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ABSTRACT

In the recent past all over the world, there has been a lot of interest in decentralisation of government functions as a way of enhancing efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery and taking government to the people. Despite decentralisation of education functions through delegation and deconcentration of functions, there are still concerns of ineffectiveness in service delivery. The purpose of this study was to investigate the factors that affect effective decentralisation of education focusing on instructional materials and infrastructure development and rehabilitation in primary schools in Abothuguchi division of Meru Central District. The objectives of the study were: to find out the perceptions of decentralisation of education services in Meru Central district by the district education officer and the head teachers; to investigate the aspects of education management decentralised to the school level in Meru Central district; to analyse the benefits of decentralisation of education management and development in Meru Central district; to assess the roles of management bodies in implementing decentralised functions in Meru Central district and to explore the challenges of decentralisation of education services in Meru Central district. The study used an exploratory descriptive survey design to target all the head teachers in the 17 public primary schools in Abothuguchi West Division of Meru Central district. The area DEO also participated in the study. Simple random sampling was used to select 14 primary schools to participate in the study while purposive sampling was used to select the 14 head teachers and the area DEO. The study used questionnaires as the main tools for data collection. A pilot study was carried out among three head teachers in the target division and a District Education Officer from a neighbouring District. Data collected was both quantitative and qualitative. Descriptive statistics were used to analyse the quantitative data obtained. Qualitative data was analyzed by arranging the responses thematically in line with the objectives of the study. The study established that majority of the head teachers had a positive perception of decentralisation of education services. The main aspects of education management decentralised to school level were financial management, procurement, and teacher management issues. The study established that head teachers and the DEO were supportive of decentralisation, noting that it has a number of benefits including enhancing local responsibility, involvement and ownership, and enabling local businesses to supply instructional and construction materials to schools leading to local level development. Management bodies at the school level, such as SMCs performed various roles such as financial management, procurement, management of physical resources, infrastructure development, and management of human resources. The major factors that affected effective decentralisation were: inadequate funds, inadequate in-service training, and lack of expertise and experience by SMC members. The study also established that there were irregular visits to schools by the DEO’s staff and poor communication channels. The study recommends that: the Ministry headquarters should increase funds to schools and disburse them in time and also put more emphasis on training and sensitizing the school stake holders and the community on the education Act and policies; the Provincial as well as the District Education Officers should visit schools frequently in order to monitor the school development programmes and also ensure there are good communication channels.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The education sector in Kenya has since independence expanded tremendously. According to the Ministry of Education Facts and Figures (2002-2008), the number of primary schools increased from 6,058 in 1963 to close to over 26,000 in 2008, while secondary schools increased from 151 in 1963 to over 6500 over the same period. The increase in the number of schools has resulted in increase of student enrolments. Enrolments in primary schools rose from 892,000 in 1963 to about 8.6 million in 2008, while enrolments in secondary schools also rose from about 30,000 in 1963 to over 1.4 million students in the same year. The Kenya Population and Housing Census Vol. II, Nairobi (2009), indicates that about 9.4 children are attending primary school while 1.8 are in secondary. This has been accelerated by the introduction of Free Primary Education (FPE) and Free Day Secondary Education (FDSE) in 2003 and 2008 respectively (Oketch & Somerset, 2010). These programmes have resulted in a surge in enrolments leading to inadequate classrooms to accommodate the numbers, overcrowding in classrooms, teacher shortage and inadequate sanitation facilities among others.

The growth of the Education sector has over time called for reforms in the way the sector is managed to enhance efficiency in service delivery based on the complexity and scope of service demands. The focus has been to deal with sector issues related to access, equity, quality, relevance and efficiency in the management of educational resources. In 2003, the Ministry of Education embarked on reforms geared towards attaining the education related Millennium Development Goals (MDG) and Education for All (EFA) and in the year 2005, a
policy framework for the sector, the Sessional Paper No. 1 of 2005 was developed to guide the education sector (Republic of Kenya, 2005).

To operationalise the Sessional Paper and build on the success of Free Primary Education, the Ministry with the support of stakeholders adopted a Sector Wide Approach to Planning SWAP in 2005. Through this approach the Ministry developed the Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP) through a Consultative process (Republic of Kenya, 2005).

KESSP identified twenty three (23) Investment Programmes which were aligned with the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) intended to implement the policy identified priorities and provide a tool for resource mobilization. This would ensure that the government; Development Partners, communities, NGOs and the private sector would support the education sector. The approach was meant to replace project approach to programme planning and implementation which was believed to promote duplication, overlaps and unharmonized processes and procedures. This approach would also reduce administrative costs on the part of the government and enhance resource utilisation.

To implement the identified sector programmes, including Free Primary Education (FPE) and Free Day Secondary Education (FDSE), decentralisation was therefore adopted to enhance efficiency in the sector management as the sector had grown in complexity and scope. This was meant to relieve the centre of administrative functions to concentrate on policy formulation and monitoring. This involved decentralising financial and procurement functions to primary and secondary schools (World Bank 2003). The government through capitation grants sent directly to school accounts and left the school governing bodies such as School Management Committees (SMCs) and Boards of Governors (BOGs) to manage resources while they account for the funds to the Ministry. Some KESSP programme components are now disbursement based such as the primary school infrastructure and
instructional materials among others. Schools are expected to prepare development plans and budgets and execute the same through specialized committees, while the Ministry provides policy directions and guidelines and conducts monitoring (Ministry of Education, 2005). Decentralisation is therefore desirable in view of the expansion of the education sector in terms of student numbers, number of institutions, teachers and multiplicity of providers which are difficult to manage from one central point.

In the recent past, there has been a lot of interest in decentralisation especially in education and other social services such as health the world over (Verspoor, 2008). The concept of decentralisation has also been advocated for by International organizations such as the organs of the United Nations system such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the International Development Agency (IDA) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) especially through projects (UNESCO, 2005).

These organizations have looked at decentralisation from different perspectives and strongly recommend it. Specifically, the World Bank has advocated for decentralization through the projects it supports in the developing world. Available literature from the Bank’s working papers and other authors indicates that there is some form of decentralisation being practiced in education as evidenced from UNESCO’s EFA reports (UNESCO, 2003). Literature review on education decentralisation indicate that different countries practice different forms of decentralisation, some to regional and local governments and others to school councils and schools (Florestal and Cooper, 1997).

The practice of decentralisation varies from administrative, financial and political decentralisation through various established structures. They also vary from partial to complete management autonomy where schools make all decisions (UNESCO, 2005b).
According to the United Nations, decentralisation means “the transfer of authority on a geographical basis whether by decentralisation (delegation) of administrative authority to field units of the same department or level of government, or by political devolution of authority to local government units or special statutory bodies” (United Nations, 1962, p. 246). This means the transfer of all or part of authority to make decisions from central authority to subordinate structures. Such structures may include, provincial, districts, municipalities and schools.

Rondinelli and Cheema (1991), describe it as the transfer of planning decision making or administrative authority from the central administrative units to, semi autonomous and parastatal organization, local government or non-governmental organisations This refers to basic administrative concept and process of shifting and delegating power and authority from a central point to subordinate level within the administrative hierarchy in order to promote independence, responsibility and quicker decision making, adopting policies and programmes to the needs of those levels. It also means the systematic and deliberate dispersal of power, authority and responsibility from the centre to the periphery or from the national government to local government.

Many countries have decentralised education and other services to some extent while retaining initial authority for policy formulation and budgeting. Decentralisation depends very much on how governance structures are set up. Generally higher degree of decentralisation is well grounded in federal state systems of governments such as can be found in USA and Canada, Australia, Brazil, Switzerland, Germany, India, Belgium and Mexico among others (Hanson, 1998).

In Kenya, decentralisation has been practiced since independence in 1963 (NCCK, 2011). Decentralisation of service delivery in many sectors of the economy including education was
implemented through a form of “majimbo” or regionalism system of Government (IPAR 2004). At this particular time, the local authorities levied and collected taxies which they used to maintain some services to the citizens. However, upon the attainment of Republican status in December, 1964, the country reverted to a centralised system but retained decentralised structures in place. The purpose was to strengthen executive power to ensure national unity and cohesion. Consequently, Kenya became a Republic with a strong Central Government. Centralisation of administrative, budgeting, decision making, management and responsibilities were therefore elements of consolidating its unity.

According to the Sessional Paper No. 10 on “African Socialism and Its Application to Planning in Kenya”, the government intended to extend planning to the provinces and districts and municipalities with a view to speed up development in the rural areas/administrative units (Republic of Kenya, 1965). However, it was not until 1983, that the District Focus for Rural Development Strategy was developed. In this strategy, planning and implementation of projects would be done at the district level while national projects would be the responsibilities of line Ministries (Barkan & Chege, 1989). This strategy did not work well for various reasons although some aspects of it are still practiced today.

According to IPAR (2004), “study, the strategy lacked legal backing, relied on an institutional framework that did not facilitate local decision making and resource mobilization; lacked capacity in participatory planning among civil servants and people’s awareness and participation in planning and implementation of strategy”.

Some of the factors that affect effective decentralised management in education include; the absence of responsive legal framework and capacity of the lower level structures. For instance the Education Act Cap 211, (1968) does not recognize Parents Teachers Associations (PTAs) which plays a critical role in resource mobilization while they do not
make decisions on the use of the same (Republic of Kenya, 1968). Further, it does not entrench decentralisation of education in law making it to some extent an administrative decision. This leaves it as an administrative decision guided from the centre which can easily be reversed in case of leadership change. According to the Ministry of Education procurement manual for primary schools, various publications and guidelines have been produced by the Ministry to ensure that the procedures and stages in the procurement of school resources are transparent and to guide the school management committees in all stages of procurement (Ministry of Education, 2007).

The success of any endeavour depends very much on the capacity for management (Baker & Branch, 2002). The ministry of education internal monitoring reports indicate that capacity building for school level management is erratic and unharmonised, thus newly deployed management staff is not regularly brought on board with current management practices.

The level of education and interpretive capacity of the management bodies could be an issue in view of the level of education of most members. Monitoring and support services by technical staff such as quality assurance and standards officers, public works personnel and audit staff are inadequate for variety of reasons ranging from lean staff numbers and facilitative resources such as funds and transport.

As a result of increased administrative units specifically the districts there is need to strengthen district level services by assigning adequate professional and support human resource for the management of the expanded education services. In addition, citizens’ voice to demand accountability is weak and in most cases absent. For decentralisation to lower structures to be effective, education managers must have skills in leadership and management and obtain the will of communities. Traditionally ministries of education find it difficult to let go arguing that the lower level structures, communities and schools do not have the capacity
to manage education (Winkler et al 2003). That is why as in the Kenyan case, capacity building initiatives and monitoring are conducted from the centre according to ministry monitoring reports. Consequently central ministries of education end up performing roles assigned to decentralised structures.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Interest in decentralisation is based on the belief that decentralisation of functions/activities or authority to lower level structures confers responsibility, enhances transparency, accountability and flexibility hence increasing efficiency and effectiveness (Rondinelli and Cheema, 1983). It envisages less bureaucratic, speedy decision making and therefore reduces transactional costs and administrative burden. Effective decentralisation of authority and decision making would basically lower transactional costs, improve governance, accountability and local ownership according to World Bank working papers and projects. A UNESCO (2003), report indicates that decentralisation enhances local responsibility and popular involvement.

As decentralisation takes root, the roles of the centre and lower level structures are clearly defined. Consequently, the central authority is left with the responsibilities of policy formulation, providing direction and monitoring and evaluation while the lower structures concentrate on day to day routine management and administration. It also leads to capacity building at the local and sub-national levels.

Despite the decentralisation of financial and procurement management in the education sector to improve service delivery, there are internal and external factors that affect effective delivery of education services.
This study sought to assess the factors that affect effective decentralisation and management of Education in primary schools in Meru County, Republic of Kenya.

1.2.1 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the factors that affect decentralisation and management of Education.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The study had five fold objectives;

1. To find out the perceptions of decentralization of education services in Meru Central district by the district education office and the head teachers.
2. To investigate what forms of education decentralisation are practiced in Meru Central district.
3. To analyse the benefits of decentralisation of education management and development in Meru Central district.
4. To assess the roles of management bodies in implementing decentralised functions in Meru Central district.
5. To explore the challenges of decentralisation of education services Meru Central district.

1.4 Research Questions

The study was based on the following research questions.

1. What form(s) of decentralisation are used in education decentralization in Meru Central district?
2. How does decentralisation benefit education management and service delivery in Meru Central district?
3. What are the factors that affect effective decentralisation of education services in Meru Central district?

4. What are the challenges that face decentralised education management and service delivery in Meru Central district?

5. How effective is decentralised education management in Meru Central district?

1.5 Significance of the Study

It was expected that the study may inform educators of the factors, benefits and challenges that affect decentralised education and exploring ways of addressing them to enhance efficiency in education service delivery. Moreover, the implementation of devolution in accordance with the Kenya Constitution 2010 may gain or elicit debates from the findings. Thus the timing of this study was appropriate at this particular time in our history.

The findings of the study may therefore benefit policy makers in designing the forms of decentralisation to adopt. It may also provide education administrators and school managers information regarding the structures and areas requiring strengthening and for scholars to raise issues for further exploration by researchers.

1.6 Scope and limitation of the study

The study was conducted in primary schools in Abothuguchi Division of Meru County. It focused only on instructional materials and infrastructure aspects of decentralisation as implemented at primary school by school management.
1.6.1 Limitation

Considering that the researcher was a full time employee, he had limited time to prepare research project. The institutions were too many and therefore the researcher focused on public primary schools and the study therefore may not bring out issues in private schools.

The study also faced the limitation of not accessing school procurement records in some areas. Even where they were accessed the data was not well documented. Further, the researcher had limitation of funds and therefore limited target sample.

1.7 Assumptions of the Study

The study assumed that the sample population would co-operate and respond truthfully to information and data capture instruments. It further assumed that the selected sample would be representative enough to give an indicative picture of the facts on the ground. This study also assumed that decentralisation of education services has been taking place in line with other government policies on decentralisation. In addition, the study assumed that since the introduction of FPE 2003 and FDSE in 2008, the district education office and school management have had greater role in the supervision of school operations and parents are now involved in the management of schools.

1.8 Theoretical Framework

According to Oso and Onen (2008), theoretical framework refers to a set of interrelated variables and definitions that present a systematic view of a phenomenon by specifying the relationship among variables. Its main objective is to explain a phenomenon. The study was based on the systems theory. The theory according to Owens (1981) posits that an organization is a system of independent structures and functions that work together towards common outcomes. It comprises many subsystems which must function harmoniously and
complement each other towards attainment of the organizations objectives. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), should one of the subsystems fail in their role, the organisation’s performance is affected. For this study the social systems theory as an open system was the focus of this study.

A formal social system according to available literature on the theory is an open system which is affected by the environment. Whatever takes place in the environment affects the system. It consists of sub systems or interdependent parts, characteristics and activities that affect and contribute to the system. In order for the system to function effectively, it must have goals that are pursued and made functional by human resources (people). As an organisation, it has formal rules, regulations, norms and structures. It is also characterised by division of labour. A social system normally does not condone non-conformity; otherwise the achievement of the set goals is compromised. Further, since a social system is political, it is driven by power relations and it has its own culture.

The education sector has the above characteristics at all levels from the national to the school levels. For instance, according to Owens (1981), a school is an open system which receives inputs from the environment and processes them into outputs which are given back to the environment. Basically, a school receives resources, finances, human resources and raw materials which it uses to produce outputs that are graduates who are released to the environment (society). The school is supported by many structures or subsystems. The interactions between all the subsystems have to function harmoniously to attain the organizational goals and in this case, determine the factors that affect the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of decentralised management and the quality of education services.
The structures that are the Ministry headquarters, province, district and the schools are the sub-systems that are critical in ensuring that there is effective service delivery. The school which is the ultimate delivery point focusing on the learner will function effectively if it receives appropriate support from the other sub-systems. In the case of any structure or subsystem not playing its role as required, the system as a whole cannot function effectively.

1.9 Conceptual Framework

A conceptual framework is a scheme of concepts or variable which the researcher will use in order to achieve set objectives (Oso and Onen (2008). Basically, it is a diagrammatic presentation of a theory. In the case under study, the inter interplay of factors such as clear policies and guidelines, human resource, administrative, monitoring and support capacity, compliance with guidelines and processes determine the perceptions, forms, benefits, roles, challenges and therefore effectiveness of service delivery. The study argued that clear policies on decentralisation of instructional materials and infrastructure development would result into effective decentralised service.

The study also expected that where guidelines were available, clear and followed by management of education institutions there would be improved service especially in the implementation of procurement of instruction materials and constructional materials. The result would be improved service delivery, management and value for money.

The study further argued that where there was goodwill among stakeholders who included the Ministry headquarters, DEO, School Management Committees, School administration among others, there would be effective service delivery. The education and training sector derives its policies from the national government and the Ministry of Education in particular which provides regulations and guidelines to all its existing structures. Goodwill from all
structures from the National government which formulates policy, provides resources and monitors and supports lower level structures is important for effective service delivery.

In relation to compliance and goodwill, the study argued that where there is goodwill to comply with set and approved government guidelines; there would be transparency and accountability, motivated human resource and support to management.

The provision of human resource with the right skills, clear roles, responsibilities and expectations is important for any system. The human resource provided must have the capacity to administer and manage resources in a transparent and accountable manner throughout all the structures. In order to attain this, the human resource must have good personnel qualities, motivated and should be provided with the right support services such as capacity building, technical skills and monitoring and evaluation services. In an effective decentralised, system all the structures from the centre to the periphery in this case from the Ministry of education to the school levels must have clearly delineated roles, and expectations on the part of each player in order to work towards the attainment of the national goals of education.

Thus with clear goals, policies guidelines and appropriate human resources with the right skills and attitudes and support from all the players effective management is attainable. The opposite would be the case as it would lead to ineffectiveness. Effective decentralised management of education services will lead to improved education services through speedy and need based decisions and prioritisation. In undertaking the study, the focus was on the policy and human resource variables as factors that affect the effectiveness of education decentralisation.
As shown in Figure 1.1 the Independent variables were expected to have a direct impact on the quality of decentralised service which is the dependent value. However, there were some intervening variables in the study which included administration capacity, management capacity and support services. An effective decentralised service will lead to quality education.
1.9.1 Operational Definitions of terms

**Efficiency:** According to Webster’s Third New International Dictionary, efficiency means “capacity to produce desired results with minimum expenditure of energy, time, money or materials”. This implies achieving a purpose economically. It means the ability to choose and use most effective and least wasteful means of doing something or accomplishing a purpose or ”efficient operation as measured by a comparison of actual results with those that could be achieved with the same expenditure of energy” (Webster’s Third International Dictionary, 1986). It means attaining a result at minimum wastage. Efficiency as regards this study refers to the best method that can lead to speedy decision making and implementation, and less wastage of time and resources.

**Effectiveness:** Effectiveness on the other hand means the quality or state of being effective, the capability of bringing out an effect or accomplishes a purpose (Webster Third International Dictionary, 1986). Simply put, it focuses on the goal and production of the desired results from the customer’s point of view.

**Decentralisation:** The Webster’s Third New International Dictionary defines decentralisation as “the dispersion or distribution of functions and powers from central authority to regional and local government bodies”. It is conceptualised in different ways by academicians and administrators. According to Fiske (1996), “Decentralisation is the process of re-assigning responsibility and corresponding decision making authority for specific functions from higher to lower levels of governments and organizations units”. The concept takes many forms ranging from delegation, devolution and deconcentration.

According to Bray (1991), decentralisation involves the authorization of lower level structures to take decisions regarding the utilization of resources. The central authority in this case, authorises the lower levels to make certain decisions and undertake delegated functions.
These functions range from authority to recruit, evaluating and promoting personnel, allocating and reallocating budgets. It is a form of delegation of authority and functional responsibilities and decisions making to lower levels. Education decentralisation therefore means the transfer of decision making from central government or Ministry of Education (MoE) to its local offices of such as the province, districts, divisions and schools.

There are many forms of decentralisation. However, for the purpose of this study focus was on Administrative decentralisation, Deconcentration and, Delegation forms of decentralisation.

(a) Administrative decentralisation: This involves providing services to the public at different levels of government. It also implies the transfer of authority for planning, financing and management of some functions from central government to agencies and Semi Autonomous Government Agencies (SAGAs). The major forms of administrative decentralisation include: deconcentration, delegation and devolution.

(b) Deconcentration: This term denotes the transfer or delegation of responsibility for managing services/functions from the national level to a local level of a central organisation such as the Ministry of Education.

In this case, decision making and policy direction are centralised. Basically, the lower levels such as the provincial, district and schools are allowed to implement policy, apply the regulations or guidelines but have nothing to do with their formulation.

(c) Delegation: It implies assignment by the central government Ministry of education (MoE) to school committees or principals the responsibilities of maintaining the school plant, appoint principals, preparing school development plan, preparing revenue and spending plans. It can also be done by creating Semi Autonomous Government Agencies and giving
regional government that is Ministry of Education offices in Municipal or Public schools power such as that of maintaining the physical school plants, preparation and approval of School Development Plan (SDP) and budgets.

From the above definitions, decentralisation in education adopts many forms and aspects. All the above definitions have a common meaning, that is, the transfer of powers and functions from a central government to lower level structures.

For the purpose of this study, the form of decentralisation adopted was administrative. Administrative decentralisation embraces deconcentration, which is the transfer of responsibility of managing services from the national level to lower level structures. It also means delegation whereby powers and responsibilities are delegated to lower level structures. It means the transfer of decision making from central government to an elected local government or school committees. Funding for the lower level structures is by the central government although the structures can raise their own revenues with the approval of the central authority.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

The focus of this chapter is literature review related to the study. It covers the following areas: background to education decentralisation; decentralisation of education in developed countries; decentralisation of education in developing countries of Asia and South America; decentralisation of education in Africa and finally in Kenya focusing on instructional materials and infrastructure development and rehabilitation.

2.2 Background to Education Decentralisation

The concept of decentralisation has been evidenced in both developed and developing countries in the belief that it can bring about reforms in service delivery (Rondinelli et al., 1983). It has appeared on the political agenda for European countries for decades and is now worldwide. Western countries have used this strategy in the belief that it will bring about reforms in the education and other social sectors. Developing countries have been encouraged to decentralise education by the World Bank through projects. However, different countries understand the concept in various ways and therefore apply different practices (Siry, 2007).

Interest in decentralisation is based on the belief that decentralised functions/activities or authority to lower level structures confers responsibility and enhances transparency and accountability and flexibility hence increasing efficiency and effectiveness (Verspoor, 2008). It also envisages less bureaucratic, speedy decision making, strengthens democracy and ownership and therefore reduces transactional costs and administrative burden. In short, it is assumed it will contribute to quick decision making and more effective utilization of resources. This would imply that in education, school management should be given a free hand to manage and account for the resources granted to them.
Dececentralisation according to Ikoya (2008) in a study on infrastructure in Nigeria concludes that the level of maintenance of school facilities is higher in decentralised than in centralised schools. The Study concluded that decentralisation enhances the effective management of school facilities. Studies have also shown that construction costs are lower in decentralised management as contracting is localised. By 1960s, some countries in Europe had decentralised education management functions. For instance, in Norway communities had been given rights to participate in school decision making as shown in the curriculum guidelines of 1974 and 1987 (Karlsen, 1999).


The Colony and Protectorate of Kenya African Education in Kenya, Report (1949) recommended that primary and intermediate schools be placed under DEBs to ease the financial burden on local authorities. The Kenya Education Commission Report (1964) recommended that public primary schools be managed by local authorities, Republic of Kenya, (1964). This report was
implemented through the Education Act. The Education Act established governance structures such as the Provincial Education Boards (PEBs), the District Education Boards (DEBs), and Boards of Governors (BoGs) for Secondary Schools and Tertiary Institutions and School Management Committees (SMCs) for primary schools (Republic of Kenya, 1968).

These bodies were entrusted with certain functions which they perform at their level. The Education Act also entrusts local government authorities with the running of education especially primary school education at the Municipalities, hence the creation of Municipal Education Offices (MEOs) in their jurisdictions.

The Report of the Commission of Inquiry: Public Service, Structure and Remuneration (1971), noted that “among other things that to realise the government’s concerns of accelerating development in rural areas, the process of both plan making and implementation of projects had to be extended to the district level and even divisions where the government comes into contact with local realities”. It also recommended that the purchase of and distribution of primary school equipment be decentralised. This resulted into the establishment of School Equipment Production Unit (SEPU). The key concern here was bringing service closer to the people.

The Legal Notice No. 50/1970, the education entrustment of functions to local authorities order under Section 5 of the education Act cap 211, the Minister responsible for education can entrust any of his functions with respect to education to a local authority. The evidence of this is found in Municipalities. However, finances come from the ministry of education since over time local authorities have been financially constrained for various reasons. A commission of inquiry into the education system of Kenya, (Republic of Kenya, 1993), observed that “growth and development of education had been impeded by centralisation of
decision making in formal education at the Headquarters” coupled with poor coordination of education services by various ministries.

The taskforce on student discipline and unrest in secondary schools in Kenya, Republic of Kenya (2001), recommended that DEBs be mandated to coordinate and monitor the disbursement of funds and other material resources to schools. BOGs are delegated the management of finances and the preparation of school plans and budgets etc. The Report of the presidential working party on Education and Manpower Training for the next Decade and Beyond (1988), also recommended decentralisation of education services to the district level. The Report of the National Committee on Education objectives and policies (NCEOP), (1976), recommended the delegation of full powers to the District Education Boards and Boards of Governors for the total management of education services. The Kenya education sector support programme KESSP and the Sessional Paper No. 1 of 2005 also mention decentralisation as a desirable approach to education management.

Through these commissions and Task Force report’s recommendations, Policy has evolved to direct the management of education services. The education Act CAP 211 (1968), set the pace for the establishment of specialised structures to promote and develop education in Kenya. These include the establishment of Semi-Autonomous Government Agencies (SAGAs) with specific mandates such as the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) to manage the teaching service, the Kenya Institute of Education (KIE) to develop curriculum, Kenya staff Education institute (KESI) for sector capacity building, the Kenya National Examination Council (KNEC) for examinations and certification, Jomo Kenyatta Foundation (JKF) and Kenya Literature Bureau (KLB) to publish education books and Kenya Institute of Special Education (KISE) to focus on the capacity to teach learners with special needs among others.
The Education Act Cap 211 of the laws of Kenya, (1968) Revised (1980), also established structures such as Provincial Education Boards (PEBs) and District Education Boards (DEBs) to oversee education at the provincial and district levels respectively. The same Act created Boards of Governors to manage secondary schools while School Management Committees (SMCs) would manage primary schools. The ACT also stipulates the composition and functions of these oversight and management bodies.

Many countries, especially since the 1990s have adopted some form of decentralisation in the social sectors such as education and health. In Kenya, there has been a clamour for devolution as ways of getting resources and services closer to the people. Decentralisation would basically lower transactional costs; improve access, governance and accountability by eliminating bureaucratic processes.

Direct schools support apart from employing and paying teachers, commenced with the introduction of Free Primary and day secondary education to stem the decline associated with high poverty levels and high costs to households. The implementation of these initiatives resulted into direct capitation grants to schools to cater for tuition and general maintenance. Before the development of this policy and programmes, the report of the National Conference on Education and Training (2003), recommended that in order to enhance access and participation the Ministry “should build, rehabilitate schools and provide more funds to boarding schools particularly in ASAL areas and pockets of poverty in collaboration with development partners”. In the same report, it was also recommended that to ensure conducive learning environment, PTAs and School Management Committees should ensure toilets/latrines and classrooms are availed. To cater for children with special needs, the ministry should make educational institutions barrier free by providing physical facilities that are
friendly. Moreover, communities should be encouraged to build more schools using locally available resources.

The Sessional Paper that culminated as a result of the recommendations of the conference recognised the need to develop and improve infrastructure and fast-track the attainment of Education for All (EFA). One of the targets as set out in the Sessional Paper No.1 (2005) is to “construct/renovate physical facilities/equipment in public learning institutions in disadvantaged areas particular in ASAL and urban slums by 2008”. The ministry would mobilise resources to develop infrastructure in regions of high poverty levels (pockets of poverty). The main goal has been to deal with a situation of overstretched facilities, poor sanitation and generally poor learning environment characterised by gender insensitive and inappropriate facilities for children with special needs.

The main strategy adopted is to work with partners and other line ministries in order to improve the school learning environment. Since decision making and management in education was highly centralised at the ministry headquarters, the only way out was to decentralise some of the functions to district and school levels. Accordingly, it is at these levels that some of the administrative, financial and decision making functions should be placed. In order to do this, the ministry would maintain a lean structure at the centre to handle policy direction, mobilise resources, planning, maintenance of quality assurance and standards and coordination of education services thus maintaining oversight role.

2.3 Decentralisation of Education

Many countries in the world including developed and developing countries have decentralised educational service by adapting different forms by moving responsibility from the Ministry of Education headquarters to ministry offices at the provinces, districts and school levels. In most cases, different forms are used by practicing different aspects in
accordance with their objectives. The central Education Ministry retains the responsibilities of policy and curriculum development.

However in most cases, these structures receive grants from state governments thus limiting their autonomy. In some cases, they raise their own resources through various activities to supplement central governments or state grants.

2.3.1 Decentralisation of Education Management in Developed Countries

In the United States of America (USA), which is administratively divided into federal states, counties, education management is by school councils run by school boards and the local school district supported by finances from the state government. The state raises revenue through which it finances education. School committee members are elected from among parents, teachers and members of the community. The schools are accountable to the school districts which in turn account to the county government. The county government in turn accounts to the state.

In the case of Canada, education is funded by Municipal governments from taxes since the central government does not have an education ministry. The municipal government which is elected, funds the school boards who manage education services including infrastructure development and maintenance in liaison with schools governance structures.

Newzealand has elected schools boards with parents as the only members and gives them responsibilities to select their own school managers and recruit their own teachers. Most financing comes from the central government through capitation grants but schools may raise their own revenues but not through charging tuition. In addition, the central government has
created Semi Autonomous Government body to carry out school evaluation, the results which are posted on the schools public bulletin boards.

The Netherlands’ Central government provides financing to community or privately managed (mainly religious affiliated) schools with advisory school councils. The schools have autonomy to recruit teachers. The central government sets the core curriculum and minimum performance standards. Municipalities have the responsibility of specifying how central government grants for disadvantaged children should be used to effectively complement other locally provided social welfare services.

On the other hand, Cyprus has a decentralised education system and has decentralised some education services such as school infrastructure building and maintenance to school boards. However, the state provides the funds in the form of grants. Teacher management, curriculum and policy are the reserve of the central education Ministry. In England, the administration of education service is devolved to local authorities’ while in Switzerland education authority and functions are vested on the regional authorities and the schools. However, policy formulation remains the preserve of the central government.

In the Wales, devolved governance was established by Wales National Assembly for Wales in 1999. Responsibilities for nearly all aspects of education and training have been decentralised. It is a partnership between the Assembly Government, the local education authority and the teaching profession and other employee groups. In 1990s, education and training were delivered through the local education authorities and a number of quangos such as the curriculum and Assessment Authorities for Wales and further and Higher Education councils for Wales (Gareth, 2007).
Armenia has entrusted education to local school committees with members elected by teachers and parents and with broad authority. The central government finances all recurrent costs through transfer of funds to the school boards. Municipalities are responsible for school infrastructure development and maintenance while regional offices provide technical assistance to the schools. However, the history of education decentralisation in this country has been phased a region at a time.

2.3.2 Decentralisation of Education in Developing Countries

In 1978, Argentina transferred nearly all primary school education to the provinces while it transferred secondary and higher education and distributed responsibilities and functions between national and provincial levels in 1992. The provincial governments which are elected and headed by governors designs curriculum for the provinces, and promotes the participation of stakeholders in the management of education. The provincial governments pay teachers. The central government has the responsibilities for assessing students’ performance, financing special education and charting education reforms. This was meant to reduce public spending and improve efficiency. In Colombia, decentralisation of education is focused on allocating resources, functions and responsibilities at the different levels of power.

Brazil has school councils composed of parents, teachers and students. The councils are charged with the responsibility of selecting the school improvement plan as proposed by electoral candidates during election contests. Candidates propose what they would do once elected. They also select the school director. The state also provides each school council with capitation grants for non personnel expenditures which the school councils have power to allocate. Teachers continue to be employees of the state since their terms of service are negotiated with the state.
For El Salvador, the parents school councils who elect the committees which are empowered to manage their own schools, including directly hiring teachers. School principals take a great role in the leadership and management of schools. The elected committees have high degree of management autonomy. This implies that the teacher management function is the responsibility of the school councils. India and Bangladesh are federated countries and education management and school construction is by communities while in Peru it is by elected Regional governments who have the responsibility of planning and budgeting for school infrastructure and procurement of goods and services.

In Pakistan, the federal government handles curriculum design; determine teacher salaries and accreditation and learning achievement evaluation. The district directs and evaluates learning funds which are granted by the federal government. The district is responsible for all expenditures. Schools are run through elected committees.

Education decentralisation in Chile is by municipal governments which have elected mayors and city councils. They are responsible for partly financing primary and secondary education. The central government is responsible for financing special education and the bulk of primary and secondary through what is known as formula financing (capitation grants) and assessing student performance.

The major characteristic of federal systems of government is that lower level structures account and report to high level structure. They have a high degree of accountability as client voice is higher.

Lessons from Latin America suggest that for decentralisation to be effective, it is necessary to undertake legal framework review to align education with the framework. Further, client demand through the roles and influence of the civil society and community is critical for
enhanced accountability. Capacity of the decentralised structures is very important for effective implementation of education services (Verspoor, 2008).

2.3.3 Decentralisation of Education in Africa

Decentralisation in many developing countries especially in Africa takes the form of decentralisation adopted is deconcentration of responsibilities to regional and local governments (Winkler, 2003).

In most African countries, decentralisation has been through donor funded projects championed by the World Bank (Winkler, 2003). This is evidenced in countries such as Mali, Tanzania, Uganda, Nigeria and Guinea among others through grants from the central governments. The objectives have been to enhance efficiency and effectiveness by holding service providers at whatever level accountable.

Schools committees are a feature in many schools in Africa where they are supported by communities and manage the resources, develop school improvement plans and also mobilise additional resources for operations, maintenance and development. In most cases, there are issues pertaining to the interpretation of decentralisation, vague role delineation and acceptance since reforms are pushed through projects and may not be locally owned.

Uganda is divided into districts, elected councils and sub counties. Funds are transferred to the districts on per capita basis and the Ministry of Education provides guidelines to schools on the administration of the funds. Grants are then transferred to school accounts who manage the funds. Teachers are recruited by the districts but paid by central government since teacher salaries are set at the national level following pay negotiations. Guidelines on
budget items are provided by central government. School construction is funded by the central government and overseen by schools management committees which are provided oversight at the regional level.

In Morocco schools are managed by Boards of Management with representation of parents, teachers and local professionals. The central government defines the functions and the responsibilities such as supervision of schools, infrastructure and human resources.

Ghana has decentralised education services by empowering District Assemblies to be in charge of primary and secondary schools. School management committees exist but play an advisory role on teacher management and supervision. The central government regulates curriculum materials and the curriculum (Yolande, Miller Graudvaux at el 2002). Ghana therefore practices de-concentration by shifting responsibilities from Ministry of Education headquarters to its offices at the regional and district offices.

Ethiopia has many levels of administration or government. These are national, regional bureaus, school districts and kebeles each with its own department of education reporting to the next level. Regional bureaus are responsible for curriculum development, provision of instructional materials and teacher training (AED 1996). As such it has a devolved system of government. In respect to education, teacher recruitment and management is by regional government using central government guidelines. Financing is however from central government. Regional administration implements school construction with the support and participation of schools.

With federal and local forms of governments which are responsible for provision of primary and secondary education, Nigeria has shared responsibilities between federal and local
governments. Local governments are responsible for primary while federal governments are responsible for secondary education. They are responsible for teacher management that is recruitment and deployment and partly payment of salaries although the bulk of funds come from federal government especially for school construction. Federal government provides policy directions and standards for both curriculum delivery and school infrastructure construction. PTAs and SMCs raise funds for operations and maintenance and sometimes PTAs hire teachers (World Bank, 1998).

Tanzania is administratively divided into regions, districts and local government authorities, sub districts (villages or wards). Education decentralisation therefore corresponds to the general government decentralisation. Primary education is managed by local government authorities and school committees with strong parental representation who oversee the running of schools by managing the funds and developing school development plans. Teacher salaries are nationally set (Maclean Keith, 1997).

However, administration is at the regional level. This is also replicated in teacher management including recruitment. Financing is by the central government for teachers, capitation grants, instructional materials, teacher training. Most of the government functions are deconcentrated while others are devolved. School construction and rehabilitation is done by local authorities and schools.

Guinea has decentralised teacher management to the regional level with power over non salary budgets. However, the state government provides for finances for training, instructional materials and salary elements.
The Republic of South Africa has a strong regional government just like Nigeria and Ethiopia. Administratively, it is divided into provinces and municipalities. Education services are provided by provincial ministries of education. Financing is from central government mixed with community and regional contributions. Schools are funded through capitation grants. However, the Central government sets curriculum evaluation standards and guidelines, sends provinces funds for instructional materials, teacher management and personnel budgetary requirements. There are school councils comprising of staff and parents established by the school Act of 1996 (Sayed, 2002). They can make decisions on curriculum, personnel, and budgeting using national and provincial guidelines. Communities are empowered to manage their own schools irrespective of which level and government is legally responsible for basic education.

The school councils appoint and assign head teachers and teacher principals are interviewed and recommended to the provincial education ministry for approval. However, personnel decisions are dictated by nationally negotiated salaries and promotion standards. Schools councils can hire their own teachers using their own resources. Principals take on the roles in leading and managing schools. Parents are provided with information on their school performance relative to others. School councils can set fees, school calendars and recommend school teachers and staff and the language of instruction.

In Malawi, upon the introduction of Free Primary Education in 1994, the result as is the case everywhere, enrolments increased leading to insufficient classrooms. With the support of development partners the education sector embarked on classrooms construction supported by the World Bank and uses local contractors.
Mali runs community schools where parents have a strong voice and authority on the management (Tiefjen, 1999). They select the governing body. The governing body selects the school head and other required personnel. They therefore hire and fire teachers. School infrastructure development and maintenance is undertaken by communities using locally available materials.

From the above, countries have used different forms of decentralisation and are at different levels of decentralisation. These range from deconcentration to regional and local government authorities and MoE offices; delegation to regional, local governments and schools. The bulk of the resources come from the central governments. It would therefore, appear that the education sector in different countries implement different forms of decentralisation. Findings from literature show that when backed by legislative framework, decentralisation is bound to enhance local responsibility and community (local level involvement) which will enhance ownership, accountability and sustainability.

According to Winkler et al. (2003), efficiency and effectiveness are likely to improve under decentralisation when service providers are held accountable for results and more so when the lower level structures contribute a portion of financing. Accountability requires clearly defined roles and responsibility hence it is clear from the outset as who is responsible for what and to what extent. Decentralisation especially to school management bodies would increase client voice as it enhances parental participation in school affairs.

However, decentralisation demands that the lower level structures have capacity to perform the functions professionally and with ethical considerations. Monitoring and review of guidelines and regulations from time to time would be necessary. For decentralisation to be effective, technical capacity and capacity building is necessary for all levels. The level of
education and hence interpretative capacity of lower level structures is very critical if sound decisions are to be made. Moreover, capacity for monitoring and support services at this level must be adequate. The centre must also be committed to decentralisation. "Decentralization tends to be successful when the central government is stable, solvent and committed to transferring both responsibility and resources, when local authorities are able to assume these responsibilities and when there is effective participation by poor people and well organized civil society" (UNDP, 2003).

In a decentralised system, the citizenry, civil society organisations must have a voice to expose vices such as collusion and corruption. A positive and vibrant media is a must for accountability by both the centre and devolved structures. The effects of absence of clear roles, inadequate capacity, weak client voice and weak monitoring systems would be overlaps, duplication and wastage of scarce resources.

2.3.4 Decentralisation of Education Management in Kenya

The Kenyan case in development of formal education commenced with the missionaries who established schools with a view to acculturate the people and provide them with rudimentary skills to read the bible.

Upon the onset of colonial government, education continued along the same lines especially for Africans (Keriga & Bujra, 2009). The colonial government ran education along racial lines that is for Europeans, Indians, Arabs and Africans (Republic of Kenya, 1993).
Following the end of World War II, in 1945, the Africans who had participated in the war began clamouring for education and by the 1950s the Africans established independent schools (community) especially in central Kenya (Wamagatta, 2008). The communities would donate land and team up to contribute materials and labour and develop schools to fill the gap of education facilities and provide relevant education other than technical and craft oriented education provided by the colonial government.

This trend continued even in independent Kenya where communities established Harambee schools (community schools) (Sifuna, 1990). The central government would then support the schools with teachers. The communities, besides constructing also maintained the schools. Although the government eventually took over the community (Harambee) schools, communities through the Parents Teachers Associations continued raising funds for expanding and maintenance. The government introduced Free Primary and Secondary Education since 2003 and 2008 respectively. However, the central government provides capitation and maintenance grants and infrastructure grants to target schools.

Management of these grants is by the school management committees for primary schools and Boards of Governors for secondary schools. Construction and maintenance is administered by these bodies (Ministry of Education, 2005 and 2007). In places where communities find a need for schools, they raise funds and construct. Under FPE and FDSE, institutional management bodies participate in planning and expenditure decisions with guidelines from the centre while implementing school development and improvement projects.
In the Kenya education sector, the schools prepare their plans and budgets. They receive funds from various sources such as the central government grants, fees and in some cases from income generating activities or projects.

In Kenya, decentralisation of functions in education service delivery has been centred on teacher management, financial and procurement management (Ministry of Education Science and Technology, 2005). The education management structure of the education sector implies shared responsibilities between the centre and lower level structures. The lower level structures are supposed to account to the higher level structures. For instance the frontline service providers are supposed to account to the Minister for Education in accordance with Education Act Cap 211 (Republic of Kenya 1968). Accountability is horizontal and vertical as is the case of Provincial Education Boards (PEBs), District Education Boards (DEBs) and District Education Officer’s (DEO’s) offices, communities and School committees. The structure on Figure 2.1 below shows the accountability structures.
Fig 2.1 Structure of the Ministry of Education

Source: Ministry of Education (2005/7)
The Education Act Cap 211 (1968), laws of Kenya, established specialized agencies of the Ministry known as Semi-Autonomous Government Agencies (SAGAs) to perform specialised supportive functions (Republic of Kenya, 1968). These include the Kenya Institute of Education (KIE), Kenya Education Staff Institute (KESI), Jomo Kenyatta Foundation (JKF) and the Kenya Literature Bureau (KLB), among others. The same legal framework established governance structures such as the Provincial Education Boards (PEBs), the District Education Boards (DEBs), and Boards of Governors (BoGs) for Secondary Schools and Tertiary Institutions and School Management Committees (SMCs) for primary schools. These bodies are entrusted with certain functions which they perform at their level. The Education Act also entrusts local government authorities with the running of education especially primary school education at the Municipalities, hence the creation of Municipal Education Offices (MEOs) in their jurisdictions.

The Provincial Education Boards are charged with the responsibility of co-ordination of all programmes activities of the districts, monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of education activities, advising the District Education Officers, supervising District Education programmes, and ensuring implementation of timely mitigation measures as recommended by Monitoring and Evaluation and audit reports.

The District Education Boards (DEBs) functions include; management of education services, teacher management, registration of schools, and supervision of education programmes (Republic of Kenya, 1968). They are also responsible for accounting for funds, quality assurance, resource mobilisation, conducting regular monitoring and evaluation of sector programmes implementation, sharing monitoring and evaluation and other reports with PDEs and headquarters, implementing risk mitigation measures as per recommendations of audits and other reports. On the other hand, Boards of Governors plan and budget for funds in form
of grants from the Ministry, implement education programmes in accordance with the budgets, monitor the implementation of education programmes. Post updated accounts on public notice boards in the school, write reports and send to the ministry through DEOs. Their other functions include ensuring official policies and guidelines are adhered to, strategic management of the institution, general oversight on delivery of education programmes. Further, they undertake Planning, resource mobilisation, utilisation and accounting for the resources, monitoring of education standards, overall teacher management and discipline, collaboration with the communities and management of non-teaching staff.

According to the Education Act Cap 211, School Management Committees receive and account for all resources, develop and implement school plans, mobilise additional resources, implement government policies and guidelines while the Parents-Teachers Association (PTA) monitor the implementation of school programmes, education services, mobilising additional resources for school development. Their composition is representatives of all the eight primary school classes and parents.

In Kenya, decentralisation of functions in education service delivery has been centred on teacher management, financial and procurement management. The centre has continued to retain authority to develop and formulate policy, formulate budget, provide guidelines and conduct monitoring and evaluation. In other countries the level of decentralisation depends on whether a country is in federal or centralised system.

The functions of the Teacher Service Commission (TSC) are devolved to the lower level structures and include recruitment of teachers’ assignment and transfer, teacher discipline and deployment (Olembo et al., 1992). The function of recruitment of teachers has for some time now been devolved to the District Education Boards for Public Primary School teachers and
that of post primary to the Boards of Governors (Republic of Kenya, 2005). These structures are financed and follow the guidelines provided by the centre. Primary school infrastructure programme is a decentralised function in the education sector in Kenya. There are two infrastructure program components namely regular programme and emergency programme. The School Infrastructure improvement works have been going on since 2004 when initial disbursements were made to North eastern province. This report has focused on the regular as the emergency was only confined to areas affected by the 2007/08 post election violence.

The involvement of the government in infrastructure development is driven by the following factors: (i) the need to get rid of over-crowded classrooms; (ii) the increase of school-age children to be accommodated in new classrooms, (iii) the need to replace the stock of sub-standard classrooms built by parents, (iv) the need to replace aging and deteriorating existing stock classrooms and (v) to improve the quality of construction. The schools to benefit are selected based on defined criteria (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, 2007).

The neediest schools were selected by DEBs through criteria that focused on: Number of permanent classrooms; Number of Permanent toilets; Number of semi permanent classrooms; Number of semi permanent toilets; Number of classes conducted outside; Number of children without desks. The programme is managed at three levels: at National level there is School Infrastructure Management Unit (SIMU) while at the district level there is a District Infrastructure Coordination Team (DICT) that manages the programme. The DICT is a multi-sectoral team that approves the school infrastructure development plans, monitors progress and liaises with the DEB for ratification of the school infrastructure development plans (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, 2007).
At the school level, the School Infrastructure Management Committee (SIMC) is made up of teachers and parents and undertakes procurement and day to day implementation under the guidance of the Assistant Education Officer (AEO) and the Public works officer who assist in the supervision of the works to ensure quality control. A Management and technical Handbook has been developed to guide the various levels of management as per the Infrastructure Management and technical Handbooks (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, 2007).

Before any disbursement, the relevant management oversight bodies must be trained in order to be able to implement in accordance with the guidelines contained the Infrastructure Management and technical Handbooks. The Ministry provides handbooks, Contract Forms; Designs and Bills of Quantities (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, 2007).

All selected schools are instructed to open infrastructure current accounts (SIBA). Guidelines/circulars outlining the conditions that must be met by the SICs/SMCs before the funds are spent are sent to the benefitting schools. They include the requirement that the school committees develop school infrastructure plans which must be approved by the DICT (Ministry of Education Science and Technology, 2007).

The DICT supervises the works using monitoring funds provided to the DEO. The AEOs support the Monitoring process on the ground because they are in contact with the schools on day to day basis. Funds for supervising and, monitoring the constructions are electronically disbursed to DEOs and are spent by the DICT and accounted for as per Government regulations. Copies of guidelines/circular for monitoring funds are issued though the DEOs. Schools are instructed to use Community contracting (labour only contract) as it is deemed to be the most cost effective method of construction.
The school committees are provided with standard designs for classrooms, latrines, furniture and associated BQs/schedule of materials to assist them in the procurement process.

The Sessional Paper No.1 of 2005 on “A Policy Framework for Education, Training and Research” regards the implementation of Primary Education as the perfect vehicle for attainment of Universal Primary Education (UPE and Education for All (EFA) goals. In 2003, the government introduced Free Primary Education to stem the declining enrolments and increase access for the poor and marginalized populations. Under this programme, the decentralised components include: Instructional Materials Grants, School Operation grants, School Infrastructure grants. There are supports projects which include; Early Childhood Development Education (ECD) Grants, School Health Nutrition and Feeding Program Support, Non-Formal Education grants, Special Needs Education grants, Most Vulnerable Children Support Grants, grants for laboratory and ICT equipment Non-formal education, Special needs education, Low cost boarding schools, Expanding education opportunities for ASALs (mobile schools) Orphans and vulnerable Children (OVC) School infrastructure teacher education, Bursary for teacher trainees, School health, nutrition and feeding (home grown school feeding initiative) among others, all geared towards enhancing access, retention, quality and equity (Ministry of Education Science and Technology, 2007). For the above components, financing is through direct grants to schools for management by various committees of the School Management committee.

In primary schools, the parents who are the majority members of the school committee participate in decisions regarding the utilisation of government grants. Decentralised management of instructional Materials to head teachers, and Parents was the start of a radical decentralisation of decision making and fund management responsibility to schools (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, 2005).
The Instruction Materials component is a huge investment with a wide coverage of all public Primary Schools across the country. It covers both formal and non formal schools. The programme started before 2003 on a pilot basis through collaboration between the GoK, DFID and SIDA, and was rolled out nationally following the introduction of FPE in 2003. Before funds are released, each primary school must establish a committee known as School Instructional material Selection Committee (SIMSC). The committees are trained on procurement, maintenance of instructional materials and are charged with the responsibility of managing the funds at the school level.

The selection and procurement of instructional materials is done at the school level by the school instructional materials management committee (SIMMC). The instructional materials procured are vetted through a well designed system and published in the Orange Book with agreed prices which is prepared every year. Discounts to schools are supposed to be in the form of instruction materials and not cash (Ministry of Education Science and Technology, 2004). There is a memorandum of understanding between the MoE and Banks stipulates bank fees chargeable.

In implementing the programme, appropriate management handbooks and guides were developed and distributed to schools. The MoE also developed a booklet “Blue Book” on roles and responsibilities of stakeholders. In addition to guidelines, itemised expenditure levels were issued to schools (Ministry of education, 2010). In 2006/07, an Educational Governance and Accountability Action Plans were also developed to enhance governance.

Respective committees undertake the procurement process. Utilization of funds disbursed at school level is guided by circulars and guidelines on expenditure items. Funds retained at the Ministry headquarters are for Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and capacity building for

Capacity building is targeted to School Management Committees, Boards of Governors, School Infrastructure Committees; Early Childhood Development (ECD), Mobile Schools Committees, Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVC) Management committees and so on. Training sessions are based on the guidelines and manuals produced to guide implementation.

2.4 Summary

In the Kenyan case, decentralisation education is not new as it started missionaries in colonial era and the government and communities in the post independence era. It is evident that both colonial and post colonial commissions and taskforce reports have recommended decentralisation of education to lower level structures for various reasons. The concept of decentralised education management in Africa has been in recent times supported by the World Bank through projects based on the argument that it enhances efficiency and client voice and good governance. Decentralisation of education in Kenya is not backed by law as is clear from the current education Act cap 211 laws of Kenya. The current education Act entrusts education to local governments which has proved difficult in the face of scarce financial resources. International experience shows that: efficiency and effectiveness are likely to improve when service providers are held accountable; when there is clear delineation of authority and responsibility; increase potential for community and parental participation and school managers must acquire leadership and management skills (Winkler, D.R.andAilen, Ian Gershberg, 2003).
The logic on decentralisation in Kenya has not been vigorously studied as in other countries such as those in Latin America and Europe. Hence, there is little data and information on the subject unlike in the cases of Ethiopia, South Africa and Nigeria in Africa and this presents a research gap. Studies by IPAR (2004), on District focus for rural development strategy, highlighted challenges of decentralisation of a general nature and not education in particular. The study found that the strategy lacked legal backing, relied on an institutional framework that did not facilitate local decision making and resource mobilization; lacked capacity in participatory planning among civil servants and people’s awareness and participation in planning and implementation of strategy. Ikiugu (2007) did a research on financial management in public secondary schools in Abothuguci Division of Meru Central District which in Kenya education system provides evidence of a form of decentralisation.

Among the key findings was that BOGs failed to follow the Ministry guidelines on procurement and failure to understand their roles in financial management. The review of literature did not come across studies on decentralisation of instructional materials procurement except for infrastructure in decentralised schools in Nigeria which showed that the involvement of local community in infrastructure leads to lower costs (Ikoya, 2008).

In most countries various forms of decentralisation are practised and decentralised education service is financed from the central government. Decentralisation in education in Africa has been gaining momentum in search of efficiency in service delivery (Winkler et al., 2003). However, there so many lingering questions such as what forms of education decentralisation are in application, if the roles of different actors are clearly defined, or whether its adoption improves accountability and effectiveness? Therefore, this study sought to fill this gap by establishing the factors that affect effective education decentralisation.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter comprises the following sections, research design, target and population, sample size and sampling procedures, research instruments validity and reliability of instruments, data collection procedures and analysis plan.

3.2 Research Design

The study used an exploratory descriptive survey design. A survey design enabled the researcher obtain information from responses for the selected sample. A survey of the district education officer, and Head teachers of primary schools through the administration of questionnaires, was conducted to generate data.

According to Orodho (2008), descriptive survey designs are used in preliminary and exploratory studies to facilitate the collection of information, summarise, present and interpret for clarification. Borg and Gall (1989), opines that descriptive survey research is focused on production of statistical information about aspects of education of interest to educators and policy makers. In this case, descriptive survey design is the best for the study as it allowed the researcher to study the prevailing situation. Over all it was descriptive as it used descriptive statistics. Once the data was collected it was coded, tabulated and analyzed using thematic analysis techniques.

3.2.1 Locale

The study was conducted in Meru Central District and specifically Abothuguchi West Division. The division borders Abothuguchi East division and Uruku division of Imenti South District of Meru County. The division lies on an agriculturally rich area of the district endowed with small scale horticulture industry and cash crops such as tea and coffee. The
choice of the location for research is informed by the fact that it has a long history of community initiatives in establishing schools. Further, familiarity and rapport with the community made it easier for the researcher to receive cooperation.

3.3 Target Population

The target population of the study was the District Education Officer (DEO) and Head teachers of public primary schools in Abothuguchi West Division of Meru Central, Kenya. The study targeted all the seventeen 14 public primary schools in the division. The target sample had the capacity to read and interpret the survey instruments and have handled the management of financial and school infrastructure development projects.

Table 3.1 Target Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Education Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Quality Assurance Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.1 Sample and Sampling Procedure

A sample is a portion of the target group or groups. According to Orodho (2000), a sample is a small part of large population, which is thought to be representative of the larger population.

Gay (1992) opines that a minimum sample of 20% of the target population can be adequate for research in social sciences. The sample was selected using simple random and non probability (purposive) sampling techniques. Where there was one respondent as in the case
of the District Education Officer purposeful sampling technique was applied. However, where there was more than one respondent as in the case of Head teachers, simple random sampling method was be used. The sample was therefore 14 public primary schools in the division and 1 district education officer, in the district. The sample size was between 50% and 100% well above Gay’s recommendation.

### Table 3.2. Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Education Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Teachers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>182</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.4 Research Instruments

The study used a set of completion questionnaires by the target sample. It was easier to administer as observed by (Kiess and Bloomquist, 1985). The use of questionnaires was easy to administer to many people in the sample simultaneously.

Questionnaires provided the respondents the latitude to give their views freely since they were anonymous as the respondents did not append their names or signatures to them. In this way the respondents were expected to give truthful responses. The initial step requested for authority to collect data, and the letter to the target respondents, pre-testing and the administration of the instruments.

The research instruments which were a set of questionnaires comprised of closed and open ended items made up of six sections. The instruments Section A was designed to capture information on personal and contextual information of the respondents. Section B captured data on the forms of decentralisation in use. Section C collected data on the benefits of
decentralisation. Section D focused on the roles and effectiveness of management bodies. Section E captured data on challenges of decentralized management while Section F captured suggestions for improvements from the respondents. The questionnaires included one for the District Education Officer of the target district, one for the Head teachers. This target group was able to read and interpret the instruments and record their responses.

3.4.1 Piloting

The questionnaires were pre-tested on a small selected sample of three Head teachers from the target division and the District Education Officer from the neighbouring District that is Meru south. The pilot district is in the same economic and social environment. The procedures applied were the same that were in the actual data collection. The instruments were given to identical subjects and the completed questionnaire was manually scored. Piloting was for the purpose of assessing how clear the questionnaire items were so that those found to be unclear could be made clearer and those found unsuitable discarded altogether.

3.4.2 Validity of Instruments

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), Validity means the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences which are based on research results. Further, according to Orodho (2008), validity is the degree to which results obtained from data analysis actually represent the phenomenon under investigation. Validity can only be obtained when there is no error. In order to improve the reliability of instruments help was sought from the supervisors since they are experts in research. According to Borg and Gall (1989), validity can be enhanced through expert judgment. In this case, the researcher sought expert judgment from research experts and supervisors in order to enhance clarity and therefore do away with vague or low quality items.
3.4.3 Reliability of Instruments

Reliability according to Mugenda (1999) is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results after repeated trials. A test or scale is reliable when it consistently yields the same results when repeated measurements are taken of the same subjects under the same conditions, (Nsubuga, 2000). The researcher used the Test - pre-test technique to assess the reliability of the instrument. This implies that the instruments were administered to the same selected group twice. Using spearman’s rank order correlation, a correlation coefficient established whether the questionnaires are reliable if the same responses are obtained. A correlation coefficient of 0.75 was deemed to be adequate to establish the reliability of the questionnaires. Thus research instruments without or with minimum errors was reliable.

3.5 Data Collection Techniques

A letter for authority to conduct research was sought from the National Council for Science and Technology (NCST). The district education officer was contacted before data collection. A letter was also sent to the sampled population before data capture instruments were sent. The researcher supervised data collection. It was collected with the assistance of colleagues in the field management such as education officers and quality assurance officers. Data capture instruments were sent in person to the contact point, the DEO and his/her officers to assist in the distribution of the questioners. The same procedure was used to collect back the completed instruments.

3.6 Data Analysis

Data once collected was cleaned, edited, coded, tabulated entered in the computer and analysed using a thematic technique focusing on form of decentralisation, effectiveness of management bodies, challenges and suggestions for improvement. Thematic procedure
required the categorization of related themes. This procedure involves identifying those areas that are relevant to the research objectives and questions thereby classifying the themes covered and coding the data obtained. The data captured was both qualitative and quantitative. The data analyses process used both quantitative and qualitative statistics such as percentages. Descriptive statistics enabled the researcher to summarize and organize data in a meaningful way for interpretation and presentation. The information was expressed in words and was presented using percentages, tables and graphs. Data was analyzed using the statistical programme for social Sciences (SPSS) software.

Descriptive statistics was used to analyze the data in order to facilitate generalization. Frequency distribution was used to show the number of respondents making similar responses. Descriptive statistics also enabled the researcher to summarize and organize data to make some meaning. Descriptive statistics involved tabulation, graphing and describing data in an organized and simplified way.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents data analysis and discussion of the study findings. The general objective of the study was to investigate the factors that affect effective decentralisation of education service delivery in Meru Central district. The findings of the research are presented based on the five research objectives:

i. To find out the perceptions of decentralization of education services in Meru Central District by the district education office and the head teachers.

ii. To find out forms of decentralization of education services in Meru Central district by the district education office and the head teachers.

iii. To analyse the benefits of decentralisation of education management and development in Meru Central district.

iv. To assess the roles of management bodies in implementing decentralised functions in Meru Central district.

v. To explore the challenges of decentralisation of education services in Meru Central district.

The background data of the respondents is given first, followed by the analysis and discussion of each of the four research objectives.

4.2 Background Information

The study participants comprised of 14 head teachers from public primary schools and the District Education Officer in charge of Meru Central district, making a total of 15 respondents. Out of the 14 head teachers who took part in the study 11 (78.6%) were males while 3 (21.4%) were females, showing that there were more schools headed by males than
females in Meru Central District. Table 4.1 shows the working experience of the head teachers.

**Table 4.1: Working experience of head teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience in years</th>
<th>No. of head teachers</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 shows that of the 14 head teachers, 12 (85.7%) had 5-10 years of experience in the school management while 2 (14.3%) had over 10 years of experience. This implies that the head teachers had adequate experience in leadership, meaning they were conversant with the issues and challenges related to education decentralisation in relation to infrastructure development and rehabilitation and instructional materials in primary schools. Previous research Waithaka (2010) has demonstrated that work experience is related to school leadership effectiveness as well as readiness to change.

Table 4.2 shows head teachers’ academic qualifications.

**Table 4.2: Academic qualifications of head teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>No. of head teachers</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Teacher Status (ATS)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 1 (P1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary Level (O Level)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.1 illustrates that head teachers in Meru Central district had not advanced much in their academic qualifications. This is shown by only 3 (21.4%) head teachers indicating that they had Bachelor in Education while the rest indicated they were Diploma holders, P1, ‘O’ level and ATS qualifiers. The findings in the table imply that although most of the head teachers had the requisite pre-service education for primary school management, they had not advanced much in education. Previous research by Njoka (2009), showed that the level of education achieved by education administrators and in-service training influences their performance on various leadership tasks, such as implementation of education decentralisation policies.

4.3 Perceptions of Decentralisation of Education Services

The first objective of the study sought to establish the perceptions of decentralisation of education services in Meru Central district. To address this objective, the head teachers were given a list of items regarding their perceptions on a 4-point Likert scale to measure their levels of agreement or disagreement on the extent to which decentralisation of education meets various targets. They were required to state their agreement levels ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Their responses are as shown in Table 4.3.
Table 4.3: Head teachers’ perceptions on decentralisation of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th></th>
<th>D</th>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated economic development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased management efficiency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redistribution of financial responsibility</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased democratisation through the distribution of power</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater local control through deregulation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market-based education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutralization of competing centers of power</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved quality of education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: **SA**-Strongly Agree;   **A**-Agree;   **D**-Disagree;   **SD**-Strongly Disagree

Table 4.3 shows that over 50% of the head teachers strongly agreed with the statements that decentralisation of education: accelerated economic development, increased management efficiency, redistribution of financial responsibility, greater local control through deregulation and also improved quality of education. This shows that decentralisation of education had a positive impact on service delivery. However, 42.9% of the head teachers disagreed that decentralisation of education brings about market-based education. This could be explained by the fact that curriculum development is still centralised and the bulk of schools are public. According to Ikoya (2008), in a study on infrastructure in Nigeria concluded that the level of maintenance of school facilities is higher in decentralised than in centralised schools. The Study concluded that decentralisation enhances the effective management of school facilities. Studies have also shown that construction costs are lower in decentralised management as contracting is localized.
4.4 Forms of Decentralisation of Education Services

The second objective of the study sought to find out the forms of decentralisation of education services in Meru Central district by the district education office and the head teachers. To address this objective, first it was important to establish whether head teachers were aware of the major policies that govern education in Kenya.

As it turned out, 13 (92.9%) of the head teachers were aware of the policies that govern education while 1 (7.1%) was not aware of the education policies. The head teachers indicated that the policies governing education in the country included the Constitution, Sessional Paper No.1 of 2005, the Education Act cap 211, of 1968, the TSC Act Cap 212, Children’s Act and Ministry of Education circulars. The DEO, Meru Central also confirmed that the major policies governing education in Kenya included the Constitution, Sessional paper No1 of 2005, Education Act cap 211 of 1968, TSC Act Cap 212 and Children’s Act. This implies that schools heads and the DEO were aware of the policy documents governing education in the country.

The head teachers were asked to indicate services that could be better offered by the ministry of education headquarter to support schools. Table 4.4 shows their responses.

Table 4.4: Services that can be offered by Ministry of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and guidelines</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of committees and BOG’s</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing grants</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in the Table 4.4, similar proportions of the respondents indicated that policy and guidelines, training of committee and BOG’s, providing grants and monitoring of the school progress could be responsibilities of the MOE. To verify this, the DEO indicated that policy, guidelines, standards and grants to schools could be better offered by the Ministry of Education headquarters. This implies that reform should be made between the role played by the BOG and the Ministry of Education. That is, the MOE should ensure that official policies and guidelines are adhered to; ensure there is strategic management of the institutions and also ensure general oversight on delivery of education programmes. This is necessary so that decentralisation process does not affect the quality of education in the country. This was the case with countries like Colombia, Mexico, Nigeria and Zimbabwe, all which saw policy swings back to centralisation after it became clear that there was inefficiency in handling teacher management at the levels to which it had been devolved (Gaynor, 1998).

The study sought to find out the training courses undertaken by head teachers regarding decentralisation of education. Table 4.5 shows their responses.

**Table 4.5: Courses undertaken**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial management</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement management</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 shows that, similar proportions (64.3%) of the respondents indicated that they had undergone financial and procurement management courses respectively. This implies that most of the school heads had been trained on some managerial skills needed to handle decentralised functions. In a previous study to determine the impact of public procurement
policy on teaching and learning in secondary schools in Thika West District, Kariuki (2011) established similar results, whereby 68.8% of the head teachers had been trained in the financial management while 31.3% had not been trained. For head teachers to effectively participate in decentralisation of education, they need to be equipped with the necessary skills to enable them perform the various tasks decentralised to the school and district level.

The head teachers were further asked whether the training received was adequate for them to effectively handle the decentralised functions, to which they responded as shown in Figure 4.1.

![Figure 4.1: Head teachers’ ratings of adequacy of training](image-url)

Figure 4.1 illustrates that half of the proportion (50.0%) indicated that the training was inadequate while the other 50% reported that it was adequate. The findings imply that although the training that the head teachers had undergone was effective in their work performance, they still needed more training. Researchers such as Winkler and Gershberg (2003) have recommended that for decentralisation to schools to be successful, principals must acquire new skills in leadership and financial management, management of teachers,
and management of school-community relations. This calls for regular in-services courses especially considering that, in Kenya, there is no training in school management prior to appointment of school head teachers. Furthermore, in-service training of principals by institutions like the Kenya Education Staff Institute (KESI) is in form of short courses that have been shown not to meet all the training needs of school managers.

The study participants were also aware of the fact that the government finances primary schools in Kenya. Figure 4.2 illustrates sources of funds in primary schools in Kenya.
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**Figure 4.2: Sources of finances in Kenyan primary schools**

Figure 4.2 illustrates that majority (92.9%) of the respondents indicated that public primary schools obtained funds from Central and local governments. These findings were in line with the Education Act policies which entrusts local government authorities with the running of education especially primary school education at the Municipalities, hence the creation of Municipal Education Offices (MEOs) in their jurisdictions. It has been established through
research that finances from these ‘traditional’ sources of funds are inadequate to run the school programmes effectively (Kariuki, 2010). Consequently, researchers and organisations such as UNESCO (2004), have advised schools to initiate income generation activities to supplement what is obtained from the government and parents. According to UNESCO (2004), sources of school funds can be classified into the following major categories: parents, government, local authorities, school activities, school facilities, community groups, charitable foundations, fund raising, business community and community groups.

The study further sought to find out how schools receive funds from the ministry. To establish this, head teachers were asked to indicate how they received funds allocated to their schools. Table 4.6 shows their responses.

Table 4.6: Methods used to disburse funds in schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods of funds transfer</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through electronic bank transfer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through cash and cheques</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 shows that out 14 schools, 12 (85.7%) heads reported that they received funds through electronic bank transfer while only 2 (14.3%) reported through cash and cheques. This implies that in most schools funds were disbursed through bank transactions which are more reliable compared to other methods such as cash and through cheques. For effective education decentralisation, it is important to guard against misappropriation of resources. In Kenya, corruption in government contracts have been regularly reported regularly; and recently this has threatened success of free primary and secondary education due to
misappropriation of FPE and FSE funds (Githongo, 2008). Disbursement of funds through banks is therefore important to promote transparency in funds management and accounting.

In relation to the management, the schools heads were asked to indicate persons or organs responsible of funds at schools. In response, 85.7% reported that school funds were managed by school management committee while 14.3% of them reported that they were managed by the head teachers. Table 4.7 shows types of school committees.

Table 4.7: School committees responsible for management of funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School committees</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional materials selection committee</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Management Committee</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender committee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 illustrates that all the schools heads reported that their schools had Instructional Materials Selection Committees, 64.3% indicated they had Infrastructure Management Committee while 50.0% indicated tender committee. This implies that almost all schools in the Meru Central district had instructional materials selection committee which is responsible for the procurement and maintenance of instructional materials in schools. Such committees are necessary to ensure decentralised education management functions are executed effectively. Table 4.8 shows members of infrastructure management committee.
### Table 4.8: Members of infrastructure management committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair person of SMC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two representatives of parents (of equal gender)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representatives of sponsor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teacher</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two class teachers representing lower and upper primary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representatives of DEO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.8, most of the head teachers indicated that members of infrastructure management committee included: Chair person of SMC (92.9%), head teacher (85.7%), 2 representatives of parents (85.7%) and representative of sponsor (78.6%). Other members were Deputy Head teachers among others. This implies that the chair person of SMC was in the top management level in infrastructure management committee. Instituting committees comprised of members from different stakeholder groups – school administration, teachers, parents and sponsor – is aimed at ensuring transparency. In the past, it has been pointed out that despite the government’s efforts to institutionalize and rationalize public procurement, leading to pressure on public institutions to strengthen of procurement laws to counter allegations of tenders being awarded on a ‘who-knows-who’ basis rather than competence (Kariuki, 2011).

Table 4.9 shows the members of school instructional material committee.
Table 4.9: Members of the school instructional material committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of the school instructional material committee</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teacher</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A teacher representative of each standard</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two elected representatives of parents one each</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representing gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chair person of SMC</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 senior teacher</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A special needs teacher</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 shows that all head teachers indicated that the members of school instructional material committees included: Head teacher, deputy head teacher, a teacher representative of each standard, two elected representatives of parents one each representing gender and the chair person of SMC. Other members were 1 senior teacher (78.6%) and a special needs teacher (64.3%). School management committees should be composed of members from different stakeholder groups to ensure transparency. Walker (2000), in a research on school management teams in New Jersey, reported that the constituent groups that must be represented on the school management teams are the principals, teachers, school-level support staff, parents and community. The inclusion of students is an optional requirement that is left to the discretion of the individual school.
Figure 4.3 shows head teachers’ responses on how materials were bought.
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Figure 4.3: Methods used to purchase instructional and constructional materials

As shown in Figure 4.3, majority (78.6%) of the respondents indicated that instructional and constructional materials were bought through tender. In addition, head teachers were also asked to indicate who decides that a school requires rehabilitation. To answer this question, all the head teachers reported that the school management committee had the power to decide and set time for renovation of the school buildings and the school facilities. They also added that school management committee members were elected by parents after every one year and recommended by the same parents (57.1%) and the District Education Officer (42.9%). This is an indication that there was decentralisation of functions in schools in Meru Central District. It is also notable that schools used different approaches in purchase of instructional materials, meaning there is need for officers at the district education offices to ensure guidelines are followed during procurement.

These findings are in line with The Education Act Cap 212, Laws of Kenya which established governance structures such as the Provincial Education Boards (PEBs), the District Education
Boards (DEBs), and Boards of Governors (BoGs) for Secondary Schools and Tertiary Institutions and School Management Committees (SMCs) for primary schools. These bodies are entrusted with certain functions which they perform at their level. The Education Act also entrusts local government authorities with the running of education especially primary school education at the Municipalities, hence the creation of Municipal Education Offices (MEOs) in their jurisdictions.

4.5 Benefits of Decentralisation of Education Management and Development in Meru Central district

The third objective of the study was to analyze benefits of decentralisation of education management and development in Meru Central district. Decentralisation is the transfer of authority and responsibility for public functions from the central government to subordinate quasi-independent government organizations and/or private sector. The importance of decentralisation is to enhance transparency, accountability and flexibility hence increasing efficiency and effectiveness. It also provides for speedy decision making, strengthens democracy, ownership and therefore reduces transactional costs and administrative burden. To address this objective, head teachers were presented with the question asking whether the management of funds at school make it easier to run the school. In response, majority (92.9%) of them agreed that management of funds at the school simplify running and development of schools. The majority who agreed further supported their answer with the following reasons: proper management of funds ensures immediate solutions of the raised problems since decision were made easily (50.0%); priorities were easily identified (28.6%) and there is transparency and easy accountability of funds (14.3%). This implies that management of funds had positive impact on school development plans.
In the past, Kenya was using the Schools Equipment Production Unit (SEPU), a parastatal under the Ministry of Education to supply books and equipment to schools. In such a centralised system where school supplies are purchased centrally through the ministry, delays and corruption can arise (Heyneman, 2004). One of the benefits of decentralisation of such functions is avoiding delays and corruption. In 2009, it was reported in the mass media of a scandal whereby SEPU illegally paid out Ksh 75 million for science equipment that was never delivered (East African Standard, 12th October 2009, p. 1&4). Therefore, it was expected that through decentralisation, schools would be in a position to procure resources more efficiently. As such, the study sought to find out where instructional materials and school construction materials were purchased. As it turned out, all (100.0%) head teachers indicated that they purchased materials from shopkeepers in local towns. The head teachers reported that purchasing goods and services from local businesses had various advantages, as shown in Table 4.10.

Table: 4.10 Benefits of purchasing from local businesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits of purchasing locally</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local businesses are easily accessible</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It lowers cost of procurement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates employment to local community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures local growth and development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures quick supply of materials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.10, the head teachers indicated that local business community were easily accessible (78.6%), they could procure resources at low cost (50.0%), it creates employment to the surrounding community members (28.6%), it ensures growth and
development of the area (28.6%) and it ensures quick supply and delivery of materials (14.3%).

To confirm head teachers responses on benefits of decentralisation in education, the DEO of Meru Central district was requested to indicate importance of decentralisation in education sector. The following were his views: decentralisation enhances local responsibility, involvement and ownership. The lower level structures feel part of the action and hence guards and contribute to the envisaged goals morally and materially; the central authority is left with the responsibilities of policy formulation, providing direction, monitoring and evaluation; capacity is build at the local levels; by bringing services closer to the people administrative and transactional cost are reduced. This is because service seekers do not have to travel to the centers for services and bureaucracy is reduced. Previous studies have shown that decentralisation of education has a number of benefits. For instance, Winkler and Gershberg (2003), in a review of research on decentralisation of education in Latin America and Eastern Europe, established that the decentralisation of teacher management is critical to creating accountability and realizing the potential benefits of decentralisation; efficiency and effectiveness are most likely to improve under decentralisation when service providers – schools, local governments, or regional governments – are held accountable for results; decentralisation of real decision making power to schools or school councils can significantly increase parental participation in the school, and high levels of parental and community participation are associated with improved school performance.

4.6 Roles of Management Bodies in Implementing Decentralised Functions in Meru Central district

The fourth objective of the study was to assess the roles of management bodies in implementing decentralised functions in Meru Central district. To answer this research
objective, head teachers were presented with questions based on the roles and effectiveness of management bodies. Figure 4.4 shows head teachers’ responses on education body that is responsible for school development plans.
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**Figure 4.4: Education body responsible for school development plans**

Figure 4.4 illustrates that majority (78.6%) of the head teachers reported that school management committee was responsible for school development plans. This implies that the major duty of school management committee was development of plans. According to Education Act, School Management Committees receive and account for all resources, develop and implement school plans, mobilize additional resources and implement government policies and guidelines.

Table 4.11 shows head teachers’ views on other services that need to be carried out by school management committees.
Table 4.11: Services carried out by school management committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services carried out</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure development</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School development plans</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of goods and services</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission of students/pupils</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.11, all the head teachers (100.0%) indicated that infrastructure development would be better carried out by the school management committee. They also cited out that schools management committee should be responsible of school development plans (92.9%) and procurement of goods and services (64.3%). Another significant proportion (50.0%) of the head teachers also suggested that admission of the students/pupils should be done by school management committee. According to USAID (2008), many countries launch into education decentralisation and the delegation of duties and powers without a proper understanding of the readiness of sub-national units to assume their newfound responsibilities; and, more importantly, without any basis for planning the capacity-building activities needed to absorb their new duties and powers. School management committees are key sub-national units in management of decentralised functions. Table 4.12 shows roles of school management committee.
Table 4.12: Functions of school management committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing and implementing school plans</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilizing additional resources</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving and accounting for all resources</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing government education policies and guidelines</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12 illustrates that over 90.0% of the head teachers indicated that the major functions of the school management committee were developing and implementing school plans (92.9%) and mobilizing additional resources (92.9%). They further added that they receive and account for all school resources (64.3%). This is an indication that the major role of the school management committee was to set projects, develop them and then put them into operation. In a previous study, Namunyu (2010), sought to determine the role of school management committees in school improvement in Busia District. His study revealed that the role of SMC was mainly planning and procurement, supervision of construction projects in schools, mobilization of parents and the community and sourcing for funds.

Effectiveness focuses on the set goals and production of the desired results. Table 4.13 shows how SMC are effective in their work.
Table 4.13: Head teachers rating on SMC effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMC activities</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Fairly effective</th>
<th>Not effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School instructional materials selection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of goods and services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.13, over 50% of the respondents indicated that school management committee was fairly effective in managing: financial (85.7%), school instructional materials selection (78.6%) and infrastructure development (64.3%). This implies that SMC members need to improve their work performance in order to meet their set goals on school development and management. A previous study by Nyaegah (2011), in Nyamira County revealed that the effectiveness of school management committees and head teachers in management of FPE was hindered by inadequate training, inadequacy of finances, lack of adequate teachers, and insufficient learning facilities.

Table 4.14 shows that knowledge SMC requires to make their work effective.

Table 4.14: Skills SMC requires to run school effectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills required</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of financial management</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of procurement procedures</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of education policies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As it can be seen in the table, all head teachers suggested that school management committee should be trained on financial management, procurement procedures and education policies. This would give them more skills on management which would positively improve the school in terms of teaching and learning facilities, buildings and also the environment. Previous research by Kiprono (2011), revealed that most SMCs had been given the mandate to implement FPE in Kenya prior to preparing them for this added responsibility. The study by Kiprono showed that most SMCs had received little training on financial management. This had resulted to misappropriation of funds meant for FPE in Kenyan primary schools. Kiprono (2011) therefore emphasized the need for SMCs to undergo training on school financial management as part of ensuring the success of FPE in Kenya and also to achieve Millennium Development Goals by 2015.

Table 4.15 shows the roles of instructional management committee members.

Table 4.15: Roles of instructional management committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting instructional materials for use in the school</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting the booksellers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that instructional materials procurement guidelines are followed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing minutes of meetings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.15, all the schools heads were in agreement that the major roles of the instructional management committee were: selecting instructional materials for use in the school and selecting the booksellers. However, 28.6% of the respondents disagreed that signing minutes of meetings was the role of instructional management committee.
Table 4.16 shows the roles of the infrastructure management committee.

### Table 4.16: Functions of infrastructure management committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the infrastructure project</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of school development plan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring curriculum delivery</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it turned out in Table 4.16, the main role of the infrastructure management committee was implementation of the infrastructure project. This was shown by 92.9% of the head teachers who took part in the study. Other functions that were cited by small number of respondents were preparation of school development plan (42.9%) and monitoring curriculum delivery (28.6%).

Table 4.17 shows roles of parents in the school

### Table 4.17 Roles of parents towards children education and school development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent roles in schools</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elect school management committee</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to school facilities development</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide on the priorities of the school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay fees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.17 illustrate that the major roles parents play in the school are selection of school management committee (100.0%) and contribution to school facilities development (71.4%).
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The result findings show that since the introduction of Free Primary Education few parents contribute to paying of school fees and also participate in making decision on the priorities of the school.

To determine the reporting mechanism between school, Province, District and the Ministry of Education, the schools heads were requested to indicate the flow of communication among those bodies. Following their responses, majority reported that the school reports to the District, District reports to the Province and the Province reports to the Ministry of Education.

Figure 4.5 illustrates responsibilities of parent’s teachers Associations in schools.
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**Figure 4.5: PTA responsibilities**

According to 64.3% of the head teachers who participated in the study, the major responsibility of PTA members was monitoring implementation. Mobilizing additional resources (28.6%) and quality assurance (7.1%) were also highlighted by few head teachers as other duties that were performed by the PTA members. This implies that in most schools
PTA members actively participated in the supervision and completion of the set projects. The result findings were in agreement with the Education Act Cap 211 (1968), laws of Kenya which stated that Parents-Teachers Association (PTA) monitors the implementation of school programmes, education services and mobilizing additional resources for school development.

Head teachers were also asked to give their opinion between decisions over budget allocation being made at school or by the ministry of education and the DEO. Table 4.18 shows their responses.

**Table 4.18: Head teachers’ responses on budget allocation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision over budget allocation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision over budget allocation are made at the school</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision over budget allocation made by the ministry of educational headquarters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.18 shows that 78.6% of the school heads indicated that decisions over budget allocation should be made at the school while 42.9% of them reported that budget allocation should be made by the ministry of educational headquarters and the District Education Office. The respondents who suggested at the school further gave the following reasons to support their answer: The school management committee is at better position to identify the school requirements, to ensure easier follow up of the funds, to allow school state their priorities and also to ensure transparency of the funds. However, those who suggested Ministry of education headquarters and the DEO Office reported that this would create awareness of the Ministry of Education requirement to the stakeholders.
The results presented in this section have shown that school-level management play a key role in the management of the decentralised education functions.

This is in line with previous research findings, which show that school management teams play a significant role in the success or failure of education decentralisation. For instance, Walker (2000) analyses the case of decentralisation in New Jersey, where the primary responsibility of the school management teams is to develop a plan that will guide the school’s implementation of its whole school reform model. Walker (2000), established that the school management teams exhibited ambivalence in their evaluation of their ability to effectively operate. Teams were unanimous that their membership was committed (86%) and that individual interests did not supersede the goals and mission of their work (88%). Teams reported that conflict among members did not pose a barrier to their ability to operate effectively (91%). On the other hand, about one-third of the teams (31%) indicated that they were unclear as to their roles and responsibilities. About the same percentage (33%) also reported difficulties in communicating with their larger school communities. Securing adequate involvement from all potential constituent groups was raised as another problem area affecting team operations (Walker, 2000).

4.7 Challenges of decentralisation of education services Meru Central district

The fifth objective of the study sought to explore the challenges of decentralisation of education services in Meru Central district. In order to address this objective, head teachers were first asked to indicate whether finances received from the government meet the instructional materials and infrastructure needs. In response, all the head teachers (100.0%) reported that they were inadequate and hence they were not able to achieve their set goals. They also added that funds were not disbursed in schools on time and this could also contribute to late completion of the school projects.
Similar findings were reported by Nyaegah (2011), in Nyamira, in addition to other challenges such as some schools failing to get money for no good reason, some of the funds being diverted to other institutions apart from primary schools, lack of transparency in the management of the funds, lack of accountability on the use of the funds and delays in the disbursement of funds.

Table 4.19 shows SMC constraints that affect school management.

**Table 4.19: School Management Committee constraints**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints of SMC members</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and experience</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of membership</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of interest</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.19 illustrates that the major constraints that affect school management were: SMC education and experience (92.9%), period of membership (92.9%) and conflict of interest (71.4%). This shows that education level and working experience should be put into consideration when selecting the school management committee. The results are consistent with findings by Kiprono (2011) whose study in Eldoret revealed that some of the challenges faced by SMCs in management of schools emanated from lack of requisite training in school management issues. The DEO also confirmed that the education, experience and conflict of interest were major challenges that hinder SMC in their work. On the other hand, the DEO reported that period of membership had no effects on SMCs effectiveness.

Table 4.20 shows head teachers responses on items based on challenges of decentralised management.
Table 4.20: Head teachers’ responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you receive support from District Public Works officer?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do contractors/tenderers deliver in time?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the procurement committees have capacity to undertake their responsibilities?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you receive support from District Public Works officer?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do contractors/tenderers deliver in time?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the procurement committees have capacity to undertake their responsibilities?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.20, another notable challenge that was highlighted by a big number of respondents was lack of enough support from the district public works officers (64.3%). However, 57.1% and 64.3% of the head teachers indicate that materials were delivered by the contractors in time and procurement committees have capacity to undertake their responsibilities respectively. Similar results were reported by Walker (2000), whose research in New Jersey revealed that school management teams faced the challenge of securing adequate involvement from all potential constituent groups. Walker’s study reported that the guidelines in the regulations which preclude in-district employees from serving in the capacity of parent or community representative had hampered their ability to recruit membership from these groups.

The result findings presented above contradict with the DEO responses where he indicated that schools received support from the District Public works officer and materials were not delivered in time from the contractors. This was an indication that the District public works did not fully support the school projects and construction and instructional materials were not delivered in time.
The head teachers and the DEO were asked to list the challenges that were encountered by the school in financial management, procurement of goods and services, budgeting and problem of education Act cap. In response, the head teachers gave their responses as: inadequate and untimely funds (64.3%), lack of expertise (42.9%), conflict of interest by school management committee (14.3%), and poor delivery of materials (21.4%). On the other hand, the DEO indicated that the challenges experienced included poor budgeting, poor documentation of financial management, problems in prioritizing the projects, poor deployment of Education Act, and lack of in–service training on financial management and procurement procedures, and lack of understanding of Education Act Cap contents.

To solve the above stated challenges, the schools heads were asked to suggest what the Ministry Headquarters, Provincial Education office, District Education office, School Management Committee, parents and sponsors could put into considerations in order to improve school management. The following were their opinions: The Ministry headquarters should increase funds to schools and disburse them in time (42.9%), put more emphasis on training of SMC (28.6%), sensitizing the school stake holders and the community on the education Act policies (21.4%), and appoint adequate personnel (7.1%). One head teacher also noted that the Provincial Education office should ensure there are good communication channels and should also visit schools frequently in order to monitor the school development programmes.

The head teachers recommended that the District education office should increase the number of staff in order to improve the office services (35.7%), inspect schools regularly (14.3%) and ensure teachers are conversant with the changing curriculum (14.3%). They also recommended that the school management committee should attend seminars and workshops in other institutions which would help them acquire skills hence improving their management
and also organize for regular meetings with all school stakeholders (7.1%). Parents should feel that it is their duty to attend school PTA meetings in order to give out their opinions on the school development progress and also suggest on ways they can be improved better, give the school the necessary financial support without relying on Free Primary Education (7.1%). This would help them meet their set goals. Sponsors should only concentrate on donation of materials and financial support and stop interfering with the school management. Effective management of decentralised education functions requires adequate participation of stakeholders at the local level. Lawler (1986) argues that legitimate participation has four requirements: knowledge and skills, power, information and rewards. This framework has been used by Wohlstetter and Mohrman (1996), to explain variations in implementation and effects among school management teams operating in different contexts. The research by Walker (2000), revealed that training is a critical component in the development of the knowledge and capacity of teams to function effectively in making quality decisions. The school management teams in Walker’s study had adequate training related to curriculum, test score analysis and professional development, than they were in the training provided around technology, school- based budgeting, hiring decisions and developing school-based reward systems.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of the study findings, discussion, conclusions and recommendations arrived at. The chapter also contains suggestions of related studies that may be carried out in the future.

5.2 Summary of the Study Findings

The purpose of the study was to investigate factors that affect effective decentralisation of education service delivery in Meru Central district. Data was collected from 14 head teachers in public primary schools and District Education Officer in Meru Central district. Given below is the summary of the study findings

5.2.1: Perceptions of decentralisation of education services

The study established that over 50% of the head teachers strongly agreed with the statements that decentralisation of education: accelerated economic development, increased management efficiency, redistribution of financial responsibility, greater local control through deregulation and also improved quality of education. This is a strong indicator that decentralisation of education had a positive impact on service delivery.

5.2.2: Forms of education decentralisation practiced in Meru Central district

Regarding the forms of education decentralisation, the study findings revealed that majority (92.9%) of the head teachers were aware of the policies that govern education. The head teachers indicated that the policies governing education in the country included the Constitution, Sessional Paper No.1 of 2005, the Education Act cap 211, of 1968, the TSC Act
Cap 212, Children’s Act and Ministry of Education circulars. The DEO, Meru Central also confirmed that the major policies governing education in Kenya included the constitution, Sessional paper No1 of 2005, Education Act cap 211 of 1968, TSC Act Cap 212 and Children’s Act. This implies that schools heads and the DEO were aware of the policy documents governing education in the country. Similar proportions of the respondents indicated that policy and guidelines, training of committee and BOG’s, providing grants and monitoring of the school progress could be responsibilities of the MOE. To verify this, the DEO indicated that policy, guidelines standards and grants to school could be better offered by the Ministry of Education headquarters. The study established that that the school heads had been trained on some managerial skills needed to manage decentralisation, but the training was inadequate.

5.2.3: Benefits of decentralisation of education management and development in Meru Central district

All (100.0%) head teachers indicated that they purchased materials from traders in Local towns. They indicated that this was due to the following factors: easy accessibility, cost, to create employment to the surrounding community members, to ensure growth and development of the area and also to ensure quick supply and delivery of materials. The DEO indicated that decentralisation enhances local responsibility, involvement and ownership. The lower level structures feels part of the action and hence guards and contributes to the envisaged goals morally and materially. The central authority is left with the responsibilities of policy formulation, providing direction, monitoring and evaluation, Capacity is built at the local levels, by bringing services closer to the people administrative and transactional cost are reduced. This is because service seekers do not have to travel to the centers for services and bureaucracy is reduced.
5.2.4: Roles of management bodies in implementing decentralised functions in Meru Central district

Majority (78.6%) of the head teachers reported that school management committee was responsible for school development plans. Another two proportions of 7.1% and 14.3% indicated that Ministry of Education and District education office are responsible of school development plans respectively. This implies that the major duty of school management committee was development of plans. All the head teachers (100.0%) indicated that infrastructure development would be better carried out by the school management committee. They also cited out that schools management committees should be responsible of school development plans (92.9%) and procurement of goods and services (64.3%). Another significant proportion (50.0%) of the head teachers also suggested that admission of the students/pupils should be done by school management committee.

All the schools heads were in agreement that the major roles of the instructional materials management committee were: selecting instructional materials for use in the school and selecting the booksellers. However, 28.6% of the respondents disagreed that signing minutes of meetings was the role of instructional management committee. The main role of the infrastructure management committee was implementation of the infrastructure project. This was shown by 92.9% of the head teachers who took part in the study. Other functions that were cited by small number of respondents were preparation of school development plan (42.9%) and monitoring curriculum delivery (28.6%). The DEO of Meru Central district also confirmed the role of District infrastructure committee where he/she reported that the major role of the committee was planning, monitoring and supervision of school infrastructure. The major roles parents play in the school are selection of school management committee (100.0%) and contribution to school facilities development (71.4%). The result findings show
that since the introduction of Free Primary Education few parents contribute to paying of school fees and also participate in making decision on the priorities of the school.

The DEO reported that period of membership had no effects on SMC. Another notable challenge that was highlighted by a big number of respondents was lack of enough support from the district public works officers (64.3%). However, 57.1% and 64.3% of the head teachers indicate that materials were delivered by the contractors in time and procurement committees have capacity to undertake their responsibilities respectively.

5.2.5: Challenges that face decentralised education management and service delivery in Meru Central district

The study established that a number of challenges were encountered by the schools in financial management, procurement of goods and services, budgeting and problem of education Act cap 211. These included lack of expertise, untimely funds, conflict of interest by school management committee, poor delivery of materials, poor budgeting, inadequate funds, poor documentary of financial management, problems in prioritizing the projects, poor deployment of Education Act Cap 211, lack of in–service training on financial management and procurement procedures and lack of understanding of Education Act Cap contents.

5.3 Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study as summarized above, it can be concluded that majority of the head teachers had a positive perception of decentralisation of education services in Meru Central District. Majority of the head teachers were in agreement that decentralisation of education accelerated economic development, increased management efficiency, promoted redistribution of financial responsibility, created greater local control through deregulation and also improved quality of education. It can also be concluded that the main forms of
decentralisation were financial management, procurement, and teacher management issues. Head teachers are of the view that some functions should still be handled at the Ministry of Education Headquarters, including policy formulation and guidelines, training of committees, monitoring, and providing grants.

The study further concludes that head teachers and the DEO were supportive of decentralisation, noting that it has a number of benefits. Such benefits include enabling local businesses to supply to schools leading to local level development; enhancing local responsibility, involvement and ownership; the lower level structures feel part of the action and hence guards and contribute to the envisaged goals morally and materially; the central authority is left with the responsibilities of policy formulation, providing direction, monitoring and evaluation; capacity is build at the local levels; by bringing services closer to the people administrative and transactional cost are reduced.

Management bodies at the school level, such as SMCs performed various roles related to decentralisation. These included financial management, procurement, management of physical resources, infrastructure development, and management of human resources. The SMCs have the functions of developing and implementation of school plans, mobilization of additional resources, and implementation of government education policies and guidelines. Lastly, the study concludes that the major factors that affected effective decentralisation of education in public primary schools were: inadequate funds, lack of enough in-service training on financial and procurement management, lack of expertise and experience by SMC members, lack of adequate support from district public works, lack of reforms leading to poor deployment of education Act and other policy documents.
5.4 **Recommendations**

Based on the findings of the study the following recommendations were made:

i. The Ministry headquarters should increase funds to schools and disburse them in time.

ii. The Ministry should put more emphasis on training and sensitizing the school stakeholders and the community on the education Act policies

iii. The Provincial as well as the District Education offices should visit schools frequently in order to monitor the school development programmes and also ensure there are good communication channels

iv. The District education office should increase the number of staffing in order to improve the office services and also ensure teachers are conversant with the changing curriculum

v. School management committee should organize for regular meetings with all school stakeholders.

vi. Parents should understand that it’s their duties to attend school PTA meetings in order to give out their opinions on the school development progress and also suggest on ways they can be improved better. They should also financially support the school budget without relying on Free Primary Education. This would help them meet their set goals.

5.5 **Areas for further research**

1. This study was carried out in one district only – Meru Central district. Further studies should be carried out in other districts to find out if similar findings would be obtained.
2. A study should be conducted on the effects of centralization of education services on the academic performance of pupils and students in Kenya.
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Appendix I

Letter of introduction to DEO and Head Teachers

Kenyatta University,
School of Education, Department of Education,
Administration, Planning and Curriculum Development,
P.O. Box 43844,
NAIROBI.

Dear Sir/Madam,

REF: RESEARCH IN YOUR AREA OF JURISDICTION

I am a postgraduate student at Kenyatta University. I am carrying out a research study on the factors that affect effective decentralisation of education in Meru Central District. Your District/Division/School has been selected for the purpose of carrying out the study.

The purpose of this letter is to request you to kindly take time and respond to the attached questionnaire as honestly as you can. Please do not indicate your name on the questionnaire. Your response will be treated with confidentiality.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Yours faithfully

KIMATHI M’NKANATA
Appendix II

District Education Officer’s questionnaire

Questionnaire No……………………… Date …………………………….

This questionnaire aims at obtaining information on factors that affect effective decentralisation of Education in Meru central district. The key issues are; how decentralization is perceived, forms, benefits and challenges of decentralisation. Please give your precise and honest answers. The responses will be treated as confidential. Please do not write your name or the name of your school on this questionnaire.

SECTION A: Personal and contextual Information

Tick as appropriate

1. Gender: Male ( ) Female ( )

2. Age; 25-30 ( ) 31-35 ( ) 36-40 ( ) 41-45 ( ) 41-50 ( ) 51 and above

3. Academic Qualifications: Diploma in Education ( ) BED ( ) MED ( ) Other ( ) Specify …………………

4. Number of members of staff in the District; Education officers ( ) QASOS ( ) School auditors ( )

SECTION B: Nature and Perceptions of Decentralisation

Tick as appropriate

1. Are you aware of the major policies that govern education in Kenya? Yes ( ) No ( )
   If yes do they include?
   (a) The Constitution, Sessional Paper No 1,2005, Education Act cap 211, 1968 and TSC Act Cap 212 ( )
2. Who finances primary schools in Kenya?
   (a) Central and local Governments  ( )
   (b) Parents  ( )

3. The functions of District Education Boards (DEBs) include:
   (a) Management of education services in the district. ( )
   (b) Supervision of education programmes. ( )
   (c) Quality assurance services. ( )

4. How do schools receive funds from the Ministry?
   (a) Through electronic bank transfer  ( )
   (b) Through cash and cheques  ( )

5. How many schools in your district have Tender committees?
   …………………………………………….

6. How many schools in your District have the following committee?
   (a) Infrastructure management committee ………………………
   (b) Instructional materials committee ……………………………

7. Who are the members of the District Infrastructure committee?
   (a) Heads of Education, works, Public Health, Environment, Water and Accounts Departments in the District  ( )
   (b) Head teachers  ( )

8. What are some of the functions performed by District Infrastructure committee?
   (a) Planning, Monitoring and Supervision of school infrastructure ( )
9. To what extent do SMC participate in the following activities?

(a) Management of finances; great extent ( ) none ( )

(b) Management of physical resources; great extent ( ) none ( )

(c) Management of human resources; great extent ( ) none ( )

(d) Infrastructure development; great extent ( ) none ( )

(e) Raising school funds; great extent ( ) none ( )

10. What services are provided by the District Education Offices to Schools?

(a) Quality Assurance, Audit, Advisory, Supervision and monitoring services ( )

(b) Registration of schools ( )

11. PTAs are responsible for:

a) Monitoring implementation of school programmes ( )

b) Mobilizing additional resources ( )

12. What services could be better offered by the ministry of education headquarters?

(a) Policy, guidelines standards and grants to schools ( )

(b) Training of committees and BOG’s ( )

13. What is the reporting mechanism between school, province, District and the Ministry?

(a) MOE → Province → District → School: Yes ( ) No ( )

(b) School → District → Province → MOE: Yes ( ) No ( )

14. What are some of the roles of Provincial education office?

(a) Coordinating education programmes in the province ( )

(b) Admitting students ( )
SECTION C: Benefits of Decentralisation

Tick as appropriate where applicable

15. What are the benefits of decentralization in education?

(a) Enhances greater local responsibility and involvement and ownership. The lower level structures feel part of the action and hence guards and contributes to the envisaged goals both morally and materially. ( )

(b) Enhances accountability as the structures such as schools account to the service recipients. ( )

(c) By bringing services closer to the people administrative and transactional costs are reduced. This is because service seekers do not have to travel to the Centre for Services and bureaucracy is reduced. ( )

(d) Risks are spread to various level structures. ( )

(e) The central authority is left with the responsibilities of policy formulation, providing direction and monitoring and evaluation ( )

(f) The lower structures concentrate on day to day routine management and administration. ( )

(g) Capacity is built at the local levels. ( )

SECTION D: Roles and Effectiveness of Management Bodies

16. Have you provided procurement guidelines and handbooks to the schools?

(a) Yes ( ) (b) No ( )

17. Do you think the guidelines and handbooks you have received from the Ministry are clear and adequate to guide implementation? Yes ( ) No ( )
18. Have the infrastructure committees undergone any training?
   (a) Yes ( ) (b) No ( )

19. Is the training provided adequate?
   (a) Adequate ( )
   (b) Inadequate ( )

20. Have the instructional management committees undergone any training?
   (a) Yes (b) No ( )

21. Is the training provided adequate?
   (a) Adequate ( )
   (b) Inadequate ( )

22. Would the following services be better carried out at the ministry headquarters?
   (a) School development plans: Yes ( ) No ( )
   (b) Infrastructure developments; Yes ( ) No ( )
   (c) Admission of students / pupils; Yes ( ) No ( )
   (d) Procurement of goods and services; Yes ( ) No ( )

SECTION E: Challenges of Decentralised Management

23. Does the legal framework (Education Act Cap 211) support education decentralization?
   (a) Yes ( ) (b) No ( )
   If No explain ………………………………………………………………………………………………………..
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

24. Do members of the public complain of poor services?
   (a) Yes ( ) No ( )
   If Yes which are the main areas of complaints……………………………………………………………..
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………..
25. Which challenges face the SMCs in managing schools?

(a) Education and Experience  Yes ( ) No ( )
(b) Period of membership  Yes ( ) No ( )
(d) Conflict of interest  Yes ( ) No ( )

26. Are finances received from the government enough to meet the infrastructure and instructional materials needs of schools?  Yes ( ) No ( )

27. Do you receive support from the District Public Works officer?  Yes ( ) No ( )

28. Do contractors / tenderers deliver in time?  Yes ( ) No ( )

29. Do the procurement committees have capacity to undertake their responsibilities?  Yes ( ) No ( )

30. What are some of the challenges encountered by your office in the following areas?

(a) Financial management

(b) Procurement of goods and services

(c) Budgeting

31. How would you propose they be addressed?

32. Do you find any problem of the education Act Cap 211 as it is today?  If yes list the areas of concern:

(a)
SECTION F: Suggestions to Improve Management

33. Suggest ways and means through which education management can be made more effective by all stakeholders;

(a) Ministry Headquarters

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

(b) Provincial Education Office

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

(c) District Education Office

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

34. What is the role of local councilors in the school?

(a) …………………………………………………………………………………
(b) …………………………………………………………………………………
(c) …………………………………………………………………………………
(d) …………………………………………………………………………………
Appendix III

Head Teacher’s Questionnaire

This questionnaire aims at obtaining information on factors that affect effective decentralisation of Education in Meru central district. The key issues are; how decentralization is perceived, forms, benefits and challenges of decentralisation. Please do not write your name or the name of your school on this questionnaire Please give your precise and honest answers. The responses will be treated as confidential.

SECTION A: Personal and Contextual Information

Tick as appropriate where required

1. Gender  Male   (    )  Female   (   )

2. Age  25-30   (   )  31-35 (   )  36-40 (   )  41-45 (   )  46-50 (   )  51 and above

3. Academic Qualifications  Diploma in Education   (   )  BED (   )  MED (   )
   Other Specify ……………………………………………………………

4. Experience;  Less than 5 years  (   )  5-10 years  (   )  more than 10 years

5. Does the school have the following; Bursar/ Accounts Clerk  (   )  store keeper  (   )  Watchman  (   )

SECTION B: Perceptions on decentralisation of education

The following table has items in perceptions on decentralisation of education. Kindly tick in the space provided according to your agreement level.

**Key:** SA= Strongly Agree,  A=Agree,  D=Disagree,  SD= Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated economic development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased management efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redistribution of financial responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased democratization through the distribution of power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Greater local control through
greater deregulation
Market-based education
Neutralization of competing centers of
time
Improved quality of education

SECTION B: Forms and Perceptions of Decentralisation

1. Are you aware of the major policies that govern education in Kenya? Yes ( ) No ( )

   If yes do they include?

   (a) The Constitution, Sessional paper No 1,2005, Education Act cap 211,1968 and TSC Act Cap 212 ( )

   (b) Children’s ACT ( )

   (c) Ministry circulars ( )

2. Who finances primary schools in Kenya?

   (a) Central and local Governments ( )

   (b) Parents ( )

3. How does the school receive funds from the Ministry?

   (a) Through electronic bank transfer ( )

   (b) Through cash and cheques ( )

4. Who manages the funds at school?

   (a) School Management Committee ( )

   (b) Parents ( )

   (c) Head teacher ( )

5. Would the following services be better carried out by school management?

   (a) School development plans: Yes ( ) No ( )

   (b) Infrastructure developments: Yes ( ) No ( )
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(c) Admission of students / pupils    Yes (  )    No (  )
(d) Procurement of goods and services    Yes (  )    No (  )

6. What is the PTA responsible for in school?
   a) Monitoring implementation of school programmes    (  )
   b) Quality Assurance services    (  )
   c) Mobilizing additional resources    (  )

7. Does your school have a Tender committee?    Yes (  )    No (  )

8. Does your school have the following committees?
   (a) Infrastructure management committee    Yes (  )    No (  )
   (b) Instructional materials selection committee    Yes (  )    No (  )

9. Who are the members of the Infrastructure management committee?
   (a) Deputy Head teacher    (  )
   (b) Head teacher    (  )
   (c) Chair of SMC    (  )
   (d) 2 class teachers representing lower and upper primary    (  )
   (e) 2 representatives of parents (of equal gender)    (  )
   (f) Representative of sponsor    (  )
   (g) Representative of DEO    (  )

15. Their functions include
   (a) Preparation of School Development Plan    (  )
   (b) Implementation of the infrastructure project    (  )
   (c) Monitoring curriculum delivery    (  )

10. Who are the members of the school instructional materials committee?
   (a) Head Teacher    (  )
   (b) Deputy Head Teacher    (  )
11. What are some of the functions performed by instructional materials management committee?

(a) Selecting instructional materials for use in the school ( )

(b) Signing minutes of meetings ( )

(c) Selecting the booksellers ( )

(d) Ensuring that instructional materials procurement guidelines are followed ( )

12. How are Instruction materials and constructional materials bought?

(a) Through tender ( )

(b) Through cash ( )

13. Who decides that a school requires rehabilitation or construction?

(a) Ministry of education ( )

(b) District Education Board ( )

(c) School management committee ( )

14. Are SMC members elected by parents?

Yes ( ) No ( )

15. How often are they elected?

.................................................................

16. Who recommends SMC members for appointment?

(a) DEO ( )

(b) Parents ( )
17. How long do they serve in the Committee?
   (a) 1 year ( )
   (b) more than one year ( )

18. Is their tenure adequate for the members to have any impact in school development?
   Yes ( ) No ( )
   If no what would you propose?
   ........................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................

SECTION C: Benefits of Decentralisation

19. Does the management of funds at school make it easier to run the school?
   Yes ( ) No ( )
   If yes explain .................................................................

20. Are instruction materials and school construction materials purchased from Nairobi or the local towns?
   (a) Nairobi ( ) (b) Local towns ( )

21. Who delivers goods and services faster, merchants from Nairobi or shopkeepers from local towns?
   (a) Merchants from Nairobi or other towns ( )
   (b) Shopkeepers from local towns ( )

23. How does this benefit the school and the community?
   ........................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................
23. Does making decisions at the school level improve the way implementation is done in purchase of materials and actual construction of facilities?
   Yes ( )  No ( )

24. Have you ever been trained in?
   (a) Financial management Yes ( )  No ( )
   (b) Procurement Management Yes ( )  No ( )

25. If yes, do you feel the training has made you a better manager?
   Yes ( )  No ( )

26. Is the training you have undergone?
   (a) Adequate ( )
   (b) Inadequate ( )

27. Do the committees undergo any training on how to manage the implementation of the infrastructure development? Yes ( )  No ( )

28. Have you provided procurement guidelines and handbooks to the instructional materials and infrastructure management committees? Yes ( )  No ( )

29. Do you think the guidelines and handbooks you have received from the Ministry are clear and adequate to guide implementation? Yes ( )  No ( )

30. What functions does the SMC perform?
   (a) Receiving and accounting for all resources ( )
   (b) Developing and implementing school plans ( )
   (c) Mobilising additional resources ( )
   (d) Implementing government education policies and guidelines ( )

31. In your opinion, does the SMC do a very good job in managing schools?
   (a) Yes ( )
   (b) No ( )
(c) No opinion ( )

32. To what extent do SMC participate in the following activities?

(a) Management of finances; great extent ( ) none ( )
(b) Management of physical resources; great extent ( ) none ( )
(c) Management of human resources; great extent ( ) none ( )
(d) Infrastructure development; great extent ( ) none ( )
(e) Raising school funds; great extent ( ) none ( )

SECTION D: Roles and Effectiveness of Management Bodies

33. What services could be better offered by the ministry of education headquarters to support the school?

(a) Policy and guidelines ( )
(b) Training of committees and BOG’s ( )
(c) Providing grants ( )
(d) Monitoring ( )

34. Who plans for school development?

(a) Ministry for education headquarters ( )
(b) District education office ( )
(c) School management committee ( )

35. Do the management of funds at school make it easier to run the school?

Yes ( ) No ( )

36. To what extent do SMC participate in the following activities?

(a) Management of finances; great extent ( ) none ( )
(b) Management of physical resources; great extent ( ) none ( )
(c) Management of human resources; great extent ( ) none ( )
37. How effective are SMC’s in managing:

(a) Infrastructure development: Very effective ( ) fairly effective ( ) not effective ( )

(b) School instructional materials selection: Very effective ( ) Fairly effective ( ) Not effective ( )

38. How effective are SMC’s in managing:

(a) Financial management: Very effective ( ) fairly effective ( ) not effective ( )

(b) Procurement of goods and services: Very effective ( ) fairly effective ( ) Not effective ( )

39. Do you consider the school management committee capable of making financial decisions?

(a) Yes ( )

(b) No ( )

40. What knowledge does the school management committees require to manage schools effectively?

(a) Knowledge of financial management ( )

(b) Knowledge of procurement procedures ( )

(c) Knowledge of education policies ( )

Any other …………………………………………………

41. Does the, SMC do a very good job in managing schools

(a) Yes ( )

(b) No ( )

(c) No opinion ( )
42. What role do parents play in the school?
   (a) Pay fees (   )
   (b) Contribute to school facilities development (   )
   (c) Decide on the priorities of the school (   )
   (d) Elect school management committee (   )

43. What is the reporting mechanism between school, province, District and the Ministry?
   (a) MOE --- Province --- District --- School: Yes ( ) No ( )
   (b) School --- District --- Province --- MOE: Yes ( ) No ( )

44. Are SMC members elected by parents? Yes ( ) No ( )

45. What would you prefer?
   (a) Decisions over budget allocation are made at the school Yes ( ) No ( )
   (b) Decisions over budget allocation made by the ministry of education headquarters and District education office. Yes ( ) No ( )
   Whatever choice state why?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….

46. Does the community feel that they own the school?
   Yes ( ) No ( )

47. Have you ever been trained in?
   (a) Financial management Yes ( ) No ( )
   (b) Procurement Yes ( ) No ( )

48. If yes, do you feel the training has made you a better manager?
   Yes ( ) No ( )

49. Is the training you have undergone?
   (a) Adequate (   )
   (b) Not adequate (   )
SECTION E: Challenges of Decentralised Management

50. Are finances received from the government enough to meet the instructional materials and infrastructure needs of the school?  
   Yes ( )  No ( )

51. Are funds received by the school on time?  
   Yes ( )  No ( )

52. What are the main constraints of the SMC members?  
   (a) Education and Experience  
   Yes ( )  No ( )
   (b) Period of membership  
   Yes ( )  No ( )
   (c) Conflict of interest  
   Yes ( )  No ( )

53. Do you receive support from the District public Works officer?  
   Yes ( )  No ( )

54. Do contractors/tenderers deliver in time?  
   Yes ( )  No ( )

55. Do the procurement committees have capacity to undertake their responsibilities?  
   Yes ( )  No ( )

56. What challenges are encountered by the school in?  
   (a) Financial management  
   .........................................................................................................................
   .........................................................................................................................
   (b) Procurement of goods and services  
   .........................................................................................................................
   .........................................................................................................................
   (c) Budgeting  
   .........................................................................................................................
   .........................................................................................................................

57. Do you find any problem of the education Act Cap 211 as it is today? If yes list the areas of concern:
   (a) .................................................................................................................................
   (b) .................................................................................................................................
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SECTION F: Suggestions to Improve Management

58. Suggest ways and means through which education services can be made more effective by all stakeholders;

(a) Ministry Headquarters

(b) Provincial Education Office

(c) District Education Office

(a) School Management Committees

(b) Parents

(c) Sponsors
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