

Marginalization and the Provision of Basic Education in Kenya's Urban Informal Settlements

Francis Likoye, PhD.
Kenyatta University, Kenya

Visiting Professor, Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education (CICE), Hiroshima University, Japan.

Presented on July 4 2016 in CICE seminar room at 16:20 – 17:50

1

Outline

This presentation explores the issue under focus under the following themes:

1. Background and Context
2. Socio-economic context of urban slums in Kenya
3. Features of Kenya's informal settlements and provision of basic education
4. Policies in the provision of Basic Ed. in Urban Informal Settlements (UISs)
5. Conclusions and Suggestions
6. Issues for further reflection/interrogation

2

Background and context

- Kenya has made tremendous efforts to provide equal education opportunities to all its citizens as a govt obligation and partly in pursuit of EFA and MDGs
- However, underneath these impressive statistics, there are many children throughout the country who fail to access basic education for a variety of reasons
- These include: children of nomadic pastoralists, children with special needs, children in urban informal settlements, street children, abandoned and neglected children, orphans, displaced and refugee children, HIV and AIDS affected children including orphans ...e.t.c.

3

Background...2

- This presentation is a systematic analysis of educational policies to increase the provision of basic education to the particular group of children in urban informal settlements in cities of Nairobi, Mombasa, Kisumu, Nakuru and Eldoret
- It reviews such policies and associated practices with regard to the sense in which they have partly played a push factor role that has left the urban poor children in UISs with the option of utilizing the alleged 'low cost' private education despite the existence of FPE policy which, as argued in this presentation, only serves to marginalize them further.

4

Socio-economic context of urban slums in Kenya

- Historically, Africans were barred, by policy, from the city's designated residential areas
- therefore, for Africans who came to Nairobi, they developed an informal settlement in the low-lying areas of the city - temporal shelter for low-level factory workers, retirees, single families, poor people and young men looking for employment.
- the growth of informal settlements in other cities and major towns in Kenya such Mombasa, Kisumu, Nakuru and Eldoret has been influenced by nearly these same factors e.g. industrialization, population growth, urban centre growth, land tenure system and high land prices and house rents

5

Socio-economic ...2

- For Nairobi, city's 1948 Master Plan and other major urban development plans continued to neglect informal settlements (e.g. 1963, 1st govt declared this settlement – Kibera- illegal and so are others)
- Unfortunately, this continues despite 2 million people in Nairobi living in informal settlements (60% of city's popln)
- thus, from the onset, African residential areas were conceived of from a position of disadvantage with limited infrastructure, general amenities, poor schools (if any) and a general lack of resources

NB-

despite modifications done in favor of city's African popln, it is still almost as it was in the past

6

Features of Kenya's informal settlements and provision of basic education

- Non-formal Schools present a formidable constituency in the Provision of basic education in urban informal settlements yet most are not recognized by the government (in Kisumu & Nairobi, nearly 60% live in UISs).
- A significant number of children in the urban informal settlements are excluded from quality pre-school education which compromises their chances for further formal schooling.
- Access to Primary Education is far below the national average and many children are out of school in the informal settlements
- While integration of children with disabilities in the formal school system is a policy, non-formal schools in the informal urban settlements rarely do this.

7

Features 2

- Access to secondary schooling as a basic education cycle is limited in the urban informal settlements
- The quality of education offered in Private/NFS is markedly poorer than that of the public school
- Non-formal schools are sustained by fees paid by parents, and the impact of government capitation for these schools is yet to be felt
- Most Non-Formal schools are registered with the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Services as local organizations or charitable institutions.
- Higher % of children in slums attend “low-cost” private schools e.g. Allavida 2012: Kibera-52% attend these – due to higher poverty index in slums

8

Table: Non Formal Schools' Enrolment by Level of Education 2004

Province	Primary		Secondary		Total
	M	F	M	F	
Coast	2240	1813	370	369	4792
Central	247	159	166	18	590
Eastern	71	84	2	12	169
Nairobi	36456	35959	3645	431	76491
R. Valley	504	470	-	-	974
Western	602	532	673	-	1807
Nyanza	1050	945	205	71	2271
N. Eastern	1413	738	545	189	2885
Sub Total	42583	40700	5610	1096	89989
Total	83283		6706		89989

Source: MoEST, NFS, Directory and National Summaries**Table Number of Non Formal Institutions, Enrolment and Teachers, November 2007**

Province	Institutions No.	Enrolment No.			Teachers		
		Girls	Boys	Total	Trained	Untrained	Total
Coast	251	4985	5405	10390	337	661	998
Central	83	643	643	1539	73	170	243
Eastern	101	789	758	1547	110	171	281
Nairobi	640	46830	44167	90997	2024	3904	5928
R. Valley	79	1642	2804	4446	416	697	1113
Western	18	875	1298	2173	78	114	192
Nyanza	133	2405	2907	5312	388	661	1049
N. Eastern	90	1661	3320	4981	131	310	441
Total	1395	59830	61555	121385	3557	6688	10245

Source: UNICEF'S Directory of NFE in Kenya

Policies in the provision of Basic Ed. in UISs

1. 1978 Sessional paper No. 5 on “Educational Objectives and Policies” – post school training in skills – yet many had no access to basic ed (so NFE not aligned to FE - no easy transition & NFE perceived as inferior)

2. 1980s implementation of SAPs – dwindling participation – reduced govt funding hence cost-sharing (model – eroded gains by efforts towards UPE – esp. in poor households e.g. in slums most affected by dropout pushing them to informality (more establishment of private schools)

- Slums provided opportunity for entrepreneurs to start providing services including ed (given the little govt support) and to date – slums have matured to be commercial targets of international ed. Providers e.g. Bridge International (May 2015, 119 organisations (17 from Kenya) released a joint statement to denounced World Bank funding to the chain of low-fee private schools Bridge International Academies who charge \$6 per child/term cf KES.\$10per child/year in public primary funded by FPE).

11

Policies ...2

3. In the year 2003 govt introduced FPE policy – 1.3M out of estimated 3M children enrolled in public schools (with a significant number coming from NFE) most of whom later dropped out – opportunity cost of being in school was too high

- FPE in 2003 and FDSE in 2008 - children in informal urban settlement did not fully benefit from it – for reasons including unavailability of public schools within their reach.
- As a result,
 - ① the few schools in slums urban informal settlements witnessed absenteeism, repetition and drop-out rates
 - ② large numbers of children in slums enrolled in privately-owned low cost primary schools that did not receive FPE grants with many remaining out of school (hence another instance of dev of more private schs.

12

Policies...3

Studies done:

- in 2003 - a total of 76 private primary and sec in Kibera cf less than 5 public primary schools located on periphery
- Oketch et. al 2010 - in slums in 2 slums in Nairobi revealed that 44% of the sampled children attended poor quality fee-charging private schools.
- Dixon and Tooley 2007 – private sch. increased to 116 (52%) in 4yrs
- House Survey in Mathare – 26 private primary Vs 1 public
- According to MoE-EMIS - despite FPE, 759,090 children (boys 351,277, girls 407, 813) were out of the formal school system in 2010 and that this was acute in slums and ASAL regions.
- * despite FPE - access still low in UISs -hist. of neglect + policy

13

Policies...3

4. The Sessional Paper No. 1 of 2005

Purpose:

to address challenges relating to access, equity, quality, relevance, efficiency in the management of educational resources, cost and financing of education, gender and regional disparities, and teacher quality and teacher utilization and consequently provide a policy framework for the education and training sector in order to meet the challenges of the 21st Century.

14

Policies...4

As a result:

- NFE centres, offering formal curriculum registered with MoES&T to be legible for government support to non-formal schools upon compliance for accountability (2008/2009, 474 schls got grants with 600 schools targeted in 2009/2010 Financial Year).
- Despite this, the enrolment into NFE/NFS, the year 2010 recorded a gap of 156,591 learners as the government had targeted 300,000 yet only 143 409 enrolled.
- 8000 public ECDE centers received Community Support Grants benefiting 251,839 children (only those attached to public primary schools)

15

Policies...5

- Looking at this funding proposal, and considering that the bulk of the 1.5 children not in the public school but are in these NFSs, rough calculations gives a figure less than half of the KES. 1020 per child in FPE – yet these are schools that are worse off – hence alienates the children in these schs further.

5. The Kenyan Constitution 2010 and the Basic Education Act of 2013 have also guided the provision and support of education in UISs.

- The Basic Education Act recognizes 2 types of basic educational institutions: public schools (established/owned or operated by the Govt AND private schools (established/owned or operated by private individuals, entrepreneurs and institutions

16

Policies...6

- the APBET policy creates de facto another type of school, the “alternative” or “non-formal” schools, which are private defining them as “institutions that resemble formal schools in that they aim at transmitting a formalized curriculum leading to formal school examinations but which differ in school practices, management, financing, staffing conditions, registration, operating environment and school structures.”
- This may imply govt tolerance to what facilities, financial dynamics and environ in which they operate (inferior?)
- Despite these, most of Kenya’s marginal populations, continue to be marginalized even in terms of basic education and where this is available, it is often of poor quality with lack of transition mechanisms and an uncoordinated large number of providers.
- Such schs. have little interest to enrol marginalised groups who require extra support e.g. children with disabilities, unless compelled through adequately enforced regulation (see Allavida 2012, in a public sch. children with disability (11%) while in all the NFs in the area, they constituted (less than 1%) .

17

Policies...7

6. National Education Sector Plan (NESP) 2013-2018 (an all-inclusive, sector-wide programme)

- Goal: Quality Basic Education for Kenya's Sustainable Development.
 - However:
 - ① No stated commitment to provision of infrastructure and facilities that will accommodate this expected increase in APBET enrolment
 - ② No transition mechanism to enable the children in these institutions, later, join the formal system (NESP appears to want to maintain them instead of eventually mainstreaming them to the formal ed.system.
 - ③ Govt support excludes facilities and infrastructure
- In this way, the policy continues to marginalize them instead of mainstreaming them to the formal schooling system.

18

Conclusions and Suggestions

- UISs lack recognition by govt as legitimate residential areas - lack supply of a range of essential services e.g. govt schools hence higher proportion of children attend low quality owned by non-state providers with their own commercial interests.
- Policies enacted for ed. in slums have not been particularly sensitive to their needs – necessitate utilization of the alleged low-cost private education despite existence of FPE policy to universalize education.
- this has produced a parallel ed. system justified as suitable for slum children due to lack of financial capacity thus further marginalizing the already marginalized poor in the slums.
- With the lack of adequate regulation and enforcement of education standards by the govt, urban poor children continue to be exploited by non-state entrepreneurs who take advantage of the void created by govt inadequacy in providing educ. for the urban poor.
- Calling for low-cost schls to stand as an alternative advances the legality of a dual education system that stratifies society according to socio-economic strata thereby promoting a system that legitimizes inequality hence marginalization.

19

Suggestions

- A strategic starting point - govt to enforce registration of all NFSs and then move on to consider them for capitation and technical support to enable them provide quality education.
- Govt to coordinate support by the private organizations to be strictly driven by the needs of the specific group of children in focus OR else channel the support to govt through a pooled mechanism so as to play this role effectively.
- Step up possible ways of improving the quality assurance mechanisms both in government schools and the so-called low-cost private schools in informal settlements as well.

20

Otherwise!

the kind of exclusion depicted by the manner in which education provision in UISs is conducted must be addressed before there emerges a more inferior, parallel and inequitable system of education that continues to marginalize the seemingly already marginalized children in an irreversible manner.

21

Issues for further reflection/interrogation

- Does NFE foster different kind of learning or is an alternative channel to formal education (if it should lead to formal ed. then the curriculum should be common rather than alternative or modified version of the formal curriculum).
- Why would private school chains, such as Bridge International Academies, be registered as non-formal schools, whereas they appear to offer formal education? Isn't the govt promoting informality?
- If the govt intends to progressively replace non-formal education by formal quality free education, why does it continuously support non-formal schools without a plan to lead to formalisation? In any case the govt has never shared any plans to phase out non-formal education including how this intention is materialised in policies.

22

Issues... 2

- Why would informality be made a permanent feature of educational provision for the poor in devg countries by the World Bank when every effort needed to be made to transit such populations to the formal sector if equity has to be achieved?
- Why would the World Bank spend more money in this sector than it would need to provide education within formal arrangements?
- Govt priorities - projects on education appear to be such elitist e.g. the laptop project - not a priority to learners in slums – why would a govt under-prioritize the needs of the underserved children in UISS- (for me: this only serves to widen the already existing disparities hence marginalisation of the urban poor in slums).

23

End...



24