which children and adults learn and the different teaching methods promoted within each sector (e.g. Durgunlu et al 2003). Where school teachers do become literacy facilitators, they will require a similar amount of training and supervision as others.

Learner/facilitator ratio

The size of learner groups has a large impact on the unit costs of programmes. In terms of the numbers of facilitators required, GCE/ActionAid (2005) suggest that there should be a ratio of at least one facilitator to 30 learners. However, generally smaller groups (up to about 25) are considered ideal for more interactive teaching. As mentioned above, the extent to which facilitators animate one or more groups will also affect unit costs.

Material resources

Books/primers (including transport and storage)

The nature of any centrally produced text books and other materials are generally thought to be much less important to the success of a literacy programme than the teaching methods and skills of the literacy facilitators (e.g. Abadzi 2003b; Oxenham 2005). However, a set of appropriately designed and contextually relevant materials will certainly aid the teaching and learning process and, potentially, make outcomes slightly less dependent upon facilitator initiative and skill. The GCE/ActionAid (2005) study found that although learner-generated materials were considered particularly important, a diverse range of materials (functional and for entertainment) should be available. Reading materials are provided free to learners, except in the case of newspapers, and the study recommends that at least one newspaper be provided for each learner group.

Issues relating to the quality and quantity of learning materials are often highlighted in evaluations of literacy programmes. The quantity of provision is primarily a running cost issue, while quality has development cost implications. In terms of quality, the discussions about multilingualism and teaching methods above are particularly relevant, and materials need to be designed (or re-designed) taking these into account (e.g. UIE 2004 and Okech and Torres 2005). In terms of quantity, it may be beneficial for learners if they can take some materials home and, where there are only temporary venues, they may have to. This implies that they will not necessarily last very long. Equally, there are frequently problems of transportation and storage and getting supplies out to classes when they are required.

Venues, equipment and furniture

Venues and equipment are often far from ideal, but especially where there are no formally designated venues and facilitators have the responsibility of finding a suitable place to teach (Okech and Torres 2005). Where this is the case, cost savings may be made, but there must be careful consideration as to whether it is a false economy. Irregular access to a suitable venue will cause significant disruption to teaching and learning activities and, in Botswana, where classes were often held outside, the public nature of them was found to discourage attendance, particularly among males (UIE 2004).
Building a literate environment

The importance of building a ‘literate environment’ in order to facilitate the development of sustainable literacy skills is generally accepted. One of the priorities set out in the Global Monitoring Report Literacy for Life is that policies must be developed that focus on generating literate environments, and not just individuals (UNESCO 2006). The GCE/ActionAid (2005) study proposes that governments should take responsibility for stimulating the market for the production and distribution of a wide variety of materials suitable for new readers, for example by working with publishers or newspaper producers.

The extent to which the private sector, NGOs and governments become involved with the implementation of such initiatives will vary with context. Furthermore, such costs may well be considered part of general social development budget. However, the kinds of initiatives that may require investment, regardless of the source of funding, are community resource centres (see UIE 2004), subsidised multilingual publication production and distribution; and the training of authors, editors and other publishing professionals.

Management issues and national infrastructure and institutions

As well as development costs, literacy providers incur central administrative and management costs, and these must also be taken into account when calculating the full costs of a programme. In addition, most governments will incur costs relating to policy formulation and implementation, and programme coordination or management, even when they do not directly provide literacy courses themselves.

The discussion in the sections above highlights many factors which are beyond the control of most individual providers, or which would be very inefficiently addressed by providers individually. In doing so it makes clear the importance of the government role to provide an enabling framework in which individual programmes can operate.

A priority of the Global Monitoring Report (2005) states that ‘Governments must clearly define responsibility for adult literacy which is often diffused across several ministries, and involves many partnerships with other organisations.’ The governments of Burkina Faso, Namibia and Senegal are three examples of countries that over the last 10 years or so have re-defined responsibilities for non-formal adult literacy through a process of decentralisation. Such institutional change requires research, management and administration, which cost money, especially when international consultants are employed to formulate and oversee change. Whatever system is developed, it is important that it is created to be adaptable to changing conditions and needs i.e. fits within broader and longer-term view for life-long learning.

2.2 Estimates of unit costs

The review above indicates the potential elements of literacy programmes that contribute to unit costs, and suggests areas where increased investment may lead to increased effectiveness. Recent figures on the unit costs of literacy programmes are not widely available, and cost-effectiveness estimates are even harder to come by.

Oxenham (2006) reviewed a number of NFEA programmes in which the World Bank had been involved and found the range of unit costs presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range of unit costs per initial enrollee</td>
<td>US$5.46–$57.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of unit costs per completer</td>
<td>US$11.73–$73.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of unit costs per “success”</td>
<td>US$11.73–$76.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are concerned that these estimates did not always make allowance for some management and infrastructure and in-kind costs, and that their may well have been other (non-Bank) inputs to the programmes that have not been taken into account.

The GCE/ActionAid (2005) benchmarking survey added considerably to the costing data available for a range of current programmes, and the results also show wide diversity across and within regions. The range of costs per learner in Africa
is US$20-$118, in Asia is US$16-$45 and in Latin America is US$19-$167. There are equally wide ranges for costs for “successful” learners (US$31-$178, US$18-$40 and US$27-$199 respectively). More details for programmes in Africa are given in Table 1.

As the authors point out, the insights provided by these figures are limited. Figures were asked for in US$, and the exchange rates used by the providers to convert their costs were not provided. As Table 1 indicates, most of the African programmes that provided cost details broke down their figures into the categories specified by the survey. However, the budgeting methods of providers vary: different providers will include different cost items under a particular budget heading, and we do not know what indirect costs have been included in each calculation. Without seeing line-by-line budget break downs, we cannot assume we are comparing like with like.

Furthermore, these costs need to be considered in the context of programme design, and an indication of how ‘success’ was measured. Some respondents gave the same figures for costs per learner and costs per successful learner, which is unlikely, and the authors suggest it may be that practitioners refuse to accept that any adult learner ‘fails’ if they are participating in the process.

Table 1: Unit costs and cost breakdowns for programmes that took part in the GCE/ActionAid (2005) benchmarking study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme/Country</th>
<th>Prog. Dev. Costs</th>
<th>Learning materials</th>
<th>Staff costs</th>
<th>Prof. Dev. Costs</th>
<th>Management costs</th>
<th>Unit Costs ($) per enrollee</th>
<th>Unit Costs ($) per successful learner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ActionAid International, Tanzania</td>
<td>$9.78 19.5%</td>
<td>$11.41 22.8%</td>
<td>$15.76 31.5%</td>
<td>$8.15 16.3%</td>
<td>$4.89 9.8%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAEA, Angola</td>
<td>$1.12 3.7%</td>
<td>$5.58 18.4%</td>
<td>$22.89 75.6%</td>
<td>$0.67 -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Skills Dev. Project, Gambia</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Action Forum, Zambia</td>
<td>$7.84 35.4%</td>
<td>$1.72 7.8%</td>
<td>$2.86 12.9%</td>
<td>$5.71 25.8%</td>
<td>$4 18.1%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ActionAid, Ghana</td>
<td>$0.33 1.6%</td>
<td>$1.67 8%</td>
<td>$13.33 64.5%</td>
<td>$1.67 8%</td>
<td>$3.33 16.1%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa Educational Trust, Somalia</td>
<td>$1.67 6%</td>
<td>$14.58 52%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5 18%</td>
<td>$6.67 23.8%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSTAN, Senegal</td>
<td>$1.67 5.2%</td>
<td>$5.83 18.4%</td>
<td>$17.5 55.2%</td>
<td>$3.33 10.5%</td>
<td>$3.33 10.5%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TINTUA, Burkina Faso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPID, Kenya</td>
<td>$0.50 1.2%</td>
<td>$5 11.8%</td>
<td>$30 70.6%</td>
<td>$1 2.3%</td>
<td>$6 14.1%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeunesse et Developpement, Mali</td>
<td>$5.98 10.8%</td>
<td>$11.96 21.6%</td>
<td>$21.53 39%</td>
<td>$9.57 17.3%</td>
<td>$6.22 11.2%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work for Rural Health, Malawi</td>
<td>$7.66 12.2%</td>
<td>$0.99 1.6%</td>
<td>$49.05 78%</td>
<td>$1.06 1.7%</td>
<td>$4.16 6.6%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADRA, Sudan</td>
<td>$8.68 11.6%</td>
<td>$7.55 10%</td>
<td>$50.58 67.5%</td>
<td>$10.16 13.6%</td>
<td>$6.60 8.8%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Witwatersrand, Lesotho</td>
<td>$33.33 28%</td>
<td>$8.33 7%</td>
<td>$41.67 35.2%</td>
<td>$26.67 22.5%</td>
<td>$8.33 7%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GCE/ActionAid (2005) and ActionAid internal project documents.
Because of the other benchmarks suggested by the GCE/ActionAid (2005), and almost universal reports from providers that further investments were needed, as a starting point for discussion they propose that ‘a good quality literacy programme that respects all these benchmarks is likely to cost between US$50 and US$100 per learner per year for at least three years — two years initial learning and ensuring further learning opportunities are available for all’ (GCE/ActionAid 2005: 59, emphasis added). The LIFE strategy chooses an estimate three times lower, and estimates the unit cost of making an adult literate to be within the range of US$50 to US$100 (UNESCO 2006: 35).

### Two more detailed examples

An analysis of costs was provided by a recent evaluation of Egypt’s Capacity Enhancement for Lifelong Literacy (CELL) project, in comparison to the pre-existing ‘standard’ programme (see Oxenham 2005 for a full summary). The CELL project did not use set primers or text-books, and instead put a great deal of emphasis on active learning and training and supporting class facilitators to teach effectively using local issues and materials. Class facilitators were required to be to be secondary school graduates and were recruited after interview and taking an examination. They were paid the same as teachers in the standard literacy campaign; EE140 per month. The course lasted a total of ten months, with most classes meeting five or six days a week — the maximum time spent in class would have been 400 hours. The maximum size of each class appears to have been 23-25 learners. The unit costs, per enrolled student, for each programme are presented in Table 2.

Based on 2004/05 pass rates, the costs per passing student were calculated to be:
- Cost per passing standard student: EE336.40 (US$58.36)
- Cost per passing CELL student: EE672.33 (US$116.63)

The CELL project was more successful than the standard programme: its retention rates and pass rates were about 10-15% and 20% better, respectively. It was also almost twice as costly per successful student, and the evaluation suggests cost savings could be made by increasing the student/facilitator ratio and reducing the amount of facilitator support. However, the quality of the teaching and support provided to facilitators was judged to be a very important factor in the programme’s relative success, and the impact on effectiveness of these proposed measures is unclear. In addition, Oxenham (2005) suggests extending the number of hours for the total CELL course from 400 to 500 hours, and reviewing the CELL policy of not supplying supporting material for reading and writing. Implementing the latter suggestions would add to unit costs per learner (although it is possible that costs per successful student would decrease).

---

3. The resource required by many providers may well increase if they were to adjust their programmes in line with the benchmarks.
Similarly high figures were also found by a comprehensive review of investment in a women’s literacy project in Senegal — Projet d’Alphabétisation Priorité Femme (PAPF), 1996-2001 (see Nordveit 2004 for a full summary). The PAPF emphasised an ‘integrated’ approach, where literacy and post literacy activities (including life skills and livelihoods training) were combined. Courses ran with about 30 learners to each facilitator and covered literacy (for a minimum of 300 hours) and skills training (for a minimum of 150 hours). Courses tended to run for about 18 months. A calculation of public costs is presented in Table 3a below. In addition to these, each participant directly contributed 2,500 FCFA (US$3) in cash or in-kind. 4

The base unit cost of US$50 was the amount, per student, made available to providers contracted to run the courses under the decentralised or faire faire system. It was negotiated with providers and took into account the operational costs of running the courses, the providers’ overhead costs, and an amount for institutional support, which was aimed at encouraging the creation of new providers or strengthening existing ones. Providers could design their own budget within this allocation of funds, and the amount spent in each area varied widely (Nordveit 2005: 276). Other than US$3 contributed directly by participant, the providers added no further funds to this budget, however, Nordveit (2004) estimated that a further US$20 per enrollee needed to be added to cover central investments and management costs.

Nordveit (2005) presents a recalculation of the total public unit costs for the integrated PAPF, on the basis of corrected enrolment data, and using a different exchange rate (US$1=580 CFA). These figures are presented in Table 3b below.

Information on the relative cost effectiveness of programmes is lacking in Senegal, but Nordveit (2004) reports that the literacy performance of learners is higher at the end of a PAPF course than the cheaper PAPA (Plan d’Appui aux Projets d’Alphabétisation), and the much cheaper PAIS (Programme d’Alphabétisation Intensif du Sénégal) is thought to have only minor results. 5

Table 3a: Public unit costs for the integrated PAPF, Senegal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost category</th>
<th>Unit cost (US$*) per</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollee</td>
<td>Completer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic unit costs</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government recurrent costs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment costs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL public unit costs</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Nordveit (2004: 42)

*Note: a conversion rate of 740 FCFA = US$1 has been used

Table 3b: Public unit costs for the integrated PAPF, Senegal, US$*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Official enrollement data</th>
<th>Corrected enrollement data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost per enrollee</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per completer</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per successful completer</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* US$1=580 CFA

4. The review also considered opportunity costs but these were considered beyond the scope of this study.
5. “75% of learners on the PAPF can fluently read a text, compared to 68% for the PAPA; and 85% of PAPF learners have a theoretical mastery of technical themes at the end of the course, compared to 67% for PAPA learners” (2000/01 academic year; DAEB 2002 in Nordtveit 2004: 80).
In this chapter, we first present new empirical data provided by five NGOs which either implement or fund literacy programmes. These programmes operate in Ghana, Somalia, South Africa and Turkey. We then present the information provided by government agencies in Burkina Faso, Brazil and Namibia. Finally, we discuss details from a non-profit organisation that does not implement literacy classes, but focuses on developing a literate environment, particularly in Senegal. The programmes' vary enormously, and we have done our best to provide a comparable summary of each one. However, the same level of detail was not always available.

NGO Programmes

3.1 Mother Child Education Foundation (ACEV), Turkish Functional Adult Literacy Programme (FALP)

The Mother Child Education Foundation (ACEV) is a Turkish national NGO specialising in early childhood and adult education. Since 1995 it has worked in collaboration with the Ministry of National Education, through signed protocols, to implement the Functional Adult Literacy Programme (FALP). The FALP was developed during 1994-1995 by Turkish academics at the request of the Government, with the goal of eventually replacing the existing Ministry of National Education programme. In contrast to the existing programme, the FALP was developed in accordance with the phonological features of the Turkish language and explicitly recognizes the need for different instructional strategies for adults compared with children.

Currently, initial training of literacy facilitators lasts from 12-14 days, and supplementary training workshops and educator support meetings take place twice a semester. New educators receive a supervisory visit four times during their first course and others are visited twice. Facilitators are volunteers but receive a stipend of approximately 121 Euro for a four-month course, and are awarded a certificate for their training and role. The minimum requirements for volunteers is that they be high school graduates of least 21 years of age. The organisers experimented with taking on school teachers as facilitators but found they tended to revert to the methods of instruction used with children at school, and ‘resisted the program’s decoding component which started with letters and sounds rather than full sentences to be memorized’ (Durguno lu et al 2003: 30). It is argued by the programme designers that the quality training and continuous support given to facilitators means the additional incentive of pay is not required (Durguno lu et al 2003).

Supervisors of FALP facilitators must also be experienced trainers for the programme. ACEV has a permanent staff of trainers/supervisors paid on a monthly basis, and contracts in additional trainers when needed. It provides 2.5 weeks of trainer training, a 3-day evaluation meeting on supervisions, and continuous on-the-job support for the supervisory process. To qualify for the trainer/supervisor role, individuals must have implemented one entire course themselves, so it takes about a year and a half to qualify.

As a result of a pilot programme, teaching time for literacy learners was increased, and a second phase was developed for graduates of the first, in order to produce more sustainable learning outcomes. Currently, FALP-I includes 120 hours of instruction over about four months, and FALP-II runs for 80 hours over about 2.5 months. FALP-I classes usually run 3 times per week and last about 3 hours. FALP-II classes usually last about 2 hours and run 2 or 3 times a week.

FALP classes and educator trainings usually take place in venues made available to ACEV free of charge (e.g. Public Education Centers and el-
elementary schools). However, occasionally ACEV has to hire private spaces for trainer trainings.

The 2007 budget was based on an estimate of 205 learning groups of 23 students for the FALP-I (4,715 students), and 30 learning groups of 20 on the FALP-II (600 students), making a total of 5,315 students. One volunteer educator is responsible for each learning group so, based on these figures, 235 educators will be involved.

**Costs and financing of the FALP**

As well as providing free training programmes such as the FALP, ACEV offers training on a for-profit basis to help fund its organisation. As noted above, most course venues are provided as ‘in-kind’ donations. However, the majority of funding for the programme comes from international aid (EU), individuals and local or international foundations (the Government does not fund the programme).

ACEV uses a comprehensive listing of cost centres and budget lines to cost the FALP. Comparing the list set out in Box 1 with the programmatic details available, all current inputs to the programme appear to have been included in the budget.

In addition, in their calculations ACEV make a substantial (over 35%) allowance for the in-kind contributions of venue space and heating. Including this in-kind contribution, the project staff (23.9%) and communication and administration budget lines (4.1%) make up 28% of budget. ACEV’s projected budget for 2007 is presented (by main cost categories only) in Table 4.

---

**Box 1: FALP Cost centres and budget lines (2007)**

**Instructor training:**
Volunteers’ Lunch, Stationary for volunteers, Trainers’ accommodation, Trainers’ travel costs, Contract Trainers’ fees, Seminar material.

**Publications/materials:**
Teacher books, Student books, Exercise booklets, Stationary for students and instructors.

**Implementation and Monitoring:**
Travel expenses from head office, Local travel expenses, Accommodation, Meetings, Field Study travel, Volunteer stipends, Supervisors’ fees.

**Facilitating Support Mechanisms:**
Publicity materials, Student and instructor ceremonies, Literacy Briefings.

**Project Staff:**
Consultants, Project Coordinator, Project Expert, Regional Monitors (4), Secretary, Accountant.

**Communication & Administration:**
Office rent, Telephone, Postage (courier, cargo), Stationery and supplies, Consumables, Other services (electricity/heating, maintenance).

**Evaluation:**
Development of instruments, Data gathering, Analysing & reporting.
Using the information provided, we cannot calculate the unit costs of the 4-month FALP-I and the 2.5-month FALP-II separately. We can only calculate the overall programme’s annual unit costs — essentially an estimate of the average unit cost for phases I and II. This is not ideal, because there is a big difference between the numbers of learners in each phase and, any student who participates in the FALP-II has already completed the FALP-I. Based on 5315 students taking part in the FALP during 2007, the programme has an average annual unit cost of either: 65.83 Euros, based on cash costs only, or 103.07 Euros, based on both cash costs and in-kind contributions. However, it is important to emphasise that the cost per learner taking both phases will be considerably higher (of the order of double?).

In terms of running costs, we have found that the budget appears to be comprehensive, and includes the management and personal costs incurred centrally by ACEV for the FALP. However, development costs will have been incurred by the programme that do not show up in this particular budget. For example, in the 2006 budget an additional cost centre for an ‘adaptation study’ was included. If the unit cost had been calculated for 2006, it is likely that we would have estimated a rather higher figure. Research and development costs are an essential part of all programmes, although they will be incurred sporadically. Snapshot observations of budgets must always be analysed with this in mind.

### 3.2 Africa Educational Trust (AET), Somali Distance Education for Literacy (SOMDEL)

The Somali Distance Education for Literacy Programme (SOMDEL) is run by the Africa Educational Trust (AET) — a British NGO — in conjunction with the BBC World Service Trust. It operates in Somaliland, Puntland and south Somalia and involves one partner NGO from each region, including the AET office in Somaliland. The programme was piloted during 2002 and 2003 and, with joint funding from Comic Relief and DFID, was expanded and extended to the end of 2006. It combines weekly radio broadcasts on the BBC

---

8. The programme summary draws considerably from the programme evaluation conducted for Comic Relief by Thomas (2006).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>% of cash costs</th>
<th>% of cash and in-kind contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trainer Training</td>
<td>10,629</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>61,637</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation and Monitoring</td>
<td>79,289</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating Support Mechanism</td>
<td>31,737</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Staff</td>
<td>130,693</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; Administration</td>
<td>22,421</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>349,906</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Kind Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(classrooms and heating)</td>
<td>197,895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>547,801</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Somali Service, with study packs and face-to-face group tutorials. This is a very different approach from the other programmes we consider here, being distance-based and designed for and implemented in a country experiencing a civil war that has devastated its economic, social and political infrastructure.

The programme comprises two levels of radio broadcasts, associated materials and tutorials. Each level runs for 12 months. Level 1 was first implemented during the pilot phase of the programme, and was repeated between April 2005 and April 2006. Level 2 first ran between April 2004 and March 2005, and began again in September 2006. In addition to literacy and numeracy, the SOMDEL courses cover issues relating to health, human rights and the environment.

As part of the preparation for the extended programme, nine trainers were trained (for 60-80 hours) to deliver workshops to the SOMDEL teachers/facilitators. A standardised project management system for the programme was also developed by the AET office in Somaliland and an external trainer. Students completing the courses take a standardised exam. The exam for Level 1 was developed during the pilot. The exam for Level 2 was developed in 2005 by the three regional coordinators and two representatives from the Somaliland Ministry of Education.

Since 2004, 390 teachers have been trained. Teacher training comprised three workshops per year for each level of the programme, the first introducing the programme and teaching methods, the second focusing on feedback and improving teaching methods, and the third on the end of course exam. Supervision of the classes is conducted by ‘outreach workers’ who have received 20-40 hours of training. They report visiting classes at least once a month to check attendance registers for students and teachers, the supply of materials, and that the radio works (Thomas 2006). Although, the outreach workers also have an advisory/support role, in practice this appears to have been a minimal component of visits.

The programme evaluation highlights that teachers used various teaching methods and that the number of hours teaching varied widely between groups. Teachers are not paid a salary but they received a $25 incentive at each workshop and $25 on completing marking their exam scripts. The classes depend on teachers finding free classroom space. Despite valuing the training that they receive on the programme, and the feeling that their experience would be of future benefit to them, all teachers interviewed during the evaluation felt they should receive a salary and/or additional incentives for the work, such as further training.

The development of literacy materials is a central part of the SOMDEL programme. In addition to specific study packs, since 2004, AET in Somaliland has trained staff and community members to write, edit and publish books. So far 64 booklets have been published, 12 written by graduates of the SOMDEL programme ($100 is given for each book published), 12 written as part of an annual story writing competition, and 40 have been developed by AET staff and specialist in Somaliland. 1000 copies of each booklet have reportedly been published and distributed across Somaliland, Putland and south Somalia. As well as distributing these materials freely, copies have been sold at cost price to other NGOs and several bookshops.

In terms of numbers of people reached by phase two of SOMDEL: 7049 students enrolled onto SOMDEL Level 2 April 2004-March 2005, and 90% passed the exam. 11461 students enrolled on Level 1 April 2005- April 2006, 11339 took the exam and 94% passed. These Level 1 students were enrolled in 401 classes run on a weekly basis by 390 trainers. In September 2006, 6000 of those who completed the Level 1 course enrolled on the second running of the Level 2 course. The number of enrollees quickly fell to about 5100, mainly as a result of severe flooding in October/November.

Costing and financing of SOMDEL

As noted above, the SOMDEL programme has been jointly funded by Comic Relief and DFID. Each funder has its own particular requirements for how programme budgets should be reported. The cost centres and budget lines presented to Comic Relief are the most self-explanatory, so we have presented these in Box 2 below. Based on the programmatic details provided, the budget appears to be comprehensive.
Box 2: SOMDEL cost centres and budget lines (2004-2006 budget presented to Comic Relief)

Capital costs:
InkJet printer & binding machine for Somali partners

Running costs:
3 Regional Project managers (Somaliland, Puntland, South Somalia);

Organisational support grants for 3 Somali partner NGOs;
(as % contribution to running costs of partner NGOs including outreach officers, admin & office costs (rent and utilities); communication costs (email, telephone, fax), bank transfers); AET UK Programme Officer (1 day a week project co-ordination)

Project costs:
PIA & ‘Real Literacies’ Community Consultation Workshops; Production of ‘Intermediate Level’ Course with Radio Programmes; Transmission of 200 half hour radio broadcasts; Printing and distribution of SOMDEL Study Packs; Regional Training Outreach for SOMDEL Tutors; Travel & Training Incentive for tutors participating in training; SOMDEL Tape Cassette Collections; Supplementary Somali basic literacy booklets & newsletters; SOMDEL Literacy Promotion Forums & Graduation Ceremonies; Annual Story-Writing Competitions and publishing grants; SOMDEL Examination and Certificates

Organisational development costs for Somali Partners:
Workshop Series 1: Project Management System; External trainer to support development of Project MGT System; Quarterly Progress Meeting for Project Managers & Outreach Officers; Workshop Series 2: Literacy Promotion (writing/illustrating/publishing)

Monitoring and Evaluation:
Monthly monitoring visits, travel costs for regional Project Managers; Mid Term Review & Final Evaluation and Report costs; Dissemination workshops for feedback on final evaluation

UK costs:
Two monitoring visits per year by UK Programme Officer; Management and administration costs (8% of project costs).

Table 5: SOMDEL (Phase 2) 3 year budget 2004-2006 (£)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost centre</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital costs</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running Costs</td>
<td>129,039</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production and distribution of materials</td>
<td>225,139</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Costs</td>
<td>129,509</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Development</td>
<td>27,053</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>25,361</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK costs</td>
<td>53,560</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>592,161</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AET’s three year project budget for Phase 2 of SOMDEL is presented by main cost centre in Table 5.

The budget does not allow us to separate the costs of the Level 1 and Level 2 programmes. Again, this is not ideal, because there are different numbers of learners taking each level and most students who participate in Level 2 have already completed Level 1. Counting up the number of enrollees on one of the year-long SOMDEL programme during this budget period (including the 5100 who enrolled on Level 2 in September 2006) gives us a total of 23,610 learners. This gives the programme a cost per learner per year (or either Level 1 or Level 2 course) of £25.08. Based on their figures for exam pass rates\(^9\), we estimate the cost per successful learner per year (or either Level 1 or Level 2 course) of £27.42. However, it is important to emphasise that the unit cost per learner taking both Levels will be considerably higher.

Having been provided with an evaluation of the SOMDEL programme, we have the advantage of knowing whether or not the funds allocated for the project were considered sufficient by the evaluator. Overall, they were. However, venues for classes were considered part of the community contribution to the programme, and sometimes teachers had to pay to secure a space. The evaluation also suggests that providing a larger financial incentive to educators may have had a beneficial impact on the programme. In addition, to develop the role of outreach workers in the way the evaluation implies may be desirable,\(^{10}\) is likely to require extra training and/or an increase in the number of outreach workers. If implemented, these measures would increase programme costs.

### 3.3 ActionAid Ghana, REFECT programme

ActionAid Ghana begins its REFLECT programme in a community after consultations about ActionAid’s development programme and the importance of literacy within it. For each REFLECT circle, 25-30 participants are recruited and two facilitators are selected, based on criteria agreed with community leaders. The facilitators are given an initial 14 days training, followed up by two refresher trainings of 5 days each year.

Facilitators also take part in monthly meetings, where they can share ideas and provide mutual support. They are not paid, but they receive a bicycle and other material incentives. As with all REFLECT circles, the majority of materials are learner generated.

Ideally, each circle will run for two years, and meet for 1.5 to 2 hours three to four times a week. As a guide, the REFLECT mother manual suggests that participants may be able to acquire basic literacy skills within about 200 hours, emphasises that it is desirable for participants to continue for longer in order to consolidate what they have learnt.\(^{11}\) Over two years, it is likely that most ActionAid Ghana circles will meet for a total of at least 400 hours. Certificates are provided for graduates of circles which successfully run for a 2 year period.

The circle’s activities are incorporated into wider development activities in the area, and each community sets up a Literacy Committee of 7-9 members (men and women) to assist the circle in its development operations. Normally PRA sessions are conducted by the wider community members with the help of the REFLECT facilitators, however, reading and writing activities are focussed on only the 25-30 participants of the circle.

**Costs of ActionAid Ghana’s REFLECT programme**

The budget provided by ActionAid Ghana indicates the annual costs of the REFLECT programme they run in Greater Accra. They run REFLECT programmes in six regions of the country and budgets for each vary slightly, particularly in relation to facilitator motivation costs. It should also be noted that ActionAid Ghana funds other NGOs in Ghana run REFLECT programmes, and the budgets for these vary too, depending on operational detail and context.

---

9. The exam pass rate for the first cohort of Level 2 students was 90%. We use this as an estimate of the pass rate for the second cohort.

10. By increasing potential for advice/support, redistribution of materials according to class sizes across regions.

11. An online version of the REFLECT Mother Manual can be found at [http://www.reflect-action.org/resources/publications/mothermanual/contents.htm](http://www.reflect-action.org/resources/publications/mothermanual/contents.htm)
The budget presented here is based on 10 circles, 20 facilitators and about 250 learners in total. The cost centres and budget lines used by the programme are set out in Box 3 above.

A summary of the budget by main cost centres is presented in Table 6, along with annual unit costs per learner. Based on a total of 250 learners, the unit costs of the programme are 560,328 Cedis per participant per year (544,328 Cedis per year if monitoring and evaluation costs are not included). Ideally, circles run for two years, so the unit costs for the entire two-year programme will be double: 1,120,656 Cedis.

On the basis of the programmatic details we have, the ActionAid budget appears to include all of the running costs of the programme. However, pre-REFLECT preparation costs (background research and promotion) are not included because they are considered part of ActionAid’s general development activities within a community. Similarly, post literacy activities are not included in the budget, because graduates are encouraged to link up with Ghana’s non-formal education unit to continue to advance their literacy skills. Finally, although ActionAid staff time for monitoring and evaluation is accounted for, none of ActionAid Ghana’s central administrative and facilities costs are included within the budget.

### 3.4 South Africa REFLECT Network (SARN)

The South Africa REFLECT Network (SARN) was formally registered in July 2005. It is not responsible for implementing literacy programmes itself, but it supports other organizations to use the REFLECT approach in a wide range of development and educational initiatives. SARN currently supports eight member organisations based in...
six regions of South Africa, and networks with an additional 15 partners across southern Africa (SARN 2006).

SARN’s key activities are training of trainers and facilitators, providing financial support to members, and activities focusing on learning and exchange. Its training of trainers courses and training for new facilitators last 2-4 weeks. It also provides facilitator refresher training (1 week courses) and thematic training on issues such as HIV and AIDS. In terms of learning and exchange, SARN organises and funds cross-national and sub-regional exchange visits between facilitators and between participants, and conducts a range of research and advocacy activities relating to the use and promotion of the REFLECT approach in the southern African context.

**Table 7: SARN Partner Projects – Provisional Maximum Scaled-up Grant Allocations Per Year, in Rand (for 2007)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>1 circle (Max amounts)</th>
<th>2 circles (Max amounts)</th>
<th>3 circles (Max amounts)</th>
<th>4 circles (Max amounts)</th>
<th>5 circles (Max amounts)</th>
<th>6 circles (Max amounts)</th>
<th>7-10 circles (Max amounts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator Training (per new facilitator)</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce Reflect to community (catering, materials) New circle(s)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop facilitator’s manual</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator’s honoraria (max R600 p/m p/p x 10 months)</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management Support</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery/materials (circles)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review/evaluation</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin &amp; transport (infrastr.)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator monthly workshops (10 p/a)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone &amp; transport (facilitators/circle members)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed funding for circle actions to go forward (used at partner org. discretion)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,350</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,950</strong></td>
<td><strong>75,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>91,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>121,250</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (Contingency/round up)</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>61,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>76,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>92,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>122,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some budget items may not be required in a specific grant year but other costs will be considered e.g.: staff recruitment costs, networking, bank charges (within the limits of the total grant per circle running)

12. SARN seeks funds from donors to support their own operational needs as well as to support their partners to run REFLECT programmes. Their partners are also expected to raise funds independently.
ule of maximum grants that they are prepared to allocate to each of their partners, for various components of running a REFLECT programme during 2007.

The provisional funding criteria SARN has set to be met by those organizations receiving this funding include:

- Baseline data is collected, documented and up-dated when appropriate.
- Facilitators are trained facilitators (minimum of 2 weeks residential course)
- Facilitators attend a minimum of one refresher training per annum.
- In-house workshops take place and are documented (a minimum of 8 per annum).
- Each circle has a minimum of 8 participants (ideally 10-20). Where there is the minimum number, membership should increase over the year of the grant.
- A minimum of 5 learning units are written per annum; used and shared with SARN.
- All circle meetings are documented, monitored and evaluated.

In Table 8 we have estimated the unit costs of the REFLECT programmes funded by SARN, assuming an average number of 15 participants per circle. Depending on the number of circles run by the partner organisation, unit costs per learner per year will vary from about 813 to 1667 Rand. If circles continue for a second year, these costs are likely to double.

The grant allocations used are based on the requirements of new circles, and the costs of some of the grant items listed in Table 7 may be lower in subsequent years. However, as was noted in the table, SARN will consider funding other items as long as the total grant allocation is not exceeded. Partners are required to apply to SARN for facilitator annual refresher training through a separate proposal process, so the costs of this are not included in Table 7. Annual refresher training is not included in Table 7, because partners apply for such funding from SARN through separate proposals. Also, no grant allocations for facilitator or participant exchanges are provided. Additionally, the real costs of running these REFLECT programmes will include a portion of the administrative and coordination costs incurred by SARN itself, and it is possible that the providers of the REFLECT programmes (SARN’s members) augment SARN’s grants with funds raised through other sources. Bearing these factors in mind, on balance, it is likely that our estimates of unit costs per learner are an underestimate of the total costs incurred in running the South African REFLECT programmes.

### 3.5 SHARE Adult Education Centre, Western Cape, South Africa

SHARE Adult Education Centre is an NGO that was established in 1990 and operates in the Helderberg region of the Western Cape, South Africa. It implements a wide range of programmes for learners who travel from within a radius of 15 km to the SHARE centre. Here we consider its Adult Basic Education and Training (ABET) courses which, at certain levels, aim to provide learners with basic literacy and numeracy skills. However, the courses fall under the General Education and Training section of the National Qualifications Framework and, as such, are part of the formal education system. Standards are set out by the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA), and learners are able to participate in nationally accredited examinations so they have access to the General Education and Training Certificate.

**Table 8: Estimated unit costs of SARN-funded REFLECT circles, per year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>1 circle (Max amounts)</th>
<th>2 circles (Max amounts)</th>
<th>3 circles (Max amounts)</th>
<th>4 circles (Max amounts)</th>
<th>5 circles (Max amounts)</th>
<th>6 circles (Max amounts)</th>
<th>7-10 circles (Max amounts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units assuming</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>1162 - 813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 participants per circle</td>
<td>(957 average)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. This section draws on personal communication with Lin Helme.
14. SHARE programmes not considered here include child development (Educare courses), computer literacy, sewing and a Reflect community development project, which focuses on young people and issues relating to child rights.
15. See [www.saqa.org.za](http://www.saqa.org.za) for more details.
General Education and Training for adults is taught in 4 Levels in South Africa. SHARE offers ABET Levels 1-3 in Afrikaans Mother Tongue, Xhosa Mother Tongue, Numeracy and English as a Second Language; and ABET Level 4.

Although ‘Unit Standards’ and ‘Specific Outcomes’ are set by the SAQA, there is no curriculum as such, and ‘this is problematic for many educators who do not have the resources and creativity to develop their own learning programmes. However, it also breaks away from slavishly following books and book learning’ (Lin Helme, personnel communication). SHARE does not undertake the initial training of its educators, but mentors them as much as possible and encourages them to undergo additional training offered by other organisations, including the Department of Education. Supervision is conducted by SHARE staff, who observe classes and run quarterly workshops to discuss issues, introduce new topics and develop new approaches. SHARE currently pays educators R180 per 2 hour lesson.

The language courses generally involve 160 hours instruction over 40 weeks (about 4 hours per week over about 10 months). Numeracy classes generally involve 80 hours instruction over 40 weeks (about 2 hours per week over about 10 months). A typical Level 1-3 learner will be involved in 6 hours of instruction per week. The target number of learners per class is about 15, but numbers may range from 5 to 25 – a reflection of the fact that participant numbers fluctuate during the year. SHARE funds learner transport home from classes, on the basis that learners would otherwise not be able to attend.

During 2007, SHARE plans to run 1 class at each of the 3 Levels of Afrikaans; 1 class at each of the 3 Levels of English; 1 class in basic English oral communication; 1 class at each of the 2 Levels of Xhosa; and 1 class at each of the 2 Levels of Numeracy. One tutor runs each class. In addition, there will be 1 Level 4 class, involving 4 different tutors.

Costs and financing of SHARE ABET

Despite having a wide range of income sources the majority of SHARE’s funding comes from donations (about 60%) and the Western Cape Education Department (about 30%). Student fees make up about 1% of SHARE’s income (SHARE Year-end Financial Statements 2005).

SHARE makes separate budget estimates for each subject in its suite of ABET courses. General administrative running costs for SHARE and staff costs for all of SHARE’s programmes are budgeted separately. The cost centres it uses for these components of its work are set out in Box 4 below. Comparing this list with the programmatic details available, it appears that all current inputs to the ABET courses have been included in the budget.

Box 4: SHARE ABET Cost centres and budget lines (2007)

Each ABET subject area: Tutors, Taxis (learner transport home), Materials (texts, photocopies, resource documents), Stationery (books, pens, paper), Venue Rental*, Training (staff workshops & development), Functions (adult learners’ week, certificate ceremony)

SHARE Administration:
Telephone and fax, Stationery, Advertising, Rentals, Refreshments, Legal, Audit, Insurance, Sundry (Transport to meetings, Annual Report, Workmen’s Compensation, Subscriptions, Office Equipment)

SHARE Education and Skills Co-ordination:
Co-ordinator, Educational Co-ordinator, Community Fieldworker, Administrator.

*Venue rental is only necessary for the Xhosa Mother Tongue courses
SHARE’s projected budget for 2007 is presented (by main cost categories only) in Table 9. The Administrative and Coordination costs for the ABET programmes have been estimated by apportioning the total Administrative and Coordination costs in the ratio of the direct costs of ABET to the total direct costs of all programmes run by SHARE. Administrative and Coordination costs then make up 9.4% and 18.9% of the total ABET budget, respectively.

Based on an average number of 15 students per class, Table 10 presents estimated unit costs for each SHARE ABET course.

Table 9: SHARE ABET BUDGET 2007 (Rand)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABET Levels 1-4</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>% of total costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans Mother Tongue</td>
<td>80,650.00</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Second Language</td>
<td>107,250.00</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xhosa Mother Tongue</td>
<td>58,950.00</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy</td>
<td>31,150.00</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>66,300.00</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total ABET direct costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>344,300.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>71.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated support costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>136,204.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTIMATED GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>480,504.46</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The support costs for the ABET programmes have been estimated by apportioning the total support costs in the ratio of the direct costs of ABET to the total direct costs of all programmes.

Table 10: SHARE: Estimation of unit costs per year (essentially per 10 month course) (Rand)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABET Levels 1-4</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>No. classes students</th>
<th>Estimated mean no. (direct costs only)</th>
<th>Unit cost: (direct costs support costs)</th>
<th>Unit cost: (direct &amp; support costs) (average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans Mother Tongue</td>
<td>80,650.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>2501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Second Language</td>
<td>107,250.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>2495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xhosa Mother Tongue</td>
<td>58,950.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy</td>
<td>31,150.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>1449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>66,300.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>1542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>344,300.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>225</strong></td>
<td><strong>1530</strong></td>
<td><strong>2136</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated support costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>136,204.46</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated grand total</strong></td>
<td><strong>480,504.46</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the overall ABET programme, the average unit cost per learner per course is either: 1530 Rand if only direct costs are included, or 2136 Rand if direct costs and support costs are included.

However, even if a learner does not attempt to qualify for the General Education and Training Certificate by completing all Levels, to achieve basic skills in literacy and numeracy, most learners will complete several of these courses.

A crucial point to make in relation to the costs, that does not emerge from these tables, is that transport costs for learners (taxis home) make up a significant proportion of overall programme costs. Considering all the classes together, transport costs make up 32% of the direct costs and 23% of the estimated grand total. The provision of taxis to transport learners home after classes is considered essential to the success of the programme, given the distance learners have to travel to reach the centre and the dangers associated with travel at night. These taxis costs are only required for SHARE’s ABET courses, and not its other programmes. Because of this, it is likely that we have over-apportioned SHARE’s support costs to the ABET programmes, and this should also be kept in mind.

**Government Programmes**

### 3.6 Ministry of Literacy and Non-Formal Education, decentralized faire-faire system, Burkina Faso

The decentralisation of the non-formal education and literacy sector took place in Burkina Faso after the first Forum on Literacy, held in September 1999. Under the faire-faire system that was adopted, the State is now responsible for the provision of policy and infrastructure, and for the supervision of programmes against minimum standards. Within the Ministry of Basic Education and Literacy (MEBA) a new Ministry of Literacy and Non-formal Education was created, supported by a General Directorate for Literacy and Non-Formal Education (DGAENF) and a Directorate for Research and Innovation in Non-Formal Education and Literacy (DRINA). At the sub-national level, policy, planning and oversight of the programme is the responsibility of the Regional Departments for Literacy and Basic Education (DREBA), Provincial Departments for Literacy and Basic Education (DPEBA), and Basic Education Districts (CEB). The setting up of, promotion and implementation of literacy and training activities tailored to local circumstances is the responsibility of operators or providers (community, private sector and NGO), within this central framework (Tiendrebeogo-Kaboret and Batabe 2006).

The national literacy scheme produced as a result of the 1999 Forum on Literacy includes two learning phases, summarized below (Napon and Sanouzerbo 2005). Learners are declared ‘literate’ on passing an examination at the end of Phase I.

**Phase I: Literacy/Basic Training**, includes two cycles, each 300 hours long
1) Initial Literacy – initiation into the learning environment
2) Basic Further Training – includes more on content. Certificate awarded on successful completion of this stage.

**Phase II: The a la carte training cycle**, includes three options:
- **Option I**: Learning Basic and Functional French (course lasts from 1,200 to 4,200 hours)
- **Option II**: Cultural, Scientific and Technical Training (scheduled for 600 hours)
- **Option III**: Specific Technical Training (varies in length and nature according to learner requirements)

### Costs and financing of the faire-faire system in Burkina Faso

Much of the funding for the faire-faire system of adult literacy provision is channelled through the National Fund for Literacy and Non-Formal Education (FONAENF). Its key roles are the collection and management of financial contribu-
tions, the funding of operators/literacy providers, and ensuring quality of literacy provision through its funding criteria. Created in 2002, it is an association governed by law with members that include the central government, international and national donors and operators/providers. In addition to providers of the national literacy scheme, a range of alternative formulations are eligible for funding through FONAENF. These include, for example, REFLECT programmes and Tin Tua’s Banma Nuara centres, which promote French to literate adults.

Standards and procedures, and grant allocations available through the FONAENF, are agreed through the Association for the Promotion of Non-Formal Education (APENF) – a collaboration of the FONAENF with relevant government institutions and operators/providers. One requirement of providers is that they design their own monitoring and evaluation systems, with clear tasks for each level of personnel – facilitator, coordinators, and supervisors. For Phase I, standards include the disqualification of operators with dropout rates that exceed 40%, and non-formal curricula requirements that require 300 hours of teaching over 60 days (Tiendrebeogo-Kaboret and Batabe 2006).

According to the documents that have been provided, the major items that can be subsidised through FONAENF are as in Table 11.

Table 11: Subsidies available for adult literacy through FONAENF, Burkina Faso (2006/7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount CFA</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial literacy centre</td>
<td>329,155</td>
<td>Construction of facility not accounted for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic further training literacy centre</td>
<td>183,755</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core subject French apprenticeship centre</td>
<td>1,623,450</td>
<td>Operator contribution of 399,000 CFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi domain training centre (Tin Tua)</td>
<td>2,190,000</td>
<td>Operator contribution of 170,000 CFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of running technical and specific training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A la carte training. Costs vary from one subject to another and are linked to agriculture, rearing, health and environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of educational course leaders</td>
<td>22,000 x (No. of course leaders) + 210,000 (provision of trainer)</td>
<td>Training of 21 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support/campaign</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>Rate and travel allowance of coordinator, 7% of campaign budget for operator support and 10% of the 7% operator support for administration management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development costs</td>
<td>To be negotiated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: based on FONAENF technical and financial report, first half-year 2005
Remuneration for facilitators, supervisors and coordinators of Phase II programmes has been harmonised by the Literacy & Informal Education Director General (DGAENF) in collaboration with development partners. The grants available are shown in Table 12 above. A similar process has not occurred for Phase II.

Unfortunately, the data on grants provided does not enable us to assess what items have been budgeted for. Furthermore, the cost data provided is not broken down in a way that enables us to estimate the unit costs for Phase I and the elements of Phase II separately. However, we have been provided with Table 13, which estimates the annual FONAENF support to literacy programmes, per learner.

It is difficult to interpret these figures because of the lack of explanatory data accompanying them, and because they do not separate unit costs for Phase I and Phase II of the programme. However, it must be born in mind that literacy providers receive funding from sources other than FONAENF. Indeed, FONAENF procedures require that communities finance the programmes it supports in kind or in cash in line with minimum thresholds. Secondly, in their discussion of the FONAENF system, Tiendrebeogo-Kaboret and Batabe (2006) conclude that the running costs proposed by the FONAENF are underestimated (especially the cost of classroom equipment and payments to literacy instructors). Third, the FONAENF grants do not take into account any of the central development, administrative or management costs incurred by the government, and Tiendrebeogo-Kaboret and Batabe (2006) highlight the need for more central investment in development costs; for example, the need to develop a literacy and non-formal education information system and overhaul the curricula.

So, although we cannot comment on the unit costs of Phase I separately, the real annual unit costs of an average FONAENF-supported literacy programme is likely to be substantially greater than the annual unit costs presented in Table 13.

### Table 12: Payments available to literacy facilitators, FONAENF (2006/7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Unit cost CFA</th>
<th>Quantity by Course</th>
<th>Total Cost by Course CFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Literacy</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator Basic</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Training</td>
<td>5,000 / centre / visit</td>
<td>5 centres; 8 visits/centre</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>14,000 / centre</td>
<td>25 centres</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: based on FONAENF technical and financial report, first half-year 2005

### Table 13: Annual FONAENF Support per learner in CFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of learners</td>
<td>41,578</td>
<td>80,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>795,650,657</td>
<td>1,469,368,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Cost per Learner in CFA</td>
<td>19,136</td>
<td>18,244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: based on FONAENF technical and financial report, first half-year 2005
3.7 Federal Government of Brazil, Literate Brazil Programme

The Literate Brazil Programme was initiated by the Federal Government in 2003, and reaffirms the duty of the State to guarantee education at all levels as a basic right. The Federal Government is responsible for financing literacy projects that are implemented by States and Municipalities, higher education institutions, NGOs and other civil society groups. The approach allows for a range of methodologies and pedagogical practices, rather than imposing a single model that providers must use. However, the programme clearly defines the elements that should be included in a provider’s pedagogical plan, which is analysed by the Ministry of Education (MEC) team and has to be approved before the project is accepted for financing.

Central policy limits literacy classes to a maximum of 25 students, and literacy courses should be 6, 7 or 8 months long, lasting a total of 240, 280 or 320 hours respectively. However, the vast majority are 8 months in duration. Classes are held 4 or 5 times a week. This is considered insufficient for guaranteeing continued literacy, so the intention is that those who attend literacy classes should continue their studies in Adult and Youth Education classes, which are offered by state and municipal authorities.

Costing the Literate Brazil Programme

International aid contributes very little to the funding of adult literacy in Brazil, and the programmes are limited by insufficient funding (Masagao Ribeiro and Batista 2006). The MEC receives a budget for the Literate Brazil Programme from the Ministry of Planning. It is based on a maximum grant allocation that the MEC will make to literacy providers, which is made up of two types of expenses: 1) the training of literacy facilitators and 2) the payment of literacy facilitators.

Training of literacy facilitators

Funding is provided for both initial and in-service training of literacy facilitators and can be used for travel and other expenses incurred by the trainer and trainee facilitators, trainer remuneration, and instructional materials and other consumables used during the training. Central policy states that initial training of literacy facilitators should last a minimum of 30 hours, and in-service training (which should be face-to-face) should last at least 2 hours per week over the length of a course. For this activity, the implementing agency receives R$40 per literacy facilitator for initial training, plus R$10 per month for in-service training. The total funding available under this category is R$120 per literacy facilitator per 8 month course.

Payment of literacy facilitators

Literal facilitators are considered to be volunteers, but grants are provided in order to reimburse expenses incurred during the implementation of classes. The implementing agency is provided a fixed sum for this of R$120 per month per class group, plus R$7 per month for each person in the class group.

In Table 14, we present these grant allocations and calculate the grant allocation per student. Based on an average class size of 20, and an 8 month course, the grant allocation per learner is about R$110 (R$108 if the facilitator is not new). Note that each facilitator usually teaches just one course.

The difficulty presented by these figures is that the government grants only cover the very basic costs of literacy programmes. In the majority of cases, partners also obtain other resources to cover items not included in central government funding, for example, payment of facilitator supervisors and programme coordinators, teaching materials, student stationery, refreshments and transport. Some partners obtain considerable additional funds, which more than double those

---

19. This section draws from a written summary of the programme provided by Timothy Ireland.
20. Information on these elements can be found at www.mec.gov.br. For example, providers are required to carry out a diagnosis of local reality before developing a plan and teaching and learning exercises should be grounded in everyday life experiences. The training of literacy promoters should include issues such as different conceptions of literacy programmes and their respective methodologies.
21. The courses remain essentially the same in character independent of their duration.
22. Based on a group of 20 students, this is currently about 75% of the minimum wage.
provided by the MEC. Others, however, operate with little extra support. As a result, the direct running costs for each programme are likely to fall somewhere within the range of R$110 to R$220 per student, per 8 month course.

However, this cost range does not take into account any of the costs incurred centrally by the government, for developing, evaluating and providing the infrastructure and institutional framework, which enables the programme to run. Unit costs that took these expenses into account would be considerably higher.

3.8 Directorate of Adult Basic Education (DAE), National Literacy Programme, Namibia (NLPN)

According to the Constitution and national educational policy, the Government of Namibia is responsible for providing basic education to all residents, including adults. Namibia’s National Literacy Programme (NLPN) was launched in 1992. The programme has three stages through which learners can progress, and the curriculum is centrally determined and common to all adult learning groups.

The Namibian Government, through the Directorate of Adult Education (DAE), is the main facilitator of the programme, and contributes to the infrastructure around which it operates. It manages policy, planning and oversight of the programme through a series of Literacy Committees at national, regional, district and class level, which mobilise, motivate, encourage and support literacy activities in the community. Regional and district education officers fulfil a similar role. The DAE’s core activities relating to the literacy programme include:

- Developing the curriculum and designing and supplying learning materials without charge. Producing primers through a tendering process.
- Training of staff (trainers, facilitators, and those responsible for the coordination/management of the programme).

In addition to the NLPN, the DAE also oversees the Adult Upper Primary Education (AUPE) programme, which is conducted in English. And in recent years, adult literacy activities have been expanded to include a) adult skills development for self employment b) community learning

---

23. This section draws on information from the South African Institute for Distance Education website www.logos-net.net/ilo/150_base/en/topic_n/t6_nam.htm (accessed Oct 06)

---

Table 14: Maximum government grant allocation for the Literate Brazil Programme, 2006 (based on a class of 20 pupils lasting 8 months)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training of Literacy Facilitators</th>
<th>Grant allocation R$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Training (R$40 per literacy facilitator)</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing/In-service Training (R$10 per literacy facilitator per month)</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total facilitator training grant</strong></td>
<td><strong>120.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payment of Literacy Facilitators</th>
<th>Grant allocation R$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed amount (R$120 per month, per facilitator)</td>
<td>960.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable amount (R$7 per month, per student)</td>
<td>1120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total facilitator payment grant</strong></td>
<td><strong>2080.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total grant | 2200.00 |
| Grant per student | 110.00 |
and development centres, and c) family literacy’ (GoRN 2006: 57). The DAE also channels Government funds to the Namibian Literacy Trust, which supports alternative non-government-run literacy activities, and NAMCOL (The Namibian College of Open Learning), which trains some personnel involved in adult literacy but has a far broader remit.24

The NLPN is currently carried out in 12 Namibian languages in Stages 1 and 2, and Stage 3 introduces learners to basic English. Both Stages 1 and 2 are ‘functional’ in their emphasis, addressing issues such as health and civics, and continue to be developed in additional minority languages. Between 1992 and 2004, 443,500 adult learners enrolled on the NLPN, over the 3 stages. 74% were tested, and 76% passed. In 2006, 22,673 enrolled across the 3 stages, and a further 7648 enrolled on the AUPE. There were 1882 literacy promoters contracted during this year.

Costing and financing of the NLPN

The NLPN received massive financial support from international organizations, such as SIDA and UNICEF, at the start of the programme, but by 1995/96 this began to decline. It is hoped that the new Education and Training Sector Improvement Programme (ETSIP), the first phase of which runs from 2006 to 2011, will serve to

Table 15: DAE summary budget information for 2006/07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget category</th>
<th>Cost NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel expenditure (Head Office and Regions)</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,694,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes 6,700,000 for Head Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(about 30 staff) and 9,580,930 for literacy promoters' honoraria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel travel and subsistence (Head Office and Regions)</td>
<td>829,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primers and supplementary readers,</td>
<td>±1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production and printing (12 languages)</td>
<td>(200.00-300.00 per primer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery costs</td>
<td>289,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery costs per learner</td>
<td>±30.00 per learner (about 909,630 in total, based on 30,321 learners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport, utilities and maintenance</td>
<td>1,129,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops and training of personnel,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including literacy promoters</td>
<td>3,418,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,868,630</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional expenditure not included in our</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calculations of unit costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership fees to Commonwealth of Learning</td>
<td>263,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial inputs to Namibian Literacy Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Namibian College of Open Learning</td>
<td>27,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>64,231,630</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. NAMCOL provides courses for adults and out-of-school youth, from the level of secondary education and above. Higher level courses offered include the Certificate in Education for Development and High Diploma in Education.
renew donor support (Ngatjizeko 2006 personal communication). The budgetary information we have access to relates to DAE expenditure.

Although we are interested in the costs of the NLPN alone, and not the AUPE, we understand that the costs provided cover both programmes, so we have based our unit cost calculations on the total number of students involved in both programmes during 2006 (30,321 students). The way in which the DAE calculates unit costs for the programme, is based solely on stationery costs required for each additional learner, which it currently estimates to be in the region of N$30.00 per year. Our estimation of unit costs below is based on the entire DAE budget, minus the amount given to the NLT and NAMCOL, and membership fees to the Commonwealth of Learning. The costs presented in Table 15 below were provided directly by the DAE.

Dividing N$36,868,630 by 30,321 learners gives a unit cost of N$1216 per learner per year.

The summary budget appears to be reasonably comprehensive, however, a detailed breakdown of costs has not been provided, so we cannot be sure which items and activities have been accounted for and which have not. It should be noted that the DAE oversees and develops other programmes, such as adult skills development for self employment, community learning and development centres, and family literacy. Therefore, not all of the DAE personnel and infrastructural costs will be dedicated to the NLPN and AUPE.

However, we also understand that a literacy promoter honoraria is currently N$727.45 per month and promoters work on one year (renewable) contracts. This indicates that their annual payment is (N$8,729.40 per year). If we use this annual figure for a literacy promoter’s honoraria and multiply it by the number of promoters in 2006 (1882), we obtain a total cost of N$16,428,730. This is considerably higher than the total figure for honoraria given in the DAE budget (N$9,580,930). If we recalculate our unit costs using this new figure, we obtain a unit cost of N$1442 per learner per year.

A Literate Environment

ARED (Associates in Research and Education for Development) is an international non-profit organisation, based in Senegal. Although not a provider of literacy programmes itself, its work is a crucial part of the development of the literate environment within Senegal. We have included it within this study as an illustration of the kinds of costs that are required to sustain adult literacy, in addition to the implementation of literacy programmes.

ARED grew out of the 1980s movement to promote African language literacy (especially in Pulaar), and set out to promote books in local languages by drawing together existing texts and facilitating their distribution to literacy classes and book buyers. Originally set up by a group of Pulaar authors, it registered as ARED in 1990 (Easton and Fagerberg-Diallo 2001). So far it has published more than 150 titles. The largest proportion of its books is in Pulaar, but ARED publishes in five other Senegalese languages, as well as in French. In addition to publishing, ARED develops pedagogical approaches and community-based training programmes.

The books produced by ARED are published in seven series: 1) literacy and maths skills, 2) planning and leadership skills, 3) civil society, 4) literature, culture, and local knowledge, 5) health, 6) scientific and technical information, and 7) religion. The curriculum for each of ARED’s training activity is developed by ARED and accompanied by a book in the language of the training. Although a wide range of training programmes is offered, from management of natural resources to conflict resolution, ARED does provide training for literacy teachers and trainers (ARED 2006).

---

25. As noted above the NLT is responsible for funding providers of alternative literacy programmes and NAMCOL has a remit far broader than servicing the NLPN. The Commonwealth of Learning focuses on distance education.

**ARED costing and financing**

Out of the total annual budget of $300,000, about two thirds of ARED’s income has been provided by long-term NGO donors and about one third comes from contracts for services (developing a book or carrying out a training activity) and book sales. Currently, sales of books contribute to about 15% of ARED’s total budget each year. None of their funds come from the government. However, under the decentralized foreign-aid supported government literacy programme (known as faire-faire), NGOs and CBOs implementing literacy programmes are provided with funding to purchase texts from organisations like ARED, that have developed certifiably effective materials. This has enormously benefited their book sales (Easton and Fagerberg-Diallo 2001).

As one would expect, the translation of books is a cheaper process than the design and development of a book from scratch. Costs per publication will also increase with book size and decrease as the size of print run increases. Occasionally, ARED receives unsolicited original manuscripts from authors. If published, ARED pays the author 10% of potential income from the book. ARED budgets for book production take account of all translation or text development costs, typing, editing, corrections, lexical innovations requiring a linguist, design, printing and distribution costs. The production of 1000 copies of a typical 100-page book from translation currently costs in the region of US$10 per book. The production of 1000 copies of a typical 100-page book from scratch currently costs in the region of US$15 per book. Development costs are covered by NGO activities, while local book buyers cover the printing and distribution costs. This strategy allows ARED to sell most books at between US$1 and US$3.

A typical ARED budget for the training of post-literacy trainers includes the main cost centres and budget lines listed below in Box 5. Such programmes will usually last for 15-20 days at 6 hours per day (so from 90-120 hours). Training sessions are usually conducted by two trainers and for 20 participants. In most cases, the participants or community provide about one third of the costs, by covering transport, and providing a training space, meals and accommodation. When ARED does not have to pay for these things, their costs are not recorded in ARED’s financial records, but they are taken account of when calculating budgets.

Maximum costs for a 20-day programme, with 20 participants and 2 trainers are presented by main cost centre in Table 16. The unit cost of providing training to one trainer is in the region of CFA 356,364 or US$712. However, the cost may vary considerably (dropping by 50%) depending on factors such as the skills and experience of trainers, location of training and origin of participants, which effect costs such as accommodation, travel and food.

It is important to emphasise once again that ARED’s programmes are unlike all the others covered by this report, because it is not a literacy class provider (or funder). In terms of training, they focus on the development of innovative curricula, which are easily used by local communities. For this reason, they work with a variety of experts, and aim to pay them an acceptable rate for their expertise. Because of the nature of the programme, the costs may be instructive of the

---

*Box 5: Typical cost centres and budget lines used by ARED to budget for a training of trainers for post literacy (2006)*

- **Trainers:** honorarium 2 trainers; per diem 2 trainers; Travel and subsistence
- **Logistics:** meals + breaks 20 participants; training room
- **Participant materials:** stationary; ARED books
- **Training supplies:** stationary
- **Coordination & planning**
- **Administration 12%**
kinds of programme development costs often not discussed in literature on costing, or incorporated into calculations.

Based on the programmatic details provided, the budget for training literacy trainers discussed above appears to be comprehensive and includes a portion of ARED’s central administrative overheads. Given that the costs may fall by half, depending on trainer expertise and training location, unit costs will vary between about US$356 and US$713. Actual costs may fall further, depending on how much is provided in-kind by the local community.

### 3.10 Discussion

The information above is presented on a programme by programme basis because at the level of detail required to understand how costing has taken place, it was impossible to carry out a synthetic analysis. We were also keen that the cost data be considered in the context of programme details. Because of the variety of ways in which budgets have been presented, it is very difficult to draw out a comparison of the various amounts spent on different components of programmes — for example, administrative compared to training costs. Additionally, the proportion spent on each component will depend on the remit of a particular programme and implementation factors such as whether or not facilitators are paid.

The budgets we received from NGO providers are all very detailed because of their responsibility to provide detailed financial reports to donors and, perhaps, because of more limited programme scale. The budgetary information provided by the Namibian government is in summary form, and in the case of Brazil and Burkina Faso we have details of the grants available to providers, so much more difficult to make informed estimates of unit costs.

Nevertheless we have made an attempt in Table 17 to summarise what we have learnt from the costing exercises, by capturing details on why we might expect the costs of the programmes to vary, along with estimated unit costs per learner per year, or per course. In order to provide some comparative figures we have translated them into US $ and compared with them the (estimated) costs of a year of primary schooling (see Table 18).

The evidence we have unearthed, suggests that the minimum unit cost of making an adult literate is much more likely to lie in the region of US$100, than the US$50 minimum currently stated in LIFE documentation (UNESCO 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Cost Centres</th>
<th>Amount (CFA)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trainers</td>
<td>3,200,000</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>2,640,000</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials for learners</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Supplies</td>
<td>23,650</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination and Planning</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-TOTAL</td>
<td>6,363,650</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration 12%</td>
<td>763,638</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COST (CFA)</strong></td>
<td>7,127,288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COST IN US DOLLARS</strong></td>
<td>14,255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit cost (CFA) per participant</td>
<td>356,364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20 participants per group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit cost in US Dollars</td>
<td>712.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 17: Unit costs and correspondence to inputs and type of programme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Programme*</th>
<th>Size - No of students</th>
<th>Estimated Unit Cost (per learner per year OR per course)</th>
<th>Key comments relevant to costs presented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government-led</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Namibia            | Government run programme | 22,673 plus 7648 on the AUPE | National, Conversion to US$*, % of annual costs of Primary School | • Only summary budget details have been provided.  
• Costs have been estimated on the basis of figures for the NLPN and AUPE combined, although we are only interested in the NLPN.  
• All personnel/administrative/infrastructure costs for the DAE have been included in our estimates. Although the NLPN and AUPE combined form the largest programme run by the DAE, they are also responsible for the development and oversight of other activities. |
| Burkina Faso       | Inputs to decentralised faire-faire programme | 80,542 (Phases I and II) | CFA19,000 per year, 38 (FX ?0.002) | 86 or 305 (EST) |
| Brazil             | Inputs to decentralised programme | 104,047 classes and 1,931,076 | R$110 to R$220 per course, 51 to 102 (FX 0.46196) | 17 to 34 |

* Based on grant allocations rather than a budget breakdown.
### NGOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Unit Costs</th>
<th>Average Circle Size</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey (FALP)</td>
<td>Functional Adult Literacy</td>
<td>5,315 (20-23 per class)</td>
<td>E65.83 cash costs per phase (E103.07 cash and in-kind)</td>
<td>87 (136) (FX 0.69116)</td>
<td>19 or 29 (EST) • Teaching venues are provided as in-kind donations. • A large proportion of the programme’s development costs will have been accounted for in earlier stages of the programme. • Costs for phase I and II not separated. Ideally, learners will do both phases of the FALP. Unit costs for the two phases (300hrs) will be considerably higher; maybe double.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARE</td>
<td>Implementing Adult Basic Education</td>
<td>225 (average of 15 per class)</td>
<td>R2,136 inc admin and coord costs, per course (R1,530 direct costs only)</td>
<td>299 (213.89) (FX 0.13980)</td>
<td>80 • Formal ABET classes • Note that the provision of transport home from classes for learners, increases costs substantially. • The portion of support costs attributed to costs of ABET programme by authors may well be too high. • Small organisation running (on average) relatively small classes, raises the overhead costs per learner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARN</td>
<td>Funding Reflect</td>
<td>Average circle size of 15</td>
<td>R813-R1667 depending on no. of circles, per year</td>
<td>113.65-233.04 (FX 0.13980)</td>
<td>30 - 62 • Figures based on details of maximum grant allocation rather than budget breakdown.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grants only cover basic provider costs and no provider expenditure on payment of supervisors, teaching materials, logistics etc. The higher figure is an estimate of what the figure would be if additional provider inputs were accounted for.**

**Government expenditure on developing, evaluating and providing infrastructure for the programme not included.**

**Teaching venues are provided as in-kind donations.**

**A large proportion of the programme’s development costs will have been accounted for in earlier stages of the programme.**

**Costs for phase I and II not separated. Ideally, learners will do both phases of the FALP. Unit costs for the two phases (300hrs) will be considerably higher; maybe double.**

**Formal ABET classes**

**Note that the provision of transport home from classes for learners, increases costs substantially.**

**The portion of support costs attributed to costs of ABET programme by authors may well be too high.**

**Small organisation running (on average) relatively small classes, raises the overhead costs per learner.**

**Figures based on details of maximum grant allocation rather than budget breakdown.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Programme Details</th>
<th>Average Circle Size</th>
<th>Cost per Year (FX)</th>
<th>Level 1 Cost (FX)</th>
<th>Level 2 Cost (FX)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ghana AA  | Implementing Reflect, Distance Radio with face to face group tutorials             | 25                   | 560,328            | 63 (126)          | 131              | Portion of ActionAid Ghana administrative overheads and development costs not included, venues are not provided. Note relatively large size of circles compared to South African Reflect programme. Ideally, the circles run for two years, so unit costs for the entire 'course' will be double.
| SOMDEL    |                                                                                  | 24510                | £25.08             | 49 (54)           | -                | Note distance nature of programme. Costs for each Level not separated. Most of those who take Level 2 have taken Level 1. The unit cost of Level 1 and 2 combined may be in the order of double the unit cost presented. Venues provided by the community. |
| Senegal ARED | Training of literacy trainers or educators                                      | 20                   | 713                | 880 EST           |                  | Note the exceptional nature of this programme, and that this figure is derived from maximum budget allocations. If these figures are compared in relation to other figures for Senegal given in Chapter Two, note the different exchange rates used. |

Notes: *All programmes are face-to-face unless otherwise stated. *Calculated using market exchange rate. EST = author’s estimate.
Table 18 Expenditure on primary education (based on GMR 2007 Education Finance Figures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Duration of primary education 2004</th>
<th>Primary school age group 2004</th>
<th>School age popn (000) 2003</th>
<th>Out of school children, school yr ending 2004 (000)</th>
<th>Public current expenditure on primary education per pupil (unit cost) in constant 2003 US$</th>
<th>Public current expenditure on primary education per pupil (unit cost) at PPP in constant 2003 US$</th>
<th>Public current expenditure on primary education per pupil as % of GNP per capita</th>
<th>Public current expenditure on primary education as % of public current expenditure on education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>298** -</td>
<td>656** -</td>
<td>11.4** -</td>
<td>33.3** -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>3291</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>44 EST -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>106z</td>
<td>447 301z</td>
<td>1459 876z</td>
<td>20.7 19.4z</td>
<td>59.4 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>447 301z</td>
<td>1459 876z</td>
<td>20.7 19.4z</td>
<td>59.4 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>1407</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7-13</td>
<td>7153</td>
<td>487z</td>
<td>447 301z</td>
<td>1459 876z</td>
<td>20.7 19.4z</td>
<td>59.4 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey**27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>8437</td>
<td>900**</td>
<td>469 EST</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. In order to include an estimate of the school age population for Turkey, we have used the provided by the GMR 2007. However, ACEV has pointed out that the duration of primary education in Turkey is now 8 years and primary school age is 6-14.
The starting point for this study was that there was a need to better understand the costing structure of different programmes, including what categories/components are identified and/or omitted from calculations. These are relatively complex issues to analyse from a study based on documentation and phone calls; and our analysis should be read in that context.

We have discussed a range of factors that are likely to affect programme outcomes and programme costs; and we have emphasised that the desirable inputs to a programme will vary considerably with context. The factors discussed included:

- Teaching methods, curriculum and length and timetabling of courses
- Trainer training, facilitator training, support/supervision
- Supervisor/facilitator ratios and facilitator/learner ratios
- Payment of facilitators
- Material resources (including books, writing materials, equipment, venue and furniture, including the storage and distribution of resources)
- The impact of taking a combined livelihoods and literacy approach
- Multilingualism/language of instruction (implications for training, curriculum, books and learner group size)
- Building a literate environment (resource centres, subsidised materials and distribution, training of authors, editors, other professionals needed for publishing industry)
- Development, coordination and management at the provider and government (if different) level. And other institutional and management costs at the government level.

The diversity of programmes in terms of their modalities, objectives and intended outcomes makes it very difficult to make meaningful comparisons between them. Every programme also takes a different approach to budgeting, which further complicates the task.

Costing Elements of Programmes

**Development Costs**

A presumption in many of the commentaries on the costing of adult literacy programmes is that development costs are small compared to implementation or running costs of the literacy programme. But this will not always be the case. For example, if there are a large number of small language groups within a country and courses are developed or adapted to be bilingual (by establishing literacy in the mother tongue before moving on to develop skills in the dominant or official language). Such costs will be highest where alphabets do not already exist for languages and where a core set of literacy learning materials need to be developed.

Similarly, if a country decides to overhaul its curricula and teaching methods in line with the cognitive theories discussed above, development costs may be substantial, but worthwhile. Furthermore, the (mainly salary) costs of policy development or institutional change conducted at the government level, and directly related to the management of adult literacy provision, are relevant and potentially large.

In the few cases where development costs have been included (in a way that allows them to be isolated) we see that development costs can make up a large fraction of total costs. For example, for the SOMDEL distance radio programme they came to about 43% (although as the 3 year project is extended, the proportion may fall). The ARED book production and training programmes in Senegal are informative, because they focus on the design of materials and training courses, and indicate the kind of costs we can expect for such activities.

**Running Costs**

Clearly, not all providers are delivering a standard literacy programme and may not have the same responsibilities for training trainers or facilita-
4. Summary, Discussion and Conclusions

How are unit costs usually determined?

Programme unit costs are usually calculated by dividing total programme costs by the number of learners. There are a number of commentaries here:

1. Although for the purpose of this study we are interested in direct costs, in addition to the issue of the opportunity cost of the literacy participants, there are the opportunity costs of the time of volunteer facilitators. There are also the imputed costs of facilities provided in kind, and we have included these in our calculations above when they have been provided. What may be viably obtained as an in kind donation by one programme, will not necessarily be available to another.

2. Where there is a threshold number of learners, without which a class will not be held; and where there are some relatively large classes, there are three figures that could be useful for a programme implementor:
   - Unit costs per learner at the start of the cycle
   - Unit costs per learner at the end of the cycle
   - Marginal unit costs calculated as the additional costs for one learner to join an already functioning class

3. The difference between costs per learner (or enrollee) and the costs per completer and per ‘successful’ completer (if there is a post course assessment) are important, although the latter adds a further complication in that different programmes measure ‘success’ in different ways. However, one should not fall into the trap of assuming that drop-outs or those who do not pass assessments have gained nothing from the course.

4. Further, a full societal economic costing could consider other resources that contribute to literacy. Thus, many of the participants in literacy programmes have previously been to school and may have acquired some literacy skills (see Carr-Hill, 1999). Abadzi (2004) argues that the total cost to make them literate should arguably include the money already spent on them. But that argument could be extended almost indefinitely and probably without a clear resolution; nevertheless, one might take it into consideration when debating the appropriate follow-up to those who drop out of school.

Actual Costs of Programmes and Omitted Costs

Actual costs of programmes have been collected from nine programmes. It has proved difficult to extract relevant information when the documents
have been sent to us. The issue therefore arises as to whether there are some costs that have been completely omitted from all the examples that we have received.

Although we would agree to the overall conclusion that data on costs are largely absent from widely-available reports or evaluations of literacy programmes, the NGO programmes we have looked at do tend to have comprehensive costing systems in place. But there are three issues which are difficult to track even for these programmes:

- Under ‘Learners’ only one of the programmes (Turkey) has made any allowance for the in-kind contributions of venues and lighting;
- Organisational overhead and administrative costs are difficult to disentangle from other items, and not always included, and it is difficult to judge how much of an organisations central costs should be attributed to their literacy programme when they run other activities which we do not have details about.

Can We Set Criteria for the Costs of a Programme and its Components?

Appropriate Range of Costs

As we have seen above, the report on the Action Aid/ GCE survey suggested that a good quality literacy programme that included all the features they had identified in their review was likely to cost between US$50 and US$100 per learner per year for at least three years (two years initial learning + ensuring further learning opportunities are available for all). This was intended mainly as a point of departure for discussion.

- Country context is crucial. One must also keep in mind how much circumstances vary (the social, linguistic, economic, geographical and historical contexts will all impact on the needs of learners, the range of approaches required, and hence costs).
- This leads into the fact that there are a wide diversity of programmes organised in very different ways, which leads to a very wide range of costs.

In the nine programmes we have studied – and even ignoring the SOMDEL distance programme and the ARED training of trainers programme, and the Burkina Faso programme (because we believe the unit cost estimate to be well below the real amount) – we have about a five-fold range of costs per participant per course or year.

Guidelines for Appropriate Costing of Components

Oxenham (2004) suggests a possible indicative framework for the categories and distribution of costs of a ‘standard’ combined literacy and livelihoods programme (see Table 19).

Table 19: Proposed Categories and Distribution of the Costs of NFEA Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Rough % to be allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional materials</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training (and refresher training) for literacy facilitators, business trainers and immediate supervisors</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remunerating facilitators, business trainers and field supervisors</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and other forms of capacity building and institutional strengthening for public and private agencies</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational and administrative expenses (offices, vehicles, lighting, fuel, consumable)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring, evaluation, research</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings, credit and enterprise development</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced from Oxenham (2004, 14)
He found that the most important factor in determining the unit cost of a programme was whether or not the programme relied on facilitators who received a salary or on volunteers with possibly a small honorarium. Obviously this is an important issue, particularly at provider level, but our investigation suggests that an even bigger issue may be the treatment of central management and overhead costs.

Although these figures can be difficult to disentangle for NGOs, they are usually included somewhere in their calculations of programme costs because of the way they have to fully account for their funds. For the government programmes, however, there is the issue of the permanent civil service with the accompanying salaries, pensions, and benefits, and building and equipment costs. The only Government programme where we were able to incorporate an estimate of these costs into our calculations was the National Literacy Programme Namibia, and there the costs were much higher.

Another important issue that affects unit costs is the intended scale of a programme: those which have high recurring development costs or are relatively small scale (with small learner groups) do tend to have higher costs. In the programmes studied, this has impacted particularly on both ARED and SHARE, although it is crucial to note the specialised nature of both programmes: the former being focused on post-literacy activities and the latter running formal ABET courses in a context where transport cost are high.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The International Literacy Decade has prompted calls for renewed commitment to funding adult literacy. There is, however, considerable diversity in the offerings of adult literacy programmes both in terms of their context, modalities, objectives; and in their accounting practices and reporting of costs.

It has to be recognised that the information available did not allow us to examine more fundamental questions such as: What level of literacy is desired and for what purpose? What is the relation between quality and outcomes? And, therefore, What is the cost benefit of different programmes.

However, the material we have unearthed suggests that a realistic estimate of the cost of making an adult literate would be a minimum of US$100 (this is the maximum estimate currently stated in LIFE documents). Those programmes that appear to have lower costs have clearly excluded some components from their costing or are exceptional like the distance radio programme in Somalia.

Content of programme

There remains uncertainty over the effectiveness of different modalities for delivering adult literacy programmes, partly because of the contextual specificity of each programme, partly because there has usually been insufficient attention to straightforward monitoring and, perhaps, partly because there have been insufficient external evaluations of programmes. However, it may well be that different modalities are more appropriate in some circumstances (countries/provinces) than in others, and that the association between modality and circumstances has not yet been reliably established, so that the relative effectiveness of different programme costs cannot be assessed.

This can be interpreted as a call for further research; but perhaps better is a call for better documentation of modalities and and measurement of outcomes. It may be tempting to call for the harmonisation of monitoring, recording and reporting practices but, given the diversity of need and of modalities, it is difficult to propose a common approach. Instead it is important that each programme should articulate clearly its objectives and intended outcomes, and how it is monitoring both of those.

Accounting Practices and Reporting of Costs

Accounting practices clearly differ even among these nine programmes. As we have shown, much of this difference is due to the different objectives and purposes of these programmes. For example, there are very large differences between the distance education programme in Somalia and the training of trainers programme in Senegal. However, much of difference we record could be attributed to the different approaches to accounting for management, overhead and administration costs, and the extent to which
we have been able to incorporate these into our calculations.

It may be tempting to call for harmonisation and rationalisation of accounting practices. It would be possible to promote common accounting practices based internationally accepted accounting procedures but, given the diversity of approaches already described, it is unclear that there would be much advantage in such harmonisation and there is a real query as to whether this would lead to more bureaucratic costs than any savings it might generate.

Instead, we would argue for a more general agreement about the components that should be considered in any costing of an adult literacy programme but that the imposition of a common costing structure would not be appropriate.

Further Exploration of the Issues

One of the problems we have encountered in this study is that the approach – soliciting documents at a distance on a cross-sectional basis with occasional follow-up telephone calls – has two disadvantages:

• Despite the obvious importance of circumstance and context, we have not been able always to completely understand the context in which the programmes are operating in terms of using existing infrastructure etc.;
• A cross-sectional snapshot of programmes means that we have not been able to properly identify development costs.

Ideally, what are required are longitudinal studies of the costing and outcomes of specific literacy programmes to understand how costs and ‘successes’ vary over the lifetime of a programme; and to understand the starting point of that target population. This would be very onerous and resource intensive. But a first step at least towards identifying appropriate costings, would be for local consultants to compile an inventory of the major programmes in each country (international consultants would eat up the budget for literacy!). This inventory should include information on objectives, intended outcomes, target audience (size and type), design of programme, delivery modalities, and specific factors making for good or poor quality. Compiling such an inventory appears tedious but is essential for developing an understanding of what is required (see Carron and Carr-Hill 1990). This could be the basis for review and discussion at the national level.
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