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Aims and Objectives

Whether the primary (P1-P6) school funding system in Rwanda support the achievement of equality of educational opportunity?

• To Understand the role played by private contributions (from parents/guardian or NGOs) in funding Rwandan schools.

• To Explore the link between levels of overall funding in different schools and school level outcomes.

• To Suggest options for reform to the funding system to help achieve greater equality of opportunity.
Definitions: Concepts of Equity and Equality

Equity has been defined in two ways;

• ‘Horizontal equity’ which stresses the need to treat similar people the same (in this pupils in school)

• ‘Vertical equity’ which encompasses the need to treat different pupils differently. (Different levels of funding for groups of pupils with differential levels of need).

• While “equitable” in school finance refers to funding based on the needs of children to enable Everyone gets exactly the same outcome
Sample

- Purposive sampling of 2 Rwandan districts: basing on contrasting socio economic factors: one better off urban (Kicukiro) and one poorer rural (Nyaruguru).
- Within the districts a system of random sampling was used to select 30 primary schools.
- In Nyaruguru in Southern province we selected every second or third school on an alphabetical list of primary schools in the area.
- In Kicukiro in Kigali there were 31 public schools in total: all were surveyed, but one (special needs) was excluded from analysis.
Research methods

• Small scale survey of 61 primary schools from both districts
• Interviews with:
  - Head of Teachers
  - Classroom Teachers
  - Parents representatives
  - Local NGOs
  - District/Sector officials
• Key informant interviews (REB, MINEDUC, MINECOFIN, DfID, UNICEF).
• Used a Mix of open ended and closed questions
Background and Context

• Rwanda like other Low Income Countries abolished fees in 2003 (World Bank, 2011).

• Rwanda introd public funding (raised from domestic sources such as taxation or received via ODA)

• This is in form of a Capitation Grant (CG), which allocates funding to schools on a per-pupil basis annually
Background and Context

• Access to primary school has increased impressively but; High dropout rates, many over-aged pupils, high class sizes, poorly trained and poorly motivated teachers affect Learning outcomes

• MINEDUC data suggests education budget to primary schools will increase in 2012/13 from 38% to 39%, but for 9YBE phase it will reduce from 65% to 57%.

• This pressure on the education budget is linked to a further challenge; ensuring quality
School funding system

Central government: Consolidated Fund Account: MINECOFIN, but held in the National Bank of Rwanda.
It is Education Budget Support funded from Taxation and also ODI

- Teachers’ salaries: (RWF 32,500 p.m. standard salary)
- Capitation grant: this is paid on a per pupil basis at a rate of RwF3,500p.a. (guidance says 50% on teaching activities, 35% on maintenance and 15% on training)
- Text books: (“Virtual” budget devolved to schools to choose books.)

Teachers Bonus: (RF 12,500 gross) payable based on performance

9YBE schools:
Including a mix of (a) primary schools (P1 – P6) (b) full 9YBE schools P1-S3 and (c) lower secondary schools (S1-S3).

Source: IPAR, based on MINEDUC discussions

District: Allocates the funding identified, the district administers teachers’ salaries and capitation grants.

School construction and District Education Funds

Construction, District Education Fund

MINEDUC

TOTAL SCHOOL FUNDING
Capitation grant + teacher salaries + earmarked district funding + text books

This shows public funding system only.
It shows the situation in 2011.
Basic education schools
Including a mix of (a) primary schools (P1 – P6) (b) full 9YBE schools P1-S3 and (c) lower secondary schools (S1-S3).

Contribution paid to school

Parental contribution

Parents and guardians

TOTAL SCHOOL FUNDING
Capitation Grant + teacher salaries + earmarked district funding + text books + private contributions (parents & NGOs).

TOTAL SALARY
Government salary of RWF32,500 + bonus (from CG) of RWF12,500 + school top-up from parental contributions and/or NGO funding.

Parents and guardians

Local Authority (District or Sector)

NGOs, community groups and churches

Support for parents

Parental contribution via district.

PTA

Parental contribution direct to school.
Findings

There are different forms in which parents make financial contributions to the running costs of a school

Forms of Parental Contribution (% of schools)

- In Kicukiro, it was predominantly through the PTA.
- In Nyaruguru, it was through the district.
  It was more mixed, including payments for school food and insurance.

‘Other’ made up mostly school food payments
Findings

A large majority of parents in Kicukiro stated an increase in contributions over the years. In contrast fewer in Nyaruguru thought that this was the case.
Findings

•The average annual parental contribution is nine times more in Kicukiro than it is in Nyaruguru. Chart shows a larger difference between the two districts.

*Parental contribution to schools (p.a.)*

Source: Parent survey (similar findings from Head Teacher survey)
Findings

The chart shows:
In Kicukiro decisions more likely to be made by the ‘general assembly’, or the PTC.

In Nyaruguru decisions more likely to be made by the PTC, District or there is more likely to be no contribution recorded at all.

Source: Parent survey (similar findings from Head Teacher survey)
The gender parity index is higher in Nyaruguru than it is in Kicukiro. More girls in school in Nyaruguru than there are boys (overall gender parity index of 1.04). This compares with 0.94 in Kicukiro.

One hypothesis: parents who contribute more decide which child’s education to prioritise, (focusing more on boys than girls). When direct costs of schooling are not as high, as is in Nyaruguru, parents not required to make such a decision.
Implications of non-payment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications of non-payment (parents’ view)</th>
<th>Kicukiro</th>
<th>Nyaruguru</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No consequence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on children being allowed to attend class</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another impact on child/parents (e.g. no food)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No parental contribution made</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Head teachers reported far fewer implications.
- NGOs reported fewer implications than parents, but still some (5/21 saying attendance affected).

“When a parent failed to pay 100f pupils don’t eat at school till pays”
(Nyaruguru, Head Teacher)

“They chase them out of school, they don’t give them their report cards, they don’t allow them to sit for exams.” (Kigali, Parent)

“Officially, no child is chased out of school, but the school puts pressure on parent by all means.” (NGO, Kigali)
The level of parental contributions has a significant impact on head teachers’ budgets.

**Kicukiro**
- Capitation grant: 47%
- Parental contribution: 48%
- Other non-govt (NGO): 5%

**Nyaruguru**
- Capitation grant: 92%

Source: Head Teachers’ questionnaire
Impact on teachers pay – and quality?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Kicukiro</th>
<th>In Nyaruguru</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 50% parental contribution was allocated to teachers’ bonuses</td>
<td>26% parental contribution was allocated to teachers’ bonuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.9% of teachers were qualified</td>
<td>66.3% teachers were qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only 11% teachers had an additional income</td>
<td>44% of Nyaruguru teachers had an additional income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher salaries (RWF p.m.)**

![Bar Chart](chart.png)

Source: Classroom Teachers’ questionnaire
Key Finding

• The levels of additional revenue parental contributions raised differed widely between the two districts.

• Levels of public funding for primary schools remain low and may not be adequate to provide a decent level of education.
Policy options

• Target additional funding at poorer areas – measured by level of poverty (addition to salaries)

• Target funding by introducing a simple formula into the CG, based on poverty measures.

  • eg Pay additional payment for each child in the bottom two poverty categories
  • Allocate an additional payment to schools in areas which have a higher proportion of people in the bottom two poverty categories
Policy options

• Policy makers need to focus on how to design fairer systems of government funding for schools;

• By following up on any illegal turning away of pupils for non payment
• By regulating voluntary contributions
  - Particular Parents can be supported
  - NGO’s can be directed to support more effectively areas with the greatest need