

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Context and Overview .....	2
2. Addressing the Realities .....	5
3. Challenges for the Future by 2015 .....	11
4. Policy Implications: Backing the Commitment .....	16
References .....	19

### List of Tables

Table 1: Projected Gross Enrolment Rates in Primary Education .....	7
Table 2: Projected Completion Rates at Primary School Level .....	8
Table 3: Projected Transition Rates (%) from Primary to Secondary School Levels 1980 – 2010 .....	10
Table 4: Trends in Educational Enrolment, 1963–1995 .....	12
Table 5: Primary Education Participation Rates based on the current situation .....	13
Table 6: Required Number of Primary Schools, 2000–2015 .....	14
Table 7: Projections on Public Expenditures on Basic Items .....	15

### List of Charts

Chart 1: Projected Gross Enrolment Rates in Primary Education by Gender .....	7
Chart 2: Projected Completion Rates in Primary Education by Gender .	9
Chart 3: Transition Rates to Secondary Level of Education for Selected Years .....	10

---

## 1 Context and Overview

The development of education, to fight ignorance and enhance economic growth, is one of the major priorities the Government of Kenya (GoK) had immediately after independence in 1963. The Sessional Paper No. 10 of 1965 on African Socialism and its Application to Planning in Kenya, set a policy and pace for fighting illiteracy, ignorance and poverty in the country (GoK, 1965). Since then, the education sector has been subjected to more than ten reviews by state funded special commissions and working parties. The major reviews include: The 1964 Ominde Commission; the 1976 Gachathi Report; the 1981 Presidential Working Party on the Establishment of the Second Public University; the Presidential Working Party on Education and Manpower Training for the Next Decade and Beyond; and the 1998 Master Plan on Education and Training Task Force (GoK, 1964; 1976; 1981; 1988; 1998). These reviews indicate the extent to which the government and other stakeholders have gone in search for a policy framework and laying strategies to make education serve the nation and meet the country's development needs.

Attempts to enhance the education sector in the country depicted through the numerous working parties, is a reflection of GoK's commitment to internationally established frameworks and perspectives for the development of education. Kenya is a signatory to the UN Human Rights Charter and The Convention on the Right of the Child, both of which recognise education as a right of every citizen. This Right was reiterated in 1990 when 1,500 participants from 155 nations, including Kenya, and many NGOs reaffirmed education as a human right by adopting the World Declaration on Education for All (EFA). Article 1 of this Declaration States:

*Every person - child, youth, adult - shall be able to benefit from educational opportunities designed to meet their basic learning needs. These needs comprise both essential learning tools (such as literacy, oral expression, numeracy, and problem solving) and the basic learning content (such as knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes) required by human beings to be able to survive, to develop their full capacities, to live and work in dignity, to participate fully in development, to improve the quality of their lives, to make informed decisions, and to continue learning.*

---

It is almost a decade since the Jomtien meeting took place, and yet the situation of education in Kenya, like in the rest of other developing countries, has stagnated if not deteriorated to its lowest levels. The Jomtien commitments of EFA, including enhancing girls' education and the integrated vision of basic education have not been met. There has been slow progress towards achieving the objectives of education for all. Access to education has not increased sufficiently, and education quality has plunged. Teachers also find themselves earning far less in real terms as we approach the next millennium. The official review of developments at African region level since the Jomtien conference has been set for 2000. However, we already know that the targets set in 1990 have not been met in this country. The shortcomings are evident in the declining access and enrolment rates, the ever decreasing completion and transition rates as well as the declining performance in national examinations.

The declining status of education raises several pertinent questions: 1) Why hasn't Kenya progressed towards achieving EFA? 2) What have been the major underlying problems? 3) Have the Jomtien commitments (theory and principles) been domesticated and translated into practice in the country? 4) Was an investment programme to achieve EFA put in place? 5) What mechanisms were put in place to monitor progress towards achieving EFA?

Although answers to these questions have not been provided, one thing is true - that education in Kenya faces many problems and challenges, ranging from the issues of access and quality, to relevance of education (these issues are well documented elsewhere - refer to IPAR's publications and GoK, 1998). Having realised this fact, the GoK has come up with new commitments - ***National Poverty Eradication Plan, 1999-2015***. The publication and release of this document raises a fundamental issue: Is this just another political game - switching the 'goal post' from 2000 to 2015 or are we really ready and able this time around to back these new commitments with practical implementations?

The National Poverty Eradication Plan (NPEP) launched in Nairobi (March, 1999) sets specific goals and targets, which include:

↑↑ *reduction of the poor in the total population by 20% by 2004 and by further 30% by 2010;*

↑↑ *increase in enrolment rates over the first six years of the Plan;*

---

- ↑↑ *increase in completion rates, especially for girls in the six year period;*
- ↑↑ *Universal Primary Education achieved by 2015;*
- ↑↑ *universal access to Primary Health Care to within 5 km of all rural households or within **one hour of local transport by 2010;***
- ↑↑ *increase by 8% each year until 2004, access to safe drinking water by poor households;*
- ↑↑ *create universal access to safe water by 2010;*
- ↑↑ *reduce time spent by women on fuelwood and water collection;*
- ↑↑ *publish 'best-practice' guidelines for rural and urban social development by 2000;*
- ↑↑ *20% of communities to draw up action plans by 2004;*
- ↑↑ *40% of all extension messages to be relevant to very poor farmers.*

It is against this background that this paper sets out to explore the real issues which need to be addressed and how the government and other players have to prepare if education is to be developed, and Universal Primary Education (UPE) achieved by the year 2015. Our thesis is that the government, NGOs and donors have collectively allowed the poverty situation Kenyans find themselves in at present. By extension, they have collectively again, been failing to create the enabling environment in which school-age children in Kenya can access and complete quality basic education. Unless there is radical change in thinking and in practice, the National Poverty Eradication Plan (NPEP) will be just like other past official documents. The year 2015 will come and the 'goal post' will be moved again to a future date.

---

## **2 Addressing the Realities**

Based on past experience and the futurology of policy analysis and research, the future of education in Kenya looks gloomy. If one takes known facts and trends in macro-economics and in education and projects them over a period of 15 years, to the year 2015, (Abagi, 1998; 1999), the outcome is not reassuring. If the government and other partners in the development of education merely carry on as in the past and at present - rhetoric, good plans in paper without implementation programmes, good enhancing projects (textbooks, bursaries) without accountability and efficiency - the impact will be devastating. Education and other social services like health will be hit hardest.

Macro-economics analyses indicate that the level of poverty in Kenya is high, and is on the increase. Forty seven per cent of the population live below the poverty line and are unable to access basic needs like food, health and education. Besides, both the agricultural and manufacturing sectors have faced a general decline in the last decade. The country's public debt burden is great having reached its record levels in June 1998, with domestic and foreign debts being 37.7% and 68.3% of GDP respectively. More than 66% of the government's budget is devoted to recurrent expenditure with almost a quarter of the budget being used for interest payment on the public debt (GoK, 1999). Given the high level of poverty, the level of savings is very low hence reducing the level of investment.

The poor infrastructure and unsure political environment is not conducive for foreign investment. Even if it is, such investment will not reach the 80 per cent of Kenyans who live in rural areas. The poverty situation exists despite the fact that in the last 35 years, Kenya has received a colossal sum of money from foreign countries and Western based agencies like the World Bank and the IMF. For example, the American Ambassador to Kenya disclosed that "her government had given Kenya more than Kshs. 60 billion since independence, but no positive impact had been realised" (Daily Nation, 1999). Amounts given by European Union and Japan are also colossal, leave alone those given by individual institutions and/or foundations such as USAID, CIDA, JICA, Rockefeller Foundations.

With this kind of experience and the poor economic situation, the incidence of poverty is likely to increase, with more and more Kenyans falling below the poverty line. If this bad trend continues, it will not be surprising to find about 60 - 65 per cent of the population living below the poverty line by the year

---

2015. Given this scenario, the magnitude of problems and challenges facing the education sector will also be greatly magnified.

The challenges facing education in Kenya are well documented in other IPAR publications (see Reference Section) and in some GoK documents (GoK, 1999; 1998). However, it is pertinent to highlight some policy issues. As noted earlier, the GoK and other partners in the development of education including households, have been investing heavily in education since 1963. The GoK expenditure in education stands at over 35 per cent of discretionary expenditures. Primary education receives about 55% of the sectoral recurrent budget. Existing surveys also indicate that under the cost-sharing policy, households have continued to meet increasing costs of education of their children. An average family in Kenya living in an urban setting spends about 30 - 40 per cent of their income on education, while an average family in a rural setting spends up to 60 per cent. In the face of the cost-sharing policy, households are supposed to meet about 95% of school recurrent expenditure in the form of textbooks, stationery, furniture, school uniform, activity fees and examination, among others. With the high level of incidence of poverty most parents have failed to meet this obligation. Their contribution has not effectively filled the resource gap created by the implementation of the cost-sharing policy (Abagi, 1998; GoK, 1998; 1999).

With the high level of poverty and the effect of globalisation, both the government and the public face difficulties in financing education. As stated in the National Poverty Eradication Plan:

*The burden of cost-sharing on poor households is especially heavy and poor families are responding by enrolling fewer children or allowing them to drop out before completing their primary education .... (GoK, 1999:39).*

The government is therefore looking for viable and sustainable policies and strategies at various levels to support the development of education in the country.

Despite increased investment in education, an unknown number of children in Kenya do not have access to primary education. No systematic census and monitoring mechanisms exist at both micro, meso and national levels to establish the actual number of children (both girls and boys) who have been denied access to education. Although data for net enrolment ratio (NER) is not

---

available, gross enrolment ratios (GER) at primary school level declined from 95 per cent in 1989 to 78% or lower at present (decline of about 2.5% every year). At this rate, if sustainable measures are not taken, GER is projected to be only 41.7% by the year 2015. The projected GER at primary school level is depicted in table 1 and chart 1 below.

**Table 1: Projected Gross Enrolment Rates in Primary Education**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Girls</b>	<b>Boys</b>	<b>Total</b>
1980	105.7	115.0	110.4
1985	95.9	100.6	98.1
1990	99.6	104.0	101.8
1995	86.3	87.4	86.8
1997	86.6	88.7	87.7
2000	87.6	88.2	87.9
2005	86.6	86.0	86.3
2010	89.0	86.8	87.9

In 1980, the enrolment rate for boys at primary school level was more than that of girls by 9.3 percentage points. However, by 1997 the gender gap had reduced to 2.1 percentage points, an indication of narrowing gender gaps in education at that level. The projections indicate that in the year 2005 the gender imbalance at the primary school level will be negligible as the GER for boys is predicted to be 86.0% and that of girls, 86.6%.

The Enrolment rate at primary school level is expected to increase marginally from 87.7% in 1997 to 87.9% in the year 2000. And in the subsequent five years, the rate will gradually decline to 86.3% in 2005 then a slight rise to 87.9% in the year 2010 (see table 1 and chart 1). It is worth noting that for the last 8 to 10 years, enrolment in primary school has been growing at a rate lower than the population growth rate. The projections reflect the same trend, hence the predicted declining enrolment rate in the future.

Further, analyses indicate that for the last five years, completion rates at primary school level have remained below 50 per cent, with the rate for girls being worse than that for boys (Abagi, 1998; 1999). Given the high rate of population growth rate of 3.4% per annum leading to 50% of the population being less than 15 years of age; and increased incidence of poverty, completion rates at primary school level will have dropped drastically to about 35 to 40% by the year 2015. The predicted completion rates by gender presented in table 2 and chart 2 are based on the current completion rates.

**Table 2: Projected Completion Rates at Primary School Level**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Girls</b>	<b>Boys</b>	<b>Total</b>
1980	-	-	36.7
1985	-	-	60.1
1990	40.5	45.7	43.2
1995	42.1	43.0	42.6
1997	45.8	46.3	46.1
2000	48.0	46.0	47.0
2005	52.0	45.5	48.7
2010	56.4	44.9	50.5

The quality of education, including its relevance to the country's needs has also been questioned. The overloaded curricula, lack of teaching materials, poor teaching approaches, poor or lack of adequate supervision and low morale of teachers are among the factors cited for the poor quality of education. Investing resources in poor quality education is like not investing at all. Based on various factors that may influence examination performance and the varied background of pupils who take examinations in any given year, predictions of the quality of education and/or performance in national examinations would not be realistic and hence are not undertaken in this paper.



There has been a noticeable decline in enrolment at secondary school level accruing to the low transition rate from primary to secondary school level. More children continue to be denied access to secondary level education in this country. For five years now, half of the qualified Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (K.C.P.E.) candidates have been missing places in secondary schools. For example, out of 401,649 K.C.P.E. candidates in 1995 only 189,187 (47%) were selected for secondary school (GoK, 1997). In 1996, only 46% of the candidates were selected for further education. The percentage of pupils missing placement at secondary school level have continued to rise with the figure standing at 53% in 1997 and 56% in 1998. In 1998, a total of 248,276 candidates who sat the K.C.P.E. examinations would not proceed to secondary schools due to limited space (Daily Nation, January 5, 1999). In the secondary sub-sector, of the 140,506 K.C.S.E. candidates in 1997, only 27,149 (19.32%) were selected for entry into post secondary institutions including public universities (Abagi, 1997; MoE, 1997). This is a decline from 20.68% in 1993.

Transition rates from primary to secondary education have also been very low. For five years now, less than 50 per cent of candidates who qualify are selected for secondary education. There are indications that about 20-25% of those who are selected do not take their places at secondary school level due to lack of fees. The transition rates from primary to secondary school levels are depicted in table 3 and chart 3 below.

---

**Table 3: Projected Transition Rates (%) from Primary to Secondary School Level 1980-2010**

	1980	1985*	1990	1995	1997	2000	2005	2010
Boys	-	-	42.9	45.4	45.3	46.4	48.3	50.2
Girls	-	-	39.4	43.9	44.5	46.9	51.2	55.9
Total	39.8	-	41.3	44.7	44.9	46.7	49.8	53.2

Source: CBS, *Economic Survey*, various issues.

\* There was no Form 1 intake in 1985 as it was the start of class 8 of the 8-4-4 system.

There is strong evidence that the Jomtien objectives of Education for All (EFA) are not being met in Kenya. Instead, more and more school-going age children have no access or limited access to quality education. The implementation of cost-sharing strategy exacerbates the situation. The current NPEP summarises the situation by pointing out that:

*... the objectives of the cost-sharing strategy for primary education are not being met. Enrolments have not risen with population and are highly sensitive to the financial demands placed on parents. Schools still lack essential materials and facilities despite households' contributions. The burden on many, especially poor households are too great .... (GoK, 1999:41).*

The major worrying issue is that despite investment in education by the government, households, private individuals, NGOs and the donors, crises facing the education sector still persist. The situation is likely to worsen if drastic measures are not taken. Various sectoral reports and papers (refer to

commissions and working parties reports) have been produced with an aim of diagnosing problems facing the education sector and finding viable and sustainable solutions. However, available evidence indicates that recommendations coming from these special reports have not been used to improve education and training in the country. Theories (political rhetoric) contained in such reports have not been translated into practical realities to salvage the education sector in the country. Given the trend in the past, one is left pondering whether we are ready and able to implement the policy commitments on poverty, in general, and education, in particular, with increased assistance as stipulated in the National Poverty Eradication Plan. If so, what will this commitment require?

### 3 Challenges for the Future by 2015

The launching of the National Poverty Eradication Plan, 1999-2015 raises several pertinent, but complicated questions as far as the education sector is concerned. These include:

- § **First**, have players in the development of education, especially the Government, seen the bright or bleak future of the development of education in Kenya?
- § **Second**, if there is light at the end of the tunnel, has the GoK thought through the implications the targets set will have on government and households' resources?
- § **Third**, are we this time, serious about developing education to achieve education for all (EFA)?
- § **Fourth**, what kind of frameworks and strategies will be necessary to reach the set targets? and
- § **Fifth**, will we be able to finance basic education for all?

From a policy perspective, we see a gloomy future. The crisis facing education will become worse.

1. More children, especially girls, will not access school by 2015 and the few who will have accessed basic education will be withdrawn en masse by their poverty stricken parents.
-

2. School-going age children, both boys and girls, from economically well endowed areas like cash crop regions, tourist and fishing areas will not bother to go to school given that the opportunity cost of attending poor quality schooling will be unaffordable to the majority of households, and the children themselves.
3. Exploitation of child labour will increase.
4. The quality of education in public schools, especially in rural areas, will continue plummeting and teachers' morale will hit bottom low thus affecting their effectiveness in schools.
5. The level of corruption and mismanagement of education resources at macro, meso and micro (school) levels will continue. This will increase parents disenchantment with formal schooling, thus hold back any little contribution in support of education.
6. Many rural and slum schools will have to be closed for lack of pupils.

This bleak prophecy is not a mere conjuncture with possibility. It is based on an extrapolation of the history of the development of education in Kenya over the last 35 years and the current globalisation trend in the world engineered by rich western nations. The historical development of education by levels is presented in table 4 below.

**Table 4: Trends in Educational Enrolment, 1963-1995 (000's)**

Education Level	Enrolled 1963	Enrolled 1995	Male/ Female	1963-95 Annual
Primary	892	5,545	1.02	5.7
Secondary	30	632	1.18	9.5
University	0.571	44.91	2.79	13.6
Teacher Training	4	16.878	1.05	4.5
Technical	1	8.148	-	6.6
Polytechnics	-	7.927	3.219	-

Source: Republic of Kenya: National Development Plan, 1997-2010, pg. 133.

With the declaration of UPE by 2015, proper conceptualisation of the issue is mandatory. The questions that policy makers and Kenyans in general should be asking are: **1)** What is UPE to Kenyans? **2)** What magic is there with 2015? and; **3)** What kind of UPE and for what use? This has to be followed by proper planning and effective implementation, as well as efficient and effective

monitoring and evaluation strategies. Huge resources (both human and financial) will be required to meet the set out goals and targets. This means that we must have a viable and sustainable investment programme for education from the start. Let us look at these commitments in terms of figures. These are based on national estimates, hiding many regional and gender disparities.

### → Pupil Population

The projection of Kenya's population based on the 1989 census shows that by the year 2000, the total population will be about 30 million people. A half of this will be below 15 years of age and hence of school-going age. At a growth rate of 3.4% p.a., the total population will be 36 million and 45.3 million in 2006 and 2015 respectively. These children will have to be provided with quality basic education. They will have to enrol and stay in school until they complete the primary education cycle. Table 5 gives an analysis of projections for enrolment, completion and transition rates given the current population growth rates.

**Table 5: Primary Education Participation Rates based on the current situation**

Year	2000		2005		2010	
	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys
GER <sup>1</sup>	87.6	88.2	86.6	86.0	89.0	86.8
Completion Rate <sup>2</sup>	48.0	46.0	52.0	45.5	56.4	44.9
Transition Rate	46.9	46.4	51.2	48.3	55.9	50.2

Given the current enrolment growth rate of 2.5%, the GER for the years 2000, 2005 and 2010 are expected to be 87.9%; 86.3% and 87.9% respectively. The gross enrolment will have to grow at 4.6% per annum to achieve UPE, GER of 100% by the year 2015.

The projected completion rates for the years 2000, 2005 and 2010 at the current growth rates are 47.0%; 48.7% and 50.5% respectively, while the projected transition rates are 46.7%; 49.8% and 53.2% for the same years. These imply that at the current completion and transition growth rates, the country is highly unlikely to achieve UPE by the target year, 2015.

<sup>1</sup> Gross Enrolment Rate at present is declining at 2.5% per annum. If we are to meet the targets as spelt out in NPEP, the gross-enrolment growth rate will have to grow at 4.6% per annum.

<sup>2</sup> If there is no improvement, the completion rate will remain constant at an average of 43% per cohort.

### → Schools Required

Today, we have over 17,000 primary schools with an enrolment of about 5.9 million pupils. On average, there are 347 pupils per primary school, with girls comprising 49.2% on a national scale.<sup>3</sup> Based on the projected number of pupils, we shall require 20,472; 23,952 and 28,023 primary schools by the years 2005, 2010 and 2015 respectively (Table 6). This implies additional 11,023 schools by the year 2015. In the face of the current economic situation in the country and the fact that 36 years after the country's independence, only 17,000 primary schools have been put up, it would hardly be realistic to expect to build 10,000 schools in the next 16 years.

**Table 6: Required Number of Primary schools, 2000 – 2015**

Year	2000	2005	2010	2015
Number of Primary Schools	17,581	20,472	23,952	28,023

### → Teacher Requirement

The increase in the number of school-going age children and those enrolled in school will definitely require increased numbers of teachers. Currently, the number of primary school teachers are 192,306, with women comprising 42.1%. The number of trained teachers in 1998 were 185,736 (42.3% women). The national pupil-teacher ratio is 31:1. We base our projection on the ideal or average pupil-teacher of 40:1 of Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). The assumption is that education has to be made efficient, thus the ratio has to be raised in the next 15 years. Based on the SSA average, about 177,590, 207,780 and 243,103 teachers would be required by the years 2005, 2010 and 2015 respectively. Again, the assumption is that all these teachers will have been trained. This would require that the country produces about 3,585 new trained teachers annually.

### → Textbook Requirement

Our survey data indicate that on average, 4 primary school pupils in public schools share one textbook (pupil-textbook ratio of 4:1) in every subject offered (Abagi, 1998). Thus, there are about 1,475,000 textbooks (total number of pupils divided by four) in public primary schools in every subject, giving the grand

<sup>3</sup> There are gender disparities in enrolment by regions, with the North Eastern province being worst hit.

total of 19,175,000 books in the 13 subjects offered at this level. This has to change if the quality of education is to be improved. The ideal situation is a pupil-textbook ratio of 1:1. However, due to economic constraints, the ratio should be 2:1 by the year 2015. This means that the primary level of education will require a total of 3,551,800; 4,155,606 and 4,862,059 textbooks in every subject by 2005, 2010 and 2015 respectively.

### → Expenditure Requirements

Estimation of financial requirements for the achievement of UPE requires a systematic and well thought-out study (Abagi & Owino, 1999; Galabawa 1985; Bray 1996; Opolot 1994). For the sake of illustration in this paper, this estimation can be simplified by just using data on expenditure per primary school pupil (unit cost) by the government. Based on 1996/97 financial year, the public expenditure on primary education for each child (unit cost) is estimated to be Kshs. 2,774/=. To offer quality education this should go up by 50% (KShs.4161/=) by the year 2006 and by 100% by the year 2015 to reach Kshs. 5,548 per child. Table 7 shows our estimated projection of public finances which would be required in specific years.

**Table 7: Projections on Public Expenditures on Basic Items**

	1999	2005	2010	2015
No. of Pupils	5,900,000	7,103,600	8,311,212	9,724,118
Spending per pupil in Kenya Shillings	2,774	4,161	6,242	5,548
No. of Schools	17,000	20,472	23,952	28,023
No. of Teachers	185,736	177,590	207,780	243,103
No. of Textbooks	1,475,000	3,551,800	4,155,606	4,862,059
Sub-Total	16,366,600,000	29,558,080,000	51,878,585,000	53,949,407,000

\* These are estimates on the basic items which need serious attention. There are other hidden costs which definitely will, in some cases double the given figures. For example, UPE by 2015, means that almost all costs of primary education currently met by parents would be met from the public kitty. We have also not included direct donor and household/community contributions.

For us to accurately project the actual costs of achieving UPE by the year 2015, it will be necessary to undertake a needs assessment to establish the actual costs of constructing classroom and laboratories as well as equipping the same.

The central government expenditure on education at primary school level is forecasted at Kshs. 29,558,080,000 by 2005 when 15% increase in enrolment rates will have been attained, and at Kshs. 53,949,407,000 by 2015, the UPE target year. It is obvious that this is a big task for the government and its partners. Currently, the proportion of discretionary expenditure in education is estimated to be over 35%. Primary education receives around 55% of the sub-sectoral recurrent budget, which is around 3.8% of GDP.

#### **4. Policy Implications: Backing the Commitment**

The National Poverty Eradication Plan (NPEP) presents a framework on how to tackle poverty in Kenya. From the launch of the Plan in March, 1999, the Government has moved a step further by appointing the Commission for Poverty Eradication (CPE) chaired by a career educationist, a politician and a businessman. This was done just less than a month after the launch, indicating the seriousness of the government this time round, to eradicate poverty.

From our analysis so far, there are indications that the government, and by extension the CPE, has a big test of backing the policy commitments. Reading between the lines gives us hope, but also reminds us of the last 35 years of investment. Since Kenyans have been optimistic all along, even during colonial rule, the following policy issues need to be dealt with soberly and urgently:

The government should create a viable and sustainable Education Investment Programme (EIP) immediately, develop it and finance its activities. The implication is that more resources need to be allocated to the education sector. Viable and sustainable financing strategies need to be developed in partnership with the private sector and communities. This will require a well-planned and systematic study on cost and financing of the education system in Kenya, including the financial implication of the declaration of UPE. Such a study will have to be well executed by a reputable local institution devoid of political interference. The study findings are the basis under which other policy related issues would be dealt with.

Since the government's goal is to achieve UPE by 2015, it should switch and/or re-allocate resources from other sectors, for example defence and general administration, to education. Secondly, there has to be sub-sectoral switch of resources within the Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development (MOEHRD). For instance, it could re-allocate resources from university education and other tertiary institutions to primary education.

---



There is need to mainstream gender in education at macro, meso and micro (school and classroom) levels in order to achieve Universal Primary Education (UPE). A specific budget should be allocated for this exercise. This means that there is urgent need to come up with a National Gender Policy to act as a framework for gender mainstreaming in education.

The cost-sharing policy at primary school level needs to be re-assessed if not abolished completely. The government will have to allocate more resources to education, shifting the burden from poor parents.

Incentives, like tax waivers and/or low interest on education investment loans, will have to be introduced to encourage private investors to support the development of education.

Foreign debt has a terrible negative effect on the social sectors. The financing of education, like in other development sectors, should not rely on donor funding. This strategy has not worked well in the past and has instead, created more dependency and suffering while promoting corruption and lack of accountability.

The government should not just concentrate on the plight of children already in school. It should also budget for those who have no access to school and those who drop out of the formal education system. There is need to create parallel programmes for out-of- school children and adults.

One of the major causes of low quality of education and dropout of children from school is lack of learning materials such as textbooks. Parents and communities have not managed to furnish schools with these necessary materials. The MOEHRD has to take this responsibility as it used to before introduction of SAPs. More resources need to be allocated for the production and distribution of teaching-learning materials to schools, especially primary schools in rural and slum areas.

Policy operational educational research and analysis need to be boosted by supporting relevant institutions to initiate, co-ordinate and carry out relevant research. More resources need to be allocated for this purpose.

Lack of effective monitoring of activities and programmes within the education sector has contributed immensely to the deterioration of services within the sector. Therefore, effective frameworks have to be put in place

---

to strengthen monitoring and evaluation divisions within the MOEHRD from the headquarters to the districts and school levels. Capacity building programmes have to be launched and supported to achieve this goal.

Several specific actions need to be taken including:

- § Bringing together policy makers, planners and education experts in a national inception workshop to determine what concrete steps should be taken to implement the suggested changes. This will be a planning workshop to prioritise issues and develop specific viable work-plans for adjustment and revitalisation.
  - § Setting in motion a formal review of the Kenya's constitution and the Education Act to identify specific sections which need adjustment to make education a basic right and a basic need in Kenya.
  - § Lobbying and/or participating in drafting an education bill which will accommodate adjustment and revitalisation issues raised.
  - § Reviewing jointly with major players the current investment and expenditure programmes in education, with a view to developing a viable and sustainable mechanism to ensure that the education sector is put at the centre of development, and thus gets reasonable resources.
  - § Setting up a team of reputable educationists to act as a 'think-tank' to advise the Government and/or the Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development on education-related issues.
  - § Setting up a team of gender experts to assist in the drafting of a gender policy in education.
  - § Putting in place mechanisms for cost-recovery measures at the Ministry headquarters and at all levels of education. This will not only reduce the cost of education but will also make available resources which would be utilised in improving the quality of education.
  - § Instituting effective and viable monitoring and evaluation mechanisms at all levels of education to keep track of progress made in education and/or to identify weak areas with a view to correcting them as soon as possible.
-

In this paper we set out to explore the real issues which need to be addressed and how the government and other players have to prepare if education is to be developed to achieve UPE by the year 2015. We have highlighted some basic issues which need serious, but urgent attention. If the NPEP commitments are not translated into practice, then the declaration of UPE by the year 2015 by the government will go in history as another national jamboree which did not realise any concrete thing. And by then, be warned Kenyans, we shall again shift, with pomp, the ‘goal post’ to the year 2025.

### REFERENCES

- Abagi, O. (1997a), “The Impact of Politicised Educational Reforms on the Quality of Primary Education: Experience from Kenya.” In *Quality in Education*, Vol. 4 Watson, K. *et al.* (Eds.), London: Cassell.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1997a), *Public and Private Investment in Primary Education in Kenya: An Agenda for Action*. Discussion Paper, No. 005/97, Nairobi: IPAR.
- Abagi, O. and G. Odipo (1997b), *Efficiency of Education in Kenya: Situational Analysis and Implications for Educational Reform*. Discussion Paper No. 004/97, Nairobi: IPAR.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1999), *Resource Utilisation in Public Universities in Kenya: Enhancing Efficiency and Cost Recovery Measures*, Occasional Paper No. 005/99, Nairobi: IPAR.
- Abagi, O. and W. Owino (1999), *Cost and Financing of Primary Education in Rwanda; Research Report*.
- Aduda, D. (1997), “Blackboard Series” in *The Daily Nation*, March 8, 1997.
- ARA Sage (1995), *Cost and Financing of Teaching and Learning Materials*, Nairobi: The World Bank and Ministry of Education.
- Bray, M. (1996), *Decentralisation of Education: Community Financing*; Washington D. C.: The World Bank.
- Central Bureau of Statistics (1996), *Welfare Monitoring Survey II: 1994 Basic Report*, Nairobi: Office of the Vice-President and Ministry of Planning and National Development.
- CESA Team (1994), *Comprehensive Education Sector Analysis Draft Report*, Nairobi: MoE/UNICEF Kenya Country Office.
- Eisemon, T. (1988), *Benefiting from Basic Education: School Quality and Functional Literacy in Kenya*, Oxford : Pergamon Press.
-

Galabawa, J. C. (1985), "Community Financing of Schools in Tanzania." A paper presented at the Commonwealth Secretariat Workshop, June 7 - 10; Gabon.

Government of Kenya (1964), Report of the Kenya Education Commission, Nairobi: Government Printer.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1976), Report of the National Committee on Educational Objectives and Policies, Nairobi: Government Printer.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1981), Report of the Presidential Working Party on the Establishment of the Second University in Kenya, Nairobi: Government Printer.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1982), "Report and Recommendations of the Working Party on Government Expenditures," by P. Ndegwa *et. al.*, Nairobi, July 1982.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1986), Sessional Paper No. 1 on Economic Management for Renewed Growth, Nairobi: Government Printer.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1988), Report of the Presidential Working Party on Education and Manpower Training for the Next Decade and Beyond, Nairobi: Government Printer.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1994), Sessional Paper No. 1 on Recovery and Sustainable Development to the year 2010, Nairobi: Government Printer.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1996a), Sessional Paper No. 2 on Industrial Transformation to the Year 2020, Nairobi: Government Printer.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1996b), *Economic Survey*, Nairobi: Central Bureau of Statistics.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1996c), Social Dimensions of Development: Revised Approach to Human-Centred Development and Targeted Poverty Interventions, Nairobi: Government Printer.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1996d), Kenya - Economic Reforms for 1996-1998: The Policy Framework Paper, Nairobi: Government Printer.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1997a), *Economic Survey*, Nairobi: Central Bureau of Statistics.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1997b), National Development Plan 1997-2001, Nairobi: Government Printer.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1997c), Draft Master Plan on Education and Training, 1997-2010, Nairobi: Ministry of Education.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1999a), National Poverty Eradication Plan, Nairobi: Government Printer.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1999b), *Economic Survey*, Nairobi: Central Bureau of Statistics.

---

- Heyneman, S. (1980), Influences on Academic Achievement: A Comparison of Results from Uganda and More Industrialised Societies - In *Sociology of Education*, July.
- Heyneman, S. (1984), Differences Between Developed and Developing Countries: Comment on Simons and Alexandra's "Determinants of School Achievement." In *Economic Development and Cultural Change*.
- Karani, F. A. *et al* (1995), Cost and Financing of Education in Kenya: Access, Quality and Equity in Secondary Education, Nairobi: The World Bank and Ministry of Education.
- Karugu, G. K. *et al* (1995), Cost and Financing of Special Education in Kenya, Nairobi: The World Bank and Ministry of Education.
- Kerre, B. W. and A. P. Obura (1992), Basic Education for All in Kenya: Working Document for the National Conference on BEFA, Nairobi: Kenya National Commission for UNESCO.
- King, K. J. (1971), *Pan - Africanism and Education in Kenya*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Kinoshito, T. (1993), "Human Resource Development." A Paper prepared for the EDI's Collaborative Approaches Seminar, Kuala Lumpur.
- Kinyanjui, K. (1974), The Distribution of Educational Resources and Opportunities in Kenya, University of Nairobi: Institute for Development Studies Discussion Paper No. 208.
- Merryfield, M. M. (1986), "Social Studies Education and National Development in Selected African Nations," Unpublished Education Dissertation, Indiana University.
- Ministry of Education (Kenya) (1996), Consultative Meeting Between Ministry of Education and Other Partners in Education Development, July 31, Utalii, Nairobi.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1998), The Master Plan on Education and Training, 1997 – 2000; Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Mitha, N. J. (1995), Cost and Financing of Education in Kenya: Access, Quality and Equity in Primary Education, Nairobi: The World Bank and Ministry of Education.
- Opolot, J. A. (1994), Study on Cost and Cost-effective Approaches to Primary Education in Uganda; Kampala: UNICEF.
- WCEFA Inter-Agency Commission (1990), Final Report World Conference on Education for All: Meeting Basic Learning Needs, Jomtien: Thailand.
-

---

## IPAR DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

**DP No. Title**

- 001/97 *Enterprise Attributes and Corporate Disputes in Kenya*. P. Kimuyu. September 1997. 33p.
- 002/97 *Delivery and Financing of Health Care Services in Kenya: Critical Issues and Research Gaps*. W. Owino. December 1997. 27p.
- 003/97 *Farmers' Response to Reforms in the Marketing of Maize in Kenya: A Case Study of TransNzoia District*. H. Nyangito and L. Ndirangu. November 1997. 16p.
- 004/97 *Efficiency of Primary Education in Kenya: Situational Analysis and Implications for Educational Reform*. September 1997. O. Abagi and G. Odipo. 33p.
- 005/97 *Public and Private Investment in Primary Education in Kenya: An Agenda for Action*. O. Abagi. December 1997. 37p.
- 006/97 *Decentralisation of Financial Management Systems: Its Implementation and Impact on Kenya's Health Care Delivery*. W. Owino and S. Munga, November 1997. 42p.
- 007/97 *Public Health Sector Efficiency in Kenya: Estimation and Policy Implications*. W. Owino and J. Korir . December 1997. 37p.
- 008/97 *A Review of Policies on the Maize sub-sector in Kenya*. H. Nyangito. December 1997. 30p.
- 009/97 *Private Investment in Kenya: Trends, Composition and Determinants*. E. Ronge and P. Kimuyu. November 1997. 38 p. Ill.
- 010/98 *Equipment Acquisitions by Kenyan Manufacturers*. P. Kimuyu. January 1998. 48p.
- 011/98 *Enterprise Response to Deficient Infrastructure in Kenya*. P. Kimuyu and S. Kayizzi-Mugerwa. November 1998. 31 p. ISBN 9966-9967-6-1
- 012/98 *Towards Maize Security in Kenya: An Evaluation of the Self-Sufficiency Strategy*. H. Nyangito. October 1998. 28p. ISBN 9966-9967-8-8
- 013/98 *Public Health Sector Pricing Policy: The Question of Fee Adjustments*. W. Owino. December 1998. 28p. ISBN 9966-9631-2-X
- 014/98 *Enhancing Health Care Among the Vulnerable Groups: The Question of Waivers and Exemptions*. W. Owino and M. Were. December 1998. 28p. ISBN 9966-9631-3-8
- 015/99 *Revealed Comparative Advantage and Export Propensity in Kenya*. E. Moyi and P. Kimuyu. March 1999. 30p. ISBN 9966-9631-4-6
- 016/99 *Provision of Agricultural Services in a Liberalised Economy: The Case Of The Smallholder Tea Sub-Sector in Kenya*. H. Nyangito and J. Kimura. June 1999. 52p. ISBN 9966-9631-5-4
-