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ABSTRACT
The Government of Kenya recognizes the importance of Early Childhood Development, as one of the most important levers for accelerating the attainment of Education for All (EFA) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). There has been tremendous effort by the Government of Kenya (GOK) and collaborating partners to improve the welfare of the Kenyan child through various funding programmes, for instance, community support grants. However, these efforts have been fragmented and with little impact especially on management and implementation process. In realization, an effective ECD programme enhances a country’s social economic growth and political stability, the Government, through the Sessional Paper No. 1 of 2005, A Policy Framework on funding Education, Training and Research are recommended. This study investigated into management and implementation of community support grants in ECE centres in Magutuni location, Tharaka Nithi County. Kenya, it examined methods and sources of CSG funding, established the management of CSG, find out challenges facing management and implementation of CSG, it also suggested mitigation measures to the identified challenges. The study is based on the theory advanced by Henry Fayol. The findings will be used address the identified gaps on the government mode of funding and management of ECE within the study location and in the country as a whole. The study target population of 911, which has been narrowed down to a sample size of 141 through random sampling. The questioners were used as research instrument for collecting data in study. The instruments were pre-tested in Eight ECE centers that were not included in the actual study to check its reliability and validity. Eight School managers participated, 10 teachers, 20 parents, one DICECE officer and one DEO. Thus, the obtained data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The study finds out that; bursaries from the government are the main source of government community grants, the decision on how to use the grant was made by the school management committee, the challenges that are faced in management and implementation of community support grants were; there is a delay in disbursement of the funds, corruption and misuse of funds, diversion of the funds to primary school and inattendance of parents to discussion on how the funds will be used. The study concluded that little funds were allocated to ECE centres and it was managed poorly. The study recommended that; the CSG should be channelled to ECE centres using the proper means of allocation to avoid funds diversion and funds should be adequate. The District Education Officer and the DICECE officer should enhance measures that will ensure all funds are well managed and implemented.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXTUALIZATION OF THE STUDY

1.1 Introduction

This section presents the background information, statement of the problem, objectives, research questions, significance of the study, limitations and delimitations of the study, it also focuses on assumptions, theoretical and conceptual framework, and operational definition of terms.

1.2 Background to the Study

Essentially, there are two sources of funding for ECCE: public and private (Kamerman, 2000). Public government funding can be a major source of funds for ECCE, particularly for low income families who cannot afford to make large private contributions. Within the public sector, funding may come from central/national or state/local government or both. At the national level funding may be come from Education, Health, and Social Services Departments, depending on the extent to which ECCE provision includes developmental as well as educational services.

National governments may have more political strength to collect revenues; regional governments may be relied on more to organize delivery of programs, accommodating local conditions. Private funds for ECCE are expenditures by households directly on the education of their own children. In some countries, private funding supplements the public funding to raise the full amount of ECCE to a desired level (typically, families will pay for more hours or longer days than are publicly funded); or, even where programs are free at point of
enrolment, parents may be expected to contribute for some extra services. In other cases, family incomes may be the only way for families to choose different types of early education.

Other private sources may also be available to fund ECCE. These include donations by independent entities, such as churches, charities, or companies. Private groups may offer funds only for some inputs (e.g. facilities or capacity building) or for a restricted time period (e.g. capital grants). Private funding also comes from loans or grants by supranational agencies, such as the World Bank. (During the 1990s, the World Bank committed funds in many countries, totalling $770 million for freestanding ECCE projects and $600 million for integrated projects).

Public and private funding sources are interdependent (Scrivner and Wolfe, 2003). In some countries public funding is only available for those with low incomes or in deprived areas; wealthier families must make larger private contributions. Given high demand for ECCE in countries where female labour force participation rates are high, families are likely to make private efforts even where public funding is scarce. Moreover, private cost-sharing (i.e. families paying some amount towards the provision of ECCE) is often essential to ensure that public funds are deployed efficiently according to need. (Where ECCE is free, it will be over-used). In some cases, public funds are used to establish a functioning pre-school market (e.g. with inspections and codes of registration for providers); families then choose and pay within the framework of a regulated market.

Globally, the challenge of providing adequate education facility in primary schools is huge (World Bank, 2003) as cited by Bonner et al. (2003). To meet Education for All (EFA) target and Universal access to primary education worldwide, an estimated number of about 10
millions of classrooms need to be built at a cost of US $30 billion. In United States of America (USA), school facilities in the seventeenth century were one-room structures with limited furnishings functioning primarily as shelter (O’Neill, 2000). As towns grew, additional rooms were added for additional space with little regard for modernizing the schools. The nineteenth century ushered in such advances as chalkboards, gas lighting and central heating. By the twentieth century, arrangement of buildings and classrooms allowed for active student participation. In 1940’s, it is noted that there was an increase in class size as well as attention to characteristics such as increased student access and natural lighting according to O’Neill (2002).

In recent time, the mean age of a school building in the USA is given as forty-two years, with 28 percent of school buildings built before 1950. Many of the building materials, furnishings, and equipment will not last half that long and will require constant upkeep, maintenance, and inevitable replacement to deter building obsolescence. The cost of maintaining public schools and facilities is enormous. According to government accountability office and American society for civil engineers, school districts have been under spending on maintenance and repair for many years. Most district schools do not have resources to address the maintenance. According to BEST (2005), it is the responsibility of each state to ensure that every child has access to a quality education. In many states, the courts have determined that school facilities that provide educational settings suited to the state’s determined curriculum are a significant part of this responsibility. However, school facility management and construction have traditionally been entirely the responsibility of the school district.

Many states particularly those who have increased funding to local school districts have put in place policies, procedures and technical assistance to ensure that their public school
facilities are educationally adequate. To meet this goal, each state should know the condition of their school facilities, the elements and determining factors in meeting the state’s educational curriculum outcomes. The state should measure these factors against one another to determine each facility’s education adequacy. It should then ensure that facilities that do not meet these standards are brought up to an acceptable level. Those that do not have financial resources to bring their school facilities up to state standards are given assistance to ensure that the facilities meet the state standards.

In New Zealand, the ECE policies have been underpinned by the government’s vision that all children have the opportunity to participate in high-quality ECE. Funding regulatory policies seek to balance a range of ECE-related goals while facilitating diversity and quality of ECE sector in order to meet their needs (Munford, 2007).

In Bolivia's, Integrated Child Development Project, Parents pay a flat monthly fee equivalent to US$2.50 (in 1993 prices) for the first child and a decreasing fee for each additional child enrolled. Families and communities can also make contributions in-kind; such as construction are involved in management of ECE centres (Child Fund org, 2013).

In Chile, according to SIDA (2000), the Ministry of Education undertook a programme to improve the quality of primary schools in disadvantaged areas of the country. Approximately 10 percent of the country’s existing primary schools (1200) took part in the programme at a cost of just under $ 17 million US dollars. The programme provided for the improvement of learning environment, including improvement of infrastructure and provision of classrooms, libraries and learning materials among others. The evaluation of the programme found significance improved achievement among participating schools as compared to their prior
performance and performance of schools outside of these programme. The results indicated that focusing on key quality dimensions within a learning system can have an important impact on the students’ skills and as a result the life chances.

In Vietnam, communities with social economic difficulties as well as mountain and island communities are given high priority and childcare fees are not levied. Establishments of public early childhood education facilities concentrated mainly in communities which are facing difficulties whereas the non public facilities and privatisation of public facilities is carried out in urban and economically developed areas.

In South Africa, facilities maintenance is also beginning to be recognized (Xaba, 2012). First, with its prescription as a school governance function in the Schools Act and, secondly, with the recent proclamation of the Schedule for the National Policy for an Equitable Provision of an Enabling School Physical Teaching and Learning Environment of the Republic of South Africa (2008). It also states that if well maintained and managed, school facilities provide conducive environments that translate into quality education. If well maintained and utilized, they can also realize substantial efficiency gains by deepening national and sector values of school-community relationships and community ownership of schools. On maintenance policies, Xaba (2012) found that schools did not have specific policies on facilities maintenance. The study also indicated that there were poor systems for facilities maintenance inspection in South Africa. Inspections were mostly conducted in an ad hoc manner and only when equipment broke down or became damaged would an inspection of facilities related to that object be conducted.
In Botswana the Ministry of Education has been assigned the task of providing an enabling environment through preschool grants to NGOS and Community Based Organizations (CBOs) for infrastructural development. In addition to this the MOE is charged with the responsibility of developing teaching and learning materials that should guide the operation of all preschool education (Republic of Botswana, 2003)

In Ghana, poverty and lack of access to good nutrition are major barriers preventing many parents from sending their children to pre-school which resulted in widespread neglect, malnutrition and abuse of many children. As a national strategy, the government of Ghana introduced the capitation grant policy to provide free meals to children in schools to improve the nutritional needs of disadvantaged children. By the beginning of March 2008 the government of Ghana, in collaboration of The New Partnership of Africa’s Development (NAPAD) secretariat had spent US $ 21.82 million on school feeding programme, (SFP). It is reported that by May 2008, 477714 children in 978 schools across Ghana were benefiting from SFP. This led to an average increase of 40% in primary school enrolment in 2007 (Kwadwo-Agyei, 2008). Egypt engages in promoting ECE education by use of standard quality assurance tools in pre-school education programmes in three governorates. These standards are; developing ECE curricula, support in development of ECE structures and funding programs (Hart and Schulmam, 2002).

In Sub-Saharan Africa and poor countries in Asia, classrooms are typically overcrowded, main buildings and other facilities are inadequate, sites are poorly planned and there is little maintenance (MOE, 2010). The approaches required to make sustainable progress for effective maintenance cost are clear, but challenges to implement remain wanting. Educational programs should include policies that address the condition, improvement and
maintenance of school infrastructure. According to MOE (2010) School construction strategies for universal education in Africa indicate that a school must have appropriate, sufficient and secure buildings. The document states that the design of classroom must be comfortable, accessible, flexible, and adaptable to provide sufficient space to ensure children’s dignity, health and wellbeing are catered for. This means that, the classroom environment should attract learners and therefore more attendance to school. Schools with well maintained permanent building and adequate playgrounds perform better than those with inadequate facilities (Okeno, 2011). Well designed and maintained school facilities also have an indirect impact on teaching and learning process (BEST, 2005).

The government of Kenya through the ministry of education provides grants in form of Community Support Grant (CSG). The grants are used in assisting early childhood centres and communities in the poorest and hardship areas of Kenya to improve access to quality early childhood education for children aged 4 to 8 years. This grants are not well utilised in some centres, thus does not fulfil its intended purpose (UNESCO, 2003). UNESCO also states that, proper management and implementation of community support grants is one of the key principles to quality ECE. The World Community renewed its commitment to ECE in the Dakar Framework of Action, whose first goal was devoted to ECE. It was concerned with expanding access to integrate ECE services, improving their quality and ensuring equity. It is now an established fact that investment in ECE pays off, educationally, socially and economically (UNESCO, 2003).

In Kenya, poor access to quality education was largely blamed on prevailing poverty. One of key objectives of the Sessional paper No 1 of 2005 entitled ‘A policy framework for education, training and research’ is to enhance access, equity and quality of education at all
levels by 2010 through providing funds to education at all levels, this was intended to be achieved through progressive government policies that promotes proper funds management and implementation.

Community support grant programme is an initiative by the ministry of education to assist early childhood centres and communities in the poorest areas of Kenya to improve access to quality early childhood education for children aged 4 to 8 years.

The ministry of education proposed to provide ECE community support grants to 5,000 ECE centers in 35 Districts in hardship and high affected poverty areas. Maara district in Tharaka Nithi County was among the district benefiting from community support grant. Each beneficiary of the fund was to receive a total of KSHS 300,000 (around 4,500 USD) in three instalments over five years.

Despite the allocation of community support grants, it was not known how the funds were utilized by ECE centers, therefore the researcher investigated the management and implementation of community support grant in ECE Magutuni Location, in Tharaka Nithi County, Kenya

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Access to good and quality Early Childhood Education (ECE) is widely recognized as an important pillar, equalizing education opportunity for children from all backgrounds. This is why the government of Kenya through the ministry of education continues to provide grants in form of Community Support Grant (CSG) which is an initiative by the ministry of education. Its purpose was to assist early childhood centres and communities in the poorest and hardship areas of Kenya to improve access to quality early childhood education for
children aged 4 to 8 years. The ministry of education proposed to provide ECE community support grants to 5,000 ECE centers in 35 Districts with low access and high poverty levels (Ministry of Education, 2003) thus Maara district was among the selected. Despite the allocation of community support grants, there are still many challenges facing ECE centers which are associated with lack of adequate funds to implement education in ECE centres. It was not well established how the funds were being managed and utilized in this centres. It was this reason the researcher sought to investigate into management and implementation of CSG in early childhood education centres in Magutuni location, Tharaka Nithi County.

1.4 Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this study was to examine the source of funding, management and implementation of CSG in childhood education centres in Magutuni, Tharaka Nithi County.

1.5 Objectives of the Study
1. To identify the sources of funding in early childhood education centres in public schools in Magutuni Location.
2. To establish how the allocated grants in ECE centres are managed.
3. To find out challenges facing the management and implementation of community support grants in ECE centres.
4. To determine strategies to mitigate the challenges facing the management and implementation of community support grant in ECE centres in Magutuni Location.

1.6 Research Questions
The study was guided by the following questions;
1. What are the sources of funding in public ECE?
2. How is CSG in ECE managed and implemented?

3. What are the challenges facing the implementation and management of community support grant?

4. What are the strategies that can be used to mitigate challenges facing the management and implementation of community support grants in ECE centres in Magutuni Location?

1.7 Assumptions of the Study

It was assumed that CSG are available to ECE centres in Magutuni, even though it does not affect the target group. It also assumed that the grants helped in alleviating structural and infrastructural deficiency within the target area and the finding of this study will bring forth solutions to funding, management and implementation gaps in ECE centres.

1.8 Limitation of the Study

Some of the limiting factors during execution of this study were; poor infrastructure, the roads terrain are rough, bumpy and dusty which limited the movement of the researcher from one centre to another, thereby affecting the set time frame. Thus resulting to the delay in completion of research study. The harsh climatic conditions in the area which is hot and dry yearly also affected the mobility of the researcher to collect the data from one school to another.

1.9 Delimitations of the Study

This study confined itself to Magutuni Location, Tharaka Nithi County. Only ECE Head teachers, Teachers and Parents from public ECE centres’ within the Location were involved in the study thus give resourceful information on CSG management and implementation.
The factor which favoured the study was the ability of the researcher to understand the local language thus gathering vital information within the Location. There were several factors influencing development of ECE programmes, but this study was restricted to the source of funding, management and implementation of CSG in ECE in Magutuni Location, Tharaka Nithi County.

1.10 Significance of the Study
This study was useful to the ECE parents, teachers, community and the development partners to understand the essence of Community Support Grants and how the grants were managed and implemented, so as to keep an eye on how the managers manage funds given to them to successful implement education in ECE centres. The Ministry of Education may use the finding of this study in policy formulation and restructuring CSG funding, management and implementation. The study also offered solutions to the challenges facing management and implementation of CSG. The research finding formed a basis for further research on ECE financing, management and implementation of CSG in Kenya for the future revision.
1.11 Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

1.11.1 Theoretical Framework

This study was based on the theory advanced by Henry Fayol. In this theory Fayol identified several educational administrative task areas which include: discipline- A successful learning centre requires the common effort and determination enhancing self-control in all school issues especially in finance management and implementation thus penalties should be applied judiciously where rules are diverted with common individual interest. Unity of command- The school management should be conducted in an orderly manner; a command chain should be applied, from the school manager to ECE pupil and community.

Financial management and Accountability-The school management team should be accountable and responsible for the school financial matter, funds should be well spent and record should be well documented and filed for traceability.

Human resource management-Retaining productive ECE teachers should always be a high priority of management. Recruitment and Selection Costs, as well as increased product-reject rates are usually associated with hiring new workers, where funds are directed to unqualified teacher is a loss to the centre. Order- For the sake of efficiency and coordination, all people related to a specific kind of work should be treated as equally as possible. The qualities of these components are critical to accessing education at all levels. School community- The school and community should have one drive, the interests of one person should not take priority over the interests of the organization as a whole, the entire organization should be moving towards a common objective in a common direction i.e. Common CSG planning, management and implementation. The theory is relevant to this study because it was
conceptualized that the head teacher needs to mobilize the above tasks in order to attain quality ECE.

1.12 Conceptual Framework

The role of the identified variables that were the main focus of this study is elaborated in the illustration presented as Figure 1.1.

**Figure 1.1: Structure of Community Support Management**

Independent variables involved community support grant management and implementation. This was manifested in provision of quality infrastructures such as classrooms, toilets, teaching/learning materials and paying teacher’s salaries in general quality education.

Dependent variable was the quality ECE centres, this was reflected in the; Infrastructure, quality teaching and learning materials, ECE teachers’ salary and pupils enrolment in the centres. Management of CSG affected the dependent variable that was the access to quality ECE.
Other variables influenced the outcome of the independent variables were enrolment in ECE centres and quality of the ECE programme. It was conceptualized that good CSG management and implementation improved access, infrastructure, teaching/learning materials and cater for the teacher salaries.

1.13 Operational Definition of Terms

Access- enrolment of pre-school age-going children to ECE programs.

Community Support Grants- an initiative (grants) provided by the ministry of education to assist early childhood centres and communities in the poorest and hardship areas of Kenya to improve access to quality ECE.

Early Childhood Development Centre (ECEC) Facilities that provides learning and support appropriate to the child’s developmental age and stage under the framework of Early childhood education.

Early childhood education (ECE) Learning and development education of young children of ages 0 to 8 years.

Government Policies- These are the principles or rules to guide decisions and actions taken by administrative of the state with regard to a class of issues in manner consistent with law and institutional customs.

Guardians Adults legally responsible for ECE pupil/s affairs
| **Implementation**- | This is the process of executing CSG plans and decisions into responsive effects. |
| **Management**- | The act in which school managers controls and makes correct decisions and directives on grants usage for attaining quality, efficient and productive ECE services. |
| **Nutrition** – | Is the process of providing or obtaining the food necessary for health and growth. |
| **Performance**- | How well or badly ECE pupils work toward outcome or results. |
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents reviews of the related literature to sources and mode of fundings and management in early childhood education, challenges facing the implementation and management of community support grant and remedies and effective measures to challenge’s facing management of community support grants.

2.2 Sources of funding and funds management in early childhood education

Higher-level government agencies may raise revenues for ECCE as a block grant, and then either provide the service directly or give local authorities flexibility over how the grant is allocated; as well, higher-level agencies may mandate that local governments contribute matching or partial-matching funds. (Indeed, decentralization appears to be a general international trend across education financing, (UNESCO, 2003). Local governments may organize so that funds are raised directly from within the local community, e.g. through donations to groups or social clubs; government agencies are in effect acting as a coordinator of services within the region.

In Brazil there are three layers of government – federal, state, and municipality – but ‘basic education’ up to secondary level is the responsibility of states and municipalities (Schady, 2005). Public investments in ECCE are made through the Ministry of Education (with other contributions from the Ministries of Health, and Social Assistance). Funding for basic education is earmarked as 25% of the state’s net tax revenues and 25% of the municipality’s net tax revenues (and 18% of federal revenues). However, because the
earmarked funding is to be applied to all education, and primary and secondary education is mandatory, there is no specific commitment for ECCE.

In total, public expenditure on ECCE is approximately 0.4% of GDP, with a gross enrollment rate in pre-primary education of 57% by age 5-6 (UNESCO, 2003). Although this is a relatively high percentage given absolute per capita GDP in Brazil, approximately one-third of ECCE enrollments are in the private sector. (Federal agencies have established curriculum requirements). At younger ages (0-3), enrollment levels in day care centers are relatively low, such that per pupil expenditures are high for those enrolled: at approximately $1,000, this is greater than per-pupil primary school expenditures. (Again, privately-funded provision is more common for day care). Provision also varies with location: in the poorer northern regions of Brazil, pre-school rates are considerably below those of the wealthier southern regions because funding is lower. Another inequity is the very high public spending on higher education relative to spending on pre-primary education.

In China, ECCE is divided such that kindergartens for children aged 3-6 are the responsibility of the Ministry of Education and nurseries for children under age 3 are the responsibility of the Ministry of Health (Wong and Pang, 2002). The national Ministry of Education is responsible for the development and implementation of policy and regulations of kindergartens and early education more broadly. However, ECCE is administered, organized, and funded primarily within local settings. With some public funding, and state guidelines and regulations, private providers operate nurseries and kindergartens. (Spending on pre-primary enrollees is approximately one-third of the amount spent on primary school enrollees.) In general, non-state entities are charged with
the responsibility of providing ECCE and of obtaining funds from all sources. In some provinces, pre-primary provision may be attached to primary school provision, with some sharing of facilities.

Parents are expected to contribute significantly for ECCE, with tax exemptions to encourage such investments. Private funding from international aid agencies has been targeted at disadvantaged, rural areas, as well as areas with minority populations; ECCE within these settings is less formal. Recent data indicate that fewer than 1 in 5 children aged 3-6 attend kindergarten, with double the rate in urban areas over rural areas. (The gross pre-primary enrollment rate is estimated at 36%, (UNESCO, 2003). Given the reliance on local agencies, the availability and quality of ECCE varies considerably across regions in China.

Public ECCE programs in Cuba offer universal provision at age 5, with infant care from six months. The state provides free childcare for working mothers, and approximately 18% of children are enrolled; other children are cared for in private homes. With public, free provision, enrollment rates are high. No private provision is admitted.

Government support for ECCE in Egypt has been relatively recent, beginning with construction of facilities and capacity building at the national level in the 1990s. Most nurseries are run either as non-governmental agencies or privately, although the Ministry of Insurance and Social Affairs plays a supervisory role. A national curriculum has also been developed by the central government.

The gross pre-primary enrollment rate is very low, at 14%; and approximately half of these enrollees are in private programs (often paid for by religious groups or employers).
However, this rate is considerably above the rate in 1990, indicating a substantial increase in resources for ECCE in Egypt. In part, this growth has been with international agencies on public projects. By 2001, expenditures per child per year were $300, with approximately 25% being paid directly by parents.

Funding for ECCE in France is primarily the responsibility of the national government, which finances the instructional component of ECCE (i.e., the teachers, Neuman and Peer, 2002). Local governments must provide support for facilities, administration, and other services. Coverage is extensive. There is universal access for 3-5 year olds, although class sizes are relatively large (above 20). Also, funding is targeted according to need, with greater funding allocated to areas of regional deprivation. This funding may be used for more intensive ECCE or for ECCE offered to younger children (aged 2). Creches (for children aged 0-36 months) are open full-day, full-year; they are regulated through the national Ministry for Social Affairs. Ecoles maternelle (for children aged 2-5 years) are open during term times and are regulated by the national Ministry of Education. Funding is for 6 hours per day; additional services are extra.

Funding amounts were estimated at $4,500 per enrollee in 2002. As of 1998, public ECCE expenditures amounted to 0.66% of GDP, a proportion considerably above most OECD countries (UNESCO, 2003). There are some parental co-payments. For infant-toddler services outside the education system, parents pay based on national guidelines with rates that vary according to family income: the amount ranges up to 12-15%, depending on the number of children (Meyers and Gornick, 2000). Subsidies for the purchase of private care are available: parents using registered family day carers may claim up to $160 per month at ages 0-3; up to $100 per month at ages 3-6; and for social
security contributions for in-home providers up to $800. Employers contribute to the cost of service through compulsory payments into the Family Allowance Funds; these contributions cover approximately 25% of the costs. There are tax reductions for employed parents of up to 25% of child care costs (max $800 per child per year) and 50% of costs for in home care (up to $12,000). Parents must also pay for supplemental services, with co-payments based on a sliding income scale. Tax subsidies are also available to encourage private providers of ECCE. The burden of ECCE expenditures is shared. The national government pays about 25% of the child care expenditures. The state about one-third, and local governments about one-eighth; employers pay around 25% and families 23-28%. For pre-primary, the national government pays a larger proportion of total expenditures.

In Germany, ECCE is split in varying extents between state and local governments. Krippe (for children aged 0-36 months) are open full hours through the year; they are funded through the local authorities. Kindergarten (for children aged 3-5 years) are open mainly during term times; they are funded by the Laender and the Ministries of Social Affairs and Education. Coverage is broadly comprehensive, with most children in public school by age 5. As of 1998, public ECCE expenditures amounted to 0.36% of GDP (UNESCO, 2003), with funding per enrollee at around $5,000 by 2002.

There are parental copayments. These vary by Laender but cover 15-30% of costs. They also vary according to income, number of children and type of care, but do not exceed $350 per year. There are some subsidies for low-income families who use private family day care services; these subsidies are paid directly to the day carer or center. There are also tax deductions available for working lone parents and for married couples if one
parent is sick/disabled. The burden of funding falls mainly on the state; parental copays are generally less than one-fifth of the total formal child care. For pre-school, state governments pay 40% and local governments pay 60% of the public expenditures.

ECCE in India is primarily the responsibility of the national government, with funding for supplemental services paid for at the local level. The centrally-funded Integrated Child Development Services Programme (ICDS) provides an integrated package of health, nutrition, and early education services to children up to six years of age from low income and rural households. Targeted at children aged 3 to 6, it currently covers approximately 20% of the population, funded at $10-$22 per child per year (with other ECE centers, creches, day-care centers, and pre-primary schools, (UNESCO, 2004).

The Indian ECCE system includes private cost-sharing, with direct parent fees for public programs (Kamerman, 2005). Thus, many families must rely on the private market for ECCE provision (either subsidized or at full fee). However, India has received World Bank support: over the period 1991-98, the World Bank committed $396 million in bank credits/loans for the ICDS programme. Private funding is also being obtained to integrate pre-primary and primary services. Coverage is targeted according to geographical impoverishment, but the ICDS programme still has uneven provision across regions and spending is a fraction of that for primary education. Contributing to equity, the policy is directed at expanding coverage rather than ensuring high quality, but some regions (Bihar and Uttar Pradesh) still have very low rates of provision.

In Indonesia, ECCE is a family responsibility and is not part of the formal education system. Some small amounts of resource are contributed by several government
ministries (Religious Affairs, Education). These fund (privately-operated) child care centers, particularly in urban areas and for younger children (aged 0-3), with some programs for preschoolers aged 5-6. In addition, the government sponsors an ECCE Forum and Consortium, to develop policies and protocols for ECCE. Thus, the burden of funding for pre-school falls almost entirely on private families.

Public contributions are estimated at <$100, or 5% of the total amount of funding. (Also, there is no formal mandate for parental leave at childbirth, SSA, 2005). Correspondingly, the gross pre-primary enrollment rate is very low, at 19% (UNESCO, 2004); almost all of these enrollees are in private pre-schools. The starting age for compulsory schooling is also late, at age seven. The common source of financing for early childhood programs is the regular budget of the government. Budgets for ECE are allocated under Education or Social Services budgets. Other times, governments earmark funds for ECE programs through trust funds or community grants (Myers, Robert, 2000). One of key objectives of the Sessional paper No 1 of 2005 entitled ‘A policy framework for education, training and research’ is to enhance access, equity and quality of education at all levels by 2010 through providing funds to education at all levels, this was intended to be achieved through progressive government policies that promotes proper funds management and implementation.

In Kenya, Community support grant programme is an initiative by the ministry of education to assist early childhood centres and communities in the poorest and hardship areas of Kenya to improve access to quality early childhood education for children aged 4 to 8 years. The ministry of education proposed to provide Community support grants to 5,000 ECE centers in 35 Districts in the hardship and high poverty affected areas. Despite
the allocation of community support grants, the grants was not well managed, this was indicated by inadequacy of community participation, poor funds management and implantation (Republic of Kenya, 2006). A study conducted by Kenya Early Childhood Development Project (1997) reveals that, despite management and implementation of community support grant in ECE, there was still low access to quality of services provided by ECE centers in Tharaka County.

The study elucidates that access to ECE services were low, particularly for the lowest income groups; there were low public awareness regarding community support grant and also the accountability of community grants was questionable, indicating the sense of poor management and implementation. Study therefore intended to investigate the management and implementation of community support grant in attaining quality of ECE and determined challenges to management and implementation of community support grant in Magutuni (Republic of Kenya, 2005).

From the above literature, majority of studies have been based on the funding of ECE centres but they have not clearly stated how the management of these funds are done. The researcher sought to investigate the sources of funds and how they are managed in ECE centres in Magutuni, Tharaka Nithi County.

2.3 Management of Community Support Grant

Many states put in place policies, procedures and technical assistance to ensure that their public school facilities are educationally adequate. In United States, Public school facilities management policy states that it is the responsibility of each state to ensure that every child has access to quality education (BEST Collaborative, 2005). Officials and
administrators are elected and appointed at state, local and school district level to improve the management of community Support Funds in order to support and enhance the delivery of educational programs and services.

In 2001, a group of very experienced school facility and community-based groups came together in a collaboration called BEST (Building Educational Success Together). The BEST partners developed a four – part policy agenda: Increase public participation in facilities planning; create and support schools as centers of community that offer school – based to children to eliminate barriers to success and serve the broader community; Improve facilities management, including maintenance and capital improvement programs and; Secure adequate and equitable facilities funding.

According to U.S Census Bureau Report (2006) as cited by Bello and Loftness (2010) the total amount of differed maintenance of schools in United States was estimated at $ 254.6 billion in 2008. There are over 94,000 public elementary middle and high schools being attended by more than 50 million students and there is need to implement an effective method of maintaining Community support funds. This funds are used to maintain facilities in ECE, pay ECE teachers and buy teaching and learning materials for ECE. So, Inadequate investment in ECE facility maintenance has led to a scenario where there are a significant number of ECE school facilities with need for major repair and renovation.

The cost of deferred expenditures currently runs to over $200 million in Los Angeles, Detroit, Chicago, Seattle, and Miami’s Dade Country, with an enormous bill of $780 million for the New York City ECE schools. The accumulated cost to repair the nation’s public schools, according National Forum of Educational Administration & Supervision
Journal according to knowledgeable sources, can now be conservatively placed at $60 billion and may run as high as $150 billion (Report to Congressional Requesters, 2005). In the year 2009, government sources estimated the ECE school repair bill to be $2,900 per student, and the cost per student for schools needing to make the repairs was $3,800 per student. Approximately 76 percent of public schools needed major repair or renovation. In this backlog, educators must be equipped with knowledge base and skill level in facility appraisal (O’Neil, 2000). It is the responsibility of government and development partners to work together to develop approaches that will contribute to significant, measurable and sustainable progress towards national goals and targets and provide good value for money (DFID, 2004) a cited by (UNESCO, 2004). Adherence to good financial planning and management practices must be a mandatory requirement for all 35 partners. Without this, problems with programme implementation and lack of transparency are inevitable and money value will generally be compromised.

In South Africa, facilities maintenance is also beginning to be recognized (Xaba 2012). First, with its prescription as a school governance function in the Schools Act and secondly, with the recent proclamation of the Schedule for the National Policy for an Equitable Provision of an Enabling School Physical Teaching and Learning Environment of the Republic of South Africa (2008): It also states that if well maintained and managed, school facilities provide conducive environments that translate into quality education. If well maintained and utilized, they can also realize substantial efficiency gains by deepening national and sector values of school-community relationships and community ownership of school. On maintenance policies, Xaba (2012) found that schools did not have specific policies on facilities maintenance. The study also indicated
that there were poor systems for facilities maintenance inspection in South Africa. Inspections were mostly conducted in an ad hoc manner and only when equipment broke down or became damaged would an inspection of facilities related to that object be conducted. He analyzed school facilities maintenance and a school governance function in South Africa. Findings indicated that schools generally do not have organizational structures for planned community support fund maintenance, nor do they have policies on facilities maintenance. Evidence of facilities maintenance at schools mainly related to concerns with facilities repairs, (mostly “as the need arises”) and general campus cleanliness; mostly with emergency and corrective forms of maintenance as opposed to crucial preventive maintenance. Therefore, there was need for interim facilities maintenance committees and, in the long term, a whole-school approach to facilities maintenance that makes facilities maintenance a strategic lever for school functionality.

In Ghana, the building of formal education is directly associated with the history of European activities on the Gold Coast (Eyiah, 2004). The colonial schools produced the first generation of English- Educated Africans and this had a great influence on the development of the country. Despite the colonial efforts to assist and regulate schools, the provision of education in the Gold Coast was carried out primarily by Christian denominations. Mostly, the mission schools provided rudimentary teaching at the primary level. Progress has however, been made in Ghana's education development. The rapid expansion of schools under the free and compulsory policy was aimed at an ultimate provision of universal education. While this lofty goal has still not been attained, it is impressive to note that, according to 1999 figures, almost 80 percent of the approximately 3.4 million children of early childhood education age were actually
attending school. Day care and kindergarten programs while not widespread, are beginning to take shape in the early child education system.

MOE (2003) Report of the sector Review and development identifies the following: Low government investment in ECE and poor management of ECE centers. The reviewed study has identified that head teachers were less concerned in management and implementation of community grants, in some ECE centers untrained teacher were contracted so as to cut the cost of paying trained teacher, Ciumwari (2010).

Although much has been done to improve access and quality of early learning programmes in ECE, for instant provision of CSG, there is a long way to go in the enhancement of service delivery (UNICEF, 2010).

Some of the prominent challenges of CSG management in ECD facilities included; absence of learning materials and resources, especially within the classroom setting, mismanagement of funds, lack of qualified teacher and inadequate ECD infrastructures (UNICEF, 2010).

Many researches have been done on how management of community grants are managed in ECE centres in other countries but no research have been done on management of community grants in ECE Centres especially in Magutuni, Tharaka Nith County. This sought to establish how the community funds grants are managed in this area.

2.4 Prominent Challenges in Management of Community Support Grant

Misuse of community support grants is the major challenge in managing them. A study conducted by a U.S senate watchdog revealed that during the last six years, the school districts have been using them one to pay for other expenses like utilities or personnel.
Although this does not seem to be a story of corrupt personnel keeping the money for their own benefit, thus should still be a major concern for state officials and residents (Michelle Tuyub, 2013)

In Sub-Saharan Africa, the challenge of providing adequate ECE education facility is huge. An estimated cost of up to US$ 30 billion is needed to build up to 10 million classrooms (World Bank, 2003). In Nigeria there are several issues confronting effective school plant maintenance in Nigeria Schools. These include: Enrolment explosion leading to excessive pressure on existing school facilities; Inadequate funding arising from economic recessions and competitions for funds by other sectors. Consequently, facilities are inadequate to cope with increased enrolment pressure. In addition, inadequate funds have not allowed for proper maintenance of available facilities. A study conducted in Cameroon showed that enrolment of children in ECDE centres has dropped drastically from approximately 93,771 in 1990 to 91,708 in 1998, this drop is viewed to have been caused by poor economic performance of the country which resulted to reduced of allocation of funds to the sector (EFA Global Monitoring Report 2012).

In Tanzania there is lack enough qualified personnel to handle ECDE. There is also poor infrastructure in terms of building where to offer this education. This has thus led to poor children’s access to ECDE in this state (EFA Global Monitoring Report, 2012).

The introduction of free primary education policy in Kenya, has impacted negatively on access to quality ECE services. Most parents are refusing to pay ECE fees, arguing that the government should provide free pre-school as well as primary school education. Thus, an increasing number of children are not benefiting from ECE experiences,
intern they bypass ECE and join primary schools. Such children miss the head start for primary school learning that they would get pre-school which is known to cushion them against hostile experiences common to lower primary school classes, especially in Standard 1. The act of funds misuse or mismanagement lags ECE education sectors behind the quality standards of good effective education. Embezzlement of Funds by Some government officials is a corrupt practices that hinders quality ECE services, this officials are involved in mismanaging or misallocation of funds that are allocated to them, (UNESCO, 2005).

Senior officials in the Ministry of Education have severally been accused of protecting corrupt headmasters and members of PTA (Parents Teacher Association) suspected of embezzling funds because they are also indirectly benefiting from incentives that are being paid by parents or government grants, (UNESCO, 2005).

They allege that several internal audit reports as well as complaints by parents and teachers to the ministry against certain school heads and PTAs have been swept under the carpet. Many officials say the payment of incentives to teachers had resulted in an upsurge of fraud by school heads who are now exposed to huge amounts of money which they were not used to handling, (UNESCO, 2005).

Poverty levels in most part of the country have affected quality ECE services, unlike primary education, pre-school services are fee-paying. This puts a particular burden on poor parents, who are also expected to contribute to the building of facilities, payment of teachers’ salaries and management of pre-schools. Little or no financial support comes from other References.
Poor children have no choice but to attend overcrowded pre-school services or stay at home if no affordable service is available in the vicinity. Usually it is parents with low education levels and those living below the poverty line who do not enroll their children in preschools. A combination of ignorance and poverty prevents children from partaking of the rich experiences offered by pre-schools, which provide a head start and a solid foundation for the development of life-long learning, (UNESCO, 2005).

Quality education in the ECE sub-sector remain constrained due to mismanagement in ECD centres thus limited teaching and learning materials, inadequate ECE centres; inadequate community participation; lack of a clear policy on transition from pre-primary to primary school; inadequate nutrition and health services; lack of enough trained Teachers; Low and irregular salaries for ECE Teachers and lack of clear entry age guidelines. Classroom conditions are poor, for instance, lighting depend only on sunlight, which is sometimes inadequate, also ECE pupils are allocated to unmaintained classrooms with no sufficient desks so as to give room to class one pupil (Oketch et al, 2008).

Another concern in the provision of ECE is the lack of adequate policy framework. As a result; centers of learning have tended to adhere to different curriculum whose outcomes are not uniform measurable thus creating mismatch for children’s entry behavior to primary schools and compromises quality of education. The most adversely affected are children of the poor rural parents; yet they are the majority in Kenya. Moreover, the management of ECE has been too long left to the abilities of individuals and affiliated societies.
It scares an educator to realize that ECE in some parts of Kenya is processed in tiny rooms called “academies” whose managers are not trained. The learning environment in most of such centers is not conducive. For instance, such centres are patched either behind shanty-like buildings, or in religious centers with too many other activities that affect learning.

Alternatively, some centers are situated far away from homes of the learners who must then walk long distances only to arrive when they are too tired to access meaningful education. In any case, it’s difficult under such learning conditions to detect children with special needs. This is because most of their teachers are not trained and/or they are more interested in enrolment than in paying special attention to children with special needs. It is at this level that one’s future is enhanced or destroyed and this is a major Concern (Republic of Kenya, 2006).

According to Sessional paper No. 1 of 2005 titled ‘A Policy Framework for Education, Training and Research’ (Republic of Kenya, 2005), the overall goal of education is to achieve EFA by 2015 in tandem with national and international commitments. The ministry has therefore; set the following specific objectives in full cognizance of the national and international goals: to ensure that all children have access to and complete free and compulsory primary education by 2010, to improve the quality of all aspects of education and to ensure that the learning needs of all, young people and adults are met through equitable access programmes by 2015.

The government is already implementing measures that seek to achieve these goals and improve the performance of this sub-sector. These include: Curriculum development for
ECE; Providing community support grants to support marginalized/vulnerable communities; and enhancing the capacity of supervision and inspection to ensure quality of ECE programmes. A background report on the Kenyan situation by UNESCO (2005) show that despite the above measures, access, equity and quality in this sub-sector remain constrained by various factors that include:

Limited teaching and learning materials, inadequate ECE centers; inadequate community participation; and lack of clear policy on transition from pre-primary to primary school among others.

Most families that lived in the hardship areas encounter difficulties that counteract government efforts to achieve education for all Kenyans. Their life styles are not conducive for learning as they often move from one location to the other in search for food and water for domestic use and their livestock (Achoka, 2007); as they move on, they take their children along with them. It is difficult to have children from these regions attend ECE education as required.

Another related concern is children who are born to parents that are forced to become exiles subsequent to land/tribal clashes in Kenya like is the case in Mt. Elgon region of Rift Valley Province (RVP) in year, 2007.

Besides the RVP, another province that has been adversely affected by perennial land/tribal clashes is Coast. It should be noted that RVP is the largest province in Kenya. It runs from north to south Kenya. Many families not only inhabit the province but also depend on it for their livelihoods. Coupled with the above challenges is the issue of culture in some communities.
Government efforts to provide equal educational opportunities for boys and girls are frustrated by some parents’ choice to pay more attention to boys who are regarded a more formidable asset to the family than the girls. Consequently, more boys than girls enroll for ECE creating gender disparity in spite of the fact that statistically Kenya’s female to male population ratios are 51 to 49%, (Achoka, 2007).

The Government of the Republic of Kenya recognizes the importance of early childhood education as one of the most important levers for accelerating the attainment of Education For All (EFA) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The EFA goal number one obligated state governments to expand and enhance comprehensive early childhood education programs which are essential to the achievement of the basic education goals. Similarly, the World Fit for Children Conference in 2002 called for every child to have a good start to life through promoting quality nurturing, care and safe environment. There has been tremendous effort by the Government of Kenya (GOK) and collaborating partners to improve the welfare of the Kenyan child. However, these efforts have been fragmented and with little impact in realization that an effective ECE program enhances a country’s social economic growth and political stability, The Government, through the Sessional Paper No. 1 of 2005, A Policy Framework on funding Education, Training and Research has recommended the development of a present ECE policy framework and service standard guidelines that will promote growth of quality ECE Countrywide.

There are so many challenges facing the implementation of ECE centres world wide. From the literature above, many studies have been done on challenges facing ECE centres but no study have been done on the challenges faced by managers in
management of community support grants in Tharaka County, Kenya. This made the researcher to find out the challenges managers face in management of community support grants that hinder implementation of ECE centres.

2.5 Strategies Used to Mitigate Issues of Management & Implementation

In United States, many states put in place policies, procedures and technical assistance to ensure that their community support grants are educationally adequate. Officials and administrators are elected and appointed at state, local and school district level to supervise the community support grants in order to support and enhance the delivery of educational programs and services. In 2001, a group of very experienced school facility and community-based groups came together in a collaboration called BEST (Building Educational Success Together). The BEST partners developed a four – part policy agenda: Increase public participation in facilities planning; create and support schools as centers of community that offer school – based to children to eliminate barriers to success and serve the broader community; Improve facilities management, including maintenance and capital improvement programs and; Secure adequate and equitable facilities funding.

In South Africa, management and implementation of community grants is also beginning to be recognized (Xaba 2012). First, with its prescription as a school governance function in the Schools Act and secondly, with the recent proclamation of the Schedule for the National Policy for an Equitable Provision of an Enabling School Physical Teaching and Learning Environment of the Republic of South Africa (2008): It also states if community grants are well managed it will translate into quality education. If well maintained and utilized, they can also realize substantial efficiency gains by deepening
national and sector values of school-community relationships and community ownership of school on maintenance policies.

Xaba (2012) found that schools did not have specific policies on management of grants. The study also indicated that there were poor systems for community grants inspection in South Africa. Inspections were mostly conducted in an ad hoc manner and only community grants are mismanaged would an inspection be done. He analyzed school governance function in South Africa. He finds that South Africa generally do not have organizational structures for planned management of grants nor do they have policies on management of grants. Therefore, there was need for interim management of community grants and, in the long term, a whole-school approach to facilities maintenance that makes facilities maintenance a strategic lever for school functionality. Maintenance funding was found to be the basis of facilities maintenance challenges at most schools. Although the Department of Education allocates money to schools, participants indicated that it was not

The government through Sector Wide Approach to Programme Planning (SWAP) and development partners worked together to come up with the Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP). The programme Comprised of twenty three investment programmes which focused improving the education sector through continuous assessment. KESSP was basically founded to oversee the achievement of the Education for All (EFA) policy and through it the government commits itself to the attainment of the millennium development goals (MDG).
The broad objective is to provide an education which is all inclusive so that every Kenyan gets quality education and training no matter his/her socio-economic status or background and also which is accessible and relevant (MoE, 2009& 2010). KESSP is a programme through which the government of Kenya, (MOE), development partners, civil society, community and the private sectors come together to support education sector development through good management. KESSP fits within the framework of National Policy set out in the Economic Recovery Strategy (ERS), Early Childhood Development and Education programme, (ECE) is among the twenty three investment programmes mentioned in KESSP (Republic of Kenya, 2005 as in MOE 2009). The overall goal of the ECE investment programme is to enhance access, equity and quality of education for all children aged 4-8 years, especially the most vulnerable children, living in hardship areas.

One of the strategies the Ministry applies in achieving good management and implementation of Community Support Grants (CSG) is ECD policies, Seasonal Paper 5 in which the government has come up with the ECE sub sector policy: which is designed with a programme of building community capacities for them to develop and equip ECE centres in partnership with stakeholders. Community Support Grants (CSG) has been proposed as one of the ECE investments under KESSP so as to achieve the overall goal of the programme (Republic of Kenya 2005, MOE 2009 as in Policy Draft 2012) CSG is paid by the MOE directly to a special bank account established by each ECE centre. Before funds are sent to the ECE centre, the ECE management committee must prepare an ECE centre improvement plan which explains how the centre will use the CSG to increase the enrolment and improve the quality of education of children aged 4 to 8 years.
The ECE centre improvement Plan is formally presented and approved at a special meeting of parents and community members before a centre can receive CSG from the MOE. The ECE management committee members are trained on how to develop a quality centre improvement plan and how to successfully manage their CSG (Republic of Kenya, 2007, MOE 2009) The CSG programme is managed in three levels. The head office, whose key responsibility is National coordination of the Community Support Grants programme, provide support and advice to districts and national programme, planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting.

The District Education Office’s responsibility is to support and advice all ECE centres in the district Selected to receive Community Support Grants, train the ECE management committee and Programme monitoring and reporting to District Education Boards and the MOE head office and finally the community (management committee) will produce an ECE centre improvement Plan, consult members of community, implement the ECE centre plan, and manage the CSG monitor the use of the funds and report to the District Education Officer (Republic of Kenya 2007, MOE 2009). Despite the continuous planning of community support grants, the grants are not well managed and implemented at a ground level, Cases of impulse funds spending has been raised with many school manager embezzling the funds in a corrupt practices that hinders quality ECE services (UNESCO, 2005).
2.6 Summary of Literature Reviewed

The literature review has shown deficiencies in management and implementation of funds, it has also demonstrated that good policy guidelines, leads to good management and thus quality ECE services.

The Kenya government has proposed to attain this, by provision of CSG to ECE centres in hardship and poverty affected areas, the initiative under Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP), establishes a policy guideline, which is national and service standards for ECE that enhances capacity building and community mobilization.

Good management and implementation of CSG enhances quality ECE services for children aged 4-8 years. Despite all this campaigns on Education for all (EFA), and related declaration of children's rights ECD programmes are poorly managed (UNESCO, 2004). The variations in management and implementation of ECD data that were collected in Kenya and part of world have demonstrated little empirical data on management and implementation of CSG. These weaknesses has contributed to poor infrastructure and learning services portraying dangers to the growth and development of ECE services.

The above gap has made a researcher carry out research on management of CSG in attaining quality early childhood education in Magutuni location, Tharaka Nithi County, Kenya.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter presents methods and strategies that were used in the proposed study. It embarked on research design, variables, study Location, the target population, sampling techniques/procedures, sample size, data collection, and research instrument and data analysis.

3.2 Research Design
The study employed a descriptive survey design. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) describe descriptive survey as collecting data in order to test hypothesis or to answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of study. Descriptive survey design was chosen because the data collection allows for gathering in-depth information that may be either quantitative (surveys) or qualitative (observations or case studies) in nature. This allows for a multifaceted approach to data collection and analysis (Cohen et al, 2000).

3.2.1 Variables
In this study, the dependent variable was management of Community Support Funds and implementation of ECE centers. The independent variables were; sources of funds, management of the funds, challenges facing management and strategies to curb this challenges.

The community support grants and implementation of ECE centres was measured using a five point likert scale where involvement and aspects of each of the modes of the
aggregates occurring SA-Strongly Agree, A- Agree, NS- Not Sure, D-Disagree, and SD- Strongly Disagree were given respectively.

3.2 The Study Location
The study was carried out in Magutuni Location, Tharaka Nithi County. It borders Nguruki on the west and Keeria on the East. It’s approximately 40km from the Chogoria Hospital in Tharaka Nithi County and 85km from Meru town in Meru County. This area can be termed as “hardship” area since it has hot and dry climate, in most part of the year and therefore receive relatively low amount of rainfall annually. The area mostly depends on donations, relief food and community grants to support ECE programmes (Kenya geographic report 2010). The study area was appropriate for this study since it has been identified to be the poorest, registered with high number of ECE drop out in 2003 to 2009 despite the government of Kenya giving out the support grants to the county (District Survey, 2010).

3.3 The Target Population
The study targeted all ECE centres in Magutuni, Tharaka Nithi county. Magutuni has 26 public ECE centers. The target population comprised of 26 head teachers, 80 teachers, 800 ECE parents, two DICECE officers and two DEO.

3.4 Sampling Technique and Sample Size
3.4.1 Sampling Techniques
The accessible population within Magutuni Location was 26 public ECE centers which were beneficiaries of community support grant, these centres were clustered, and then random sampled. The rationale for clustering the ECE centers was to obtain well defined sample. The research adopted stratified sampling technique to select 18 ECE centres,
simple random sampling technique to select 40 teachers of ECE centres and 80 parents to participate in the exercise after allowing all the population equal chance to take part in the study. DICECE officers and DEO were purposively selected.

3.4.2 Sample Size

A sample size of 18 Head teachers 80 parents 40 ECD teacher two DICECE officers and one DEO was randomly sampled to make a total of 141.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of population</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE Teachers</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE Parents</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICECE Officers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>911</strong></td>
<td><strong>141</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2017

3.5 Research Instruments

Research questionnaire with Likert scale was used to collect quantitative data. This study employed questionnaires for head teachers, ECE teachers and parents, DICECE officers, and DEO. Questionnaires helped to gather large information within the shortest time possible. It further allowed for more than one respondent to respond to the same question of investigation making it appropriate for education studies to investigate the status quo of the phenomena.
The questionnaires consisted of open and closed ended items with section A to E. Section A was dealing with bio-data of the respondents. Section B to E gathered data on factors ECD funding, management and the challenges facing the implementation and management of community support grant in Magutuni Location, Tharaka Nithi County.

3.5.1 Pilot Study
The questionnaires were pre-tested in Eight ECE centers that were not included in the actual study. Eight ECE head teachers, 10 teachers, 20 parents, one DICECE and one DEO participated in the piloting but was excluded in the actual study.

The procedure to be used in the pre-testing the questionnaire was similar to those that was applied in the actual study. Piloting enabled the researcher to gather meaningful and coherent information that ascertained reliability and validity of research instrument.

3.5.2 Validity
The research instrument’s validity was attained by checking the content of the instruments after re-testing to make sure that they contain all possible items measuring the content of the objectives. The researcher also consulted and discussed with the experts in consideration to the objectives of the study.

3.5.3 Reliability
Reliability is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results after repeated trials (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). Test-retest was used to estimate the degree to which the same result was obtained with repeated measure of accuracy of the same concept in determining the reliability of the instrument. A comparison between the responses obtained in both test was made. Correlation
coefficient was employed to ascertain the degree of reliability. A coefficient of 0.8 was considered enough to judge the instrument reliability for the study.

3.6 Data Collection Techniques
The study relied on both primary and secondary sources of data. The primary data were collected using the questionnaires while the secondary data were collected through observations and DICECE archival records Magutuni Location. The researcher visited the respondents and administered the questionnaires; this process was conducted through direct contact with the respondents. The respondents were instructed on how fill the questionnaires accurately, honestly as the researcher waits. After completion, the researcher collected questionnaires for data analysis.

3.7 Method of Data Analysis
Quantitative data was analysed using descriptive statistics, this was done by categorizing, coding and then drawing statistical conclusion. It was further condensed into few manageable groups and classes for more analysis to purposeful and usable categories and thus presented using tables and graphs. Qualitative data was obtained, sorted and then analyzed thematically (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2001). The researcher analyzed the data using statistical program for social sciences (SPSS) version 11.5 and results presented in form of frequency tables and percentages. The results were discussed and interpreted so as to answer the research questions.

3.8 Logistical and Ethical Considerations
The logistical and ethical aspects that were taken into consideration are described in the following sub-section.
3.8.1 Logistical Considerations

The researcher obtained a letter of introduction from Graduate School of Kenyatta University. The letter was used to obtain a permit from the national commission for science, technology and innovation.

The researcher visited the county commissioner and the county director of Education in Tharaka Nithi for authorization to carry out the research in ECE centers in Magutuni Location and subsequently, visited the study Location. The researcher requested for permission from the head teacher in each ECE centre so as to go on with the research activities, similarly, their consent to participate in the study was sought.

3.8.2 Ethical Considerations

The copies of research findings are destined to be availed to all the participating institutions. Prior visit to book appointments with the sampled school heads for data collection was pre-arranged at a convenient time to them. Assurance of confidentiality to the respondents by the researcher by not unsealing information from one respondent to another or publicizing it without permission from relevant individuals or authority was practiced. Participation only took place after proper consultation and their signed informed consent.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents results of research findings and interpretation. The discussions in this section are related to literature review and study objective stated below;

i) To identify the source of funding in early childhood education centres in public schools in Magutuni Location.

ii) To establish the management of the allocated grants in ECE centres in Magutuni Location.

iii) To find out challenges facing the management in implementation of community support grants for quality ECE centres.

iv) To determine strategies to mitigate the challenges facing the management and implementation of community support grant for quality ECE centres in Magutuni Location.

4.2 General and demographic information

This section presents the general and demographic information of the respondents.

4.2.1 General information

The sample size consisted of 141 respondents drawn from 26 public ECE centers which were benefiting with CSG, this included ECE teachers, head teachers, parents, DICECE and DEO. Out of sample size of 141 respondents, the total response rate was 99.98%. This response information is further elaborated in the table 4.1
Table 4.1: Respondents Response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents Occupation</th>
<th>Respondents Target population (N=911)</th>
<th>Respondents Sample size (N=141)</th>
<th>Respondents Response rate (N=133)</th>
<th>Respondents Response rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE Teachers</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE Parents</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>55.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICECE Officers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>99.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2017

4.2.2 Demographic data

Demographic data sought included; gender, age, occupation and educational level of the respondents that comprised of ECE head teachers, teachers, parent, DICECE and DEO.

4.2.2.1 Gender

The majority of the participants were female, although a sizeable number were male participants. Female dominated with nearly two-thirds while male with more than a third participant, this is well illustrated in figure 4.1.
The respondent’s participation age was 18 years and above, this age allows the individual to acquire national identification as a citizen of the country, all sampled respondent had 18 years and above. Almost half of the respondent had 40 years and above, less than a sixth had 18-24 years while 58 respondents had 25-39 year, this information is further shown in the table 4.2.

**Table 4.2: Age of the participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 years and above</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39 years</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 years</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>141</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Sources of funding in ECE centres

The first objective of this study was to establish the source of funding in ECE centres. The Head teachers were asked to indicate the main source of funding, they stated that grant which was allocated in form of government community grants disbursed in six instalments of about 100,000 per instalment in a span of ten years. The school managers also said that some extremely needy pupils in ECE are allocated bursaries which are transferred direct to their school fees accounts; they added that, preschool pupils pay tuition fees to cater for school needs.

The head teachers and DICECE officers were asked to indicate when they first received the CSG. According to the information they gave, all the respondents said that they first received community support grant in the year 2007. This corresponded with the information which was given by DICECE officers, that, community support grant was first implemented by the government in the financial year 2007.

The study also went to extent of finding out how Community Support Grant (CSG) was done in an effort to reach to the stakeholders. The results are as indicated in the figure 4.3
From figure 4.3, the study established that the stakeholders were informed about grants through meetings and letters. More than half respondents indicated meetings while less than half said that they were notified via letters. The study establishes that more than two third of the schools had received between Ksh 50,001 and 100,000. Less than half of the schools received cash between 100,001 and 150,000 while the schools that received between Ksh 10,000 and 50,000 accounted for less than a sixth of the sampled population.

The study also established the key decision maker on utilization of the Community Support Funds. The results are shown in the table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School committee</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2017

From table 4.3 indicates that majority of the respondents (83%) said the decision on how to use the grant was made by the school management committee. 11% of the respondents
indicated that Head teachers were the decision maker followed by 6% who reported that Ministry of Education is the one that make decisions on the community funds. The findings of the study concurs with (Republic of Kenya, 2007, MOE 2009) which reported that school committee are the key decision maker on Community Support Funds because they are trained on how to develop a quality centre improvement plan and how to successfully manage their Community Support Funds.

The study also established the improvements initiated using Community Support Funds by schools. The results are shown in table 4.4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement of:</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECE teacher’s salary</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/learning materials</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2017

From table 4.4 it is clear that majority of the respondents (42%) indicated that, improvements regarding ECE quality were done after receipt of community support grant. It was followed by 37% of the respondents who reported that after the initiation of community support funds the ECE teacher’s salary was increased. Teaching /learning materials was the least with 21%.
4.4 Challenges facing the management in implementation of community support grants for quality ECE centres.

Respondents were asked to tick in their responses regarding predetermined challenges on a likert scale. The data findings revealed an array of challenges facing the implementation of community support grant.

The challenges identified to be most significant were those that had a mean of 20.4 and above measured on a 5 point Likert scale, this were, under payment of teachers, inadequate funding, delay in releasing the funding and endemic poverty among a greater number of parents. Findings from the study indicate that delays in releasing the funds were the most significant with a computed mean of 22.8. Among the other significant identified by the study includes Inadequate funding (mean 21), Underpayment of teachers (mean 20.4) Endemic poverty among a greater number of parents (mean 20.8).

According to the Head teachers the major challenge affecting the implementation of CSG was little allocation of the funds and funds delay, unable to complete any ECE project within the specified time frame. It was therefore difficult to meet the needs of the ECE centre thus poor management and implementation of funds. Head teachers also stated that some parent also stopped paying the required ECE fees. This created a great problem in the management of the ECE services especially when bearing the fact that parents are expected to pay the teachers’ salaries in each particular centre. Some respondents had a lot of expectation as far as CSG are concerned despite the fact that funds given were very little, for instance, The ECE teachers cited poor salary payment.
According to the ECE teachers, the challenge was not issues of CSG but in attendance of parents in meetings whenever they were invited to discuss ECE matters thus missing crucial information on responsibility of ECE services. Significant number of respondents said, that corruption and misuse of funds was a major challenge cited leading to mismanagement of centres. Some of ECE manager were pointed doing unnecessary things such as setting school monuments, organizing ECE teacher trips and parties, buying school animal among others, others was unable to account the usage of CSGs in the previous year’s, raising doubts on management and implementation of the funds.

Respondents also indicated lack of active participation of the committee member’s in school development thus blind management of funds. Funds diversion to primary school was also a challenge not only cited by the ECE teachers but also by DICECE Programme Officers. The DICECE Programme Officer also added the challenge of transfers of head teachers from one school to another which created a breakdown of implementation of the funds.

According to DICECE Programme Officer, it had been found out during monitoring of the funds, many head teachers were unwilling to complete a project that had been earlier started by another head teacher. Most of the head teachers preferred to initiate their own projects which had no relationship with the previous head teacher thus creating a big problem in management and implementation of CSG.

4.5 Strategies to mitigate challenges facing the Implementation of CSG
The respondents were asked to suggest measures that could be taken to mitigate the identified challenges to which they responded as shown in figure 4.4
Information on figure 4.5 present’s findings that reveal the strategies that can be put in place to address the challenges facing the management and implementation of community support grant. Majority respondents cited that the government should increase the amount of CSG allocation to ECE centres as the current allocation is in inadequate to effectively solve issues of quality and improve ECE services. One of challenges that were identified to impede the implementation of CSG was lack of government to include ECE in the free primary education programme, this was contested by less than a sixth respondents. The findings revealed that more than a seventh of the respondents said that, the only solution to avoid the inefficiency CSG is to include ECE in the free primary education programme.

Prompt release of community support grant fund to school would mitigate the problem occasioned by delays in releasing the funds as revealed by almost a sixth of the respondents. Further study supported by about a seventh of the respondents found out that, employment ECE teachers and increase of their salary, would be the only way to enhance access to quality
ECE and good management as many as parents take their children to private ECE centers where there are adequate teachers and facilities.

It was established that though the government provided the grant to public schools to enhance access in quality ECE, lack of teachers occasioned by non-employment and low payments were responsible for parent opting to look for alternative school mainly in the private sector thereby reducing the effectiveness of CSG in promoting quality in public ECE schools. As indicated by the results, less than a sixth of the respondents indicated that community should envisage initiating income generating projects to supplement the community support grant funds and minimize poverty.

The study further established that more than a seventh of the respondents indicated that, apart from the provision of community support grant, the government through the ministry of education should provide teaching and learning materials to ECE since it provides community support to support marginalized /vulnerable communities (Sessional Paper No. 1 of 2005).
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
In this chapter, summary of study findings is presented. The chapter also covers conclusions and recommendations of the study as well as suggestions for further research.

5.2 Summary of findings
The summary of the findings in this study reveals that the main source of funding was community support grant which was allocated in form of government community grants, disbursed in six instalments of about 100,000 per instalment in a span of ten years. The study findings indicates that, lack of active participation of the committee member’s in school development lead to a blind management of CSG, funds diversion to second priority was a challenge not only cited by the ECE teachers but also by DICECE Programme Officers. The DICECE Programme Officer also added the challenge of transfers of head teachers from one school to another which created a breakdown of good management and implementation of the funds. According to DICECE Programme Officer, during monitoring of the funds, many head teachers transferred to new schools were unwilling to complete a project that had been earlier started by former head teacher. Most of the head teachers wanted to start their own projects which had no relationship with the previous head teacher thus creating a big problem in management and implementation of CSG.

The third objective was the challenges facing the management and implementation of CSG in ECE. The following challenges were identified; Underpayment of teachers, delay in releasing CSG funds, inadequate funding, Lack of government to include ECE in the programme of
free primary education (FPE), Endemic poverty among a greater number of parents, and lack of community support in some ECE centres.

The study determined effective strategies to remedy the challenges facing the implementation of CSG in Magutuni Location, Tharaka Nithi County. The researcher identified the following strategies aimed to mitigate the above identified challenges; increased CSG funding, inclusion of ECE in the programme of FPE, employment of ECE teachers and increment of their salaries by the government, prompt allocation of CSG to beneficiary school, initiating income generating projects to supplement CSG, and provision of teaching and learning materials to ECE centers by ministry of education.

5.3 Conclusion

From the finding of this study it has been concluded that, the main source of funding in ECE was community support grants, which was allocated in form of government community grants, disbursed in six instalments of about 100,000 per instalment in a span of ten years.

The allocated grants are not well managed due to lack of active participation by ECE stakeholders in CSG planning. Funds diversion and mismanagement was a challenge affecting proper utilization of CSG according to the study findings. The study has shown that, proper management of CSG in early childhood education was dependent on good funding system, planning, utilization, and team work and government policies.

Implementation of CSG has also been a challenge to many ECE centres under study. The identified challenges were; diversion of the funds to the primary school, issues of corruption, transfer of head teachers, changing of ECE management board often, purchasing unnecessary product for ECE and laxity among the ECE parents in provision of funds in the running of
the centre. It has been concluded that the management and implementation of the ECE centres on CSG, have affected ECE centres, despite the challenges of poor management and implementation of funds, the findings have also showed that, slight improvement was seen since the introduction of CSG. In most of ECE centres, the grants have improved quality of learning by acquiring text books and infrastructures. In general it has reduced cost of education for ECE parents and improved ECE services. Many learning and teaching materials have been acquired through the use of the funds. Play equipment’s and materials have also been bought using the funds.

Some of the measures that can be applied to mitigate challenges of management and implementation of CSG are; the school managers should document properly how fund are utilized for transparency, regular monitoring of CSG should be carried out oftenby the relevant authorities and challenge’s identified to affect flow, planning, management and implementation of CSG should be addressed with immediate effect, the government should also ensure adequate grants are allocation to the ECE centre within the intended time frame, policies and measures that will govern proper utilization of funds should be well framed and implemented to guide proper usage of funds in ECE centres, Government should develop proper CSG policies that will provide guidelines of fund planning, management and implementation of the allocated funds, these guidelines should be chaired by qualified management committee team, the contract of the team members should be at least 2 or 3 years to enable the members to have enough time to complete any given project. This would minimize chances of having committee members who have not been trained on the management and implementation of CSG.
5.4 Recommendations of the study

Based on the study objectives and research findings, the researcher makes the following recommendation;

i) The CSG should be channelled to ECE centres using the proper means i.e. to formulate policies that will help in allocation to avoid funds diversion, the funds should be adequate so as to improve development of ECE programmes in the marginalized areas and those in pockets of poverty. Funds should be availed to all the public ECE centres to enable more and long term projects. In the long run this would empower the ECE centres in provision of quality ECE for the children in the area via good management and implantation of the funds. All the ECE centres should be provided with the funds regardless of the location of the centre without any categorization of poverty index. This would enable all the children in the area under study to benefit from ECE services and therefore promote equality among the children in the study location. The government should therefore provide free or affordable ECE services and hence make it compulsory for all children aged above 4, this should be done either by broadening of free primary education (FPE) to include ECE, to enhance access or completely provide full budget for ECE.

ii) The head teachers should make sure that all allocated funds are properly managed and well utilized, they should ensure that the funds directed to ECE centres are utilized for intended projects with no funds diversion. The head teachers should liaise with the ECE teachers in order to provide the correct materials required for both learning and playing. Education programmes should be organized by the DICECE office in the district in order to sensitize on proper administration and
management of CSG in the centres, they should also conduct monitoring and evaluation of the funds to enhance proper handling of CSG in the ECE Centres.

The funds should be handled by school management board in order to create seriousness among the school manager so as to eliminate cases of corruption and funds misuse.

iii) The District Education Officer and the DICECE officers should enhance measures that will ensure that all the funds are well managed and implemented, the offices must ensure that there is accountability of all funds and that all the guidelines pertained in the utilization of CSG are followed without failure.

iv) All the management committee members and the stake holders of the public ECE centres should be enlightened of the importance of ECE to all the children. Workshops and seminars should be held to educate them on their role in the development of the ECE centres. Only those members who have the interest of the children at heart should be elected as members of ECE committee.

v) ECE managers should ensure that all the data regarding the functioning of every ECE centre is kept and updated via proper documentation.

vi) The government should consider employing ECE teacher for sustained access and retention in ECE.

vii) There should be prompt release of CSG beneficiaries when they are made available to facilitate a smooth implementation.

viii) Schools should consider as a matter of priority to initiate income generating project to supplement CSG.
ix) The government through the ministry of education should provide teaching/learning materials to ECE centres.

5.4.1 Suggestion for Further Research

Further research should be carried to establish the relationship between CSG and enrolment of pupils in the ECE centres.
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Appendix I: Letter of Introduction to the Respondents

Dear Respondent,

REF: RESEARCH FIELD WORK

I am a postgraduate student pursuing master of education (early childhood) in the school of education, Kenyatta University. I am currently undertaking a study on the management of community support grants in early childhood education centres in Magutuni Location, TharakaNithi County. I will appreciate if you spare some of your time to give views on the required information for the purpose of this research. The results of this study will hopefully enable the government, Ministry of Education, administrators, teachers, and communities practice effective management in early childhood education and development. All your responses to the questionnaire will be treated with the utmost confidence and will be used strictly for the purpose of the study. You are therefore kindly advised not to indicate your name for confidentiality. Please answer all the questions.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours faithfully,

………………………………….

GITONGA HELLEN MUGURE
Appendix II: Questionnaire

FOR: Teachers, Head teachers, Parents, DICECE Officers and DEO

Do not write your names or signature on any page

NB: Section A is applicable to all participants; Section B,C,D and E is specific and should only be attended by relevant participant

PART A

RESPONDENTS BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Gender: Male [ ] Female [ ]

2. Occupation: Teachers [ ] Head teachers [ ] Parents [ ] DICECE officers [ ] DEO [ ]

PART B

HEAD TEACHERS ONLY

3. What is the source of funding in ECE in your school? Community support grants
   Developing partner’s grants [ ] other government budgetary [ ]

4. If is a community support grants, when was the first allocation in your school? 

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

5. What was the total allocation during the first disbursement for your school……

6. Are the grants managed and implemented well? Yes [ ] No [ ]

7. If yes, do you have a prove documents supporting CSG usage and accountability? Yes [ ]
   No [ ] If No, were you trained on how to use the Community Support Grant? Yes [ ] No [ ]

8. Who decides on how to use the money?……………………………………………………………..

9. What mode of communication do you use to inform the community about the availability of community support grant?………………………………………………………………………………
10. Have you initiated new project or improvements in regard to ECE after receiving community support grant? Yes [ ] No [ ]

11. Does the community grant significantly improve ECE services such as building of infrastructures? Yes [ ] No [ ] if Yes or No briefly explain…………………..

12. Does community support grants helps in paying the ECE Teachers? Yes [ ] No. If Yes, what percentage?……………………………………………………………………

13. How often do the government officers visit your centre for community support grant monitoring and inspection? Very often [ ] Often [ ] No opinion [ ] rarely [ ] Not at all [ ]……..if Yes, state when……………………………………………….

14. Give comment on the government officers’ monitoring and inspection in regard to community support grant? Very thorough [ ] Thorough [ ] No Idea [ ] Not very thorough [ ]

15. The following are some of the suggested impacts of CSG on management and implementation in ECE. For each of the following statements tick in the appropriate box in provided key.

**SA- Strongly Agree; A- Agree; NS- Not Sure; D- Disagree; SD- Strongly disagree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i)Improved quality of learning and teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)Improved enrolment and access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)Reduced cost of education to parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv)Improved teacher salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v)Quality of learning environment improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi)Enhanced community empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. The following challenges are thought to be affecting the management and implementation of community support grant. For each of the statements that follow, please tick in the column/box that best represents your opinion use the key provided.

17. Suggest strategies that could be used in mitigating the challenges highlighted below
   
   i) Lack or inadequate community support grant
   
   ii) Inadequate funding
   
   iii) Delays in releasing the funds
   
   iv) Underpayment of teachers
   
   v) No place to source for teaching-learning materials

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

PART C

TEACHERS ONLY

18. Do you have sufficient information and knowledge about community support grant? If yes explain……………………………………………………………………………………

19. Has your school ever received community support grants?…………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

20. If Yes in No. 19, how many disbursements per year………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………
21. The following are some of the suggested impacts of CSG on management and implementation in ECE. For each of the following statements tick in the appropriate box in provided key.

22. The following are challenges thought to be affecting the management and implementation of community support grant. For each of the following statements, tick in the box provided above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Improved quality of learning and teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Improved enrolment and access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Reduced cost of education to parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Improved teacher salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Quality of learning environment improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Enhanced community empowerment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Lack of community support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Inadequate funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Delays in releasing the funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) No ECE funding at times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Under payment of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) No place to source for teaching-learning materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) Lack of government to include ECE as part of FPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii) Endemic poverty among a greater number of parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Suggest mitigation to the challenges above………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………

24. Who is the remuneration provider? Government [ ] Parents [ ] Non-government [ ] if is
the government, in which form, TSC salary☐ CSG salary ☐

25. What is the average amount that you receive as your salary per month?
1000 – 3000  [ ] 3001- 5000 [ ] 5001 – 8000 [ ] 8001 and above.

26. How do you rate the salary you receive? Very satisfactory [ ] Satisfactory [ ] No opinion [ ]
Unsatisfactory [ ] very unsatisfactory

27. Do you receive your salary on the agreed time? Yes [ ] No [ ] If no
why?...........................................................................................................................................

PART D

DICECE officers/ DEO

28. What has been the government allocation of community support grant for ECE centers in
each location in Maara Sub-County?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magutuni Location</th>
<th>Allocated amount in KES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. How was the awareness about community support grant to the community
done?...........................................................................................................................................
30. What is your comment on access and management and implementation of ECE after community support grant allocation? (Tick accordingly). Improved ECE fees payment greatly [ ] Improved access to quality teaching/learning facilities/infrastructure’s [ ] Not improved development in ECE at all [ ]

31. What challenges are facing access and management of community support grants in ECE centres?
Briefly state the remedies to this problems………………………………………………
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32. Do you have any information or knowledge on community support grant? If yes explain…………………………………………………………………………………………

33. Do you pay fees for ECE education? Yes [ ] No [ ] if yes how much? Per term? 0-1,000[ ] 1,001-2,000[ ] 2,001-5,000[ ] 5,001-10,000[ ] and how much does community support grant contributes for each pupil……………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………

34. How do you rate ECE services in your school? Very good [ ] Good [ ] Average [ ] Poor [ ] Very poor

35. Please give reasons to your answers in question 37 above…………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………

THE END

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
Appendix III: Letter from Graduate School

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL

E-mail: dear-graduate@ku.ac.ke
Website: www.ku.ac.ke

P.O. Box 43844. 00100
NAIROBI, KENYA
Tel. 8710901 Ext. 4150

Our Ref: E55/CE/25149/2011
DATE: 7th September, 2016

Director General,
National Commission for Science, Technology
and Innovation
P. O. Box 30623-00100
NAIROBI

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION FOR GITONGA HELLEN MUGURE - REG.
NO. E55/CE/25149/2011

I write to introduce Ms. Gitonga Hellen Musure who is a Postgraduate Student
of this University. She is registered for M.Ed degree programme in the
Department of Early Childhood Studies.

Ms. Gitonga intends to conduct research for a M.Ed Project Proposal entitled,
"Investigation into Community Support Grant's Management and Implementation
of Quality Early Childhood Development Education in Tharaka-Nithi
County, Kenya."

Any assistance given will be highly appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

MRS. LUCY N. MRAABU
FOR: DEAN, GRADUATE SCHOOL
Appendix IV: Research Permit

This is to certify that:

Ms. Gitonga Hellen Mugure of Kenyatta University, 38-60401 Chogoria, has been permitted to conduct research in Tharaka-Nithi County on the topic: Investigation into Community Support Grants Management and Implementation of Quality Early Childhood Development Education in Magutuni, Tharaka-Nithi County for the period ending 5th December, 2017.

Applicant's Signature

Director General
National Commission for Science, Technology & Innovation

CONDITIONS
1. You must report to the County Commissioner and the County Education Officer of the area before embarking on your research. Failure to do so may lead to the cancellation of your permit.
2. Government Officer will not be interviewed without prior appointment.
3. No questionnaire will be used unless it has been approved by the relevant Government Ministries.
4. Excavation, filling and collection of biological specimens are subject to further permission from the relevant Government Ministries.
5. You are required to submit at least two (2) hard copies and one (1) soft copy of your final report.
6. The Government of Kenya reserves the right to modify the conditions of this permit including its cancellation without notice.

Republic of Kenya
National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation
Research Clearance Permit

Serial No. A 12137

CONDITIONS: see back page
Appendix V: Research Authorization from National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

Telephone: +254-20-2213471, 2241349, 3310571, 2219420
Fax: +254-20-318245, 318249
Email: dg@nacosti.go.ke
Website: www.nacosti.go.ke
when replying please quote

Ref: No. NACOSTI/P/16/35316/15071

6th December, 2016

Gitonga Hellen Mugure
Kenyatta University
P.O. Box 43844-00100
NAIROBI.

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on “Investigation into community support grants management and implementation of quality Early Childhood Development Education in Magutuui, Tharaka-Nithi County, Kenya,” I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Tharaka Nithi County for the period ending 5th December, 2017.

You are advised to report to the County Commissioner and the County Director of Education, Tharaka Nithi County before embarking on the research project.

On completion of the research, you are expected to submit two hard copies and one soft copy in pdf of the research report/thesis to our office.

DR. STEPHEN K. KIBIRU, PhD.
FOR: DIRECTOR-GENERAL/CEO

Copy to:

The County Commissioner
Tharaka Nithi County.

The County Director of Education
Tharaka Nithi County.
Appendix VI: Research Authorization from Ministry of Education

REPUBLIC OF KENYA

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Telegrams: “Elimu”, Chuka
Telephone: Chuka 630353
FAX: 064 630166
Email: tharanithicountyedu@gmail.com
When replying please quote:

TNC/ED/GC/GEN/S.VOL.II/153

COUNTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION
THARAKA NITHI
P.O. BOX 113-60400
CHUKA.

5th May, 2017

Gitonga Hellen Mugure
Kenyatta University
P.O. Box 43844-00100
NAIROBI

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Your letter Ref NACOSTI/P/16/35316/15071 dated 6th December, 2016 refers.

Authority to carry out research on “Investigation into community support grants management and implementation of quality Early Childhood Development Education in Magutuni, Tharaka Nithi County, Kenya,” is hereby granted for the period ending 5th December, 2017.

On completion of the research, you are required to submit one hard and one soft copy in pdf of the research report/thesis to our office.

Best wishes.

Kaburu Lawrence R.
For: County Director of Education
THARAKA NITHI

County Director of Education
THARAKA NITHI
P.O. Box 113 CHUKA

5 MAY 2017