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Executive Summary

This Situation Analysis of Education in Kenya was undertaken on behalf of UNICEF Kenya Education and Young People Section. This was a desk analysis, drawing primarily upon materials provided by UNICEF. While the overall focus was broad, emphasis was placed on areas related to UNICEF’s mandate and on informing the 2009-2013 Country Programme.

The Situation Analysis leads to a number of recommendations. As foreshadowed by UNICEF in the Terms of Reference, there are areas in which data are inadequate to address important areas of concern, and these deficiencies are noted along with required improvements.

There have been important and positive developments in education in Kenya in recent years. Free primary education has led to increased enrolment, with reasonable gender balance. Consequently there is considerable progress in meeting the government’s major aim of achieving Education for All Goals and Millennium Development Goals 2 & 3 by 2015 – essentially access and gender equity goals.

Significantly, early childhood development and education is perceived and endorsed as an essential underpinning to achieve educational (and social) goals. Free secondary education is being introduced, along with increased focus on science, technology and ICT. The proportion of the national budget allocated to education is now almost 30 per cent.

Kenya’s future directions and priorities in education are guided and informed by comprehensive reports such as Vision 2030 and a National Strategy for Transformation, 2008-2012. Initiatives such as ‘flagship’ projects and Core Poverty Programmes tackle key areas within an overall national framework of economic, social and political development.

Consequently, Kenya’s overall education policy for the future is coherent rather than ad hoc or piecemeal. International agencies have assisted, with UNICEF playing a significant policy partner and programme sponsor role.

The body of the report begins with a review of policies, target areas and the need in the current context for contingency planning. Structures and governance issues are outlined, noting particularly the importance of devolution at the community level if national policies are to be effectively implemented. The next section addresses financing, including factors which may impact upon assumptions and hence result in a need to re-prioritise commitments. There is evidence that supply and demand input to budgeting processes under-represent the community ‘demand’ input. A particularly important point questions whether target expenditure is in fact sufficient to meet needs of currently disadvantaged children, especially those out of school.

Levels of education are then discussed, with the main focus being on early childhood and primary schooling. There is a miss-match between the policy priority which is increasingly given to early childhood development and education, and the available or projected funding to enable access, with quality. There is some evidence that current provision disadvantages the already disadvantaged, although data on the type and coverage of ECDE are inadequate. Similarly, primary education is under-served by available data. Anomalies and inconsistencies within available data mean that key issues like efficiency/cohort progression in the primary system cannot be addressed with confidence. There are looming concerns, particularly relating to quality, system efficiency and measurable learning outcomes, especially in the transition to secondary by larger primary cohorts. Discussion also addresses secondary schooling and aspects of school culture, the potential of non formal education, and aims for the post-secondary sector, with particular concerns for adequate qualified teachers and continuous professional development challenges.

Education in Kenya does face serious challenges. These are outlined in the report and are taken up under Concluding Comments and Recommendations.

There are three recommendations with national implications:
1. First, the impact of the global economic crisis, and related uncertainties, requires a planning approach which identifies options and contingencies.

2. Second, achieving EFA and MDG goals requires engaging disadvantaged groups in education, and this involves different strategies from the ‘mainstream’.

3. Third, there are serious deficiencies in the conceptualisation and collection of data, meaning that evidence-based knowledge on key issues is lacking or unreliable.

Additional recommendations include a number which are pertinent to UNICEF:

- Ongoing support, with monitoring and evaluation, is needed for programmes such as the Child Friendly Schools Initiative which are being taken to scale.

- Several forms of support are required for ECDE: advocacy and communication strategies, particularly in under-served areas; partnering with government on development of qualitative indicators which address and document the outcomes of ECDE; undertaking and/or sponsoring case studies of good practice across a range of programme types; supporting increased recognition and training for ECDE teachers; and assisting the UNICEF Child Survival and Development team to include infancy and early childhood psycho-social development monitoring as an integral component of the CSD programme.

- To date, most attention has focused on the problematic transition from primary to secondary schooling. Attention also needs to focus on the ECDE to primary transition, ensuring that the distinctive purpose and nature of ECDE is recognised and valued.

- Non formal education has potential to meet the needs of many of those not engaged in schooling, particularly the large numbers of out of school children, but requires enhanced advocacy, more creative strategies and adequate resources.

- Negative and harmful aspects of school climate, especially bullying and sexual harassment, are apparent at secondary level. The origins of such anti-social behaviour need to be addressed at ECDE and primary level.

- Capacity building is needed at the local level in data gathering, monitoring and evaluation in order to facilitate the objective of meaningful devolution.

- Social budgeting has the capacity to ensure a community stake and voice in fiscal aspects of decision making and priority setting, and initiatives such as training packages are needed.

- The next census is in 2009. Particularly given the identified weaknesses in current databases, there is a positive and proactive role to assist government in defining and obtaining data which will provide sound evidence on critical indicators.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADF</td>
<td>African Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKF</td>
<td>Agha Khan Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARVs</td>
<td>Anti Retro Virals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASALs</td>
<td>Arid And Semi-Arid Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOGs</td>
<td>Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOPA</td>
<td>Budget Outlook Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs</td>
<td>Community Based Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>Central Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDF</td>
<td>Constituency Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDTF</td>
<td>Community Development Trust Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEPD</td>
<td>Continuous Education and Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFSI</td>
<td>Child Friendly School Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHE</td>
<td>Commission for Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>Canadian International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>Directorate of Basic Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBs</td>
<td>District Education Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEOs</td>
<td>District Education Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHE</td>
<td>Directorate of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOAS</td>
<td>Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRD</td>
<td>Department of Research Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTE</td>
<td>Directorate of Technical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARC</td>
<td>Educational Assessment and Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECD</td>
<td>Early Childhood Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECDE</td>
<td>Early Childhood Development and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECDE</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>European Economic Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA</td>
<td>Education for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Education Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERS</td>
<td>Economic Recovery Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSP</td>
<td>Education Sector Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBOs</td>
<td>Faith Based Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPE</td>
<td>Free Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTI</td>
<td>Fast Track Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>Gross Enrolment Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoK</td>
<td>Government of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPI</td>
<td>Gender Parity Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELB</td>
<td>Higher Education Loans Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDA</td>
<td>International Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEC</td>
<td>Information, Education and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSET</td>
<td>In-Service Education for Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JICA</td>
<td>Japanese International Corporation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRMP</td>
<td>Joint Review Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCPE</td>
<td>Kenya Certificate of Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCSE</td>
<td>Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KESI</td>
<td>Kenya Education Staffing Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KESSP</td>
<td>Kenya Education Sector Support Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIE</td>
<td>Kenya Institute of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KISE</td>
<td>Kenya Institute of Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNEC</td>
<td>Kenya National Examinations Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KShs</td>
<td>Kenya Shillings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATF</td>
<td>Local Authority Trust Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOF</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOH</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOL&amp;HRD</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST</td>
<td>Ministry of Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPND</td>
<td>Ministry of Planning and National Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTEF</td>
<td>Medium Term Expenditure Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACECE</td>
<td>National Centre for Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASMLA</td>
<td>National Assessment System for Monitoring Learning Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCST</td>
<td>National Council for Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NER</td>
<td>Net Enrolment Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE</td>
<td>Non-Formal Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFCs</td>
<td>Non-Formal Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFS</td>
<td>Non-Formal Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPER</td>
<td>National Public Expenditure Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Overseas Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODE</td>
<td>Open and Distance Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODL</td>
<td>Open and Distance Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVC</td>
<td>Orphans and Venerable Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR</td>
<td>Primary Completion Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDE</td>
<td>Provincial Director of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>Public Service Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Parents Teachers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTR</td>
<td>Pupil Teacher Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTTC</td>
<td>Primary Teacher Training College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoK</td>
<td>Republic of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBMA</td>
<td>Results Based Management Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBI</td>
<td>Social Budgeting Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCs</td>
<td>School Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFP</td>
<td>School Feeding Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDA</td>
<td>Swedish International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCs</td>
<td>School Management Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STI</td>
<td>Science Technology and Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAP</td>
<td>Sector Wide Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIVET</td>
<td>Technical, Industrial Vocational and Entrepreneurship Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR</td>
<td>Textbook Pupil Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSC</td>
<td>Teachers’ Service Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTC</td>
<td>Teachers Training College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTI</td>
<td>Technical Training Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commission for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPE</td>
<td>Universal Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD</td>
<td>United States Dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>The World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Country Context

Key country characteristics, briefly noted below, impact upon issues and challenges outlined in the body of this Situation Analysis.

The Republic of Kenya’s\(^1\) eight provinces (including Nairobi) are subdivided into districts\(^2\) and then divisions and local authorities, with considerable devolved autonomy. The land area of over half a million square kilometres is diverse; for example, 20% is arable land supporting 80% of the population, while almost 80% is arid or semi-arid land (ASAL) and supports 20%. In 2005, an estimated 58% of the population lived in rural areas. Traditional dependence on agriculture for livelihoods through subsistence farming and grazing is becoming less viable, forcing many poor families to seek livelihoods in urban areas, such as the crowded and under-served slum areas of Nairobi that have become home to more than a million people.

Kenya’s population of almost 38 million is expected to increase in 2008 by 2.8% - a decline in the rate of increase from previous decades. The demographic profile highlights gender disparities. Fertility rate differences are significant: in urban areas 3.3% and in rural areas 5.4%; and 3.2% for women with some secondary education versus 6.7% for those with no education. Average life expectancy in 2008 is estimated at 56.4 years (similar for males and females). Increased life expectancy is more likely now that HIV/AIDS prevalence shows evidence of decline, and more infected people are accessing ARV drugs (UNICEF, 2007a, p.3).

With about 43% of Kenyans between 0-14 years, the current 0-4-year cohort larger than any other 5-year cohort, the high dependency ratio, with >50% of the estimated population below 15 years, and almost half the population living in poverty (RoK, 2003), there are heavy demands on social services such as health care and education.

English and Kiswahili are the official languages, while widely used regional languages serve as mother-tongue and reflect Kenya’s diverse ethnic mix. The predominant religion is Christianity (70%), then indigenous beliefs (22%) and Islam (6%). The HDR 2007-08 (UNDP, 2008) estimated adult literacy (15+ years) at almost 74%, with a 7.5% gender gap (Males 77.7% / Females 70.2%). The 2012 literacy goal is 80%.

In terms of trade, Kenya spends considerably more each year on imports than it earns from exports; in 2004 annual imports were valued at US$4,566m and exports at US$2,686m.

In terms of international comparators, Kenya is ranked:

- 93\(^{rd}\) of 134 countries on the Global Competitiveness Index for 2008-2009 (World Economic Forum (2008));
- 148\(^{th}\) of 155 countries on the Human Development Index 2007-2008 (UNDP, 2008a);
- 148\(^{th}\) of 177 developing countries included in the Human Poverty Index; (UNDP, 2008b);

Although estimates from different sources vary, there are indications of sustained GDP growth in recent years, from 3% in 2003 to 7% in 2007 (World Bank, 2008). The government associates this growth with its Economic Recovery Strategy (ERS) for Wealth and Employment Creation (GoK, 2003) which has seen the country’s economy back on the path to rapid growth since 2002 (KenInvest, n.d.).

---

1 See Map in Attachment 1
2 MoE, EMIS, (2007) currently collates data for 76 districts
However, the aftermath of the December 2007 election resulting in displacement of over 300,000 people, and the anticipated impact of the ongoing global financial crisis, mean there are significant challenges for Kenya with direct implications for this Situation Analysis. The World Bank’s September 2008 Country Brief notes (p. 1) that “the fiscal situation is deteriorating, that inflation rose from 10.5% to 16.9% between January and May 2008 and is expected to continue to rise in the short term”. Of immediate concern is the Bank’s observation that:

The combination of output and employment losses and sharply rising inflation will have a direct impact on poverty. On a preliminary basis, we estimate that poverty headcount has increased by 22 percent and a measure of severe poverty has gone up by 38 percent\(^3\) which means gains made over the past five years on this front have been reversed (p. 1).

The draft 2008 UNICEF Country Programme Document (UNICEF, 2008a) notes the sharp increase in inflation and the likelihood that economic growth in 2008 will be half of 2007 “at best”. Consequences for this Situation Analysis flow from the UNICEF statement (p.4) that, “The crisis has already resulted in cuts in certain development expenditures as budgetary resources have been reallocated to fund activities arising from the effects of the violence.”

The current global financial crisis further exacerbates the fragility of Kenya’s economic situation, with potentially severe adverse consequences for heavily resource-dependent sectors such as education.

Context of Education in Kenya

The provision of education and training to all Kenyans is fundamental to the success of the Government’s overall development strategy. First, the long-term objective of the Government is to provide every Kenyan with basic quality education and training, including two years of Early Childhood Development and Education (ECDE), 8 years of primary and four years of secondary/technical education. Second, the development of quality human resources is central to the attainment of our national goals for industrial development. Third, the realization of universal access to basic education and training ensures equitable access to education and training for all children, including disadvantaged and vulnerable groups (RoK, 2008, p. xvi)

This overview contains the following sections:

- Education policy priorities, their rationale and expected outcomes
- Structures and governance
- Financing

Education Policy Priorities, their Rationale and Expected Outcomes

The overall education sector goal is to achieve Education for All (EFA)\(^4\) and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs\(^5\)) by 2015, in tandem with national and international conventions and commitments (RoK, 2008, p. 1), (notably the Convention on the Rights of the Child, CRC\(^6\)).

---

\(^3\) The MDG Status Report for Kenya (2005, p.8) observes: “The population in absolute poverty was estimated to be 44.7% in 1992, 52% in 1997, and 56% by 2002. The major indicators of poverty can be recognized in a number of sectors: low coverage in water supply services; a general decline in child nutrition and the provision of health services; increased pressure on environmental goods and services, especially the forest resources; and increased numbers of people receiving below minimum level of dietary energy consumption.”

\(^4\) See Attachment 2

\(^5\) See Attachment 3

\(^6\) See Attachment 4
**Vision for the Future**

There have been significant policy developments in Kenya in recent years. “... the policy environment is changing faster than earlier envisaged. The main engine behind the change is the NARC Government’s Economic Recovery Strategy (RoK, 2003), a comprehensive policy tool aimed at accelerating economic growth; poverty reduction through job creation; investment in people and social protection; improving governance and the physical infrastructure. It changes the story of hopelessness and lethargy into one of hope and enthusiasm” (GoK, 2005, p.2). The ERS has been a milestone which underpins subsequent transformative policies, notably Kenya Vision 2030 (below). Importantly, the ERS “is anchored on the pillars that closely relate to the MDGs. Due to the close relationship of the socio-economic targets in ERS and MDGs, the implementation of the former impacts positively on the achievement of the MDG targets” (GoK, 2005, p. 8).

In 2007, the Government of the Republic of Kenya articulated an ambitious and comprehensive vision for the future of the country. This is encapsulated in ‘Kenya Vision 2030’ which in turn is operationalised through key Ministry and development partner documents and reports (elaborated below). The implementation strategy incorporates Medium Term Plans, including the National Strategy for Transformation, 2008-2012, and Flagship Projects. Vision 2030 is supported by the subsequent ‘Education Sector Report 2008 (RoK, 2008).

**The Development Framework**

‘Kenya Vision 2030’ (2007) provides a policy framework, with priorities, as a “development framework covering the period 2008 to 2030”. The Vision:

(i) endorses and draws upon a representative stakeholder consultative process;

(ii) emphasises guiding values and principles, notably through a recurring emphasis on access and equity, and

(iii) takes an inter-woven stance towards three “pillars” — the economic, the social and the political;

(iv) uses five-year rolling plans, with identified key strategies (and “flagship projects”), as implementation landmarks en route to Vision 2030.

While each pillar is acknowledged as crucial and inter-dependent, Vision 2030 places “the highest premium on the stable macroeconomic environment” (p.6), since this is key to achieving the GDP goal of 10% growth per annum from 2012. In turn, the economic pillar will impact on the feasibility of attaining, “A just and cohesive society enjoying equitable social development in a clean and secure environment” [the social pillar] and, “an issue-based, people-centred, result-oriented, and accountable democratic political” society [the political pillar].

**Goals and Strategies: The First Five Years**

Vision 2030’s first five year plan, the National Strategy for Transformation, 2008-2012, aims “to reduce illiteracy by increasing access to education, improving the transition rate from primary to secondary schools, and raising the quality and relevance of education” (p.16).

Related goals include: integration of special needs education; an 80% adult literacy rate, increased school enrolment to 95%, increased transition to university and technical education; and an emphasis on science and technology as part of post-secondary expansion.

The stated strategies to achieve these goals are:

(i) Integrating early childhood into primary education;

---

7 The 10% target is contrasted with 6.1% in 2006.
Reforming secondary curricula;
Modernising teacher training; and
Strengthening partnerships with the private sector (p.16).

The Ministries of Education, and Science and Technology, have responsibility for Kenya’s Education Sector and for realising goals articulated in Vision 2030. Hence the RoK/MoE Education Sector Report (2008) focuses on ‘Realizing Vision 2030 Goals through Effective and Efficient Public Spending’. The Sector’s “key policy priority is to improve the performance of education in terms of access, quality and relevance by reduction of cost burden” (p. xi).

**Target Areas**

A complete listing of the ‘Education Sector Strategic Objectives and Specific Targets’ is contained in Attachment 5. Sector performance in achieving key targets is discussed later in this report. Within the target areas, the Education Sector has a number of cross-sectoral ‘Core Poverty Programmes (RoK, 2008, pp. xii-xiii) at varying stages of development and implementation, including:

(i) Support to Early Childhood Development and Education (ECDE).
(ii) Free Primary Education (FPE): introduced in 2003 and largely responsible for the subsequent substantial increase in primary education.
(iii) Grants to support: Non Formal Schools (NFS); Schools in Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASAL), including mobile schools; School Feeding; Special Needs Education; School Feeding, Health and Nutrition; bursaries for school, university, teacher training and Technical, Industrial Vocational and Entrepreneurship Training (TIVET) students.

Complementing and supplementing these initiatives is the Kenya Education Sector Support Program (KESSP) 2005-2010 which focuses on all sub-sectors and the related cross-cutting issues geared to delivering quality education and training to Kenyans. High priority areas within the 23 Investment Programmes include: in-service training and teacher education; primary school infrastructure; instructional materials; capacity building; school health and nutrition; provision of education in ASAL and urban slums; non-formal education; and cross-cutting issues such as HIV/AIDS, gender, guidance and counseling.


**UN and UNICEF Priorities**

As would be expected, development partners have broadly endorsed the goals and targets of Vision 2030, some of which – notably EFA and MDG’s - were formulated through action by international agencies in the first instance. Strategically, these goals have adopted Sector Wide Approaches (SWAPs) which are Government-led.

Consequently, following its cluster review/UNDAF strategic process, the UN agencies:

… agreed on three priority areas to align with the Vision 2030 and the Kenya Joint Assistance Strategy (KJAS); (i) improving governance, realization of human rights and gender equality, (ii) empowering people who are poor and reducing disparities, (iii) promoting sustainable and equitable economic growth for poverty and hunger reduction with a focus on vulnerable groups (UNICEF, 2008a, p.7).

UNICEF Kenya has developed four priority areas in the forthcoming five-year country programme, consistent with the National Strategy for Transformation 2008-12. These are:

---

8 Core Poverty Programme areas, with expenditure from 2004/5 to 2007/8, are listed in Attachment 6
1. Child survival and development;
2. Increased use of evidence for policy,
3. Prevention of HIV and AIDS; and,
4. Involvement of youth in their own development. (UNICEF, 2008a, p. 7)

The guiding strategies for the country office, which will apply to the Education and Young People Section (below) build on several key principles:

- A strong rights based approach focusing on the most disadvantaged and vulnerable, including those in areas of natural and human disasters;
- Taking an evidence based approach to policy, technical support, and monitoring and evaluation activities;
- Generating disaggregated data to obtain finer understanding of gender, social and ethnic disparities;
- Communication for behaviour and social change;
- Strengthened national policy and institutional capacity building, emphasising “informed demand (evidence-based) by rights holders in order to reduce inequalities that exclude large numbers of men, women, boys and girls from full enjoyment of their rights” (p.7).

Policy and programmatic initiatives taken or proposed by the Education and Young People Section within the UNICEF Country Office are summarised below.

The Section has made important contributions to policy development in several key areas which also emerge as significant in this Situation Analysis. Principally, these include:

- The Early Childhood Development Policy Framework and National Service Standard Guidelines, jointly with UNESCO;
- Development of a Gender Policy in Education, with CIDA;
- The draft Non Formal Education (NFE) policy of the Ministry of Education;
- The National Children’s Policy based on the UNCRC observations.

Programmatic initiatives taken to date by the Education and Young People Section include: development, trialing and associated cascade training of ‘Child Friendly Schools (CFS) strategies’ (now assumed to be mainstreamed by the MoE); development and trial of tools to monitor learning achievements in lower primary (MALP); participatory story-telling, training and parent education modules for psychosocial and life-skills development of children 4-8; training of officers and communities in management of community support grants (for ECDE centres); NEP girls’ scholarships; emergency preparedness support; supply of NFE kits; support to the pilot Cash Transfer Programme for Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVC);

Foreshadowed programmes, within the frameworks outlined above, for the Education and Young People Section are intended to contribute to the result areas of access, quality and empowering youth. Specific aims (UNICEF, 2008a, p. 9) include:

- The ‘access to basic education’ sub-component will contribute to disparity reduction in education and achieve 15 per cent increase in enrolment to ECD of children 4-5 years of age in the ASALs and urban informal settlements of Nairobi, Mombasa and Kisumu; and 15 per cent increase in primary school enrolment of children in the ASALs and urban informal settlements of Nairobi, Mombasa and Kisumu.
- The ‘education quality’ sub-component will use the Child Friendly Schools package as a measure of quality teaching and learning in pre-primary, primary and secondary schools nationwide and establish a framework for National Complementary Basic Education with clear linkages to formal education implemented in selected districts. An important strategy will be the WASH component in schools to improve both access and improve the learning outcomes.
The ‘Young People’ sub-component will enable youth in selected districts to access quality relevant learning and skills building programmes that are responsive to the needs of the labor market; peace education will be integrated into the curriculum nationwide by 2013.

Need for Contingency Planning

It is implicit from previous sections that Kenya faces some unpredictable factors which may impinge on its vision and goals. These include the flow through of global financial turmoil as well as indigenous circumstances such as natural disasters and displacement.

Consequently, an important cautionary note concerns the achievability of future goals. It is commendable that Kenya has articulated its future in clearly formulated terms. Understandably, the future is largely cast in a best-case scenario framework.

However, the purpose of a Situation Analysis is to establish a base from which to identify the array of directions and possible outcomes which may develop from the current situation. There are a number of caveats and circumstances outlined in this section which may impact upon the planned vision for Kenya’s education system. These, along with other factors identified below, mean that planning and priority setting is difficult and somewhat unpredictable. For UNICEF, this means that it is critically important to identify options and contingencies in its next planning phase. This point is further developed later in this Analysis.

Structures and Governance in Kenya

The Ministry of Education and Ministry of Science and Technology are responsible for the Education Sector. Other ministries have complementary or overlapping relationships, for example the Ministry of State for Youth Affairs has responsibility for ‘youth polytechnics’.

Key organisational structures are: six Directorates - Basic Education, Higher Education, Technical Education, Quality Assurance and Standards, Policy and Planning, and Research Development; two autonomous government agencies; and several semi-autonomous government agencies, examples being the Teachers Service Commission, the Kenya Institute of Education, the Kenya Institute of Special Education, and the Kenya National Examinations Council.

Two Directorates are centrally relevant to this Situation Analysis: Basic Education, and Higher Education. Areas of responsibility and goals are:

- **Basic Education** - ECDE, Primary Education, Special Needs Education, Primary Teacher Education and Non-Formal Education (NFE). The main goal of the Directorate of Basic Education is to enhance access and equity to quality basic education that will lead to attainment of MDGs and EFA by 2015.

- **The Directorate of Higher Education** - caters for secondary school education, tertiary colleges and universities. The secondary education division’s main objectives are to increase access and participation; reduce the high cost of secondary school education to households; improve the quality; improve management capacities and accountability in secondary schools. The directorate coordinates university policy ... and pre-service secondary school teacher training.

Enrolment patterns and internal efficiency of the educational system are elaborated later in this report. In brief, an 8-year primary, 4-year secondary and 4-year post-secondary structure has operated since 1985. Enrolment ratios – about which validity and reliability issues are raised below – indicate that the primary Net Enrolment Ratio (NER) is approximately 79\(^\text{10}\) to 87\%, with a balanced gender ratio, while secondary enrolment declines significantly to about 42\%, and post-secondary represents only % of the eligible age group. Actual enrolments in 2006: 7.63m primary; 1.03m secondary; 0.11 tertiary (RoK, 2008, pp. 25-29) indicate significant attrition at each successive level, even when taking due

---

\(^9\) The focus and mandate of these organisational structures are detailed in the Education Sector Report 2008, pp.2-6.

account of the cycle durations (8,4,4 years). The reasons for this relate both to supply and demand factors, as discussed further in this analysis.

**Governance**

With respect to governance issues, Kenya’s poor record on corruption and transparency has been detrimental to growth and at times has led to suspension or diminution of development assistance and loans. As indicated above in ‘Country Context’, Kenya rates poorly on the Corruption Perceptions Index (147 of 180 countries). The Government of Kenya has taken action to stem corruption. The Kenyan Anti-Corruption Authority was established in 1999 but to dubious effect. More recently, the ‘Governance Strategy for Building a Prosperous Kenya’ states (GoK, 2007, section B, para.4), “In addition to the measures already undertaken, the government fully recognizes that accelerating and deepening the reform agenda in the areas of governance and anti-corruption is critical for accelerating economic growth, a necessary condition for sustained reduction in poverty.”

Vision 2030 (RoK, 2007, p. 9) aims to “intensify efforts to bring about an attitudinal change in public service that values transparency and accountability to the citizens of Kenya.”

Development agencies continue to monitor probity issues in the disbursement and application of funds. Any significant negative developments will jeopardise support for Kenya’s future plans.

The following section outlines another component of governance – devolution and acceptance of responsibility at the local level. This entails a critical re-alignment of Kenya’s governance arrangements, and one which is essential to achieve Vision 2030.

**Decentralisation and Local Responsibilities**

One of the most apparent disjunctions between policy and practice is the area of devolution and active community participation in decisions affecting them and their children. On the one hand, as discussed above, Vision 2030 regards authentic devolution and ownership as fundamental to achieving the aims of its social and political pillars; noting (p.21) that an increase in devolved funds allocated to local communities is a strategy to address equality of opportunity. This is endorsed by development partners. On the other hand, reports question the extent to which this is achievable, given past practice and local capacity.

The UNICEF/GoK Social Budgeting Report (2006d) provides a compelling critique of current weaknesses at local level, as outlined below.

- **Technical capacity:** There is weak technical capacity at the policy-making level, including developing strategic plans.

- **Duplication and multiple accountability:** At constituency level, there are multiple, uncoordinated funds (discussed below under Financing). Hence there are parallel, not necessarily complementary, and potentially duplicative, special funds alongside centrally disbursed initiatives administered through regional ministry heads.

- **Financial Accountability:** Capital project implementation at local authority level have experienced problems: “either the money has been ineffectively managed or used for non-intended or non-authorized purposes. There is a need therefore, for systematic capacity development, supervision, and technical assistance to assist LAs in project implementation” (p.101).

- **Stakeholders’ Participation:** A lack of participation and consultation with communities means budgets, and budget priorities, are not open, and this hinders genuine participation in design, implementation and monitoring of activities which are funded at the local level. This directly runs counter to Kenya’s stated vision and values for communities. One consequence, the Social Budgeting Report argues, is local formation of alternative community based organisations.
The need for evidence based decision making is – for good reason – stressed in UNICEF’s Draft Country Programme, and in Education and Young People documentation. A major challenge highlighted in this Situation Analysis is addressing the poor quality of data on which decisions currently need to be based, particularly in crucial areas such as enrolments, retention, and patterns of student throughput.

This inadequacy is particularly relevant to key target groups whose participation is vital to achieving EFA and MDG2. The KESSP Aide Memoire (MoE, 2007b, p.18) comments that, ... over 1 million children are still out of school, most of whom are believed to be in the ASAL and urban informal settlements. There is a need to gain more accurate data on who and where these children are, and what is keeping them out of school, together with strategies to help them stay in school and complete their primary education.

Monitoring and evaluation procedures and data are presently inadequate as a basis for planning – a concern identified by UNICEF (2008a) and in the CRC’s observations (2007, p.4). This weakness is also apparent at the local level where strong evidence-based data are crucial for context-sensitive planning and accountability. Without such data, decision making is compromised, the strength of local argument is diminished, and the prospect of further funding becomes vulnerable.

The Social Budgeting Report (UNICEF/GoK, 2006d, p.105) points out that neither district nor national monitoring and evaluation units have “district-based data that can be used to reach optimal decisions. In addition, little work on budget tracking is going on at the districts.” As with other areas of local need above, capacity development in data definition, management and interpretation are required. These, with budgetary and planning skills, are core skills for effective devolution. Underscoring the desired way forward, Vision 2030 (p.8) advocates continued use of “devolved funds to strengthen decentralisation of development projects at the community level. Improved planning, prioritisation, and coordination of such projects at the local level will be accorded priority in realising that goal”.

These fundamental challenges related to data quality, interpretation and use for planning and evaluation purposes are of such significance to Government, the UN system and all development partners, UNICEF’s good offices might help leverage further resources and accelerate plans for strengthening EMIS through KESSP.

Financing

Recent Developments and Cautions

As outlined in the Country Context, Kenya’s economic recovery of recent years has stalled in 2008, with GDP expected to underperform expectations by at least half, with inflation increasing. At the macro level, development funds have been, or will be, negatively impacted as a result of diversion to deal with the 2008 effects of the political crisis, particularly the displacement of over 300,000 and increasing poverty, and as an inevitable flow-on effect of the global financial crisis which may result in cuts in trade from wealthy countries, and in aid from donors and banks. This concern is echoed in a recent statement by the World Bank.11

The strong possibility of economic downturn, compounded by possible re-alignment of shrinking development funds, underscores the need for agencies such as UNICEF to identify options and contingencies in programming. More so than in recent years, short-to-medium-term programming is necessarily undertaken in a time of uncertainty, both with respect to priorities and resourcing levels.

11 Under the headline “World Bank pours cold water on Vision 2030‖, the Business Daily (23/11/08) noted that “the World Bank has called for a fundamental ‘modification’ of the Vision 2030 economic development blueprint and cast serious doubts on the possibility of Kenya achieving and sustaining a 10 per cent growth rate - effectively challenging a key premise on which the economic master plan is founded. The institution terms as ‘ambitious’ Kenya’s objective of sustaining a 10 per cent economic growth rate, noting that the country has recorded an average growth of only three per cent in the last sixteen years to 2005.”
The following summary of education financing draws upon data which (necessarily) reflect actuals and projections from present or recent trends. The preceding discussion, coupled with the impact of uncertain external economic circumstances, require that future levels and focus areas of financing be treated as problematic, at a minimum to the extent of allowing for tuning modifications.

**Overall Funding Allocation**

Education in Kenya receives the major share of social sector funding. It was estimated in 2006 (UNICEF/GoK, 2006d, pp. v, 82) that education receives 70% of the total social sector budget allocation. Not surprisingly, there is some concern in other sectors that this reflects an imbalance, for example that worsening health indicators such as infant mortality and life expectancy may be partly due to a relatively under-funded health sector.

Budgetary allocations for education continue to favour primary schooling. Whereas in 2005, there were 7.6m primary school enrolments, with a budgetary allocation of 56%, 12% for universities with only 0.092m students, the ECDE sub-sector’s 1.6m children were supported by a 0.04% public education allocation, while the rapidly expanding secondary education sub-sector with 0.93m students in 2005 received 21%. Primary schooling receives by far the largest share of the education budget, while the critical ECDE, Special Education and NFE sub-sectors receive very small allocations overall or per child.

UNICEF (2008a) notes that 28% of the total Kenyan national budget is spent on education “and is nearing the expected 30% target” (p.3). The MoE (2007, p.3) reported that in 2005-06, 6.7% of GDP was spent on education, and that, “Total budgetary allocation to the sector for both recurrent and development budgets rose by 21.7% from KShs. 92.7 billion in 2005/06 to KShs. 107.8 billion in 2006/7” (MoE, 2007b, p.3). Of total education spending, 64% was on primary education, 25% on secondary education and 11% on tertiary.

**Recurent Funding**

A very high proportion of government expenditure goes to recurrent funding, estimated at 97%, of which 88% are for salaries (UNICEF/GoK, 2006d, p. v).

... though the government is spending a big percentage of the national wealth to improve education standards almost all of it pays salaries leaving very little to improve access, quality, enrolments and research in education. This has a negative impact on the quality of education offered (p.82)

**Development Funding**

As a consequence of the deployment of the recurrent budget, many of the initiatives needed to achieve goals such as EFA and MDG are funded through the Development budget. More than 90% of the Development Budget is from development partners and the civil society (RoK/MoE, 2008, p.xiii). Attachment 7 shows expenditure estimates and sources for externally funded initiatives in 2006-07 and 2007-08. However, this budget of $100m is not large in comparison to that of other developing countries, and, for 2007-08, contains a 33% loan component. Reasons for this are noted below.

The size of the Development Vote funding is estimated at 7% of the total education budget. However, more resources are required towards addressing regional and gender disparities and increasing access to education for vulnerable groups including children with special needs, orphans and children in marginalised and informal urban settlements (MoE, 2007b, p. 3).

**The Level and Role of Overseas Development Assistance (ODA)**

The level of ODA has fluctuated in Kenya. For example, between 1997 and 2003, Kenya received less than a 1:25 ratio of aid, with a per capita average ODA of US$0.75, compared to the Sub-Saharan Africa average of US$20 (GoK, 2005, p.9).
There has been more recent improvement but this may be wound back as a result of the global financial crisis, compounded by global flow-through effects on the Kenyan economy.

Even prior to the current crisis, concern was expressed about ODA commitment, as implied in the MDG Status Report’s (GoK, 2005, p. 10) exhortation to rally all national and development actors behind the MDGs, and engaging the international community in constructive dialogue on the need to honour their pledges to increase development assistance to at least 0.7% of their Gross National Income, reduce the debt burden, improve trade practices, and support the transfer of appropriate technology to developing countries.

**Capacity to Achieve Objectives**

Consequently, it is both timely and essential to question the capacity to achieve the Kenyan Government’s “core objective ... to restore economic growth and reduce poverty through employment and wealth creation” and, as stated in the Economic Recovery Strategy (ERS), to use “investment in human capital” as the pillar and strategy to achieve MDGs (GoK, 2005, pp. 9-10).

If a realistic analysis requires down-scaling of objectives and feasible outcomes, it will not only be the Government of Kenya which re-prioritises in a different time-scale, but also key development agency partners such as UNICEF. The case is made later in this report that the international, vastly experienced character of UNICEF places it in a strong position to assist Government in this process, while simultaneously considering options and contingencies for its own programming.

**Disadvantaged Groups: Unmet Needs**

There is an apparent anomaly emerging from educational expenditure data above. On the one hand, government spending on the education sector approximates the 30% target, as a percentage of budget. On the other hand, this Situation Analysis identifies several key areas in which additional resources over and above the target are required to meet substantive targets, such as EFA and MDG goals.

For example, UNICEF (2008a, p.3) points out that resource-requiring issues remain, e.g. “1.2 million children are still out of school. These include the most disadvantaged groups (OVCs, children with special needs, children in slums and those in the geographically challenging areas). Furthermore, Kenya still faces low rates of primary completion and transition to secondary schooling.

The Minister for Planning and National Development has pointed out that “it is true that the government will need to significantly increase funding beyond the current levels towards the MDGs-related activities” (GoK, 2005, p. 6) and, to this end, the Government issued a directive “to mainstream MDGs into national planning and budgeting processes” (p.5).

Government funding sources include a number at the constituency level, principally the Local Authority Transfer Funds, the Constituency Development Fund and the Constituency Bursary Fund, and “these funds have significantly improved the MDG’s-related infrastructure ... at the constituency level as long as international partners honor their commitments” (p.6). Funds referred to in the previous sentence are from the government budget. Inevitably there is confusion arising from reference to development partner commitments in this context.

**The Key Challenge**

Clearly, if the expenditure target is regarded as (almost) achieved, but significant needs remain unmet, stakeholders need to address:

1. How the target (30% of national budget) was derived, and whether it should continue to be an ‘accepted’ benchmark by agencies such as UNICEF;

2. How (and indeed ‘if’) this ‘shortfall’ will be met.
An Inclusive Approach to Budgeting: Supply and Demand

The remainder of this section on finance and budgeting focuses on a set of very important propositions raised through the Social Budgeting Initiative (SBI). Irrespective of whether social budgeting is adopted as a strategy, the questions which it raises are fundamental. They illustrate a source of tension between current fiscal processes and espoused policy.

This is seen most evidently when basic principles underpinning Vision 2030 – especially those of local ownership and commitment – are contrasted with status quo budgeting. There is also a strong argument that full achievement of EFA and MDG’s will be facilitated by a process which values and practises participation as “people identify the resources in the district, identify and prioritize their needs, identify the interventions required ... including resource allocation and monitor their implementation” (p.vi). ‘Prioritizing’ is particularly important as a means of matching community needs with the ‘resource envelope’.

Briefly stated, the Social Budgeting critique is:

... the current MTEF budgetary process ... fails to target and budget for the social sector needs and identify with the people at the grassroots. Budgetary allocations to the social sector have remained recurrent heavy as opposed to policy, which emphasizes increased allocations to development. The current budgetary process has focused more on achieving macroeconomic targets, emphasizing the supply side of the budget. The demand side of it, where consumer needs are taken into account, has been largely ignored. This has left a gap between policy statements and practical implementation especially in social sectors that cater for the needs of the children (UNICEF/GoK, 2006d, p. vi).

There are strong reasons why recognising the rights of communities benefits the government and the economy, as well as children. Most obvious is the potential for decline in high wastage through: failure to complete; repetition; dropping out; and ‘children unfriendly’ assessment and staging barriers. International experience informs us that, in general, the greater the community stake and participation in, and endorsement of, schooling, the greater the decline in these wastage factors. For example, lowering primary school repetition rates by 1% is estimated to realise a saving of Ksh 0.5 billion p.a. (p. 39).

Since UNICEF was co-sponsor of the SBI with the GoK, there is considerable harmony between the Initiative and UNICEF’s values for educational and social development. Local participation, a community stake in decisions affecting them, skills training at decentralised levels, and a concern that the voice of the disadvantaged is articulated, heard and taken into account – are some of the reasons why endorsement of a social budgeting (or similar) approach strengthens the conceptual and fiscal bases of UNICEF programming.

This Situation Analysis does not have information on how the Social Budgeting Initiative has been received, either within UNICEF or by the GoK. Assuming at a minimum a neutral response, there is potential for the Education Section of UNICEF to strengthen programming arguments, and to link social budgeting arguments with government objectives. A further strength of UNICEF is its experience in capacity building, especially at the local level. This is crucial for operationalising the devolution envisaged in Vision 2030.

Lastly, it should be noted that social budgeting argues for a synergy between macro and localised approaches, and is not mounting an either/or argument.

This calls for a dual budgeting framework where the macroeconomic framework (supply or growth side) is harmonized and negotiated with the human development and rights framework (i.e. the demand or development side) for an effective and equitable budget. It is therefore imperative that planning and budgeting should focus on achieving both macro and social targets and be participatory and rights based. Social budgeting provides one of the avenues of achieving an effective budget (UNICEF/GoK, 2006d, p. 11).

13 Attachment 8 contains a concise summary of the concept of Social Budgeting

14 Vision 2030 is partly predicated on macroeconomic performance [drawing upon variables such as inflation and economic growth] of annual GDP of 10%. Since this seems an increasingly optimistic target, the more micro and localised thinking associated with Social Budgeting could be a more flexible way forward.
Levels of Education: Characteristics, Achievements and Issues

The next major section of this report focuses principally on early childhood development and education (ECDE) and primary schooling, since these levels are of most concern to UNICEF. Secondary and post-secondary education are addressed more briefly. Important issues are raised in relation to secondary education, particularly as these affect access and retention for the larger primary cohort now moving through the system. The post-secondary sector, while important, is less relevant to this Situation Analysis than the schooling sector, with the exception of teacher training. However, there is relatively little information available to the writer on post-secondary education, including teacher training. While not directly related to UNICEF’s mandate, this may be an area to be flagged for increased attention.

The sections on ECDE and primary schooling are detailed. To understand the situation facing these sub-sectors, data are analysed at some length. Issues concerning conceptualisation and accuracy of data also needed to be addressed. For the reader who does not wish to engage with the detail, key points are addressed in Concluding Comments and Recommendations.

Early Childhood Education and Development (ECDE)

The Significance of the Early Years

*Early childhood education is the foundation of a child’s education and the child is most vulnerable at this stage (UNICEF/GoK, 2006d, p. v).*

*The ECDE programme in Kenya is expected to create a social setting, provide an enabling environment for the emotional development of the child, enhance the child’s communication, creative and exploratory skills and stimulate its mental development (p. 14)*

For too many Kenyan children, early growth and development do not proceed normally and in extreme cases, result in death, disability or delayed physical and psycho-social development. Continuing high levels of low birth-weight among babies, and persistent early childhood and maternal malnutrition, especially affecting food insecure areas, highlight ongoing major public health challenges, have profound consequences for learning, and for life-long earning potential, mental and physical health.

Intentionally, the first of the six EFA 2015 Goals, and the first of Kenya’s Vision 2030 strategies focus on early childhood development and learning, mindful that children with improved cognitive, language, social, emotional and physical ‘readiness’ are much more likely to start primary school at the recommended starting age of six, and are less likely to repeat the early grades, or drop out. Activity-based ECDE enhances ‘school readiness’ for disadvantaged children (Young, 2002, p.123), and thus ECDE is a Core Poverty Programme as well as a Vision 2030 Strategy.

A holistic approach is endorsed in Vision 2030 and is programmatically addressed in UNICEF’s integrated programme in the ‘learning districts’, where, despite many gains, malnutrition continues to be a concern (GoK/UNICEF, 2006b, pp. 84-86).

Increasingly, ECDE has been recognised as a cost-effective investment: in children, families and community; and ultimately the human resource capacity of the country (Van der Gaag & Tan, 1998).

The economic benefits of ECDE are perhaps most evident in relation to girls and women. As more girls proceed to higher levels of formal education in Kenya, and pursue income-generating employment, they will reflect global trends to marry later, have fewer children, and provide enhanced support for their families, as clearly illustrated by global data15. ECDE is therefore a building block strategy for gender equity and opportunity. Kenya cannot afford not to invest in a better start to life and learning for all children.

Strategies must be developed to meet the costs associated with expansion and quality control in the ECDE sub-sector to realise Vision 2030. Under-servicing of disadvantaged areas, often associated with continuing gender disparity, runs counter to access and equity goals. Investment need not solely be through government alone: East Asian experience shows that as women’s education increased, so did earning capacity and participation in the workforce, and employers, entrepreneurs, community groups and working parents provided support for child care and ECDE, and this issue is later addressed in funding options.

Management and structural arrangements require review. In Kenya, early childhood services for children from birth to three are coordinated through the Ministry of Health’s health and nutrition services, whereas the Ministry of Education focuses on children four-to-five years of age, and aims to support the “holistic integrated services that create a strong foundation for the child’s cognitive, psychosocial, moral, spiritual, emotional and psychomotor needs before they join primary education” (RoK/MoE, 2008, p. 22). This age-based, discipline-linked division risks perpetuating ‘ministerial and professional silos’ (Mustard, 2006) that may not adequately reinforce psycho-social aspects of early nurture in health / nutrition services, or under-value health / nutrition imperatives in early education programmes. Rather like the Ministerial division between primary and secondary education, the Ministerial division during the early years may engender compartmentalisation instead of addressing the ‘whole child’.

UNICEF has played a significant role in supporting the ECDE sub-sector, including: support at national level for policy development; capacity strengthening of communities to administer community support grants and manage ECDE centres; parenting education on psychosocial development and life skills through culturally relevant folktales; documenting the impact for ECDE of integration with health, nutrition and protection components in ‘learning districts’. 16

As noted later, there is potential for a continuing and expanding UNICEF’s role in advocacy, communication, programme development and support.

**Achievements and Challenges**

The preceding section outlines the rationale for the high priority given by government and partners to strengthened early learning. The following section examines achievements and challenges for ECDE, based on actual developments and available data.

**Policy framework**

With UNICEF and UNESCO support, the ECDE sub-sector has developed an Early Childhood Development Policy Framework, and National Service Standards to guide implementation. It is hoped that this policy, and the way it is implemented and communicated, will assist in addressing a number of the issues and challenges in ECDE outlined below.

**Enrolment increases are inadequately documented**

Enrolment has increased substantially. MoE data report an increase in public ECDE centres from 1.32 million in 2001 to 1.67m in 2006, an increase of 25% over 5 years. Privately sponsored centres are reported to have increased from 0.53 million in 2003 to 0.59 million in 2006, an 11% increase over three years. These figures mask a plateau in enrolments from 2003 to 2005, presumably as a result of the marked increase in primary enrolments following FPE (RoK/MoE, 2008, p. 22) when many five-year-old children entered St.1 rather than preschool.

However, data on this sub-sector are partial and sometimes inconsistent. For example, GERs are reported but, with the exception below, not NERs, yet both indicators have the same denominator (age-specific population). Age ranges cited for ‘pre-primary’ baseline enrolments (3-5 yrs) in UIS data (UNESCO, 2008) are inconsistent with those used by the

---

16 UNICEF Annual Reports, 2005-07.
MoE (4-5 yrs). Additionally, available documentation does not adequately distinguish between the defining characteristics of public as against privately sponsored centres.

**Improbable Data and Secondary Sources**

A stark example of improbable data can be seen by comparing the percentage increases in year-to-year enrolments in ECDE centres, where in every district and every province, from 2005 to 2006, enrolments allegedly increased by 2% (rounded), yet the previous comparison (2002 to '05) showed large sub-national variability in the percentage increases over time.\(^{17}\)

Secondary sources tend to cite GER for ECDE enrolments, and these increase from 47% in 2001 to 58% in 2005, with approximate gender parity, but substantial inter-provincial variability (Fig. 1). The apparent presence of large numbers of under- and over-age children in centres, as documented in household-based surveys implies a large GER / NER gap, assuming quality NER data can be collated.\(^{18}\) Over-age (delayed) entry to St.1 exacerbates problems of efficiency and completion at primary level, as illustrated below. Clearly, data sources require improvement if this sub-sector is to be monitored in a useful, policy-informative manner, and this point is elaborated in the Quality of Data section below.

**Under-serving the disadvantaged**

Of particular concern, though similar to overall education sector performance patterns, is sub-national variation. NEP is particularly under-served by ECDE centres (Technical Appendix, Table 4); with reported 20% GER (23% Boys / 17% Girls) (MoE, EMIS, 2007). NEP does have madrassa centres which offer an alternative form of ECDE, but it is not clear whether data are available on these centres.

**Figure 1: Gross Enrolment Rate in ECDE by Gender and Province, 2006**

In contrast to NEP, Nairobi is reported as having a GER of 134% (125 B / 134 G), by far the ‘highest’ ECDE GER (Fig. 1). However, Nairobi is reported to have very low participation in primary school (Fig. 2). Furthermore, the recent evaluation of UNICEF’s ‘Learning Districts Programme that included parts of Nairobi, reported 13% below-five participation in the learning communities, and noted that this has “declined by about half since the 2002 baseline survey ... attributed to implementation of FPE‖ (GoK/UNICEF, 2006b, p. xii).

No plausible explanation has been advanced for the contrast between MoE’s ECDE GER data (Fig. 1) and the low levels in UNICEF’s learning communities in Nairobi, nor between ECDE and primary GER data (c.f. Figs 1 & 2). There may be data and classification errors, and/or provision of non-government ECDE programmes schooling in Nairobi slums. These,

---

17 MoE/EMIS, 2007, adapted as Table 4 in the ‘Technical Appendix’: (reading far right-hand column and other columns shaded in green).

18 NER data 22% are reported for 2005 by UNICEF, alongside a GER of 50%, and the 26% difference therefore supports the above argument.
combined with population cohort estimates may have produced anomalies in derived indicators such as GER and NER, and such data need to be interpreted cautiously.

Quality of centres, of teachers, of learning

Quality of centres is dependent on quality of teachers. The number of ECDE teachers increased from 63,650 in 2003, to 74,529 in 2006, of whom 71% were reported as ‘trained’ (RoK/MoE, 2008, p.22). Salaries are low and irregularly paid. Inter-district comparisons (UNICEF, 2008) of ECDE Pupil:Teacher Ratios (PTR) show wide variation, with some having classes of over 50. In these circumstances, teacher motivation and opportunities for quality teaching are jeopardised, potentially exacerbating teacher attrition (UNESCO, 2005, p. 8).

Understanding adverse conditions for ECDE teachers is a pre-condition for addressing these conditions, alongside improved disaggregated data, drawing upon both quantitative and qualitative approaches to address inequitable deployment and teaching / learning environments.

The relative lack of information on qualitative aspects of ECDE means limited data on teaching and learning quality are available. For ECDE, age-appropriate teaching strategies require interaction and play, not rote learning methods. ‘Child friendly’ principles must be at the core. While data are largely anecdotal, there are claims (UNESCO, 2005) that many parents pressure centres to adopt ‘teacher-centred’ methods (such as drills and skills) which run counter to the holistic development required in the early years.

There is an unmet need for advocacy and communication at the community level in support of ECDE. Experience in other countries suggests that effective communication strategies rapidly increase understanding of and support for ECDE (as against mini-primary schools).

Quality of data and indicators of quality

The fact and impact of poor (or no) data have been referred to above, illustrating a more generic problem. It is crucial that more stringent and reliable data are obtained to illuminate variation in access and participation across the country, and to explain the reasons for such variation. Without this, policy and programme initiatives may miss their intended target.

Quality of ECDE programmes is insufficiently addressed through available data. Because EFA 2000 and EFA 2015 ECDE Goals were framed in terms of access, the recent RoK/MoE Sector Report (2008) restricts its coverage of the ECDE sub-sector to a brief, quantitative, access-focused summary. While important, quantitative criteria alone will not significantly assist MoE or partners to address the reasons why ECDE may make a significant difference to children’s lives. The introduction to this section indicates that this is what drives the ECDE policy imperative.

There are sets of indicators available which identify and suggest evidence gathering strategies for qualitative processes and outcomes of ECDE (e.g. Meyers, 2000). These should be used to complement quantitative system-performance data. There is no evidence from information for this Situation Analysis that this is the case so far. Given UNICEF’s strong international record with development and use of qualitative indicators, this is a potential area for support to ECDE in Kenya.

The need for advocacy and a communication strategy

An effective ECDE communication strategy – whether to government, communities, the private sector or development partners – requires national evidence of ECDE programmes’ impact and outcomes. This is currently inadequate. Sound evidence-based reporting on, for example, cohort progression and children’s achievement, is the foundation of a communication strategy to galvanise support.

---

19 By contrast, private providers such as the Madrassah Resource Centres (MRC)supported by Aga Khan Foundation (AKF) have maintained a deliberate focus on quality, rather than access targets in order to retain the support of the fee-paying families. (personal communication)

20 The need for a comprehensive, evidence-based, sector-wide communication strategy has been noted as a critical shortcoming of KESSP.
Overall, it is apparent that ECDE enrolments have increased over recent years, although the majority of Kenyan children do not have access to, or whose families choose not to access, ECDE centres. Further, there are systematic variations across the country in participation rates, and these appear to disadvantage the already disadvantaged. Efficiency and quality issues need scrutiny and analysis to ensure the appropriateness of ECDE programmes for school readiness and enhanced psycho-social development.

There is an inherent contradiction between the importance assigned to quality ECDE in policies, EFA commitments and poverty alleviation strategies (especially for disadvantaged children), and the dependence on non-government sources and parental fees to pay teachers’ salaries. A thoughtful, data-based analysis of the sub-sector in 2005 by the Teachers Service Commission (MoEST, TSC, 2005) offered 12 recommendations related to meeting staffing, deployment, training, quality assurance and financing challenges of expanding access with quality within the ECDE sub-sector. Four funding options are considered.

TRC recommends a modest-cost option to ensure one trained ECDE teacher at each centre, estimated to require about 2.75% of the education budget (pp.31-32), by contrast with the current level of 0.04%. Most of these recommendations have yet to be acted on, yet remain vital for the viability of ECDE. Importantly, the TSC emphasises a need for evidence-based advocacy for increased government, development partner, community and family funding.

Other recommendations, implicit in the challenges outlined above, are addressed later in this analysis, particularly in the areas of: improved disaggregated data collation, availability and use; improved sub-sector efficiency to minimise participation of over-age children; quality assurance; inclusion of psycho-social development monitoring in all health/nutrition initiatives for infants and young children; and evidence-based advocacy and communication to address demand-side constraints in areas with low support and participation.

Primary Education

An Overview

Kenya’s eight year primary school cycle is two years longer than the norm for developing countries. Usually, the first eight years are regarded as the elementary cycle (6+2, or sometimes 5+3). Consequently, international comparisons using the primary schooling indicator are not necessarily comparing ‘like with like’ on variables such as completion rates, GER and NER, transition, and sub-sectoral spending.

There are sound arguments in support of an eight year, compulsory cycle. For example:

The eight-year cycle is consistent with national evidence of the significant impact of education of girls beyond grade six and key indicators such as age of marriage, fertility rates, quality of caring practices as mothers, and economic prospects of the family. Impacts of schooling beyond six years (i.e. into adolescence) are reflected in global data (c.f. box plots, Attachment 10).

If large percentages of students complete the eight year Kenyan primary cycle, they will approximate the ILO minimum age for employment of 15 years, reducing the likelihood of widespread child labour. Nevertheless child labour remains an issue for contemporary Kenya.

Primary school enrolment statistics are encouraging in terms of meeting MDG and EFA goals for 2015, and have been significantly increased by the introduction of free primary education (FPE) in 2003, although with variable levels among the provinces (Fig 2). As further discussed later in this section, these data are questionable, given the sharp contrast

---

21 The operation of ECDE centres depends on local management through religious, NGO or community bodies, supported by community-based grants for public centres and classes.

22 The impact of at least primary education on key indicators is documented in the DHS (2003), and recent MICS (2007).

between ECDE and Primary data for Nairobi, and the use of different figures in different secondary sources.

This analysis is not confident that primary data used to compile provincial variability (Figs 1, 2) and derived indicators GER, NER, GER / NER Gaps and GPI (Table 1) are accurate, and suggests caution in accepting the figures cited and inferences drawn from these data.

Figure 2: Primary Gross Enrolment Ratios by Province, 2006

This is not surprising, given that ‘affordability’ had been rated as the leading impediment to enrolment and retention for out-of-school children in both urban and rural areas24. Nevertheless, the overall statistics mask demographic factors which disproportionately disadvantage some students, as summarised below.

Table 1: Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER), Net Enrolment Ratio (NER), GPI and GER/NER Gaps; 2000-2006

Key Data on Primary Schooling

This Situation Analysis has collated and analysed available disaggregated data tables from various sources. Key data on sub-system performance are summarised below. While a number of overall trends are encouraging, the validity and reliability of data vary considerably. It is apparent that data gathering and reporting systems require improvement, including through disaggregation, to better understand the situation of the disadvantaged, as well to identify amelioration strategies.

- Combined public and private primary school enrolment increased from 5.94m in 2000, to 8.2m in 2007. Closer scrutiny of Table 1 indicates that the year-to-year increases are uneven,
with significant enrolment ‘spikes’ in 2003 (FPE introduction) and 2007 (for reasons not clear from the available information).\textsuperscript{25}

- As with aggregated data on education indicators, these summary data mask year-wise, district / provincial and grade-wise variations over this period. Some of these more subtle changes are only discernible by closer inspection of the district and provincial data for the selected years 2002, 2005, 2006 (Technical Appendix, Table 5).

- The introduction of Free Primary Education in 2003 resulted in a large overall primary increase in enrolments (a nationwide average increase of 17% for boys and girls, by comparison with 2002). Many children who had been enrolled at various grade levels but had dropped out were attracted back to school by the FPE policy. Consequently, there were encouraging increases in Standards 2 and 3, and to a lesser extent, Standards 4 to 7, although the largest percentage of school entrants in 2003 enrolled in St. 1\textsuperscript{26}

- Following the large Standard 1 increase averaging 36% nationwide in 2003 (by comparison with 2002), there is an overall decline in Standard 1 enrolments in 2004, 2005, 2006, suggesting that many over-age children enrolled in 2003, but fewer over-age entrants enrolled in St. 1 in subsequent years.

- Reductions in over-age enrolments, however, cannot account for the large increase in St. 1 enrolments in 2007, where there is a reported increase of 18% (i.e. from 1.16 million in 2006 to 1.36 million in 2007), nor does it explain the increased enrolments in 2007 in Standards 1-5, and St. 8, against the decreased enrolments (relative to 2006) in Standards 6-7. These grade-wise data highlight why it is misleading to discuss an ‘average increase’ of almost 8% in 2007 primary enrolments.\textsuperscript{27}

- It is possible that the increases in 2007 compared to 2006 reflects improved system efficiency in enumerating children from non-government and non-formal schools, as committed under KESSP. Without additional information, this remains speculative.

- District data aggregated to provincial data and the overall national picture are currently available to the author only for selected years (2002, 2005, 2006).\textsuperscript{28} These data reveal significant inter-district and inter-provincial enrolment variations. Over the period 2002-2005, nationwide primary enrolments increased by 25% overall, (an average annual increase of >8%, mostly attributable to the FPE year increases). These data mask significant provincial variations ranging from 56% (NE) and 51% (Coast), to 34% (Nairobi), 30% (Rift Valley), 29% (Western), dropping to 22% (Nyanza), 19% (Eastern), and 11% (Central).

- Inter-district and inter-provincial enrolment variability is important, but it is not clear whether there are plausible interpretations for large variations, or whether data may be incorrect. If the analysis were pursued by MoE district officers at the sub-district level, the patterns of variability would readily identify schools where more detailed analysis would be helpful for planning. Three examples of data requiring careful interpretation and response (particularly in light of EFA and MDG goals) are:

  o Comparing 2006 with ‘05, where nationwide GER shows no change, there are wide inter-district variations in the percentage increase / decrease, especially within Rift Valley, Nyanza, Central and Western Provinces, ranging from -44% to 53%. The reasons for such wide variations are not readily apparent.

---

\textsuperscript{25} Raw enrolment data are summarised for each year from 1999 to 2007, disaggregated by grade (Standards 1-8) for Boys, Girls and Total enrolments, and for all 76 Districts, and 8 Provinces. These detailed data are set out in the Technical Appendix, Table xx.

\textsuperscript{26} These data for Standards 1-8 over the period 1999-2007 inclusive have been collated in the Technical Appendix, Tables 2 and 3.

\textsuperscript{27} Technical Appendix, Tables 2 and 3.

\textsuperscript{28} These data have been used as the basis for a number of detailed tables that have been amended to show percentage changes as appended (Technical Appendix, Tables 4, 5, 6, 7).

\textsuperscript{29} These analyses are based on Tables 4-7 adapted from EMIS (2007), Fact Sheet.
EMIS Provincial GERs ranged from 28 (NE), to 40 (Nairobi), to 96 (Coast), 102 (Central), 112 (RV), 127 (Eastern), 128 (Nyanza) and 136 (Western), giving a nationwide average GER of 107, with a 5% gender disparity (110 B / 105 G) for 2006, as evident in Table 1 and Fig. 2 above.

Variability among districts and provinces is also apparent by examination of Table 7 in the attached Technical Appendix, masking a range from 21 (NEP) to 98 (Nyanza).

- Accurate GER and NER depend on accurate age-specific population estimates to provide the denominator for both indicators. In the case of Kenya, population estimates for the 6-13 year-old cohort depend on projections based on the 1999 Census. These age-group estimates are likely to be increasingly unstable at lower system levels, and with each intervening year, due to some in-country migration and factors that may differentially affect district-based age-specific populations.

- The gender gap in enrolments has remained relatively constant, with GPI averaging 0.96 between 1999 and 2007, ranging from 0.99 in 2000, to 0.94 in 2004 and 2005. The Gender Gap for GER data is slightly larger than for equivalent NER data, possibly suggesting that consistently higher proportions of over-age boys than girls in primary schools.

- Significantly for UNICEF, in areas where considerable UNICEF technical and financial support to primary education was provided, the gains in total enrolment of 56% between 2002 and 2005, and a further 7% between 2005 and 2006 are significantly above national ‘averages’, admittedly starting from a very low enrolment base and relatively small numbers (less than 10% of national enrolments).

- Scrutiny of data suggests caution in assuming the accuracy of derived indicators such as GER and NER, especially at sub-national levels. For example, in both Western and Nyanza Provinces, NER are reported in 2005 and 2006 as 97% and 98% respectively (i.e. almost every child from 6-13 is enrolled), yet the corresponding GER / NER gaps are 39% (GER 136%) and 30% (GER 128) respectively. This casts doubt on the veracity of the reported NER’s. It is well nigh impossible that in Western and Nyanza Provinces, almost every primary-aged child is enrolled in primary school, given what is known about related indicators.

- Data reported on Nairobi are puzzling, and inaccuracies are likely. In 2006, Nairobi was reported to have a GER for ECDE of 134 (125 B / 144 G) (Fig. 1 above), and an overall GER primary (Fig. 2 above) of 40 (39 B / 32 G). Such a dramatic attrition from ECDE to primary seems implausible, particularly in post-FPE years. A partial explanation may lie in the provision but non-enumeration of primary non-government schooling in Nairobi slums but this must remain a hypothesis until stronger explanatory and contextually grounded data are provided.

Each of the groups below is of particular concern to UNICEF, as recent and projected programmes demonstrate.

- Students from ASALs and Nairobi slums participate in government primary schooling at a level which is well below the norm for Kenya, and MDG Goal 2 (Fig. 2).
- Due to HIV/AIDS the percentage of orphans is large: estimated at 12-15% at primary school (UNICEF/GoK, 2006d, pp.30,40, c.f. Rok/MoE, 2008, p. 28) and 13% at secondary level (UNICEF/GoK, 2006d, pp.30,40). Bursary support is available for orphans but at a relatively low level, jeopardising retention.
- Child labour similarly threatens the achievement of Universal Primary Education (UPE) and EFA and MDG2 goals. In addition to non-enrolment of these children, child labour does of course pose a moral issue which is of long-standing concern to UNICEF and others. “In Kenya, the Government in consultation with UNICEF, WHO, ILO considers child labour to

---

30 This concern is being addressed by government in the current planning of a nationwide census in 2009.
31 Compare Figs 1 and 2 attached above
32 As claimed in a recent UNICEF Voices of Youth Article (2008, Fatuma’s Diary)
include both paid and unpaid work and activities that compromise physical, psychological, social and moral development of children. It is work that deprives children the opportunity for schooling. It is exploitative, and denies children the opportunity to be children and makes them assume the roles of adults prematurely” (UNICEF/GoK, 2006d, p.22).

It is essential that vulnerable groups such as slum dwellers, those from ASALs, orphans and those engaged in child labour undertake a full cycle of primary education if EFA and MDG’s are to be realised. This is a fundamental issue of children’s rights. It will be crucial that access, retention and support be monitored and regularly reported. The capacity to do so may need strengthening, as noted below under Monitoring and Evaluation.

Acknowledgement of these disadvantaged children also means acknowledging that strategies for enrolling and retaining them through the primary cycle need to be different from those adopted to date. ‘More of the same’ may consolidate gains already made but may miss the disadvantaged target group whose participation is essential for achieving EFA and MDGs. It is encouraging to note some innovative trials, such as mobile schools in ASALs and suggested initiatives such as multigrade arrangements and teacher training modules for rural areas (Irvine, 2005).

While the FPE policy has been generally positive, it has also had some negative consequences. System resources have been strained, resulting in over-crowding, teacher distribution imbalances and consequent questions over quality of education. In turn, such factors lead to high wastage rates through repetition, dropping out, and low completion and transition rates (UNICEF/GoK, 2006d, p. 25).

Transition rates from primary to secondary school have remained almost constant at an average of 45%, but with a slight decline in 2003. While the gross enrolment in primary school has suddenly shot up, accessible student places in secondary schools have remained almost the same, at least in the short run. This has an effect of lowering the transition rates (p. 73).

In its summary of key education challenges, Sector Report (RoK/MoE, 2008, p. xv) comments:

Despite ... achievements, the Government currently faces several challenges in the education sector. These include inadequate transition rates from primary to secondary schools; shortage of classrooms, especially in primary schools (leading to congestion); low cognitive achievement; an escalating teachers’ wage bill that currently absorbs 73 per cent of the MOE’s recurrent budget; inadequate teaching/learning materials; inadequate teaching staff; high teacher pupil ratio; inadequate capacity for both Quality Assurance and Standards and Education Officers in the field particularly as regards to low establishment.

**Efficiency**

In efficient school systems, children enrol in Standard 1 at the recommended entry age, progress without repetition through each grade, complete the primary cycle with assessed mastery of academic standards at each grade level, then continue to secondary or equivalent schooling. At a system level, repetition and drop-out are markers of inefficiency, often characterised by ‘bottlenecks’ at key examination points where it is necessary to meet defined academic standards to proceed to the next level, and adding immensely to the real and opportunity cost of schooling, not only for families but also to the system.

It is important yet difficult to collate reliable data on the progression of cohorts of children through their schooling careers. Due to uncertainties about reliability and accuracy of data, the ‘reconstructed cohort’ approach combining data on progression, repetition and drop-out at each grade level over time is not feasible. However, when grade-wise data on repeaters are not available for each year, an ‘apparent cohort’ can be reconstructed by tabulating grade-wise enrolment data over a number of successive years, assuming each year, each cohort should progress intact one grade higher. The ‘apparent cohort’ approach assumes that students who repeat will appear in the same grade level the following year, and that on a nationwide basis, a reasonably concise picture of cohort’s progression is feasible.
‘Apparent cohorts’ can readily be constructed and analysed at school, cluster, district and provincial levels, but in contexts where there may be family migration or internal displacement, apparent cohorts at sub-national levels may be misleading or incomplete.

The following analysis is based on EMIS enrolment data from 1999 to 2007 (Technical Appendix, Tables 2 & 3) to enable some reflection on grade-wise progression of apparent cohorts from Standards 1 to 8. The step-wise progression of each apparent cohort is also noted in terms of the percentage at each grade, relative to the ‘cohort starting year’ for each Standard 1. By allocating each St.1 cohort ‘100%’ (mindful that this does not equate to a Net Intake Rate (NIR) of 100%, and includes children repeating St.1), the apparent attrition of successive cohorts year by year can be compared for boys, girls and combined enrolments.

Some interesting findings relating to efficiency emerge from the ‘apparent cohort’ data:

- Although enrolments over this nine-year period increased overall by from 5.87 million to 8.21 million, these increases mask large variations over time, and at different grade levels;
- The St 1 cohort increased by 36% in 2003 (FPE year), almost double the equivalent increase in any other Standard. This ‘bulge’ is progressively moving through the system and in 2008 should be enrolled in Standard 6. Planning must be proactive to accommodate this;
- From Standards 1 to 8, there is an overall decrease of 29% for the 1999 St.1 cohort, compared with a 1% gain for the 2000 St.1 cohort, largely due to the numbers of students in St.8, many of whom need to repeat to pass the KPSE;
- From 2001 to 2007, (with the exception of FPE year 2003), there is an 11% overall annual increase in the numbers of children in Standard 8, peaking at a worrying 48% increase in 2007 compared to 2006, again reflecting the impact on system efficiency of low overall pass rates in the end-of-cycle examination (St.1), forcing children to repeat or drop out;
- Fluctuations in ‘apparent cohort retention’ are quite dramatic. For example, for the 1999 St.1 cohort, 71% are shown as St.8 enrolments in 2006 – an attrition of 29% over the primary cycle. By contrast, 101% of the 2000 cohort (i.e. more than the number that started) were enrolled in St. 8 in 2007, yet only 54% of the 2001 ‘apparent cohort’ were enrolled in St. 8 – a dramatic drop from 88% of this cohort who had reached St. 7 in 2006.

‘Apparent retention’ for some apparent cohorts is positive beyond expectations and, in the Kenyan context, counter-intuitive relative to other available information. There is no apparent substantive explanation for the magnitude and patterns of these differences. Furthermore, the confusing ‘trends’ are not consistent with data reported on repetition and drop-out rates, such as those reported in the Sector Report (2008, p. 27) showing an increase in primary completion rate of almost 17% from 2001 to 2006.

These ‘apparent cohort’ data and interpretations must be regarded with caution, and may be inaccurate, notwithstanding that the cohorts are based on official MoE data.

Year-wise by grade-wise data on repetition rates, drop-out rates, and transition rates are unavailable to the author. The variability among districts and among grades is certain to be equally challenging to interpret, yet for programmatic purposes, it is essential to distinguish the differences within a school, as well as those between schools.

For example, inequitable teaching loads and class sizes are sources of friction among teachers in any school, and in schools where large numbers coming for the first time to St.1 combine with other children repeating that grade create large classes, whereas often in upper primary classes in the same schools, through attrition, classes are much smaller, students are familiar with the routines and expectations of school, and larger classes would be more manageable than in the initial grades.

33 The progression of the 2003 Standard 1 cohort from 2003 to 2007 is shaded in light green in Table 3, and is also shown as a ‘percentage annual increase’ to show the ‘enrolment bulge’.
34 Data are not yet available for 2008
35 This concern is raised in relation to examination pass rates and transition rates from primary to secondary
Disaggregated data are imperative in order to make sound evidence-based decisions on practical issues such as equitable teaching loads, gender-balanced staffing, consolidation of non-viable or dysfunctional schools, as well as macro-level policies and practices that have an impact on crucial family decisions such as enrolments in ECDE and enrolments of six-year-olds in St.1, or withdrawing older adolescent boys and girls still struggling to complete the primary cycle, high quality.

The complex patterns and trends in enrolment, drop-out, repetition over time, and in different parts of the country, combined with limited available data have made an analysis of system-wide efficiency challenging. However, for 2003, EMIS data show:

- A reasonably consistent 2% drop-out rate (except for St 7 where it increases to 2.6% for Boys and 3.3% Girls: Fig 3), with some inter-provincial variation;
- An overall repetition rate (St.1-8) averaging between 1-3% with considerable inter-provincial variability, ranging from <1% in Nairobi to 10-12% in Rift Valley, Coast and Western Provinces;
- Primary completion rates for successive cohorts (e.g. 1990-97, 1991-98 to 1996-03) improving from <50% to about 60% overall, with a small gender gap (Fig. 4). These data are for earlier cohorts, but do not correspond to the erratic patterns of ‘apparent completion’ in the Years x Grades table;
- Average class sizes increased from 30.5 in 2001 to 34.7 in 2003, and remained at that level to 2006 (GoK/MoE, 2008, p. 25), while PTRs increased from 35:1 in 2000 to 42:1 in 2006 (Technical Appendix, Table 8), again masking considerable variation among districts collating to provinces. However, an ‘average’ of 42:1 undoubtedly masks variability between and within schools. Field reports and observations suggest that there are many teachers struggling with classes of 60 or more children. Quality is compromised in these circumstances;
- For each of the above indicators and the proxy indicator of ‘apparent cohort attrition’ that reflect on system efficiency, it is important to include and analyse 2007 and 2008 data, and data for secondary schooling by district and grade, when available, given the large enrolment increases in 2007, the post-election internal displacement of families and children in 2008, and the concern about low transition from primary to secondary school.

---

36 Chege’s evaluation (2006, p. 4) provides a table sourced from the MoE, showing grade-wise repetition rates averaging about 6% for the years 2004,05,06 respectively, compared to the sex-by-province repetition data for 2003, averaging 10%.
In general, nationwide enrolment increases are not reflected in improved system efficiency:

- System inefficiency begins in the earliest years, where repetition and drop-out reflect the limited readiness of many children starting formal schooling, and the enrolment of many over-age children in St.1.

- The introduction of FPE in 2003 had its most dramatic impact on increased enrolments in St.1, but also on other primary grades. The 2003 ‘bulge’ is moving through the system and must be accommodated in forward planning of facilities and staffing.

- Primary completion rates between 50-60% highlight the failure of the system to attract and retain about half the children. Put another way, 40-50% of children nationwide are still unable to realise their right to a primary education of good quality.

- The KSPE has increasingly become a ‘bottleneck’ with large increases in enrolment in St.8 over the past eight years, presumably swollen by candidates who repeat St.8.

- The persistent GER / NER gap (Table 1) reflecting the presence of over-age children shows little evidence of a narrowing trend. When the benefits of schooling are not translating into enhanced earning potential, with every extra year it takes a child to complete this basic eight-year cycle, the lost opportunity cost increases for the family. At the system level, inefficiencies continue to add a large, yet avoidable, cost burden.

**Quality**

Measurable learning outcomes are not a focus of the MDGs, but continue post-2000 to be a major focus of the EFA movement, within the overarching EFA 2015 ‘Quality’ goal, viz:

Improving all aspects of the quality of education and ensuring excellence of all so that recognized and measurable learning outcomes are achieved by all, especially in literacy, numeracy and life skills (EFA 2015 Goal 5, c.f. Attachment 3)

Quality of schooling is more than what can be measured in learning achievements, inevitably encompassing teacher-student and student-student interactions and relationships; quality of curriculum, teaching and learning materials; school and classroom environment; leadership; governance; teacher professional development; inclusiveness; gender relations and other quality attributes of schools addressed in educational literature, and in Kenyan schools working within the ‘Child Friendly Schools’ Initiative (CFSI).

From parents’ and children’s perspectives, quality will also firmly encompass perceptions of relevance as the inter-connectedness of school and day-to-life and meaningful employment prospects. This is particularly important for children from disadvantaged families, where continuing in some form of education can only be justified if it is perceived to be enhancing their daughter’s or son’s self-confidence and potential earning prospects.

‘Quality’ is at the core of the UNICEF global ‘child-friendly school initiative’ (CFSI) that has been documented in many countries for its impact on quality, including children’s learning achievements. To date, it has not been possible to compare the ‘measurable learning
achievements' of those children in Kenya who have been educated in a CFS environment, with children from similar circumstances attending ‘regular’ primary schools, nor the impact of CFSI, including the In-Service Education and Training (INSET) on other important ‘quality components’ such as inclusivity and gender.

In the absence of available information on children’s learning achievements over time and at various stages during the primary cycle, this analysis is limited to the brief summary of Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE) - used by the MoE (2008, pp. 32-33) as the only marker discussed under primary ‘quality and relevance’.

The mean 2002 KCPE score of 247.9, based on 540,069 candidates, had improved slightly to 249.8 with 666,451 candidates by 2006, interpreted as indicating “performance of the sector has gradually improved (p. 33). However, some key limitations need to be addressed:

- By comparing the ‘Candidature’ (i.e. number of candidates sitting KCPE) for each year from 2002-2006 (RoK/MoE, 2008, p. 33) against the St.8 enrolments for the same year (Technical Appendix, Table 4), for three of the five years, there are more ‘candidates’ than ‘enrolments’, creating serious doubts on the accuracy of the data;
- In the absence of measures of dispersion (e.g. range, standard deviation) for each year’s results, it is not possible to interpret the small annual mean differences;
- From the brief summary, it is not possible to comment on whether a larger or smaller number/proportion of children are considered to have ‘passed’ the KCPE at a level sufficient to allow their transition to secondary school, nor whether there has been a qualitative improvement in the pass/fail ratio in recent years;
- The KCPE data are limited to St.8 children, but it is imperative to obtain and analyse data on children’s learning outcomes at other earlier grade levels, particularly in the Kenyan context of automatic promotion from grade to grade, whereby children may be promoted with no real evidence that they have met basic mastery criteria;

![Figure 5: Transition Rates from Primary to Secondary: 1998 - 2003](image)

Transition rates hovering between 42-46% over the period 1998 to 2003 (Fig. 5) give cause for concern. One the one hand, there are supply-side constraints due to the limited number of available secondary schools relative to primary, and demand-side constraints such as the tuition and lost opportunity costs to families when they must consider whether four further years of education will lead to enhanced life and earning prospects for their adolescent daughter or son. This decision becomes increasingly difficult with each year spent by adolescents who have not completed primary school by 13 years of age.

37 Chege, (2008) evaluated the effectiveness of CFS within the “UNICEF CFSI framework [that] seeks to guide schools in becoming ‘child-seeking’ and ‘community-based’ with the aim of ensuring that all children — girls and boys — learn in environments that are inclusive, healthy, and protective and that schools are effective with children and involved with their families and communities,” using a small purposive sample drawn from 8 schools, 2 in each of 4 (of the 11) CFS Districts.
Promising work supported by UNICEF on Monitoring Achievement in Lower Primary (MALP) addresses the need for tools to monitor children’s mastery of basic skills, especially in the lower primary grades, where monitoring linked to teacher routines to progressively track each child’s progress through successive units of work, and where necessary, provide remedial assistance and supplementary learning materials to ensure that every child reaches ‘minimal competencies’ each year of school.

To date, the work has focused more on tool development and trial. A study involving 2,400 lower primary children sampled from schools in Garissa, Kwale and Nairobi (RoK/MoE, 2007b). Inter alia, highlighted generally low levels in key basic skills that reinforce earlier concerns that many children are proceeding grade by grade via automatic promotion yet do not have adequate subject mastery as prerequisite for the next grade-level tasks.

System-wide assessments of children in lower primary are recommended “in order to improve teachers’ capacity in test item development” (p.35). More urgently than test item development is the need to provide assistance to all teachers to focus not only on end-of-year exams but also on the day-to-day imperative of monitoring the continuous progress of every child in the key academic subjects.

Modest KCPE results, the absence of continuous assessment and remedial education strategies linked to regular monitoring of individual children in key basic subjects, and the impact of low quality on repetition and transition to secondary schooling suggest a continuing role for UNICEF through the CFSI, MALP, and in-service training initiatives to develop a stronger culture of continuous assessment in primary schools.

Secondary Education

Free secondary education, introduced as a waiver of tuition fees in all public day secondary schools in 2008, will improve transition rates but are likely to strain resourcing and quality (GoK, MGD Status Report, 2005, p. 17). Inequitable gender patterns are also a concern. The relative parity at primary level declines for females at secondary level. The Kenya Education Sector Support Program (KESSP) “recognizes expanding access to secondary education at relatively low cost, while improving the quality of secondary education to be immediate challenges to be tackled by the Ministry of Education” (MoE, Secondary Strategy, 2007, p. 5).

These challenges are not only a response to demand for quantitative throughput but also reflect a need for new types of skills and knowledge, in particular, science, technology and ICT, as reflected in policy priorities such as Vision 2030. This is partly to service a changing economic structure, with anticipated positive impact on poverty reduction and access and equity. Attachment 8 contains a summary statement of the Ministry’s reasoning on the increasing significance of secondary education.

In 2006, there were 20,229 primary schools but only 4,247 secondary schools – only 21% as many – and no secondary schools in a few districts (c.f. Technical Appendix, Table 5, taken from MoE/EMIS, 2007, and RoK/MoE, 2008, p. 27). Clearly, it is essential to expand access to secondary schooling. In areas where there are no secondary schools or acceptable boarding facilities, the cycle of delayed entry to school, repetition, early dropping out, limited learning achievements, early marriage and large families living in adverse conditions is exacerbated (RoK/CBS-DHS, 2003; UNICEF/KNBS-MICS, 2007). One of Vision 2030’s ‘flagship projects’ for 2012 is to build and equip 560 new secondary schools.

While there is a dramatic decrease in the number and percentage of children in secondary schools, relative to the compulsory primary cycle, UNICEF (2006d, pp. 33-39) noted:

- GER from 1999-2004 shows slight improvement from about 24% to 30%, with a consistent 4-point gender gap (p.33);

---

38 At the time of writing this draft it is not clear to what extent free secondary education has in fact been implemented.
Secondary completion rates from the 1996-99 (87%) to 1998-01 (95%) cohorts show an increase of 4% p.a., but then drop back by 2003 (i.e. the 2000-2003 cohort) to 89%, with a decrease in the 2000-2003 cohort gender gap to 1% from the previous 3-5% gaps;

Repetition at the secondary level in 2003 was minimal (p. 37), averaging slightly more than 1%, with the important exception of girls in NEP (7%), and to a lesser extent, boys in Coast and Nyanza Provinces (3%);

Drop-out rates are worrying, (averaging 7.3% Boys / 6.9% girls nationwide), with some inter-provincial variability from 4% in NEP to almost 10% in Nyanza and 9% Western. It is interesting that the drop-out rates for girls are lower in Forms 2 and 3 (p.39), suggesting that for the smaller number and proportion of girls who do transition from primary to secondary, once the initial Form I year is completed, may try to complete the cycle;

In 2003, Nyanza (25% B / 22% G) and Western (15% B & G) were the provinces with the highest proportions of orphans enrolled in secondary, and this is likely to have contributed to the higher drop-out rates noted for these provinces. Understanding why adolescent students drop out is important, as it undoubtedly reflects system inefficiency and possible irrelevance, and the increasing opportunity cost of staying at school.

Achieving secondary expansion, with concurrent quality improvement, will be difficult. For example, the MoE Secondary Education Strategy (2007a) aims to increase “efficiencies within the existing system through increasing class sizes and teaching loads” (p. 83) with proposed action being to “promote class size of 45 students” (p. 85), though with a lower ratio mooted for ASALs. When such “efficiencies” are combined with teacher education and deployment issues, and the policy priority on increasing science and technology curriculum in relatively poorly resourced schools, the development of an expanded, responsive and more gender-equitable secondary system becomes one of the sector's greatest challenges.

It is the case that at secondary level, unlike primary, female student’s participation is lower than for males although this does vary across provinces. While the difference is not great, it does suggest a gender bias which should be monitored and further analysed. The principal reasons advanced to date have been “pregnancies, early marriages and gender violence within communities and school environments” (GoK-MDG Status Report, 2005, p. 17). To these must be added school-based deterrents such as too few female teachers as role models for girls, toilet facilities, a curriculum that may be perceived as increasingly irrelevant to life and potential earning prospects, and the real costs and opportunity costs to families of each successive year of formal education, especially for girls.

School Culture

Schooling quality includes not only learning and resourcing but also school culture and social environment. It is well established that these affect school participation, enjoyment and retention.

One of the most pernicious and damaging sub-cultural aspects of schooling is bullying. No documentation on widespread bullying has been made available to the author of this Situation Analysis. However a draft UNICEF document does indicate the increasing presence of bullying in secondary schools, directed particularly at younger students and at those with disabilities. Combined with claims in the same document of sexual harassment, often covert, these must be a cause of concern and action.

It is likely that this could be a future action area for UNICEF, along the lines of staff sensitisation, provision of teaching and learning resource materials and other approaches which have been used in other countries. At this stage, this is a tentative suggestion since data have not been received to substantiate these issues, but if data are available this could well become a significant action area for the forthcoming Country Programme.

39 More recent data were not available at the time of writing, nor were the Years x Forms (Grades) data that are needed to complete the apparent cohort flows discussed earlier.
Consistent with the philosophy espoused by Kenya Vision 2030, oversight of secondary schools is expected to shift towards increased community ownership and parental involvement in school management. Hence there will be a “need to strengthen the management capacity of the Board of Governors (BOGs) and legally incorporate Parents-Teachers Association (PTAs) in line with the new policy” (MoE, 2007a, p. 108).

This is an area where UNICEF globally has considerable experience. In Kenya, local capacity building has been a feature of UNICEF support but the challenge is to develop strategies that enable such labour-intensive activities to be expanded and adopted by government without any decrement in quality. UNICEF is traditionally less experienced in supporting secondary education, despite its importance, but in the context of KESSP, secondary education may be better supported technically by other development partners, with a clear role for UNICEF in local capacity and information strengthening for participatory, evidence-based decision making.

Out-of-School Children and Adults: Non Formal Education (NFE)

Provision of education for out-of-school children (and adults) has been largely neglected, underscoring the importance of UNICEF’s programmatic initiatives in this area. The 2005 MDG Status Report (p.14) noted that a significant challenge is, “Low quality of education offered in non-formal education and lack of linkage with the formal education system (inadequate teaching and learning resources, poor physical facilities and low prioritisation by Government in terms of budgetary allocations).”

Responding to this challenge, the Government of Kenya’s 2005 Sessional Paper #1 (consistent with the philosophy of Kenya 2030) states that “education and training should focus on the acquisition of life-skills and life-long learning. This requires different ways to access to information and knowledge resources, and the possibilities of pursuing education and training through non-formal as well as formal means”. Consequently, additional educational opportunities are envisaged through a system of Non-Formal Education (MoE/KESSP, 2007) and through adult and continuing education (MoE, 2007a, p.109).

These are seen as entry and re-entry strategies which will assist access and equity and help to achieve EFA and MDG goals. The government therefore intends to develop a national qualifications framework to provide linkages and access points between the non-formal and formal systems. This will entail registration of NFE centres, and quality assurance of curriculum, achievement testing and management.

The diverse non-government system encompasses many schools which serve low socio-economic groups, for example in Nairobi slums and in madrassas in ASALs. A recent article (UNICEF, 2008d) suggests that this non-government schooling has not benefited from free education, and this needs to be a concern of both development partners and government (which is attempting to redress the imbalance through targeted Core Poverty Programmes).

The MoE requires assistance in development of the NFE system (and this is one of the designated ‘Core Poverty Programme’ areas, (see Attachment 6). UNICEF Kenya has been a partner with the MoE in developing the draft Non Formal Education policy. Finalisation and dissemination of NFE policy guidelines is expected in 2008.

UNICEF Kenya’s Education and Young People section is developing and implementing initiatives to benefit the million plus out-of-school children. NFE is an appropriate means of educational delivery. NFE is flexible in terms of, for example, syllabus, location, class sizes and sponsoring agency. It is also usually low cost. There is an array of NFE approaches which have been trialled and implemented internationally. UNICEF has been a key player in many of these. The Education and Young People section may wish to develop briefing materials on NFE, drawing upon international experience, for consideration by stakeholders.

40 However, in some countries, the modest costs are expected to be met by local communities rather than through government support. This is inherently inequitable.
The point is made elsewhere in this report that the EFA and MDG2 goals will not be achieved by ‘more-of-the-same’ primary education. Alternative strategies are needed to reach those for whom formal primary schooling is not viable, or is perceived as not viable. NFE has significant potential for such children. To be credible, however, NFE requires strong evidence based advocacy, and UNICEF is well positioned – at country and international levels – to make a major advocacy contribution.

Post-Secondary

While less central to this Situational Analysis than lower levels of schooling, the university, TIVET and teacher training sub-sectors are increasingly important, and require essential improvement to realise Vision 2030 aims, especially given the drive towards more effective and widespread study in areas of science, technology and ICT both as areas of general study and as training for teachers.

Over time, the effect of free primary and secondary schooling will place increased pressure on access to post-secondary education. Vision 2030 aims for an increase in transition to post-secondary from 3% to 8% by 2012, along with an increase in the 29% who study science, engineering and manufacturing (UNDP, 2008).

In addition to access, quality and relevance concerns, the post-secondary sector faces structural issues. For example:

Coordination among Ministries for some sub-sectors: The 2007 KESSP Aide Memoire (MoE/KESSP, 2007, p. 15) notes the “Need for coordination of TIVET programmes in MOE, Ministry of Science and Technology, Ministry of State for Youth Affairs and KIE programmes on curriculum development, implementation and monitoring.” (A similar split coordination issue is raised above and in recommendations with respect to primary and secondary education.)

Physical up-grading is needed but uneven: While the 2008 Education Sector Report indicates a number of rehabilitation and construction projects, and up-grading of eight Technical Training Institutes to Polytechnics, there are significant financial constraints in the sub-sector. A number of projects have stalled. The Report notes (p.15) that, “While development partners have been involved in infrastructure development at primary and secondary levels, GOK and individual universities fund most the construction projects at this level.”

While outside the immediate priorities for UNICEF, qualitative and quantitative improvements at post-secondary level will be needed if significant bottlenecks are to be avoided in coming years. Achievement of Vision 2030 goals necessarily requires an accessible post-secondary sub-sector with a curriculum which is pertinent to the country’s development needs.

A significant gender issue also emerges that has implications for the staffing of schools and by extension, the willingness of girls to continue into secondary and then higher education. Without enhanced transition and progression from primary to secondary, then secondary to post-secondary education, there will continue to be very few women graduating. This limits the pool of potential women candidates for traditional professions such as medicine, dentistry, law and engineering, but, more importantly for basic education, also limits the potential pool of women from rural and disadvantaged areas who may be eligible and willing to undertake professional training to become teachers, nurses, community development officers etc., to serve in areas where it is difficult to recruit qualified candidates from other parts of the country. Without affirmative actions to redress this, under-served areas will continue to inhibit overall national development.

These concerns are reflected in the situation of teacher recruitment, education, professional development and teacher management. As in all rapidly expanding systems, there will be a degree of disconnect between the standards expected for new teachers entering service, and the presence of large numbers of less well educated but experienced teachers. The
system has a responsibility to provide pathways and incentives for under-qualified teachers and managers to upgrade their academic and professional qualifications.

Internationally, this teacher-upgrading challenge has been addressed in a number of ways, such as through a combination of one or more of: self-directed study; open and distance education (i.e. study while continuing to teach); weekend or vacation ‘residential schools’; accredited in-service short-courses; or paid leave.

The enormity of the challenge, and the potential impact on budgeting are highlighted in the 2007 KESSP Aide Memoire (p. 7):

TSC highlighted the ongoing shortage of teachers at primary (40,000) and secondary (10,000) education levels. The implementation of the recently agreed teacher salary settlement between the MOE and Kenya National Union of Teachers (KNUT) including bringing forward the payment of the final instalment, will impact significantly on the levels of available resources for KESSP. This has required MOE to transfer funds from its development to recurrent budget.

The main challenges in teacher management include: (i) the training and utilisation of teachers; (ii) effective service delivery through a professional teaching cadre; (iii) inadequate capacity to manage reform by Agents at district and institutional levels; (iv) stakeholder interference including teachers’ resistance for the implementation of reforms; (v) shortage of teachers; (vi) inadequate financial resources to implement reforms, and (vii) limited skills upgrading for teachers.

In response, the TSC proposed a number of actions. At the time of writing, it is not clear to what extent the TSC action plan has been implemented. As Kenya faces expanding enrolments at a time of severely constrained resources, the morale and commitment of teachers and managers, and the overall standards of education will be adversely affected if continuous education and professional development (CEPD) are not sensitively, equitably and strategically addressed.

Inevitably, there must be ’trade-offs’ between the demands for increased remuneration and professional opportunity on the part of teachers and managers, and the incentives and opportunities provided by the system that encourage CEPD, without disadvantaging students by frequent teacher absences for continuing education or training-related activities.

Concluding Comments and Recommendations

This section of the Situation Analysis begins with a number of overall observations drawn from the report. A number of these underpin the subsequent Recommendations. There are two categories of Recommendation: those which are at a ‘macro’ level, and likely to be beyond the scope of UNICEF except perhaps at an advocacy level; and those which are more programmatic and where UNICEF is well placed for action and/or advocacy.

Concluding Comments

In recent years, education in Kenya has improved significantly, or is positioned to improve significantly. The goals of EFA and MDGs 2 and 3 are much closer to realisation, especially as a result of introduction of free primary education from 2003. This has led to significant increases in enrolment while, for the most part, retaining reasonable gender balance. Other key developments include:

- An increased the proportion of the national budget allocated to education, with the goal of 30% effectively met;
- Introduction of free secondary education in 2008 (although data on implementation and coverage are not available);
Articulation of ‘core poverty programmes’, with anticipated funding, to directly address education-related needs of those who are disadvantaged;

Acknowledgement of the critical role of Early Childhood Education and Development, although with insufficient attention to required resourcing;

Greater emphasis on development of human resource capacity, particularly through science, technology and ICT, with implications for secondary curriculum, TIVET and universities;

Attempts to place greater emphasis on governance, particularly through meaningful devolution and community participation;

Willingness to partner with development agencies, within a sector-wide approach, particularly where trial initiatives are promising and potentially generalisable, such as UNICEF’s Child Friendly Schools Initiative.

It is important and commendable that these and other policy and programmatic developments have not been articulated in a piecemeal fashion. Rather, the Kenyan government, with support from development partners, has placed emphasis on coherent, inter-woven and complementary policies for the future of education in the country. In turn, education policies are framed within the overall economic, social and political context of the nation. UNICEF is one of a number of development partners which has played a significant role in assisting, and sometimes leading, such initiatives through policy support and programmes.\(^{41}\)

At the national level, Kenya has developed a comprehensive and ambitious policy (Vision 2030) (RoK, 2007a) with an implementation strategy (Medium Term Plans, including the National Strategy for Transformation, 2008-2012, and Flagship Projects\(^{42}\)). Vision 2030 builds on economic, social and political ‘pillars’. In content, priority setting and process, 2030 is compatible with donor objectives and values. There is complementarity between 2030 and the priorities and programmes pursued by UNICEF, and the draft country programme reflects this.

Vision 2030 is a transformative document. If realised, its aims transform Kenya into a more equitable society, with stronger enactment of devolved and democratic rights, drawing upon and replicating the lessons of the newly industrialising middle-income societies of South East Asia as exemplars for growth and development (RoK, 2007a, p.4).

Hence, there are some reasons for optimism and some important indicators of progress. Nevertheless, Kenya faces major challenges in achieving its desired and stated directions. Several of the points below are taken further under Recommendations.

1. Qualitative improvement in teaching and learning remains a major challenge, notwithstanding initiatives such as KESSP, a suite of “core poverty programmes”, and government-adopted, donor-initiated programmes such as school clusters and child friendly schools\(^{43}\). Improvement is handicapped by teacher deployment issues, with the need for teachers contradicted by large numbers of unemployed trained teachers, limited or inadequate resources and high pupil : teacher ratios.

2. All stakeholders agree that significant progress in slum areas of Nairobi and in the ASALs is crucial to achieve national goals (discussed further below). Effective implementation of the core poverty programmes is vital, as are potential facilitating factors such as mobile teachers and multigrade classrooms (Irvine, 2005).\(^{44}\)

---

41 UNICEF’s contribution includes support for The Early Childhood Development Policy Framework and National Service Standard Guidelines’, (with UNESCO); ‘Gender Policy in Education’, (with CIDA); the (draft) ‘Non Formal Education Policy’ of the Ministry of Education. Significant UNICEF programmes have included ‘Child Friendly Schools’ (with USAID) and initiatives for out of school children, proposed to develop into a framework for ‘National Complementary Basic Education’ with clear linkages to formal education (Draft Country Programme, 2008, p.9).

42 And supported by the Education Sector Report (2008): Realizing Vision 2030 Goals through Effective and Efficient Public Spending.

43 “The child friendly schools initiative that was piloted in 11 districts has now been taken up by the Ministry of Education for mainstreaming at the national level. The CFS demonstrated the impact of improved teaching learning capacities of at least 40,000 teaching staff and school management committees in a joint partnership to make schools as friendly spaces for children.” (UNICEF Draft Country Programme, pp.5-6)

3. No less important, but in some ways remedial, is the challenge to provide education and engage school-age children who are out of school. Out of school children\footnote{UNICEF (draft country programme, p.3) estimates 1.2 million children are still out of school. This long-standing situation was exacerbated by post December 2007 election conflict and dislocation, discussed below.} are numerous and under-served. Programmes in this area, such as UNICEF’s, are promising, though small-scale initiatives. Recent Kenya government policy acknowledges and makes budgetary provision for Non Formal Schooling\footnote{Government grants have been made to Non Formal Schools over the last four years. 208 schools have been registered and are receiving grants, however this is estimated to represent 20% of such schools nationwide (Education Sector Report, p.9).}. However, the role and definition of NFE – which in many other countries has been a principal delivery mechanism for such disadvantaged groups – does not yet appear to have been delineated, at least not in operational terms. There is evidence that NFE may be resisted because of a ‘second-best’ stigma. Taken overall, it is difficult to predict the likely impact and acceptance of the Non Formal Schooling sector.

4. Early childhood education and development, acknowledged as essential for all children but critical for disadvantaged sectors of society, needs increased tangible support beyond foreshadowed levels.

5. There is an apparent anomaly emerging from educational expenditure by government. On the one hand, total spending approximates the target, as a percentage of budget. On the other hand, this Situation Analysis identifies several key areas in which additional resources are required to meet substantive targets, such as EFA and MDG goals. UNICEF (2008a, p.3) points out resource-requiring issues remain such as the “1.2 million children who are still out of school. These include the most disadvantaged groups.” Clearly, if the expenditure target is regarded as (almost) achieved, but significant needs remain unmet, stakeholders need to address if and how the “shortfall” will be addressed.

6. Numerous quantitative and qualitative issues can be anticipated with the projected significant growth of the secondary sector. Access and transition issues are immediate. Coordination between primary schooling (located in a Directorate of Basic Education) and secondary schooling (located in a Directorate of Higher Education) schooling must be monitored and facilitated.

7. Improved governance is vital to enable and sustain reforms. Vision 2030 underscores the need for greater transparency and accountability. Assuming political will from all levels of government, effective community engagement and decision making (not least in relation to proposed increases in ‘devolved funds’) are vital. To date, performance in this area has been uneven at best, especially in disadvantaged areas. International experience shows this is a difficult objective to achieve. To be effective over time, devolution of meaningful decision making at community level requires effective monitoring and reporting, an area (along with community participation and community based organisations) in which UNICEF has significant experience.

The preceding challenges are neither surprising nor insurmountable. They do underscore the critical ongoing and future role for development partners, not least UNICEF.

**Recommendations**

There are two sets of Recommendation outlined below. First are three national issues which relate to: (i) the future economic situation; (ii) acknowledging and addressing the distinctive needs of those whose participation is required to achieve key goals; and (iii) the need for improved data for decision making. Second are a set of more specific areas for action, including a number to which UNICEF can make a significant contribution.

**Recommendations Concerned with National Issues**

1. **Implications flowing from an uncertain future**

   External influences on Kenya, beyond Kenya’s control, will impact significantly and almost certainly negatively, on the capacity to provide the economic platform required to meet key targets such as projected GDP increases. These influences include the
ongoing global financial crisis and likelihood of declining external assistance, coupled with deteriorating terms of trade.

These current economic circumstances require that some underpinning assumptions for Vision 2030, and plans outlined in the 2008 Education Sector Report, need to be made problematic. Fallback positions are required: “what is expendable, in what priority order?, and what is non-negotiable?” “What may be the unanticipated impact of external factors upon society, and particularly children?”

In this Situation Analysis, the starting point has been to build from the assumptions and directions of key policy documents. This approach, which is essentially linear, adopts parameters based on a shared view of the status quo and on a predictable unfolding of the future. There are strong reasons for questioning this approach in the current context.

A linear form of planning is incompatible with a fluid and unpredictable environment. Consequently, options need to be identified and contingencies articulated. This applies as much to UNICEF as to government, and UNICEF should be in a position to take a proactive and flexible stance.

For UNICEF, crucial issues include:

- What may be the impact of the global financial crisis on funding sources and levels, and might this require programming scale-back?
- Which Kenyan government planning assumptions (GDP being the most obvious example) are now jeopardised? And where shortfalls or cutbacks are likely to occur, are these in areas where donors such as UNICEF may need to positively intervene, thereby diverting funds from intended targets?
- What new emergency situations may emerge, and can these be anticipated and programmed for, based on the 2008 combined UN education response and emergency preparedness protocols?
- Can UNICEF, specifically the Education and Young People Section, re-frame its proposed country programme to incorporate the uncertain, through option and contingency planning?
- And can UNICEF, drawing upon its international expertise and strategic advantage, and the recent necessity to address unpredictable situations for similar reasons in other countries, assist the government of Kenya and other stakeholders to re-visit planning in an unpredictable environment?

Recommendation 1:

Acknowledging the compelling reasons for an uncertain future, UNICEF identify options and contingencies with respect to quantum of resourcing, priority setting and coping with unanticipated directions. Multiple and flexible approaches to programming are required.

2. The quality of data for decision making

This Situation Analysis has illustrated numerous examples of questionable, or simply inaccurate, data. The validity and reliability of much macro-level data are suspect.

There are anomalies and errors in data required to monitor education system performance. This handicaps the ability to present reliable cohort progression data and other efficiency measures.

There are also inconsistencies in the way key concepts - such as GER and NER - are reported.

Planning and effectiveness decisions are made based on national statistics. In light of problems of the kind noted above, major improvement is needed in EMIS and
related monitoring and evaluation systems, with special attention to data quality and verification at the school and district levels.

Recommendation 2

Inadequacies in current data definition, validity and reliability should be illustrated. Remedial and improvement strategies need to be identified and acknowledged by key partners. UNICEF places emphasis on an ‘evidence based’ approach to making decisions and drawing lessons. This aim is compromised by current weaknesses. Consequently, the UNICEF Education and Young People section needs to:

(i) critically interrogate data before accepting presented tabulations and their conclusions;
(ii) foster a cross-sectoral approach to the critique and evaluation of data;
(iii) consider playing an advocacy role with the aim of galvanizing action among key stakeholders who can mobilise tangible improvement in quality of education data.

3. Key goals and disadvantaged groups

There is strong evidence that policies which have been effective in increasing primary school enrolment require adaptation to address the needs of children from disadvantaged areas such as Nairobi slums and ASALs. The enumeration and participation of such children is essential to realise EFA and MDGs 2 and 3.

Free primary education has been effective in increasing participation in the government system. However, based on available data, FPE does not significantly benefit non-government schools in Nairobi’s (one million plus population) Kibera slum, with negative participation outcomes, especially for girls. Similarly, participation in ASALs is well below national norms.

Targeted strategies are required to make a positive difference in the enrolment and retention of disadvantaged students. A linear extension of past strategies may miss this group, resulting in non-achievement of EFA and MDG goals.

Based on best-available data, there remain substantial numbers of students from disadvantaged areas who are yet to realise their right to quality primary education. The ‘usual’ strategies to increase access and enrolment may not be effective with these groups.

Recommendation 3

UNICEF Education and Young People Section has a potentially very significant role, entirely consistent with its mandate, in articulating and enumerating the schooling (and community) situation of slum and ASAL children, with a view to identifying what policy and strategic modifications are required to bring about improved outcomes. Such an initiative differs from, but complements, the ongoing focus on out-of-school children.

UNICEF can play an advocacy role with key stakeholders to mobilise targeted support, and clearly articulate the danger of missing key national (and international) benchmarks if new strategies are not developed.

Recommendations Related to UNICEF Programming

1. Support to recent and ongoing initiatives: Child friendly schools and cluster training

International agencies such as UNICEF need to support and continue to monitor programmes which have had apparent success at the demonstration phase but which, regrettably, sometimes decline and become less effective when taken to scale. Not infrequently, agencies remove their involvement and support prematurely.
This particularly applies to initiatives such as CFSI that operates in selected schools of 11 districts and takes a ‘cascade’ approach to change in which potential departures from the original model are multiplied. Nationwide expansion is premature from this base.

Recommendation UNICEF maintain support and monitoring for child friendly and school cluster initiatives, even though these may no longer be a programme centrepiece when considered alongside projected developments. This will require funding and negotiated on-going involvement with government implementation authorities to engage in monitoring and evaluation activities.

2. Capacity building at the local level to obtain evidence-based data

Devolution is a key objective for government, and is fundamental to UNICEF’s priorities and values. The success of devolution partly rests on building capacity at the local level to obtain sound accountability and planning data.

In this report’s discussion of ‘Decentralisation and Local Responsibilities’, a critical need is evident for improved data at the local level. Strong evidence-based data are crucial for context-sensitive planning and accountability. Without such data, decision making is compromised, the strength of local argument is diminished, and the prospects of further funding become vulnerable.

Recommendation: UNICEF assess the feasibility of developing capacity building training materials in data gathering, monitoring and evaluation with stakeholders at the local level. A pilot project, including training programs, would be a significant contribution to achieving a government priority which is not adequately addressed. A partnership approach, within sections of UNICEF and with support from one or more donor agency partners may be possible and desirable. While the focus of this recommendation is on relevant community members, UNICEF should also endorse and support the clear need for improved skills and accountability in data gathering and reporting by district and sub-district officers.

3. Capacity development in social budgeting

UNICEF’s co-sponsorship with the GoK of the ‘Case for Social Budgeting’ has resulted in an important argument for broadening of the way budgeting is carried out, although there is no evidence that the report has been operationalised. In particular, social budgeting underscores the need for a community stake and voice in relevant fiscal aspects of decision making and priority setting.

Recommendation: UNICEF develop a dissemination package, or set of packages, on the concept and implementation of social budgeting, aimed at government representatives and communities. This will be a communication undertaking illustrating an approach and set of techniques which will assist in achieving Vision 2030 priorities. Assuming a positive response, a follow-up will be development of training packages and case study materials.

4. Early Childhood Development and Education initiatives

ECDE has, somewhat belatedly, moved into central focus as an underpinning for overall educational performance and human capacity development. Outcomes from ECDE demonstrably exceed investment costs. Key policies endorse ECDE, and UNICEF has been a significant development partner. However, resources lag behind need, and coverage is uneven.

The success of ECDE is not measured solely by access and throughput. Qualitative processes and outcomes are equally vital, both for the sake of children and to ensure
that ECDE moves beyond the ‘mini-primary’ school mentality. UNICEF has an international strategic advantage in qualitative benefits and associated measurement.

In Kenya, current ECDE structures vary but there appears to be little available documentation from which to learn ‘what works, in what circumstances’. UNICEF is well placed to undertake a series of case studies of ECDE practice in Kenya – government and non-government (including madrassas).

Recommendations: There are several areas in which UNICEF can make a significant contribution:

- Advocacy and communication strategies be defined and implemented, particularly with respect to mobilising understanding, and hence support, for ECDE at community level, especially in under-served areas.

- UNICEF Kenya take advantage of international strategic experience in qualitative benefits and associated measurement, to develop, pursue and implement, as a partner with government, qualitative indicators to more effectively address and document the experience and outcomes of ECDE.

- UNICEF support documentation of short, positively oriented exemplars of good practice, or acceptable alternatives, along with an activity-based dissemination strategy.

- Teaching at ECDE level is currently under-valued and under-rewarded. This is an area where UNICEF can advocate, drawing on international experience.

- UNICEF Education and Youth Section assist the Child Survival and Development team to include well-tried parenting education strategies to enhance psycho-social development, as an integral component of child survival and early development.

5. Transition from ECDE to Primary

Available documentation frequently cites difficulties surrounding transition from primary to secondary schooling. This is usually in terms of availability of places at the higher level. There is another equally important transition which has not yet been addressed; the transition from ECDE to primary schooling.

Recommendation: If ECDE is to achieve its intended purpose, it must be recognised as different in character, content and aims to formal primary schooling. It is different but preparatory. UNICEF is well placed to undertake case studies of this transition, drawing upon children’s cognitive, emotional and self-confidence development. The lessons learned from such case studies will have several purposes, including appropriateness of content and methodology, and ensuring that the distinctive nature of ECDE is recognised in practice, including by primary school teachers.

6. Non-Formal Education

Like ECDE, UNICEF internationally has a diverse and successful record in promoting and implementing NFE. The nature and form of initiatives vary depending on the country and pressing needs. NFE is a pressing need in Kenya, with over a million out-of-school primary age children, many of whom will not return to formal schooling. NFE is a core poverty programme priority area and UNICEF has been a partner in developing Kenya’s NFE policy.

Recommendation: Drawing upon its international strategic advantage and expertise, UNICEF engage actively with government in furthering development for NFE, particularly in terms of the available array of models, objectives and outcomes.
UNICEF also has an advocacy role in legitimising NFE as a credible and worthwhile alternative to formal schooling. Additionally, UNICEF’s experience in monitoring and evaluating NFE programmes needs to be integrated with NFE implementation.

7. **School climate**

This Situation Analysis reports troubling claims of bullying and sexual harassment in schools. These must be a source of immediate, serious concern. Superficially this appears to be a secondary school issue, but experience suggests origins will lie at primary level.

**Recommendation**

Within CFSI, ‘school climate’ is an appropriate action area for UNICEF. Sensitisation modules are needed for staff and students, with learning resource materials pitched at appropriate levels. UNICEF’s prior international experience would be a guide to effective strategies and sample materials. UNICEF is also well placed – through its advocacy and communication expertise - to raise awareness of the damage to individuals and to the health of the school and wider community of such destructive behaviours.

8. **The utility of the 2009 Census**

This Situation Analysis has illustrated significant weaknesses in conceptualisation and reporting of key data on Kenya’s educational system. This compromises decision making and in the extreme can lead to withholding of funding support. A sound national statistical base is vital for government and development partners.

**Recommendation** UNICEF ensure that difficulties with the database currently in use, based on the previous census, are communicated to authorities responsible for definition and conduct of the forthcoming census. UNICEF needs to take a proactive and positive role, including through making use of ‘good practice’ as identified over time by UNICEF professionals who monitor and collate the *State of the World’s Children*. 
References


Kenya Education Support Program (nd.). Joint Financing Agreement. (with Development Partners), Nairobi.


Attachments

Attachment 1: Map of Kenya
### Attachment 2: Goals and Targets from the Millennium Declaration

#### GOAL 1 ERADICATE EXTREME POVERTY AND HUNGER

**TARGET 1** Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than $1 a day

**TARGET 2** Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger

#### GOAL 2 ACHIEVE UNIVERSAL PRIMARY EDUCATION

**TARGET 3** Ensure that by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling

#### GOAL 3 PROMOTE GENDER EQUALITY AND EMPOWER WOMEN

**TARGET 4** Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and at all levels of education no later than 2015

#### GOAL 4 REDUCE CHILD MORTALITY

**TARGET 5** Reduce by two-thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate

#### GOAL 5 IMPROVE MATERNAL HEALTH

**TARGET 6** Reduce by three-quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio

#### GOAL 6 COMBAT HIV/AIDS, MALARIA, AND OTHER DISEASES

**TARGET 7** Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS

**TARGET 8** Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases

#### GOAL 7 ENSURE ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

**TARGET 9** Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programs and reverse the loss of environmental resources

**TARGET 10** Halve by 2015 the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation

**TARGET 11** Have achieved a significant improvement by 2020 in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers

#### GOAL 8 DEVELOP A GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR DEVELOPMENT

**TARGET 12** Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, nondiscriminatory trading and financial system (including a commitment to good governance, development, and poverty reduction, nationally and internationally)

**TARGET 13** Address the special needs of the least developed countries (including tariff- and quota-free access for exports of the least developed countries; enhanced debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries and cancellation of official bilateral debt; and more generous official development assistance for countries committed to reducing poverty)

**TARGET 14** Address the special needs of landlocked countries and small island developing states (through the Program of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States and the outcome of the 22nd special session of the General Assembly)

**TARGET 15** Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries through national and international measures to make debt sustainable in the long term

**TARGET 16** In cooperation with developing countries, develop and implement strategies for decent and productive work for youth

**TARGET 17** In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable, essential drugs in developing countries

**TARGET 18** In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communication

---

Note: The Millennium Development Goals and targets come from the Millennium Declaration signed by 189 countries, including 147 heads of state, in September 2000. The goals and targets are related and should be seen as a whole. They represent a partnership of countries determined, as the Declaration states, “to create an environment—at the national and global levels alike—which is conducive to development and the elimination of poverty.”


Attachment 3: Dakar Framework for Action: EFA 2015 Goals and Strategies

**Goals**

1. Expanding and improving comprehensive early childhood care and education, especially for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged children;

2. Ensuring that by 2015 all children, particularly girls, children in difficult circumstances and those belonging to ethnic minorities, have access to and complete free and compulsory primary education of good quality;

3. Ensuring that the learning needs of all young people and adults are met through equitable access to appropriate learning and life skills programs;

4. Achieving a 50 per cent improvement in levels of adult literacy by 2015, especially for women, and equitable access to basic and continuing education for all adults;

5. Eliminating gender disparities in primary and secondary education by 2005, and achieving gender equality in education by 2015, with a focus on ensuring girls' full and equal access to and achievement in basic education of good quality;

6. Improving all aspects of the quality of education and ensuring excellence of all so that recognized and measurable learning outcomes are achieved by all, especially in literacy, numeracy and essential life skills.

**Strategies**

1. Mobilize strong national and international political commitment for Education for All, develop national action plans and enhance significantly investment in basic education

2. Promote EFA policies within a sustainable and well-integrated sector framework clearly linked to poverty elimination and development strategies

3. Ensure the engagement and participation of civil society in the formulation, implementation and monitoring of strategies for educational development

4. Develop responsive, participatory and accountable systems of educational governance and management

5. Meet the needs of education systems affected by conflict, natural calamities and instability and conduct educational programs in ways that promote mutual understanding, peace and tolerance, and that help to prevent violence and conflict

6. Implement integrated strategies for gender equality in education that recognize the need for changes in attitudes, values and practices

7. Implement as a matter of urgency education programs and actions to combat the HIV/AIDS pandemic

8. Create safe, healthy, inclusive and equitably resourced educational environments conducive to excellence in learning, with clearly defined levels of achievement for all

9. Enhance the status, morale and professionalism of teachers

10. Harness new information and communication technologies to help achieve EFA goals.
Attachment 4: Convention on the Rights of the Child

UNICEF’s mission is to advocate for the protection of children’s rights, to help meet their basic needs and to expand their opportunities to reach their full potential. UNICEF is guided in doing this by the provisions and principles of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Built on varied legal systems and cultural traditions, the Convention is a universally agreed set of non-negotiable standards and obligations. These basic standards—also called human rights—set minimum entitlements and freedoms that should be respected by governments. They are founded on respect for the dignity and worth of each individual, regardless of race, colour, gender, language, religion, opinions, origins, wealth, birth status or ability and therefore apply to every human being everywhere. With these rights comes the obligation on both governments and individuals not to infringe on the parallel rights of others. These standards are both interdependent and indivisible; we cannot ensure some rights without—or at the expense of—other rights.

A legally binding instrument

The Convention on the Rights of the Child is the first legally binding international instrument to incorporate the full range of human rights—civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights. In 1989, world leaders decided that children needed a special convention just for them because people under 18 years old often need special care and protection that adults do not. The leaders also wanted to make sure that the world recognized that children have human rights too.

The Convention sets out these rights in 54 articles and two Optional Protocols. It spells out the basic human rights that children everywhere have: the right to survival; to develop to the fullest; to protection from harmful influences, abuse and exploitation; and to participate fully in family, cultural and social life. The four core principles of the Convention are non-discrimination; devotion to the best interests of the child; the right to life, survival and development; and respect for the views of the child. Every right spelled out in the Convention is inherent to the human dignity and harmonious development of every child. The Convention protects children’s rights by setting standards in health care; education; and legal, civil and social services.

By agreeing to undertake the obligations of the Convention (by ratifying or acceding to it), national governments have committed themselves to protecting and ensuring children's rights and they have agreed to hold themselves accountable for this commitment before the international community. States parties to the Convention are obliged to develop and undertake all actions and policies in the light of the best interests of the child.

Articles 28, 29 and 30 below are of special relevance to education

Article 28

1. States Parties recognize the right of the child to education, and with a view to achieving this right progressively and on the basis of equal opportunity, they shall, in particular:

(a) Make primary education compulsory and available free to all;

(b) Encourage the development of different forms of secondary education, including general and vocational education, make them available and accessible to every child, and take appropriate measures such as the introduction of free education and offering financial assistance in case of need;

(c) Make higher education accessible to all on the basis of capacity by every appropriate means;

(d) Make educational and vocational information and guidance available and accessible to all children;
(e) Take measures to encourage regular attendance at schools and the reduction of drop-out rates.

2. States Parties shall take all appropriate measures to ensure that school discipline is administered in a manner consistent with the child's human dignity and in conformity with the present Convention.

3. States Parties shall promote and encourage international cooperation in matters relating to education, in particular with a view to contributing to the elimination of ignorance and illiteracy throughout the world and facilitating access to scientific and technical knowledge and modern teaching methods. In this regard, particular account shall be taken of the needs of developing countries.

Article 29

1. States Parties agree that the education of the child shall be directed to:

(a) The development of the child's personality, talents and mental and physical abilities to their fullest potential;

(b) The development of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and for the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations;

(c) The development of respect for the child's parents, his or her own cultural identity, language and values, for the national values of the country in which the child is living, the country from which he or she may originate, and for civilizations different from his or her own;

(d) The preparation of the child for responsible life in a free society, in the spirit of understanding, peace, tolerance, equality of sexes, and friendship among all peoples, ethnic, national and religious groups and persons of indigenous origin;

(e) The development of respect for the natural environment.

2. No part of the present article or article 28 shall be construed so as to interfere with the liberty of individuals and bodies to establish and direct educational institutions, subject always to the observance of the principle set forth in paragraph 1 of the present article and to the requirements that the education given in such institutions shall conform to such minimum standards as may be laid down by the State.

Article 30

In those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities or persons of indigenous origin exist, a child belonging to such a minority or who is indigenous shall not be denied the right, in community with other members of his or her group, to enjoy his or her own culture, to profess and practise his or her own religion, or to use his or her own language.

Source: http://www.unicef.org/crc
Attachment 5: Education Sector Specific Goals and Strategies

Strategic Objectives of the Sector

The sector has set the following strategic objectives:

I. To ensure that all children (girls, children in difficult circumstances, those from marginalized/vulnerable groups) have access to free and compulsory primary education by 2010 and achieve a Net Enrolment Rate (NER) of 100 percent in 2015;

II. To enhance access, equity and quality at all levels of education and training by 2010;

III. To increase transition from primary to secondary education to: 70 percent in 2008, 80 percent in 2012 and 90 percent in 2015;

IV. To ensure that the learning needs of all are met through equitable access to appropriate learning and life-skills programmes by 2015;

V. To promote and popularization of Open and Distance Learning (ODL) at all levels of education and training by 2010;

VI. To increase the proportion of women in teaching, administration and research, science and technology at all levels of institutions of higher learning to 30 percent by 2012;

VII. To enhance national awareness, appreciation and prioritization of ST&I, Information and Communication Technology (ICT) and TI VET for global competitiveness by 2012;

VIII. To develop and install responsive governance structures and effective management systems for all levels of education, training and STI by 2010 and for effective service delivery;

IX. Expand public universities to have a capacity of at least 5,000 students intake annually each by 2015 and increase the proportion of students studying science related courses to 50% with at least one third of these being women by 2010;

X. To promote innovativeness and research in tertiary colleges and universities;

XI. To improve the quality and relevance of teaching, learning and research at universities and TI VET institutions by 2010;

XII. To enhance capacity of the sector to coordinate and support development of STI and TI VET;

XIII. To develop strategic collaborations and linkages with relevant national and international organizations and Government.

Specific Targets

In order to monitor and evaluate progress achieved, the sector has set the following specific targets:

- Attain MDGs and EFA by 2015.
- Achieve a transition rate of 70 percent from primary to secondary school level from the current rate of 60 percent, paying special attention to girls’ education by 2008.
- Ensure that all children, especially girls, children in difficult circumstances including those with special needs, and those from marginalized/vulnerable groups, have access to free and compulsory primary education by 2010.
- Increase enrolment in TIVET institutions by 25 percent by 2012.
- Equip all of TIVET institutions with relevant training facilities by 2012.
- Upgrade eight technical institutions by 2009 to National polytechnics.
- Establish a TIVET Authority by June 2008.
- Set up an STI Fund by 2009 and STI Foundation by 2012.
- Develop an Electronic National Research Inventory and Database by June 2008.
- Establish a Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards in MoST by June 2008.

Source: MoE (2008, pp. 1-2, 8)
• Establish 11 centres of excellence in Technical Institutions by 2008.
• Achieve 50 percent improvement of levels of adult literacy by 2010.
• Expand public universities to have a capacity of at least 5,000 students intake annually each by 2015;
• Increase the proportion of students studying science and technology related courses in tertiary institutions to 50 percent, with at least one third of these being women by the year 2010;
• Achieve a female ratio of at least one-third of top management in public universities; and
• Equip Kenyan youth with the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes through science and technology training to meet the challenges of industrialization and globalization by 2030.
### Summary of Core Poverty Programmes (Recurrent & Development Expenditures Non Wage):

**2003/04 - 2007/08**

<p>| Programme                                                      | Expenditure (Kshs Millions) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary education - IM and operating costs, including support to poor urban non-government</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>7300</td>
<td>7600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary education - school construction and rehabilitation</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1,919.80</td>
<td>1,528.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School feeding, health, de-worming</td>
<td>1,346.00</td>
<td>1,371.00</td>
<td>1,374.00</td>
<td>1,344.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to ECDE</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to support HIV/AIDS orphans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to support ASALs primary education</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to Low Cost Primary Boarding</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds to support NESS</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to support special needs education</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools, bursaries and scholarships</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,121.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to ASALs secondary schools</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school classroom construction in ASALs and urban slums</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>113.6</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds to Supply of science equipment in targeted secondary schools</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTTCs bursaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University bursaries and scholarships</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University bursaries and scholarships (HELB)*</td>
<td>1,759.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,100.00</td>
<td><strong>2,800.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Endowment Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIVET Bursaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation of Technical Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Incubators</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centres of Excellence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT Infrastructure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of core poverty programmes</strong></td>
<td>9,520.90</td>
<td>7,071.10</td>
<td>15,319.40</td>
<td>16,652.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MoE (2008, p. 15)

* This is the total budgeted figure for 2007/2008

** This is the total expenditure including staff expenses
### Attachment 7: Summary of Externally Funded Programmes

#### Summary of Externally Funded Programmes: 2006/07 & 2007-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free Primary Education Support</td>
<td>IDA</td>
<td>463.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Education Sector Support</td>
<td>IDA</td>
<td>1,116.98</td>
<td>1,683.02</td>
<td>21.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Track Initiative</td>
<td>FTI</td>
<td>3,388.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education III – Grant</td>
<td>ADF</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education III – Loan</td>
<td>ADF</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>12.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(VVOB)</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>43.88</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Education</td>
<td>OPEC</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMASSE Project</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>197.2</td>
<td>173.26</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIcad – JKUAT</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>200.36</td>
<td>55.51</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Education Sector Support</td>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>445.66</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Schools Improvement Project</td>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.29</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegemeo Institute (Egerton University)</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya (CMRT/STACK)/ Egerton Uni.</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Support for NEP</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mobile Task Team DEMMIS</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30.45</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating HIV/AIDS in Education</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Sector - Policy &amp; Investment</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29.44</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KESI - Capacity Building</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Capacity Assessments</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS Education and Life Skills</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>22.17</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary and Complementary Education</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>85.17</td>
<td>31.79</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Participation</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>23.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Education Sector Support</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74.89</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications, Partnerships &amp; Participation</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23.02</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Education Sector Support</td>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>1,326.19</td>
<td>1,360.00</td>
<td>17.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Education Sector Support (A-in-A)</td>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>435.2</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Feeding Programme</td>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Feeding Programme</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>1,159.40</td>
<td>1,142.83</td>
<td>14.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of Education</td>
<td>S. Arabia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9,404.98</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,912.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exchange Rate: KSh 1.00 = US$0.0126904 (as of 22/11/08)

Grants $ 66.96
Loans $ 33.45

Attachment 8: Concept of Social Budgeting

Social budgeting can be defined, as a process of identification and mainstreaming spending at the local level by local institutions (e.g. local authorities, Community-based organizations- CBOs, regional authorities, and constituency development fund (CDF) committees) and subsequent use and domestication of information to develop and deliver social services that a community needs, through locally based partnership structures and on principles of community engagement, social inclusion, equality and participation.

A social budget therefore encompasses social expenditure and income (earmarked to cover social expenditure) of different institutions, the government and to a lesser extent the private sector. It is a process through which the budget as a policy instrument and a tool of development is initiated and sustained by the people themselves. The outcome of the budget as an effective policy instrument and a tool of development depends on the participatory preparation and spending of available resources. This is the insight that guides social budgeting.

For a long time in Kenya, the budget has focused more on achieving macroeconomic targets. In addition, the budgetary process is practically non-participatory in the sense that most decisions including prioritization are made at the top by duty bearers with little inputs from the implementers and beneficiaries or claim holders on the ground.

It is important to mainstream social indicators in budgeting so that when targeting inflation, monetary policy and fiscal policy we also target infant and child mortality levels, net enrolment rates, access to safe drinking water, HIV prevalence, among other human development issues. This calls for a dual budgeting framework where the macroeconomic framework (supply or growth side) is harmonized and negotiated with the human development and rights framework (i.e. the demand or development side) for an effective and equitable budget. It is therefore imperative that planning and budgeting should focus on achieving both macro and social targets and be participatory and rights based. Social budgeting provides one of the avenues of achieving an effective budget.

## Attachment 9: Public Education Percentage Financing by Sub-Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Sector</th>
<th>2000/01</th>
<th>2001/02</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary education</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University education</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Admin. &amp; Planning</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical education</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous services</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools for handicapped</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early childhood education</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Grand Total Expenditure          | 100.0   | 100.0   | 100.0   | 100.0   | 100.0   |

Attachment 10: Age of Marriage, Fertility Rate and Years of Education

Source: UNESCO World Education Report, 1995, p.27
Attachment 11: Context for the Secondary Education Strategy

The Importance of Secondary Education

The global growth in demand for Secondary Education is driven by five key factors:

(i) The huge bulge in the number of students completing primary;
(ii) An increasing demand for new types of skills and knowledge;
(iii) A growth in the service sector and its requirement for ‘knowledge workers’ at the expense of the government or agrarian sectors;
(iv) A democracy’s need for better educated citizens.
(v) The increasing private returns of secondary education as the labour market demands graduates with a set of knowledge and competencies that can only start to be acquired at the secondary education level and beyond. Yet the clear rationale for investing in secondary education can also be understood for a number of additional reasons that highlight how education at this secondary level contributes to individual earnings and overall national economic growth. Specifically the reasons include:

- **Growth and poverty reduction**: Secondary education plays a particularly important role in increasing economic growth since this economic growth is shown to have a positive correlation to years of school attainment.
- **Need for a balance**: Historically countries that have experienced the most rapid and sustainable increases in educational attainment, as well as outstanding economic performance, have pursued a balanced upgrading of the primary, secondary, technical and tertiary levels of education.
- **The sub-sectoral bridge**: Within any education system, secondary education is the bridge between primary schools, tertiary institutions and the world of work. Secondary education can provide a set of pathways for progress or the bottleneck that prevents an equitable expansion of education opportunities. Further, increasing the provision and coverage of secondary education has been clearly shown to boost completion rates in primary education. In fact secondary education must be viewed as an essential incentive for primary completion.
- **Developer of social capital**: Education contributes to the development of social capital by increasing an individual’s propensity to trust and be tolerant of others.
- **Gender equality**: Findings are that investments in female education have a positive impact on gender equality, women’s empowerment and well-being. Further, that the higher the levels of education, the greater the benefits on women’s own health outcomes from risks of disease.
- **Socio-economic equality**: Any consideration of equity in education must obviously address issues related to outcomes as well as to merely access. National educational policy and practice assists in mitigating the influence of social and economic privilege on education achievement.

### Table 2: Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Enrolment Rates and Gender Gap: 1990-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>107.9</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>108.2</td>
<td>105.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>110.5</td>
<td>111.1</td>
<td>110.4</td>
<td>107.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>104.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Gap</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Primary

| MF                  | 74.3 |       | 57.1  | 57.1  | 63.5  | 66.2  | 62.4  | 62.4  | 74.9  | 74.2  | 75.8  | 75.5  |
| M                   | 74.4 |       | 56.8  | 56.8  | 63.1  | 65.3  | 62.1  | 62.1  | 74.8  | 74.1  | 75.5  | 74.8  |
| F                   | 74.3 |       | 57.4  | 57.4  | 63.8  | 67.1  | 62.6  | 62.6  | 74.9  | 74.2  | 76.1  | 76.1  |
| Gender Gap          | 0.1  | -0.7  | -0.7  | -1.8  | -0.4  | -0.4  | 0.0   | -0.1  | -0.6  | -1.3  |       |       |

#### Secondary

| MF                  | 23.8 | 24.4  | 38.9  | 38.9  | 38.2  | 39.2  | 41.2  | 41.2  | 43.5  | 47.6  | 48.2  | 50.3  |
| M                   | 27.5 | 26.4  | 39.7  | 39.7  | 39.1  | 40.2  | 42.1  | 42.1  | 43.0  | 49.2  | 49.4  | 52.0  |
| F                   | 20.2 | 22.4  | 38.0  | 38.0  | 37.4  | 38.2  | 40.3  | 40.3  | 44.0  | 46.0  | 47.1  | 48.6  |
| Gender Gap          | 7.2  | 4.0   | 1.7   | 1.7   | 2.0   | 1.8   | 1.8   | -1.1  | 3.2   | 2.3   | 3.4   |       |

#### Tertiary

| MF                  | 1.6  | 1.6   | 1.5   | 2.7   | 2.7   | 2.7   | 2.8   | 2.8   | 2.7   | 2.7   | 2.7   | 2.7   |
| M                   | 2.4  | 2.2   | 2.2   | 3.6   | 3.6   | 3.6   | 3.7   | 3.7   | 3.4   | 3.4   | 3.4   | 3.4   |
| F                   | 0.9  | 0.9   | 0.9   | 1.9   | 1.9   | 1.9   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.1   | 2.1   | 2.1   | 2.1   |
| Gender Gap          | 0.9  | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 0.9   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   |

#### Literacy Rate (% of population 15+)

| MF                  |       |       |       | 73.6  | 73.6  | 73.6  | 73.6  | 73.6  |       |       |       |       |
| M                   |       |       |       | 77.7  | 77.7  | 77.7  | 77.7  | 77.7  |       |       |       |       |
| F                   |       |       |       | 70.2  | 70.2  | 70.2  | 70.2  | 70.2  |       |       |       |       |
| Gender Gap          |       |       |       | 7.4   | 7.4   | 7.4   | 7.4   | 7.4   |       |       |       |       |

#### G:B Ratio (%)*

| MF                  | 0.9  | 1.0   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| M                   | 1.6  | 1.6   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| F                   | 0.9  | 0.9   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |

* Ratio of Girls / Boys in primary / secondary education (%)
### Table 3: Enrolments and Apparent Cohort Transition Rates: 1999 – 2007: (Boys & Girls)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1</td>
<td>488,882</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>497,609</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>499,952</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>493,809</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>675,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2</td>
<td>485,392</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>475,612</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>439,340</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>523,444</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>587,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3</td>
<td>418,997</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>418,688</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>419,613</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>487,889</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>493,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4</td>
<td>399,413</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>439,667</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>472,857</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>477,069</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>502,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5</td>
<td>348,764</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>391,452</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>443,433</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>452,083</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>453,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6</td>
<td>313,236</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>350,604</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>343,542</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>418,272</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>432,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 7</td>
<td>309,731</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>329,463</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>380,826</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>412,013</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>448,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 8</td>
<td>228,639</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>303,190</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>280,753</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>333,564</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>342,563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Primary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Enrolments</th>
<th>%Gap</th>
<th>%Gap</th>
<th>%Gap</th>
<th>%Gap</th>
<th>%Gap</th>
<th>%Gap</th>
<th>%Gap</th>
<th>%Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2,993,054</td>
<td>2,978,098</td>
<td>3,199,732</td>
<td>3,120,495</td>
<td>3,651,873</td>
<td>3,810,355</td>
<td>3,908,855</td>
<td>3,866,577</td>
<td>4,199,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3,073,932</td>
<td>3,908,855</td>
<td>3,866,577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1</td>
<td>456,768</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>484,880</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>471,916</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>463,609</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>628,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2</td>
<td>428,520</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>451,511</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>411,547</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>488,954</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>550,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3</td>
<td>396,668</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>427,884</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>392,687</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>451,591</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>459,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4</td>
<td>385,377</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>402,181</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>395,363</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>444,153</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>445,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5</td>
<td>347,448</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>352,702</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>368,564</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>416,005</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>401,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6</td>
<td>321,785</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>322,693</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>350,318</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>387,949</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>399,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 7</td>
<td>321,383</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>320,288</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>333,702</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>375,691</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>404,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 8</td>
<td>216,605</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>220,803</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>247,833</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>267,213</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>308,719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Primary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Enrolments</th>
<th>%Gap</th>
<th>%Gap</th>
<th>%Gap</th>
<th>%Gap</th>
<th>%Gap</th>
<th>%Gap</th>
<th>%Gap</th>
<th>%Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2,874,554</td>
<td>2,959,316</td>
<td>3,112,692</td>
<td>2,966,315</td>
<td>3,460,404</td>
<td>3,574,423</td>
<td>3,688,429</td>
<td>3,735,537</td>
<td>4,012,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,988,831</td>
<td>3,688,430</td>
<td>3,735,537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Source:
MoE, EMIS Section, (2008), adapted and enhanced
## Table 4: Enrolments and Apparent Cohort Transition Rates: 1999 – 2007: (Total)

### KENYA PUBLIC & PRIVATE SCHOOLS: ENROLMENTS: TOTAL 1999 -2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>945,650</td>
<td>982,489</td>
<td>971,868</td>
<td>957,418</td>
<td>1,303,950</td>
<td>1,250,659</td>
<td>1,190,011</td>
<td>1,159,953</td>
<td>1,363,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>913,912</td>
<td>890,574</td>
<td>927,123</td>
<td>850,887</td>
<td>1,012,398</td>
<td>1,137,825</td>
<td>1,124,912</td>
<td>1,112,416</td>
<td>1,246,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>815,665</td>
<td>846,572</td>
<td>880,918</td>
<td>939,480</td>
<td>952,352</td>
<td>1,063,987</td>
<td>1,012,290</td>
<td>1,206,316</td>
<td>1,260,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>784,790</td>
<td>799,794</td>
<td>866,864</td>
<td>808,927</td>
<td>916,723</td>
<td>922,210</td>
<td>971,689</td>
<td>1,034,118</td>
<td>1,160,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>696,212</td>
<td>694,397</td>
<td>779,195</td>
<td>742,634</td>
<td>849,142</td>
<td>878,297</td>
<td>895,428</td>
<td>965,113</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>635,021</td>
<td>637,997</td>
<td>705,597</td>
<td>693,860</td>
<td>786,101</td>
<td>846,779</td>
<td>857,675</td>
<td>746,107</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>631,114</td>
<td>636,398</td>
<td>671,071</td>
<td>667,069</td>
<td>756,17</td>
<td>816,416</td>
<td>889,112</td>
<td>528,595</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>445,244</td>
<td>449,193</td>
<td>509,788</td>
<td>553,715</td>
<td>547,966</td>
<td>642,283</td>
<td>671,122</td>
<td>995,161</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>5,867,608</td>
<td>5,937,413</td>
<td>6,312,424</td>
<td>6,086,810</td>
<td>7,112,277</td>
<td>7,384,778</td>
<td>7,597,284</td>
<td>7,632,114</td>
<td>8,211,269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** MoE, EMIS Section, (2008), adapted and enhanced
Table 5: Number of ECDE, Primary, Secondary Schools, and ECDE Enrolments: 2002, 2005, 2006

Source: MoE, EMIS, (2007), Fact Sheet (adapted to highlight year-to-year percentage changes)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVINCE/DISTRICT</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Coast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littoral Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littoral Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MoE, EMIS, (2007), Fact Sheet (adapted to highlight year-to-year percentage changes)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>124,824</td>
<td>125,786</td>
<td>250,610</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>128,835</td>
<td>130,111</td>
<td>258,946</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>132,312</td>
<td>134,049</td>
<td>266,361</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>136,520</td>
<td>138,246</td>
<td>274,766</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>140,192</td>
<td>142,177</td>
<td>282,369</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free State</td>
<td>106,514</td>
<td>109,821</td>
<td>216,335</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>111,092</td>
<td>114,154</td>
<td>225,246</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>115,684</td>
<td>119,194</td>
<td>234,878</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>120,156</td>
<td>124,332</td>
<td>244,488</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>124,972</td>
<td>129,604</td>
<td>254,576</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>124,824</td>
<td>125,786</td>
<td>250,610</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>128,835</td>
<td>130,111</td>
<td>258,946</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>132,312</td>
<td>134,049</td>
<td>266,361</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>136,520</td>
<td>138,246</td>
<td>274,766</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>140,192</td>
<td>142,177</td>
<td>282,369</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free State</td>
<td>106,514</td>
<td>109,821</td>
<td>216,335</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>111,092</td>
<td>114,154</td>
<td>225,246</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>115,684</td>
<td>119,194</td>
<td>234,878</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>120,156</td>
<td>124,332</td>
<td>244,488</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>124,972</td>
<td>129,604</td>
<td>254,576</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>220,599</td>
<td>231,230</td>
<td>451,829</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>244,427</td>
<td>251,622</td>
<td>496,049</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>260,506</td>
<td>273,353</td>
<td>533,859</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>277,152</td>
<td>295,539</td>
<td>572,691</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>293,964</td>
<td>316,780</td>
<td>610,744</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7: ECDE, Primary and Secondary Schools GER by District: 2002, 2005, 2006**

**Source:** MoE, EMIS, (2007), Fact Sheet (adapted to highlight year-to-year percentage changes)
Table 8: Primary Schools NER, Completion, Teachers, PTR by District: 2002, 2005, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kohima</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J峨ma</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moni</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visakhapatnam</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mysore</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chennal</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengaluru</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolkata</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagpur</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumbai</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Delhi</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MoE, EMIS, (2007), Fact Sheet (adapted to highlight year-to-year percentage changes)