



TRANSPARENCY
INTERNATIONAL
RWANDA



RWANDA PUBLIC EXPENDITURE TRACKING SURVEY IN EDUCATION (9YBE)

March 2012



ACRONYMS

CG: Capitation Grant

DEO: District Education Officer

E.P: "Ecole Primaire" (primary school)

FGD: Focus Group Discussion

Fr: Frequency

GoR: Government of Rwanda

GS: 'Groupe Scolaire'

IT: Information and technology

MINECOFIN: Ministry of Economic and Finance

MoE: Ministry of Education

MoF: Ministry of Finance

N/A: Not applicable

9YBE: Nine Year Basic Education

PETS: Public Expenditure Tracking Survey

PTA: Parents-Teachers Association

Rwf: Rwandan Franc

SMC: School Management Committee

SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

UNESCO: United Nations Education, Science and Culture Organisation

USD: United States Dollar

RWANDA PUBLIC EXPENDITURE TRACKING SURVEY IN EDUCATION (9YBE)

March 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS.....	3
LIST OF TABLES	6
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:.....	8
1. INTRODUCTION.....	9
1.1. Problem context.....	9
1.2. Research questions.....	9
1.3. Objectives.....	10
1.4. Methodology.....	10
1.4.1. Approaches and data collection instruments.....	10
1.4.2. Study population and sampling strategy.....	10
1.4.3. Data collection.....	12
1.4.4. Supervision and quality control.....	12
1.4.5. Plan of analysis.....	12
2. BENEFICIARIES' AWARENESS OF THE CAPITATION GRANT AND HOW IT WORKS.....	13
2.1 Awareness of the CG as a government grant per each child for the first 9 years at school.....	13
2.2. Awareness of the 9 Year Basic Education programme as programme providing free education.....	13
2.3.Awareness of the fact that no pupil should be excluded due to failure to pay extra contributions.....	14
3. RESOURCES RECEIVED BY SCHOOLS AS CAPITATION GRANT.....	17
3.1. Amounts of CG funds per selected school per quarter per pupil.....	17
3.2.Items usually covered by CG funds.....	18
3.3. Items actually acquired by classrooms with CG funds.....	18
3.4. Items acquired by schools as a component of the CG.....	19
3.5.Satisfaction with the CG spending.....	19
4. COMPLIANCE WITH THE GUIDELINES ON REQUEST, DISBURSEMENT AND USE OF CG.....	20
4.1. Compliance with the deadline of submission of the pupils' number by school head teachers.....	20
4.1.1.First Quarter 2009 – Beginning of the school year.....	20
4.1.2.First Quarter 2010 – Beginning of the school year.....	21
4.2. Compliance with the use of the CG.....	21
4.3. Perceptions on the timeliness of selected CG benefits.....	23
4.4. MoF Compliance with the deadline for CG funds disbursement.....	24
4.5. Transparency in CG-related tendering processes.....	27

5. CAPITATION GRANT LEAKAGE.....	28
5.1.Respondents perceptions on any difference between requested fund and the grant received.....	28
5.2.Capitation Grant requested by District and received by schools.....	28
5.3. Capitation grant received and number of school pupils (2009-2010).....	30
5.4. Relationship between number of pupils submitted by schools to districts and those submitted by districts to MoF	31
5.4.1.First Quarter 2009 – Beginning of the school year.....	31
5.4.2.First Quarter 2010 – Beginning of the school year.....	32
6. STAKEHOLDERS' PARTICIPATION IN MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING OF CAPITATION GRANT.....	33
6.1. Participation in meetings to develop school action plans.....	33
6.2.Frequency of participation in the development of school action plans.....	33
6.3.Perceptions on stakeholders' participation in developing school action plans.....	34
6.4. Existence of School Management Committee (SMC) and Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) in schools.....	34
6.5. Perceptions on SMCs and PTAs in the overall school management.....	34
6.6. Monitoring and auditing of the CG.....	35
7. CONTRIBUTIONS PAID BY PARENTS AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS.....	37
7.1.Parents' contributions in education sector.....	37
7.2.Should parents keep paying extra contributions?.....	37
7.3. Other stakeholders' support to schools beside parents' contributions and the CG	38
7.4.Awareness of pupils excluded due to failure to pay extra contributions.....	38
7.5.Occurrence of school pupils to be excluded due to failure to pay an extra contribution.....	39
8. PERCEIVED IMPACT OF CAPITATION GRANT.....	40
9. Conclusion and Recommendations.....	41
9.1.Conclusion.....	41
9.2.Recommendations.....	43
10. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	44

TABLES LIST:

Table 1: Study population in the selected districts	10
Table 2: Awareness of the fact that the Government of Rwanda provides capitation grant/ funds per each pupil for the first 9 years at school.....	12
Table 3: Awareness of the 9 Year Basic Education Programme according to which education in Rwanda is free of charge	12
Table 4: Awareness of the fact that no child is supposed to be excluded from school just because his/her parents cannot afford to pay extra contributions to the school.....	13
Table 5: Source of information on the Capitation Grant.....	13
Table 6: Availability of avenues for lodging complaints in case a problem is perceived in the use of the Capitation Grant in school.....	14
Table 7: Potential avenues for lodging CG-related complaints.....	14
Table 8: Whether a problem was heard in the use of the Capitation Grant in school over the last 2 school years.....	14
Table 9: Amounts of CG received by selected schools per quarter and per pupil (Quarter 4 of 2009 and Quarter 1 of 2010)	16
Table 10: Kind of items that schools usually fund with the Capitation Grant	17
Table 11: Items acquired by classrooms as a component of the CG over the period 2009-2010.....	17
Table 12: Items actually acquired by schools as a component of the CG over the period 2009-2010.....	18
Table 13: Respondents' satisfaction with how the CG is spent by their schools.....	18
Table 14: Schools compliance with the deadline of submission of the pupils' number for the 1st Quarter of 2009.....	20
Table 15: Schools compliance with the deadline of submission of the pupils' number for the 1st Quarter of 2010 School Year.....	21
Table 16: Schools compliance with the guidelines on CG use (School Year 2009).....	22
Table 17: Parents' perceptions on the timeliness of selected CG benefits.....	23
Table 18: Teachers' perceptions on the timeliness of selected CG benefits.....	23
Table 19: Date in which the Capitation Grant reached the schools – Q3/2009.....	24
Table 20: Date in which the Capitation Grant was received by schools – Q4/2009.....	25
Table 21: Date in which the Capitation Grant reaches schools – Q1/2010.....	25
Table 22: Perceptions on transparency in CG-related tendering processes over the last two school years.....	27
Table 23: Adequacy of the fund requested and the grant received for the 2009-2010 period.....	28
Table 24: Actual value of the Capitation Grant requested by District and received by Schools (2009-2010).....	29
Table 25: The relationship between the Capitation Grant and the number of school pupils – Q3, 2009.....	30
Table 26: Relationship between the number of pupils submitted by school to district and that submitted by district to MoF for the 1st quarter 2009.....	31

Table 27:Relationship between the number of pupils submitted by schools to districts and that submitted by districts to MoF for the 1st quarter 2010.....	32
Table 28:Respondents' participation in meetings to develop school action plans.....	33
Table 29:Frequency of respondents' participation in such meetings.....	33
Table 30:Respondents' perceptions on teachers and parents' participation in developing school action plans (% active)	33
Table 31: Presence of a SMC and a PTA in schools (% Yes)	34
Table 32:Respondents' perceptions on SMCs and PTAs in the overall school management.....	34
Table 33: Parents' views on frequency of key monitoring mechanisms of the capitation grant.....	35
Table 34:Teachers' views on frequency of key monitoring mechanisms of the capitation grant.....	35
Table 35:Presence of an accountant at school.....	36
Table 36:Extent to which parents still pay other education contributions in spite of the Capitation Grant.....	37
Table 37:Respondents' opinion on whether parents should pay extra contributions irrespective of the capitation grant	37
Table 38:Existence of other financial or in-kind support to schools apart from the capitation grant and the parents' contributions over the last two years.....	38
Table 39:Respondents awareness of any school pupil being excluded of school over the last 3 years due to failure to pay extra contributions.....	38
Table 40:Respondents' views on how often pupils are excluded due to their parents' failure to pay an extra contribution	39
Table 41:Perceived impact of the CG (1 to 4 scale score and % agreement)	40
Table 42:Perception on various aspects of the capitation grant.....	40

Acknowledgments

Transparency International Rwanda (TI-Rw), the civil society organization leading the fight against corruption and to promote good governance, is implementing a three-year project which aims to contribute to accessible, equitable and high quality primary education through more effective use of resources, focusing on the capitation grant allocated to the 9 Years Basic Education programme (9YBE).

This report presents the findings of the first phase of the project, which consisted in a Public Expenditure Tracking Survey (PETS).

The research, which was carried out nationwide and used a combination of quantitative and qualitative tools, firstly analyzed teachers, pupils and parents' awareness of the 9YBE. It then explored how the capitation grant is requested, disbursed, managed and used, investigating whether there is any leakage of funds. The study also assessed parent's involvement in the management of funds and the contributions requested to families to complement the capitation grant. Finally, the report presents the perceived impact of the 9YBE programme.

This research is particularly important because, since the introduction of the capitation grant, no independent assessment had been carried out to ascertain whether all financial transfers from the central Government to schools are used properly and efficiently.

On behalf of TI-RW, I would like to warmly thank those who made this study possible: First and foremost, Results for Development Institute which funded the research through their Transparency and Accountability Program. Secondly, I would also like to thank TI-Rw's Executive Director, Apollinaire Mupiganyi, the Government Champion, Mr. Kayisire Callixte, TI-RW team involved in the project (Albert Rwego Kavatiri, Francine Umurungi and Alessandro Bozzini), as well as Mr. Révérien Interayamahanga and Peter Ruyumbu, the consultants, who played a major role in the implementation of this project. It is equally important to thank TI-Rw's partners for their valuable inputs and availability to contribute to the validation of the methodology of this study, particularly the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Education, Unicef and DFID. Finally, I would also like to thank the teachers, parents and pupils who were interviewed and who provided the opinions and information without which this work would have not been possible.



Marie Immaculée Ingabire

Chairperson of Transparency International Rwanda

1. INTRODUCTION



1.1. Problem context

Within the context of the global agenda of achieving Education for All, education has been made the main pillar of Rwanda's national strategy for sustainable development. Since 2003, universal basic education is a major priority. The introduction in 2009 of the Nine Year Basic Education Program (9YBE) now offers six years of primary and three years of secondary education to all Rwandan children free of charge.

Primary school enrolment in Rwanda – 97% for boys and 98% for girls – is among the highest in the region, according to Ministry of Education (2010). To further strengthen support of the education sector, USD 16.3 million have recently been made available by the government of Rwanda as a capitation grant (CG) to the country's schools for their operations. The CG is provided as follows: 3,500 Rwf per pupil per year and 12,500 Rwf per teacher per month. As per the 3,500 Rwf per pupil per year, 50% of this amount is supposed to provide school materials such as books, 35% goes to school rehabilitations and construction while 15% goes to capacity building of teachers. The mechanism of the capitation grant is supposed to work as follows: schools inform the District authorities on the number of students they have and the Districts inform the Ministry of Education; this in turn requests the appropriate amount of money to the Ministry of Finance, which transfers the money directly to the accounts of each school.

However, scaling up of resources does not automatically lead to better outcomes as existing decentralised accountability mechanisms are often inadequate and ineffective in controlling resource flows. Cases of embezzlement, leakage of funds or bad management might occur at different stages of the disbursement of the grant, but particularly at District and school level.

To ensure the transparent and accountable management of the capitation grant, independent monitoring is essential. All the service users need to become more knowledgeable about existing risks of corruption in the Universal Basic Education sector to contribute to improved access to, equity in and quality of primary education through more effective use of resources.

It is in this framework that Transparency International Rwanda (TI-Rw), the civil society organisation leading the fight against corruption and the promotion of good governance, decided to start a project entitled "Transparency and Accountability in the management of resources allocated to the Nine Years Basic Education (9YBE) programme in Rwanda". This initiative, supported financially by "Results for Development" through their "Transparency and Accountability Program" (TAP), wishes to contribute to accessible, equitable and high-quality primary education through more effective use of resources. The present report is the result of the first phase of the three-year project, which consisted in a Public Expenditure Tracking Survey (PETS), as explained below in more details.

1.2. Research questions

The questions which guided the research are the following:

- To which extent are guidelines for accessing/disbursing the capitation grant respected by providers?
- Do beneficiaries receive all the resources they are entitled to?
- What is the level of leakage of funds allocated to the capitation grant from the higher level to the facility level (school)?
- Do beneficiaries/stakeholders know about capitation grant and how it works?
- Are beneficiaries sufficiently involved in the management of capitation grant?

1.3. Objectives

The ultimate goal of each TAP project is to improve the effectiveness of public spending and service delivery in health or education such that government resources are reaching and improving the lives of those who need them most.

Specifically this survey aims to:

- Collect evidence based data on the allocation and utilization of the 9YBE capitation grant
- Examine how effective guidelines for accessing / disbursing the capitation grant are respected by the providers
- Determine the level of leakage of funds allocated to the C.G. from the highest level to the facility level
- Explore the level of involvement of beneficiaries in the management of the C.G.
- Formulate policy recommendations for more effective use of the capitation grant

1.4. Methodology

1.4.1. Approaches and data collection instruments

The study is based on a mix of quantitative and qualitative approaches. Beside the desk review, three methods or data collection instruments were used: individual interview, questionnaire and focus group discussions.

The first step was a desk research, which focused on relevant policy documents and statistics from the Ministry of Education (MoE). It covered mainly documents on the capitation grant and the Nine Year Basic Education programme (9YBE). This allowed to gain an in-depth knowledge of the policy background in which the CG and the 9YBE operate in Rwanda, as well as a historical perspective on the education system in Rwanda. Moreover, desk research was also conducted which focused on policy, laws and reports on the request, disbursement and use of the CG at the level of the school, district and Ministry of Finance (MoF).

Thus the desk review did not only focus on policy documents and laws but it also included an analysis of reports at the two levels which are key to track 9YBE expenditures, that is payment orders issued by the Ministry of Finance and bank statements from the bank accounts of the schools, which were later on compared to check whether there was any leakage of funds. Records at District offices (on number of schools, number of pupils and teachers per school, funds requested and so on) were also examined in this phase, and enumerator team leaders were given a list or grid with all the data they had to find out at District offices through interviews with District education officers. Leakage was calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Leakage} = 1 - \frac{\text{Resources Received by facility}}{\text{Resources Intended for facility}}$$

After the desk review, a structured questionnaire was designed based on indicators deriving from the study objectives. The questionnaire was used with parents, pupils and teachers to collect data on their knowledge, experience and perceptions on the use of the CG, its disbursement, management, impact, potential challenges and ways to report problems. While the questionnaires for teachers and parents were broadly similar and very detailed, those for pupils were shorter and simpler, focusing on basic knowledge of the CG as well as its use and impact.

As far as the qualitative approach is concerned, this study used individual interviews with selected parents and head-teachers, district education officers, as well as officials from MoE and MoF.

1.4.2. Study population and sampling strategy

The concept of study population, also known as target population, refers to the category of people under investigation. The study population for this research is multidimensional. Primarily, this survey involved ordinary citizens. These are direct and indirect beneficiaries of the CG. They include pupils, parents and teachers, as well as head teachers. In addition to these categories of people, other key informants and CG stakeholders were considered for this study. They include district education officers and officials from MoE and MoF.

The survey made use of multistage sampling with 4 strata, namely: Province, District, school and respondents. The research did not take into account the representativeness at strata level but only at national level. The first strata (Province) is fully taken into consideration (all of the 5 Provinces of Rwanda were surveyed). At the second stage, only 3 Districts were selected randomly per Province which makes a total of 15 Districts out of 30 in the whole country (50%). The school (the third stratum) is the Statistical Unit of the PETS survey, meaning that it is the entity being studied; particularly, it is at this level that it was analyzed whether there was any leakage of funds. The latter was selected using systematic random sampling technique. The fourth stage involved the selection of respondents of the research tools (students, teachers, head teachers and parents who are members of PTAs at school level). These respondents were selected randomly from the list made available by the school management.

Four samples were drawn from the 4 different study populations pertaining to the 9YBE program in the whole country namely:

- Total number of schools,
- Total number of students,
- Total number of teachers and head teachers
- Total number of parents who are members of PTAs at school level.

The first three samples are calculated using a margin error and a confidence level of 4 and 95% respectively while for parents, the total number was considered (because in each school only five parents are members of PTA). Such samples provide an adequate figure for undertaking statistical analysis that falls within the defined confidence level and margin error. Other considerations were resources and time period available for the research. Using the Raosoft sample size calculator, the estimated samples are as follows:

Table 1: Study population in the sample districts

Province	District	Schools' Sample size	Total nr. of schools	Students' sample size	Teachers' sample size	Parents' sample size
Kigali City	Nyarugenge	2	30	22	26	10
	Gasabo	3	71	40	30	15
	Kicukiro	2	46	24	20	10
South	Huye	5	118	38	40	25
	Nyaruguru	5	115	40	38	25
	Ruhango	5	100	40	42	25
North	Burera	5	116	48	46	25
	Musanze	5	110	50	48	25
	Gicumbi	6	128	52	50	30
East	Nyagatare	5	110	48	48	25
	Ngoma	5	98	38	38	25
	Rwamagana	4	82	34	34	20
West	Ngororero	6	133	45	45	30
	Rubavu	5	97	42	40	25
	Karongi	7	154	42	50	35
Total		70	1,508	602	595	350

As far as sampling for the qualitative dimension is concerned, 65 individual interviews were organized: 3 people (1 teacher, 1 parent and 1 student) per District (3 x 15 = 45 interviews), 5 with District education officers (one per Province) and 4 at national level in relevant institutions (MoF, MoE, UNICEF and DFID). Due to redundancy, as the information already gathered was to a large extent consistent, it was deemed unnecessary to organize more interviews and focus group discussions.

1.4.3. Data collection

The fieldwork was carried out by a team of skilled enumerators, team leaders and supervisors. In a bid to guarantee the quality of data, training was organized for the recruited interviewers on survey methods, questionnaire structure and content, interviewers' responsibilities, as well as on survey ethics.

While quantitative data was collected by enumerators, interviews and FGD were conducted by the consultants and TI Rwanda research staff because of their experience in such an endeavor.

- Pilot Survey

Before starting the data collection process a "pilot survey" was carried out in Kanombe sector, Kicukiro district, which was not on the list of sectors selected for the actual survey. This exercise proved very important as it helped to test the questionnaire: questions clarity, wording, coherence and consistency. It should be noted that all data collection tools and survey methodology were submitted to a number of education stakeholders who validated them in an ad hoc workshop, prior to embarking on the fieldwork.

1.4.4. Supervision and quality control

For data quality control purposes, the following measures were taken:

1. Recruitment of skilled enumerators and supervisors
2. Training of enumerators and supervisors
3. Testing of the questionnaire
4. Supervision of data collection activity
5. Overall coordination of the field work
6. Use of SPSS and excel softwares for data analysis
7. Data cleaning prior to analysis

1.4.5. Plan of analysis

After data collection, data entry clerks were recruited and trained on the data entry process. Based on the questionnaire, a specific data entry template was designed by an IT expert using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Quantitative data from desk review was analyzed using excel software. After data entry, a tabulation plan was drafted by the consultants to facilitate the analysis plan. As far as qualitative data is concerned, content analysis method was used in the analysis.

The data collection coverage was as follows:

Teachers: 493/595 (82.9%)

Pupils: 533/602 (88.5%)

Parents: 191/350 (54.6%)

Weighted Average Mean $\bar{x} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i w_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i}$ It is not easy to meet parents and interview them, as many of them live far from the school, resulting in a lower number of parents in the data collection coverage.

Formula used to calculate scores

For some indicators, the following formula was used to calculate their scores:

Where $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ are quantitative scores (0, 1, 2, 3, 4) and

w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n are frequency scores corresponding to respective qualitative scores

0 is the lowest score while 4 is the highest

2. BENEFICIARIES' AWARENESS OF THE CAPITATION GRANT AND HOW IT WORKS

Following the background of the project and the presentation of the PETS' methodology, it is now time to turn to the actual findings of the survey. Firstly, this chapter presents the level of beneficiaries' awareness of the CG and of how it works. Pupils, parents and teachers' opinions and experience are considered here.

2.1 Awareness of the CG as a government grant per each child for the first 9 years at school

The CG is a mechanism adopted by the GoR to implement its universal free education programme. The survey examined whether parents, pupils and teachers are aware of this reality. The table below presents the results.

Table 2: Awareness of the fact that the Government of Rwanda provides capitation grant/ funds per each pupil for the first 9 years at school

	Parents		Pupils		Teachers		Total	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Yes	183	98.4%	484	91.0%	485	98.8%	1152	95.30%
No	3	1.6%	48	9.0%	6	1.2%	57	4.70%
Total	186	100.0%	532	100.0%	491	100.0%	1209	100.00%

The survey reveals a very high level of awareness of all categories of respondents with regard to the fact that the Government of Rwanda provides a capitation grant/ money per each student for the first 9 years at school. As shown in the table above, 98.8 % of teachers, 98.4% of parents and 91% of pupils are aware of this reality. However, there is a slight discrepancy between the level of awareness of the pupils (lower) and that of the two latter categories (higher). A tentative explanation for that discrepancy may be that teachers and parents are not only adult but also more familiar with the government policies than pupils.

Surprisingly 9% of pupils are not aware of the existence of the government support in the form of capitation grant. Does it mean that they do not benefit from it? This is discussed under the chapter on CG use and leakage.

2.2. Awareness of the 9 Year Basic Education programme as programme providing free education

Table 3: Awareness of the 9 Year Basic Education Programme according to which education in Rwanda is free of charge

	Parents		Pupils		Teachers		Total	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Yes	184	98.9%	498	93.8%	487	99.2%	1169	96.80%
No	2	1.1%	33	6.2%	4	0.8%	39	3.20%
Total	186	100.0%	531	100.0%	491	100.0%	1208	100.00%

Since 2003 the GoR committed to make basic education universal. It is therefore for the sake of implementing the "education for all" policy that a free education was granted to all children for the first 9 year at school. The survey sought to assess the level of respondents' awareness concerning the fact that as per the 9 Year Basic Education Programme, education in Rwanda is free of charge. The table above shows a very high level of respondents' awareness of this fact. This was declared by 99.2% of teachers, 98.9% of parents and 93.8% of pupils. As it was the case in the previous table, awareness is again slightly lower among pupils than among parents and teachers.

2.3. Awareness of the fact that no pupil should be excluded due to failure to pay extra contributions

As will be shown later in this report, despite the free nature of basic education parents may be requested to voluntarily pay some extra contributions to complement education efforts. The survey examined whether respondents are aware of the fact that no child should be excluded from a public school just because his/her parents cannot afford to pay such extra contributions to the school. The result is as follows:

Table 4: Awareness of the fact that no child is supposed to be excluded from school just because his/her parents cannot afford to pay extra contributions to the school

	Parents		Pupils		Teachers		Total	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Yes	182	97.8%	481	90.4%	487	99.2%	1150	95.10%
No	4	2.2%	51	9.6%	4	0.8%	59	4.90%
Total	186	100.0%	532	100.0%	491	100.0%	1209	100.00%

As shown in the table above, the level of awareness is very high among all respondents' categories, though once again it is slightly higher among teachers (99.2%) and parents (97.8%) than among pupils (90.4%). The awareness of this fact implies likelihood that children from poor families will not be excluded from school due to failure to pay extra contributions. However, the actual state of compliance with such requirements is discussed in tables 39 and 40.

Table 5: Source of information on the Capitation Grant

	Parents		Pupils		Teachers		Total	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Head-Teacher	113	59.2%	221	41.5%	390	79.1%	724	59.5%
District Education Officer	32	16.8%	194	36.4%	77	15.6%	303	24.9%
School management committee	37	19.4%	36	6.8%	52	10.5%	125	10.3%
Community meeting	28	14.7%	108	20.3%	25	5.1%	161	13.2%
Parents-Teachers Association	75	39.3%	67	12.6%	60	12.2%	202	16.6%
School staff	12	6.3%	107	20.1%	76	15.4%	195	16.0%
Media	81	42.4%	49	9.2%	191	38.7%	321	26.4%
School notice board	7	3.7%	0	0.0%	10	2.0%	17	1.4%
Children	18	9.4%	N/A	N/A	0	0.0%	18	1.5%
Parents	N/A	N/A	112	21.0%	9	1.8%	121	9.9%
Others	9	4.7%	38	7.1%	32	6.5%	79	6.5%

Various sources of information on the capitation grant are available for education stakeholders such as parents, teachers and pupils. Head-teachers emerged as the most common source of information on the capitation grant (79.1% for teachers, 59.2% for parents and 41.5% for pupils). Moreover, media stood as another important source of information on the capitation grant (42.3% for parents and 38.7% for teachers). Other sources such as Parents-Teachers Association (PTA), School Management Committee (SMC), District Education Officers (DEO), school staff and community meetings are available to the community though in smaller proportions. The diversity of sources of information on the CG may explain the very high level of respondents' awareness of the CG as shown in preceding tables.

Table 6: Availability of avenues for lodging complaints in case a problem is perceived in the use of the Capitation Grant in school

	Parents		Pupils		Teachers		Totals	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Yes	163	93.1%	445	89.7%	375	79.8%	983	86.2%
No	6	3.4%	44	8.9%	71	15.1%	121	10.6%
Don't know	6	3.4%	7	1.4%	24	5.1%	37	3.2%
Total	175	100.0%	496	100.0%	470	100.0%	1141	100.0%

The survey also sought to examine whether teachers, parents and pupils have avenues to lodge complaints in case of CG-related problems. It emerged from this study that the majority of them have such avenues. 93.1% of parents, 89.7% of pupils and 79.8% of teachers declared having them. Apparently, based on this finding, the proportion of parents and pupils with such avenues seems to be slightly higher than that of teachers. As it is mentioned in other parts of the report, it is always worth bearing in mind that the parents who were interviewed in the framework of this research are all members of the PTAs, therefore a higher degree of awareness on the existence of complaint mechanisms is understandable. The table below presents the major avenues through which complaints on CG use, if any, can be lodged.

Table 7: Potential avenues for lodging CG-related complaints.

	Parents		Pupils		Teachers		Total	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Head-teacher	59	30.9%	221	41.5%	147	29.8%	427	35.1%
District Education Officer	80	41.9%	194	36.4%	185	37.5%	459	37.7%
School Management Committee	35	18.3%	36	6.8%	76	15.4%	147	12.1%
Local leaders + Sector leaders	60	31.4%	108	20.3%	46	9.3%	214	17.6%
Parents-Teachers Association	73	38.2%	67	12.6%	141	28.6%	281	23.1%
Police	30	15.7%	107	20.1%	31	6.3%	168	13.8%
Media	15	7.9%	49	9.2%	26	5.3%	90	7.4%
Ombudsman	9	4.7%	N/A	N/A	32	6.5%	41	3.4%
Transparency International Rwanda	24	12.6%	N/A	N/A	48	9.7%	72	5.9%
Parents	N/A	N/A	112	21.0%	N/A	N/A	112	9.2%
Other	2	1.0%	38	7.1%	31	6.3%	71	5.8%

As shown in the previous table, the majority of respondents from all categories (teachers, parents, pupils) declared having avenues for lodging CG related complaints. Various avenues emerge from the above table. The District Education Officer stands as the most common avenue (41.9% among parents, 36.4% among pupils and 37.5% among teachers). Parents-Teachers Association, Head Teachers and local leaders were also cited as main avenues. Importantly, Head-Teachers and parents prove to be sound potential avenues for pupils' complaints.

Table 8: Whether a problem was heard in the use of the Capitation Grant in school over the last 2 school years

	Parents		Pupils		Teachers		Total	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Yes	19	10.5%	21	4.3%	54	11.4%	94	8.30%
No	162	89.5%	463	95.7%	418	88.6%	1043	91.70%
Total	181	100.0%	484	100.0%	472	100.0%	1137	100.00%

Apart from investigating on the existence of potential avenues to lodge complaints on the use of the CG, the survey sought to examine whether teachers, parents and pupils actually have experienced any CG-related problems. The majority of respondents declared that they did not hear/experience any problem of this kind. The share of respondents with this opinion is slightly higher among pupils (95.7%) than among parents (89.5%) and teachers (88.6%). This seems to be partly explained by the fact that, unlike the latter categories, pupils stand only as recipients of CG, while others are involved in the management of the CG, which confers them with an opportunity to monitor the use of CG. Very low but not negligible proportions of respondents (11.4% of teachers, 10.5% of parents and 4.3% of pupils) have nevertheless heard of some problems.

The most common problems mentioned by respondents who fall in this category include teachers' motivation allowance paid late, embezzlement of the CG, lack of transparency in CG-related tendering process and waste of the grant. The fact that most respondents have not heard of any problem suggests that either the CG is properly used in general or that teachers, parents and pupils do not have efficient mechanisms to be aware of problems pertaining to the usage of the grant. This point is examined in more details later on.

3. RESOURCES RECEIVED BY SCHOOLS AS CAPITATION GRANT

The amount of the capitation grant should be proportional to the number of pupils that the school has. According to the Ministerial order governing the capitation grant, each school receives Rwf 875 per quarter per pupil. The section below describes the amount of funds disbursed for two quarters of different school years.

3.1. Amounts of CG funds per selected school per quarter per pupil

The following data relates to 15 schools sampled in 15 districts (one school per District) and two quarters were considered. The quarters considered were randomly selected as time and resources did not allow to focus on the entire period of study, while the choice to show results for only 15 schools merely aims at easier presentation, as results from all the 70 schools in the sample are consistent. Data come from school and District records.

Table 9: Amounts of CG received by selected schools per quarter and per pupil (Quarter 4 of 2009 and Quarter 1 of 2010)

School (Q1, 2010)	Quarter 4 of 2009		Quarter 1 of 2010	
	Number of pupils	Total amount received by school	Number of pupils	Total amount received by school
1. E.A.R BYUMBA	1,112	973,000	1,217	1,064,875
2. E.P. GACURABWENGE	818	715,750	805	704,575
3. E.P. MESHERO	1,220	1,067,750	1,230	1,076,250
4. G.S. KAGEYO	1,716	1,501,500	1,699	1,486,625
5. G.S. NOTRE DAME DU BON CONSEIL	1,675	1,465,625	1,623	1,420,125
6. KAGARAMA	577	504,875	577	504,875
7. E.P BYUMBA	1,752	1,533,000	1,716	1,501,500
8. E.P KIRAMBO	1,480	1,295,000	1,447	1,226,125
9. E.P RUHENGERI	1,060	927,500	1,053	921,375
10. E.P GASAKA	592	518,000	656	574,000
11. E.P MUKURA	583	510,125	650	568,750
12. E.P MBAZI	752	658,000	752	658,000
13. GICACA	1,179	1,031,625	1,109	970,375
14. KAGASA	1,703	1,490,125	1,944	1,701,000
15. NYAMATA	1,176	1,029,000	1,176	1,029,000

As shown by the table adapted from desk research, the amount of funds received by each school depends on the number of pupils it has. As mentioned earlier, according to the relevant ministerial order, each pupil is entitled to Rwf 875 per quarter. The higher the number of pupils, the bigger the amount a school should get as CG. This is an objective criterion and our research shows that it has been complied with by MoF for the quarters considered in this survey. Indeed, all schools are entitled to 875 Rwf per pupil per quarter (as the total per year is 3,500 Rwf), therefore for example in the case of E.A.R Byumba, the school was entitled to $Rwf\ 875 \times 1,112 = Rwf\ 973,000$, which is what the school has actually received according to its records. The same applies to all the 70 schools in the sample.



TI-Rw representatives meeting with senior officials from the Ministry of Finance

3.2. Items usually covered by CG funds

Table 10: Kind of items that schools usually fund with the Capitation Grant

	Parents		Teachers		Total	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Teachers' motivation allowance	112	58.64%	272	55.17%	384	56.14%
Materials for teachers and pupils	149	78.01%	408	82.76%	557	81.43%
Construction of the school and school infrastructure	120	62.83%	327	66.33%	447	65.35%
Clean water supply	102	53.40%	250	50.71%	352	51.46%
Electricity	112	58.64%	216	43.81%	328	47.95%

The table above, based on perception of respondents as assessed through questionnaires, shows that the CG is used in various aspects including catering for materials for teachers and pupils, teachers' motivation allowance and salaries, school construction/infrastructure, clean water supply, electricity, telephone, pupils' food, etc. Materials for teachers and pupils emerged as the items most commonly purchased with the CG according to respondents (81.4%) followed by school construction/infrastructure (65.3%), and teachers' motivation allowance (56.1%). Other items such as supply of clean water, electricity and telephone are also significantly covered by the CG.

3.3. Items actually acquired by classrooms with CG funds

Table 11: Items acquired by classrooms as a component of the CG over the period 2009-2010

	Parents		Pupils		Teachers	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Text books	187	97.9%	493	92.5%	423	85.8%
Desks	N/A	N/A	475	89.1%	391	79.3%
Teachers' tables	N/A	N/A	419	78.6%	312	63.3%
Teachers' chairs	N/A	N/A	419	78.6%	320	64.9%
Blackboards	N/A	N/A	484	90.8%	382	77.5%
Chalk	N/A	N/A	501	94.0%	443	89.9%

Items such as textbooks, chalk, desks and blackboards prove to be largely covered by the CG, as showed by the table above based on respondents' perceptions. It emerged from this survey that the large majority of respondents including CG recipients confirmed this fact. More importantly, the fact that text books are covered by the CG constitutes not only a valuable contribution to the promotion of quality basic education but also a step to relieving poor families from the burden of striving to cater for school materials. However, one of limitations of this survey is that it was not easy to examine the proportions of pupils who have

already acquired textbooks for each taught subject. It must be specified that this question was not asked to parents (hence the N/A indications) because it was considered that it would be difficult for them to assess what items were actually purchased at classroom level. On the contrary, teachers and pupils are well placed to answer this question as they can easily see whether a new desk or blackboard is acquired and brought to their classroom.

3.4. Items acquired by schools as a component of the CG

Table 12: Items actually acquired by schools as a component of the CG over the period 2009-2010

	Parents		Pupils		Teachers		Total	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Clean water	161	84.3%	413	77.5%	324	65.7%	898	73.8%
Electricity	133	69.6%	341	64.0%	305	61.9%	779	64.0%
Sanitation	164	85.9%	449	84.2%	397	80.5%	1010	83.0%
Telephone	58	30.4%	88	16.5%	100	20.3%	246	20.2%
Sick room	55	28.8%	132	24.8%	77	15.6%	264	21.7%
Sport infrastructure and equipment	157	82.2%	411	77.1%	362	73.4%	930	76.4%

Data in table 12 shows that, according to respondents' perceptions, the CG is used to acquire school infrastructure among other things. The table above examines the type of school infrastructure, apart from classrooms and offices, acquired over the 2009-2010 period. Overall, sanitation (83%), sport infrastructure (76.4%), clean water (73.8%) and electricity (64%) were acquired in this period thanks to the CG. Moreover, some schools were equipped with telephone (20.2%) and sick rooms (21.7%). In this case, parents were included in the questions as they (at least those who are members of PTAs whom are targeted by this survey) play a role in decisions to purchase this kind of items related to general infrastructures of the schools.

3.5. Satisfaction with the CG spending

Table 13: Respondents' satisfaction with how the CG is spent by their schools

	Parents		Pupils		Teachers		Total	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Not satisfied at all	3	2%	14	2.7%	33	7.05%	50	4.3%
Somewhat satisfied	13	7%	49	9.6%	77	16.45%	139	12.0%
Satisfied	102	55%	216	42.3%	252	53.85%	570	49.0%
Very satisfied	63	34%	230	45.0%	78	16.67%	371	31.9%
Don't know	3	2%	2	0.4%	28	5.98%	33	2.8%
Total	184	100%	511	100.0%	468	100.00%	1163	100.0%
Score	3.19	79.8%	3.29	82.2%	2.68	67.04%	3.03	75.7%

In this case, a scoring methodology was used to measure satisfaction: overall satisfaction was scored 3.03 out of 4 (where 4 is the best score), equivalent to 75.7%, meaning a high satisfaction vis-à-vis the capitation grant. Scores in the table above reveal that pupils (82.2%) and parents (79.8%) prove more satisfied than teachers (67.04%). As highlighted in some of the interviews conducted in the framework of the research, this situation may be partly explained not only by the fact that the teachers' motivation allowance is sometimes paid late, but also that the teachers' economic conditions remain poor in Rwanda. Teachers' dissatisfaction is reflected to some extent in the table 22 (under point 4.5.) on transparency in CG-related tendering processes.

It is important to point out that overall satisfaction with how the CG is spent has also been expressed in interviews with top officials from MOE and MOF as well as from key development partners working in the field of education. Such interview permitted to unveil some challenges in the management of CG, namely weak reporting from schools to Districts, lack of uniform template for financial reporting at schools level, limited skills in PFM, lack of accounting software and compliance with guidelines on tender procedures. But in spite of these punctual challenges, the overall assessment of how the money is spent at school level is unanimously good.

4. COMPLIANCE WITH THE GUIDELINES ON REQUEST, DISBURSEMENT AND USE OF CG

The CG is established by ministerial order and other guidelines which set procedures and deadlines for requesting, disbursing and using that grant. This chapter examines whether stakeholders actually comply with such procedures and deadlines.

4.1. Compliance with the deadline of submission of the pupils' number by school head teachers

The art 6 of the title 2 of Ministerial Order no 001 of 30/01/2007 provides that schools must submit the number of their pupils to the District no later than 15 days after the beginning of the school year.

4.1.1. First Quarter 2009 – Beginning of the school year

Table 14: Schools compliance with the deadline of submission of the pupils' number for the 1st Quarter of 2009

School	Number of pupils submitted by school to District	Date of submission of number of pupils by school	Date required/ 15 days after beginning	Delay in number of days
1. E.E.R BYUMBA	1,058	No date	03/02/2009	NA
2. G.S KAGARAMA	604	22/02/2009	03/02/2009	19
3. G.S KIBUYE	997	15/02/2009	03/02/2009	12
4. G.S RWAMAGANA	1,430	14/02/2009	03/02/2009	11
5. E.P RUHANGO	755	No date	03/02/2009	NA
6. E.P KIRAMBO	1,490	No date	03/02/2009	NA
7. E.E.R RUHENGERI	1,075	No date	03/02/2009	NA
8. E.P GASAKA	903	No date	03/02/2009	NA
9. E.P RANGO	626	No date	03/02/2009	NA
10. E.P BYUMBA	1,716	No date	03/02/2009	NA

The 2009 School year started on 19/01/2009. The due date of submission of these numbers to District authorities was on 03/02/2009, i.e. 15 days after the beginning of the first term. However, the desk research analyzed the school records and found that a significant number of head-teachers do not indicate the dates of submission on their reports when they sign them (hence the several "no date" in the table). For that quarter, for example, only 3 schools out of 10 indicated the dates and the range of numbers of days, where the dates are indicated, of submission varies between 11 and 19 days.

The fact that most submissions did not indicate any date looks strange and unusual given that indicating the date is common practice for any correspondence. Since this happened too many times to be considered a simple mistake, researchers assumed that this was done intentionally in order to hide such delays.

Furthermore, the table above shows that all the 3 schools which indicated the dates on the cover letter of report submissions did so with delays ranging from 11 to 19 days. The failure to meet the set deadline entails failure to disburse fund on time by the MoF and thus hinders the timely implementation of the school action plan. Head teachers were interviewed on this issue as to guide researchers on reasons behind this delay. Some of them argued that the delay of submission of the number of pupils is motivated by the practice of delays in disbursing the requested C.G. by the MOF, while others pointed out the laziness of head teachers.

4.1.2. First Quarter 2010 – Beginning of the school year

Table 15: Schools compliance with the deadline of submission of the pupils' number for the 1st Quarter of 2010 School Year

School	Number of pupils submitted by school to District	Date of submission of number of pupils by school	Date required/15 days after beginning	Delay in number of days
1. E.E.R BYUMBA	1,220	No date	19/02/2010	NA
2. G.S KAGARAMA	605	15/02/2011	19/02/2010	On time
3. G.S KIBUYE	1,212	29/03/2010	19/02/2010	39
4. G.S RWAMAGANA	1,425	06/03/2010	19/02/2010	17
5. E.P RUHANGO	853	No date	19/02/2010	NA
6. E.P KIRAMBO	1,490	No date	19/02/2010	NA
7. E.E.R RUHENGARI	1,053	No date	19/02/2010	NA
8. E.P GASAKA	656	No date	19/02/2010	NA
9. E.P RANGO	650	No date	19/02/2010	NA
10. E.P BYUMBA	1,716	No date	19/02/2010	NA

As it was the case in the school year 2009, the large majority of school reports on the number of pupils for the 2010 school year as submitted to the DEO do not mention the submission date. Only 3 out of 10 schools sampled for the desk research indicated the submission date. The due date of submission of these numbers to the District was on 04/02/2010, i.e. 15 days after the beginning of the first term. Out of the 3 schools whose reports indicated the submission date, only one submitted it in time, while the 2 remaining did it late. The delay ranges from 17 to 39 days. For this quarter, for example, 3 Schools out of 10 have indicated the dates and the range of numbers of days, where the dates are indicated, of submission varies between 17 and 39.

4.2. Compliance with the use of the CG

The Ministerial Order mentioned above provides that the use of the CG must respect certain proportions: 50% must be used for the functioning of the school, 35% for infrastructure and sanitation and 15% for training. This means that schools receive the cash but are not entirely free to spend it on whatever they want to, as they have to follow the guidelines. The table below examines whether schools comply with these proportions.



TI-Rw representatives meeting with Dr. Mathias Harebamungu, Minister of State for primary and secondary education

Table 16: Schools compliance with the guidelines on CG use (School Year 2009)

SCHOOL	USE OF THE CG	AMOUNT	%	COMMENTS
G.S KAGARAMA	Functioning	1,058,750	50%	Compliant
	Infrastructure Repair & Sanitation	741,000	35%	Compliant
	Training	317,000	15%	Compliant
	Total	2,116,750	100%	
G.S KIBUYE	Functioning	1,742,900	61,7%	Not Compliant
	Infrastructure Repair & Sanitation	755,125	26,8%	Not Compliant
	Training	323,625	11,5%	Not Compliant
	Total	2,821,650	100%	
G.S RWAMAGANA	Functioning	2,175,187	81,2%	Not Compliant
	Infrastructure Repair & Sanitation	336,600	12,6%	Not Compliant
	Training	165,000	6,2%	Not Compliant
	Total	2,676,787	100%	
E.P RUHANGO	Functioning	?		Data not clear
	Infrastructure Repair & Sanitation	?		Data not clear
	Training	?		Data not clear
	Total			
E.A.R BYUMBA	Functioning	1,502,151	47,4%	Not Compliant
	Infrastructure Repair & Sanitation	1,477,375	46,6%	Not Compliant
	Training	192,900	6%	Not Compliant
	Total	3,171,726	100%	

It is important to specify here that this is an in-depth analysis which is extremely time consuming as it implies a thorough assessment of a number of reports and documents at school level. Consequently, due to budget and time constraints, it was decided to only target five schools (one per District) randomly selected. These results, therefore, merely complement the survey and cannot be considered representative of the whole country; instead, they identify important trends and challenges which will be considered when formulating recommendations.

The desk research found that only 1 out of 5 sampled schools complied with these proportions for the 2009 school year. Three of them did not comply while data for 1 school were not clear and thus it was impossible to examine the compliance. The table above shows that schools tend to spend more than they should on school functioning at the expense of other items, especially training, though one school overspent in infrastructure repair and sanitation.

Unfortunately, training is obviously neglected by most of the sampled schools while it proves to be a key factor to increase the quality of the education system.

It is worth mentioning that the interviews conducted during this research project highlighted two different positions as far as the compliance with the guidelines is concerned. On the one hand, it is obviously crucial that schools should follow the instructions given to them by the Ministry in order to avoid abuses in CG spending, including corruption and embezzlement. On the other hand, however, some observers pointed out that a certain degree of flexibility could be useful as it would allow schools with different needs to spend the funds in line with their own priorities and thus better respond to their specific needs.

It seems therefore desirable to find a balance between the need to set clear guidelines and the necessity to allow some flexibility to schools.

4.3. Perceptions on the timeliness of selected CG benefits

The two tables below present teachers' and parents' perceptions on the timeliness of some selected CG benefits. These include teachers' allowance, training and school materials.

Table 17: Parents' perceptions on the timeliness of selected CG benefits

	Very late	Late	Timely	Very timely	Total Fr	Total Score	%
Motivation allowance	2	7	18	3	30	2.7	67.5%
Training	1	6	40	1	48	2.8	70%
Teaching materials	0	3	44	18	65	3.2	80%

Table 18: Teachers' perceptions on the timeliness of selected CG benefits

Teacher	Very late	Late	Timely	Very timely	Total	Total Score	%
Motivation allowance	21	113	149	40	323	2.6	66.1%
Training	20	49	132	22	223	2.7	67.4%
Teaching materials	11	31	179	57	278	3	75%

Here again a scoring methodology was used, with scores ranging from 1 to 4 (4 being the best score); percentages were then derived from the scores. Teaching materials tend to be the timeliest compared to the teachers' motivation allowance and the training. This is shown by the fact that the score (80% for parents respondents and 75% for teachers) is the highest. This allowance proves to be the least timely as perceived by the respondents. Although the table 16 shows that schools seem to give less consideration to the training as a CG benefit, this item does not stand as the least timely as perceived by the respondents.

4.4. MoF Compliance with the deadline for CG funds disbursement

The ministerial order mentioned above states that the CG is disbursed by the MoF at the beginning of the quarter. Although the “beginning of the quarter” looks vague given that it does not mention the exact date, the assessment of the MoF’s compliance with this provision assumed that two weeks after the submission of the pupils’ number by the schools should be considered as the deadline if the CG is to serve effectively the schools during the concerned quarter .

Table 19: Date in which the Capitation Grant reached the schools – Q3/2009

School Name	Number of pupils	Total amount received by school	Date of reception	Deadline	Delay (number of days)
1. E.A.R BYUMBA	1,112	973,000	10/11/2009	10/09/2009	60
2. E.P. GACURABWENGE	818	715,750	10/11/2009	10/09/2009	60
3. E.P. MESHERO	1,220	1,067,750	10/11/2009	10/09/2009	60
4. G.S. KAGEYO	1,716	1,501,500	10/11/2009	10/09/2009	60
5. G.S. NOTRE DAME DU BON CONSEIL	1,675	1,465,625	10/11/2009	10/09/2009	60
6. KAGARAMA	577	504,875	20/10/2009	10/09/2009	40
7. E.P BYUMBA	1,752	1,533,000	4/09/2009	10/09/2009	On time
8. E.P KIRAMBO	1,480	1,295,000	5/09/2009	10/09/2009	On time
9. E.P RUHENGERI	1,060	927,500	5/9/2009	10/09/2009	On time
10. E.P GASAKA	592	518,000	14/8/2009	10/09/2009	On time
11. E.P MUKURA	583	510,125	17/8/2009	10/09/2009	On time
12. E.P MBAZI	752	658,000	24/8/2009	10/09/2009	On time
13. GICACA	1,179	1,031,625	02/09/2009	10/09/2009	On time
14. KAGASA	1,703	1,490,125	02/09/2009	10/09/2009	On time
15. NYAMATA	1,176	1,029,000	02/09/2009	10/09/2009	On time

The third quarter of 2009 started on 10th August and ended on 30th October. The table above, based on the analysis of schools’ records, shows that several schools received the CG with significant delay. Out of 15 schools visited, 6 received the capitation grant with a delay ranging from 40 to 60 days. This has a serious negative impact on the functioning of schools. The other 9 schools, however, received the capitation grant on time. It is surprising that 4 out 6 schools with delays are located near their respective Districts office where they can easily benefit support from the DEO and hence avoid such malpractice.

Table 20: Date in which the Capitation Grant was received by schools – Q4/2009

District	Number of pupils	Total amount received by school	Date of reception	Deadline	Delay (number of days)
1. E.P. E.A.R BYUMBA	1,112	973,000	10/11/2009	01/12/2009	On time
2. E.P. GACURABWENGE	818	715,750	10/11/2009	01/12/2009	On time
3. E.P. MESHERO	1,220	1,067,750	10/11/2009	01/12/2009	On time
4. G.S. KAGEYO	1,716	1,501,500	10/11/2009	01/12/2009	On time
5. G.S. NOTRE DAME DU BON CONSEIL	1,675	1,465,625	10/11/2009	01/12/2009	On time
6. KAGARAMA	577	504,875	20/10/2009	01/12/2009	On time
7. E.P BYUMBA	1,752	1,533,000	24/11/2009	01/12/2009	On time
8. E.P KIRAMBO	1,480	1,295,000	31/12/2009	01/12/2009	30
9. E.P RUHENGERI	1,060	927,500	4/11/2009	01/12/2009	On time
10. E.P GASAKA	592	518,000	19/11/2009	01/12/2009	On time
11. E.P MUKURA	583	510,125	16/11/2009	01/12/2009	On time
12. E.P MBAZI	752	658,000	24/11/2009	01/12/2009	On time
13. GICACA	1,179	1,031,625	21/10/2009	01/12/2009	On time
14. KAGASA	1,703	1,490,125	21/10/2009	01/12/2009	On time
15. NYAMATA	1,176	1,029,000	21/10/2009	01/12/2009	On time

The table on the fourth quarter of 2009 shows that out of 15 schools visited, 14 received the capitation grant on time, while only 1 received it with a delay of 30 days. This shows a big improvement compared to the third quarter. The research does not permit to formulate explanations on why many more schools seem to have received the CG on time in this quarter.

Table 21: Date in which the Capitation Grant reaches schools – Q1/2010

District	Number of pupils	Total amount received by school	Date of reception	Deadline	Delay (number of days)
1. E.A.R BYUMBA	1,217	1,064,875	24/03/2010	03/03/2010	21
2. E.P. GACURABWE NGE	805	704,575	24/03/2010	03/03/2010	21
3. E.P. MESHERO	1,230	1,076,250	24/03/2010	03/03/2010	21
4. G.S. KAGEYO	1,699	1,486,625	24/03/2010	03/03/2010	21
5. G.S. NOTRE DAME DU BON CONSEIL	1,623	1,420,125	24/03/2010	03/03/2010	21
6. KAGARAMA	577	504,875	06/06/2010	03/03/2010	97
7. E.P BYUMBA	1,716	1,501,500	31/5/2010	03/03/2010	89
8. E.P KIRAMBO	1,447	1,226,125	31/5/2010	03/03/2010	89
9. E.P RUHENGERI	1,053	921,375	20/4/2010	03/03/2010	47
10. E.P GASAKA	656	574,000	10/4/2010	03/03/2010	37
11. E.P MUKURA	650	568,750	25/2/2010	03/03/2010	On time
12. E.P MBAZI	752	658,000	15/04/2010	03/03/2010	42
13. GICACA	1,109	970,375	20/03/2010	03/03/2010	17
14. KAGASA	1,944	1,701,000	20/03/2010	03/03/2010	17

The first quarter of the 2010 school year ran from 04/02 to 01/04/2010. The survey found out that in this quarter almost all schools received the capitation grant with a significant delay, as indicated in the table 21 above. Indeed, 14 out of 15 schools visited received the capitation grant with a delay ranging from 17 to 97 days. This shows that the disbursement of the capitation grant worsened compared to the previous quarter and this has a serious negative impact in the functioning of schools. Again, it has not been possible to identify the reason why the timing of the disbursement worsened compared to the previous quarter.

To conclude on this aspect, the survey reveals a very poor compliance of MoF with the deadline of disbursement of CG funds. This hinders manifestly the timely implementation of school action plans. Some head-teachers who were interviewed during this survey contended that they are often obliged to borrow money from some business people while waiting for the disbursement of the CG. It is a serious problem if public schools are obliged to borrow money from private individuals for their functioning as this contradicts the concept itself of public (thus State-funded) education. Such delays also affect negatively the quality of teaching.

4.5. Transparency in CG-related tendering processes

Table 22: Perceptions on transparency in CG-related tendering processes over the last two school years

		Non-transparent at all	Non-transparent	Transparent	Very transparent	Total	Score	Percent
Parents	Transparency of capitation grant related tenders for material supply	0	7	113	42	162	3.22	80.4%
	Transparency of capitation grant related tenders for classrooms repairing and extension	0	7	118	38	163	3.19	79.8%
Teachers	Transparency of capitation grant related tenders for material supply	22	44	233	56	355	2.91	72.7%
	Transparency of capitation grant related tenders for classrooms repairing and extension	21	38	227	54	340	2.92	73.1%

As in many countries, since a long time, tendering processes in Rwanda have been criticized to be characterized by both corruption and nepotism. In response to that phenomenon, the GoR has set up a series of institutions such as the Rwanda Public Procurement Authority, the Office of the Auditor General, the Office of the Ombudsman, etc. The implementation of the CG programme in the education sector often entails tendering processes in the areas of school repairing and extension, school materials supply, etc. The current PETS has collected respondents' perceptions on the level of transparency of CG-related tendering processes. Once again a scoring methodology was used, where 1 is the worst and 4 is the best score; the scores have then been converted into percentages for an easier understanding (where a score of 1 equals 0% and 4 translates into 100%). Overall, the level of transparency is perceived high (above 72%). Parents tend to find the process more transparent than teachers. As a matter of fact, parents scored very high (80.4% and 79.8%) the transparency of tendering transparent on school materials supply and school repairing/extension respectively, while the same types of the tendering processes, teachers scored it slightly less high (72.7% and 73.1%); again, this might be a consequence of the fact that only parents who are members of PTAs were interviewed in this survey. Interviews with key resource persons have not unveiled any major problem on tendering processes, though the representative from Mineduc is fully aware that in some cases tendering procedures are not followed correctly, making this one of the challenges the Ministry has to address.

5. CAPITATION GRANT LEAKAGE

This chapter examines the level of leakage of the CG. This is about the discrepancy between the fund disbursed by the MoF and the amount received by recipient schools as revealed by the desk research. The formula to calculate the leakage is presented in the introduction chapter under methodology section (paragraph 1.4.1).

5.1. Respondents perceptions on any difference between requested fund and the grant received

Before looking at the analysis of funds registered in MOF and schools' records, it is interesting to look at people's perception on whether the CG received corresponds to what it was requested. Even though parents and teachers do not necessarily have proper information and real data, it is useful to analyze their perceptions; instead, pupils were deemed not informed enough to answer such a question.

Table 23: Adequacy of the fund requested and the grant received for the 2009-2010 period

	Parents		Teachers		Total	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Yes, always adequate	90	52.6%	179	37.6%	269	41.6%
No, always less than requested	10	5.8%	56	11.8%	66	10.2%
No, sometimes less than requested	33	19.3%	37	7.8%	70	10.8%
No, sometimes more that requested	1	0.6%	8	1.7%	9	1.4%
Don't know	37	21.6%	196	41.2%	233	36.0%
Total	171	100.0%	476	100.0%	647	100.0%

A significant proportion of parents and teachers (41.6%) declared that over the last three years the amount of the CG received by the schools matched with the funds requested. Cumulatively, 21% (10.2%+10.8%) of respondents maintained that the amount received is smaller than what was requested. Schools in which such a situation occurs experience serious budget deficits, which constitute a cause for teachers' de-motivation, poor school infrastructure, poor school materials and therefore low quality education. Of course, inadequacy of funds does not necessarily mean leakage, and indeed respondents tentatively explained such a discrepancy mainly by resource limitation at the central government level. However, perceived corruption and embezzlement was cited by some respondents as cause of the discrepancy.

Surprisingly, 36% of the respondents (teachers and parents) have no idea about this reality. The proportion of teachers who "don't know" (41.2%) proves higher than that of parents (21.6%). The fact of not having information on the amount of funds requested and received challenges the participation of parents and teachers in the management of the CG (which – as shown in Chapter 6 below – emerged as being high). It may imply a low level or simply a passive participation. Another tentative explanation, given that it is unlikely that many teachers are not aware of such crucial information, is that a number of respondents deliberately decided not to disclose their opinion on a potentially sensitive issue.

Despite the fact that some respondents argued that sometimes the funds received as capitation grant prove smaller than that initially requested, the desk research revealed no leakage at all as shown in the table below.

5.2. Capitation Grant requested by District and received by schools

As stated above, the Public Expenditure Policy on Capitation Grant provides that the Head of School must submit the number of pupils of his/her school to the district within 15 days following the beginning of each term. Then, the district compiles all schools numbers, prepares the request of Capitation Grant and submits it to the Rwandan Ministry of Finance. The latter disburses the funds and transfers the Capitation Grant directly to the individual account of each school.

The table below was created based on the analysis of MOF payment orders, that is the documents attesting the funds disbursed, and the bank statements from the schools' bank accounts, which show the funds received. In order to present the analysis in a clear and concise way, and given that the results across the 70 sampled schools were consistent, the amounts disbursed by MOF and received by the schools were grouped by District. In other words, for example, RWF 660,189,935 is the amount that all sampled schools in the Burera District requested to MOF; the amount of money disbursed by MOF to the same school was also RWF 660,189,935 and so was the total CG received by those schools, which lead to the conclusion that there was no leakage.

Table 24: Actual value of the Capitation Grant requested by District and received by Schools (2009-2010)

District	Capitation grant requested by District for schools	Capitation Grant disbursed by MOF	Capitation grant received by schools
1. Burera	660,189,935	660,189,935	660,189,935
2. Gicumbi	571,889,751	571,889,751	571,889,751
3. Huye	540,546,333	540,546,333	540,546,333
4. Kicukiro	259,323,875	259,323,875	259,323,875
5. Karongi	623,805,625	623,805,625	623,805,625
6. Musanze	590,134,375	590,134,375	590,134,375
7. Ngoma	536,852,919	536,852,919	536,852,919
8. Ngororero	713,830,621	713,830,621	713,830,621
9. Nyagatare	602,905,000	602,905,000	602,905,000
10. Nyamagabe	620,703,526	620,703,526	620,703,526
11. Nyarugenge	295,942,500	295,942,500	295,942,500
12. Rubavu	508,00,545	508,00,545	508,00,545
13. Ruhango	551,870,394	551,870,394	551,870,394
14. Rwamagana	441,545,694	441,545,694	441,545,694
15. Gasabo	312,006,375	312,006,375	312,006,375
Total Amount	7,321,546,923	7,321,546,923	7,321,546,923

Based on data from the bank accounts of 70 schools grouped per each of the 15 districts, a total of RWF 7,3 billion was received as capitation grant by Districts schools. The amount requested by district is equal to the total amount received by all schools of these districts and is also equal to the Capitation Grant disbursed by the Rwandan Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, as indicated in the Ministry's records. The desk research thus indicates that there is no leakage (as indicated in the table above) between the amount requested by District and the amount received by Districts schools from the Ministry of Finance. Leakage is also calculated as follows:

$$\text{Leakage} = 1 - \frac{\text{Resources Received by District}}{\text{Resources Intended for District}}$$

$$\text{Leakage for 15 Districts} = 1 - \frac{7,321,546,923}{7,321,546,923}$$

$$= 1 - 1 = 0$$

$$\text{Leakage for 15 Districts} = 1 - 1 = 0$$

Based on this leakage calculation, it emerged that there is no leakage at all. The most likely reason for such lack of leakage is that there is no intermediate transfer from Ministry of Finance to the district level. The funds are directed disbursed from MoF to the schools bank accounts.

5.3. Capitation grant received and number of school pupils (2009-2010)

The Ministerial Order (Ministry of Education) provides that the Capitation Grant for each pupil is RWF 875 per quarter (equivalent to RWF 3,500 per year). The table below examines whether this provision is abided by: researchers examined the schools' records and compared the number of students and the total amount received by each school in order to check whether each school actually got RWF 875 per pupil per quarter as indicated in the ministerial guidelines.

Table 25: The relationship between the Capitation Grant and the number of school pupils – Q3, 2009.

District	Number of pupils	Total amount received by school	Capitation grant per pupil	Capitation grant per pupil/ministerial order
1. E.P. E.A.R BYUMBA	1,112	973,000	875	875
2. E.P. GACURABWENGE	818	715,750	875	875
3. E.P. MESHERO	1,220	1,067,750	875	875
4. G.S. KAGEYO	1,716	1,501,500	875	875
5. G.S. NOTRE DAME DU BON CONSEIL	1,675	1,465,625	875	875
6. KAGARAMA	577	504,875	875	875
7. E.P BYUMBA	1,752	1,533,000	875	875
8. E.P KIRAMBO	1,480	1,295,000	875	875
9. E.P RUHENGARI	1,060	927,500	875	875
10. E.P GASAKA	592	518,000	875	875
11. E.P MUKURA	583	510,125	875	875
12. E.P MBAZI	752	658,000	875	875
13. GICACA	1,179	1,031,625	875	875
14. KAGASA	1,703	1,490,125	875	875
15. RANGO	1,813	1,586,375	875	875

Leakage = 1 - $\frac{\text{Resources Received by District}}{\text{Resources Intended for District}}$

Leakage for 15 Districts = 1 - $\frac{7,321,546,923}{7,321,546,923}$

7,321,546,923

Leakage for 15 Districts = 1 - 1 = 0

Desk research in 15 selected schools (see the table above) confirmed that there is no leakage between the Capitation Grant provided by the Ministerial order and the amount disbursed by the Ministry of Finance and received by District schools for each pupil. Indeed, each school received RWF 875 per pupil as provided for by the MOE order.

5.4. Relationship between number of pupils submitted by schools to districts and those submitted by districts to MoF

5.4.1. First Quarter 2009 – Beginning of the school year

Table 26: Relationship between the number of pupils submitted by school to district and that submitted by district to MoF for the 1st quarter 2009

School	District	Number of pupils submitted by schools to Districts	Number of pupils submitted by Districts to MoF	Difference
1. E.E.R BYUMBA	GICUMBI	1,058	1,058	0
2. G.S KAGARAMA	KICUKIRO	604	604	0
3. G.S KIBUYE	KARONGI	997	997	0
4. G.S RWAMAGANA	RWAMAGANA	1,430	1,430	0
5. E.P RUHANGO	RUHANGO	755	755	0
6. E.P KIRAMBO	BURERA	1,490	1,490	0
7. E.E.R RUHENGERI	MUSANZE	1,075	1,075	0
8. E.P GASAKA	NYAMAGABE	903	903	0
9. E.P RANGO	HUYE	626	650	0
10. E.P BYUMBA	BURERA	1,716	1,716	0

The comparison between numbers of pupils submitted to districts by schools and those submitted to MoF by Districts was carried out with the objective to check whether there is any difference between the two aggregates. The desk research, based on the comparative analysis of school records and District records, indicates that there is no difference at all for the beginning of the School Year 2009. Numbers submitted by both schools to Districts and by Districts to MOE for all sampled schools are equal. This is important information as the amounts disbursed as CG depend on the number of pupils of each schools, as explained above.

5.4.2. First Quarter 2010 – Beginning of the school year

Table 27: Relationship between the number of pupils submitted by schools to districts and that submitted by districts to MoF for the 1st quarter 2010

School	District	Number of pupils submitted by schools to Districts	Number of pupils submitted by Districts to MOF	Difference
1. E.A.R BYUMBA	GICUMBI	1,220	1,217	- 3
2. G.S KAGARAMA	KICUKIRO	605	577	- 28
3. G.S KIBUYE	KARONGI	1,212	1,212	- 0
4. G.S RWAMAGANA	RWAMAGANA	1,425	1,425	- 0
5. E.P RUHANGO	RUHANGO	853	853	- 0
6. E.P KIRAMBO	BURERA	1,490	1,490	- 0
7. E.E.R RUHENGERI	MUSANZE	1,053	1,053	- 0
8. E.P GASAKA	NYAMAGABE	656	656	- 0
9. E.P RANGO	HUYE	650	650	- 0
10. E.P BYUMBA	BURERA	1,716	1,716	- 0

Unlike it was the case for the first quarter of 2009 school year, the desk research (based as above on the comparative analysis of school records and District records) revealed a small discrepancy between the number of school pupils submitted by the head-teachers and that submitted by the DEO for the 1st quarter of the school year 2010. The discrepancy was observed in two schools from two different districts and cannot be considered as corruption practice because this difference is found at District level with smaller number compared to that of the school level.

6. STAKEHOLDERS' PARTICIPATION IN MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING OF CAPITATION GRANT

The ministerial order governing the CG provides for the participation of different education stakeholders in the management of this grant. Those stakeholders include parents and teachers among others. This chapter examines the issue of participation in the management of the capitation grant.

6.1. Participation in meetings to develop school action plans

Table 28: Respondents' participation in meetings to develop school action plans

	Parents		Teachers		Total	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Yes	161	89.4%	292	62.5%	453	70.2%
No	19	10.6%	175	37.5%	194	30.1%
Total	180	100.0%	467	100.0%	647	100.3%

Overall, 70% of respondents (teachers and parents, cumulatively) have participated in meetings to develop action plans for their schools over the 2008-2010 period. However, the proportion of parents who participated in such meetings stands higher (89.4%) than that of teachers (62.5%). A significant proportion of teachers (37.5%) were never involved in such meetings. This is not surprising given that the parents who were interviewed in this research are all members of PTAs so are involved in school management, while not all teachers are members of the SMCs. Only their representatives are members of such committee and this partly explains this proportion of teachers who have not participated in such meetings.

6.2. Frequency of participation in the development of school action plans

Table 29: Frequency of respondents' participation in such meetings

	Parents		Teachers		Total	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Always	88	53.7%	127	44.7%	215	47.9%
Often	52	31.7%	59	20.8%	111	24.7%
Sometimes	23	14.0%	84	29.6%	107	23.8%
Rarely	1	0.6%	15	5.3%	16	3.6%

Overall, respondents have often been involved in meetings to develop action plans for their schools over the last three years. Cumulatively, 72.6% are involved at least often. Again, the proportion of the parents who are at least often involved is higher than that of teachers. This could be due to the fact that all parents who were interviewed are members of the school management committees while generally, not all teachers are members of the same committee.

6.3. Perceptions on stakeholders' participation in developing school action plans

Table 30: Respondents' perceptions on teachers and parents' participation in developing school action plans (% active)

	Parents		Teachers	
	Score	%	Score	%
Teachers	3.25	81.1%	2.89	72.4%
Parents	3.22	80.5%	3.09	77.3%
Pupils	2.63	65.9%	2.41	60.3%

The idea that parents who participated in this research are more involved than teachers in developing the school action plan (see the preceding table) is also reflected in the above table, which measures the respondents' perception on whether the involvement of parents, teachers and pupils in developing school plans is active. Parents' scoring on active participation is slightly higher (81.1% about teachers and 80.5% about parents' participation) than teachers' scoring. Moreover, teachers tend to find parents' participation slightly more active (77.3%) than their own participation (72.4%). However, pupils' score is lower, showing that they feel that parents and teachers are less actively involved in developing their school action plans, as shown in the table above.

6.4. Existence of School Management Committee (SMC) and Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) in schools

Table 31: Presence of a SMC and a PTA in schools (% Yes)

Structure	Parents		Teachers	
	Fr	%	Fr	%
School Management Committee (SMC)	165	92.2%	418	89.9%
Parent-Teacher Association (PTA)	176	98.3%	447	95.1%

The large majority of respondents (both teachers and parents) share the view that their schools have a School Management Committee (SMC) and a Parent-Teacher Association (PTA). The existence of such committee and association is very important especially as far as good planning for and use of the CG are concerned. The existence of such structures however does not provide any information on the way they work. The table below examines respondents' views on how active those structures are.

6.5. Perceptions on SMCs and PTAs in the overall school management

Table 32: Respondents' perceptions on SMCs and PTAs in the overall school management

		Not Active	Moderately active	Active	Very Active	Total	Score	Percent
Parent	Management Committee	3	13	77	68	161	3.30	82.6%
	Parents-Teachers Association	2	5	94	63	164	3.33	83.2%
Teachers	Management Committee	9	24	215	152	400	3.28	81.9%
	Parents-Teachers Association	7	24	269	124	424	3.20	80.1%

Overall, both teachers and parents maintain that both SMCs and PTAs are active in the overall management of the school including the CG. The scores for the activeness of both structures are slightly more than 80% as perceived by both teachers and parents who were interviewed during this study. It is assumed that active participation of those structures increases transparency and effective use of the CG.

6.6. Monitoring and auditing of the CG

Table 33: Parents' views on frequency of key monitoring mechanisms of the capitation grant

	Annually	Biannually	Quarterly	Monthly	Weekly	Don't know	
School visits by the District Education Officer	27	8	62	11	0	68	176
	15.3%	4.5%	35.2%	6.3%	0.0%	38.6%	100.0%
Meetings of the PTA	8	9	122	22	2	12	175
	4.6%	5.1%	69.7%	12.6%	1.1%	6.9%	100.0%
School management committee meetings	7	2	55	40	17	52	173
	4.0%	1.2%	31.8%	23.1%	9.8%	30.1%	100.0%
Capitation grant audit	45	8	20	11	1	77	162
	27.8%	4.9%	12.3%	6.8%	0.6%	47.5%	100.0%

A significant proportion of parents ignore the frequency of the meetings of the CG monitoring systems. 38.6%, 30% and 47.5% do not know how often school visits by the District Education Officer (DEO), SMC meetings and CG audits take place. However, this periodicity tends to be quarterly for the school visits by the DEO, meetings of the PTA and meetings of the SMC as declared by 35.2%, 69.7% and 31.8% respectively. The interview with head teachers confirmed that PTA and SMC are done quarterly and whenever it deems necessary. As for the CG audit, the periodicity proves to be annual according to 27.8% of respondents. Different answers on the periodicity of meetings of the CG monitoring systems may be interpreted not only as insufficient information by some parents and teachers but also as indicator that both categories do not participate regularly in their respective structure. If this is the case, it can affect transparency and proper use of the CG.

Table 34: Teachers' views on frequency of key monitoring mechanisms of the capitation grant

	Annually	Biannually	Quarterly	Monthly	Weekly	Don't know	Total
School visits by the District Education Officer	80	19	130	34	4	186	453
	17.7%	4.2%	28.7%	7.5%	0.9%	41.1%	100.0%
Meetings of the PTA	31	13	251	59	4	101	459
	6.8%	2.8%	54.7%	12.9%	0.9%	22.0%	100.0%
School management committee meetings	15	6	121	101	46	157	446
	3.4%	1.3%	27.1%	22.6%	10.3%	35.2%	100.0%
Capitation grant audit	97	12	41	10	2	278	440
	22.0%	2.7%	9.3%	2.3%	0.5%	63.2%	100.0%

As it was the case for parents, significant proportions of teachers ignore the frequency of meetings of the CG monitoring systems. 41.1%, 22%, 35.2% and 63.2% do not know how often school visits by the DEO, meetings of the PTA and of the SMC as well as CG audits take place. However, other significant proportions maintain that meetings for the PTA (54.7%), visits by the DEO (28.7%) and by the SMC (27.1%) take place on a quarterly basis, while the CG audit is carried out annually according to 22% of respondents. This confirms to a big extent with the views expressed by parents (see the previous table).

Table 35: Presence of an accountant at school

	Parents		Teachers		Total	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Yes	164	95.3%	447	98.5%	611	97.6%
No	5	2.9%	7	1.5%	12	1.9%
Don't know	3	1.7%	0	0.0%	3	0.5%
Total	172	100.0%	454	100.0%	626	100.0%

Almost all schools have accountants, as indicated by 97.6% of respondents. Most schools selected for this study run 9 year basic education programme and do have accountants, unlike most schools with exclusively 6 year primary education programme which do not. The presence of an accountant in schools constitutes a mechanism for better management of the CG. The accountant's role is paramount especially with regard to keeping financial records for the CP.

Interviews with key resource persons allowed to broadly confirm the findings. Though the overall assessment of the CG management is good, as already mentioned above, auditing and monitoring emerged as areas which need attention. While there was no independent monitoring of the 9YBE programme, which constitute part of the rationale for the present project, Minecofin counts on the presence of auditors at District level to seal the existing loopholes.

7.CONTRIBUTIONS PAID BY PARENTS AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS



The ministerial order mentioned earlier and related guidelines provide that despite the fact that basic education is free and despite the CG, parents may still be requested to voluntarily pay some extra contributions to complement education efforts. However it states clearly that a child should not be excluded just because his/her parents cannot afford to pay such extra contributions to the school.

7.1.Parents' contributions in education sector

Table 36:Extent to which parents still pay other education contributions in spite of the Capitation Grant

	Parents		Pupils		Teachers		Total	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Yes	104	63.8%	306	67.3%	315	66.5%	725	66.4%
No	59	36.2%	141	31.0%	155	32.7%	355	32.5%
Don't Know	0	0.0%	8	1.8%	4	0.8%	12	1.1%
Total	163	100.0%	455	100.0%	474	100.0%	1092	100.0%

Despite the CG, parents keep paying some contributions for the purpose of their children's education. Overall, the majority of respondents (66.4% cumulatively) confirmed this fact. It is indicated in nearly the same proportion by teachers (66.5%), pupils (67.3%) and parents (63.8%). However, a significant proportion of respondents (32.5%) said that such contributions are no longer paid.

7.2.Should parents keep paying extra contributions?

Table 37:Respondents' opinion on whether parents should pay extra contributions irrespective of the capitation grant

	Parents		Pupils		Teachers		Total	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Yes	121	72%	262	58.4%	297	72.6%	680	66.2%
No	48	28%	187	41.6%	112	27.4%	347	33.8%
Total	169	100%	449	100.0%	409	100.0%	1027	100.0%

The majority of respondents considered that parents should keep paying extra contributions irrespective of the CG. This was expressed by 66.2% of respondents. This idea is more common among teachers (72.6%) and parents (72%) than pupils (58.4). This is an indicator that the CG is not enough and that most parents and teachers (the majority of them being also parents) are still willing to contribute to education efforts for their children. However, it is forbidden to exclude pupils due to their parents' failure to pay such extra contributions. This issue is examined in the table 37.

Although the majority of respondents believe that parents should keep paying contributions aside the CG, a significant proportion of respondents (33.8%) feel that there is no need to pay such sums. These are mainly those who suggest that if education is free in public school at least for the 9 year basic education, then parents should not be requested to pay anything.

7.3. Other stakeholders' support to schools beside parents' contributions and the CG

Table 38: Existence of other financial or in-kind support to schools apart from the capitation grant and the parents' contributions over the last two years

	Parents		Teachers		Total	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Yes	64	39.3%	193	43.9%	257	42.6%
No	72	44.2%	195	44.3%	267	44.3%
Don't know	27	16.6%	52	11.8%	79	13.1%
Total	163	100.0%	440	100.0%	603	100.0%

A part from the CG and parents' contributions, a significant number of schools seem to have no other source of financial/material support. This opinion was shared by 44.3% of the respondents. However, a nearly equal proportion (42.6%) maintained that their schools do have other sources of financial/material support. They consist mainly of donations from foreign partners and from some national leaders who pledge to assist the schools after visiting them.

7.4. Awareness of pupils excluded due to failure to pay extra contributions

Table 39: Respondents awareness of any school pupil being excluded of school over the last 3 years due to failure to pay extra contributions

	Parents		Pupils		Teachers		Total	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Yes	14	8.0%	65	13.4%	36	7.6%	115	10.1%
No	155	88.6%	421	86.6%	433	91.2%	1009	88.8%
Don't know	6	3.4%	0	0.0%	6	1.3%	12	1.1%
Total	175	100.0%	486	100.0%	475	100.0%	1136	100.0%

Most schools do not exclude pupils over parents' failure to pay extra contributions. The large majority of respondents (88.8%) including parents, teachers and pupils argued that they do not know any pupil who has been expelled of schools for that reason over the last three years. This is other evidence that the CG contributes to improve school enrolment and reduce drop-out rate as it reduces the poor parents' burden to pay school fees. It also confirms that such contributions are paid by parents largely on a voluntary basis, otherwise respondents would have reported cases of pupils from poor families being excluded from school.

However, a small but not negligible proportion (10.1%) of respondents contended that they know pupils who were expelled over failure to pay extra contributions and this is very concerning. The table below examines how often this occurs.

7.5. Occurrence of school pupils to be excluded due to failure to pay an extra contribution

Table 40: Respondents' views on how often pupils are excluded due to their parents' failure to pay an extra contribution

	Parents		Pupils		Teachers		Total	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Rarely	1	9.10%	8	10.5	3	10.70%	12	10.4
Sometimes	5	45.50%	50	65.8	9	32.10%	64	55.7
Often	2	18.20%	8	10.5	7	25.00%	17	14.8
Always	0	0.00%	10	13.2	4	14.30%	14	12.2
Don't know	3	27.30%	0	0	5	17.90%	8	7.0
Total	11	100.00%	76	100	28	100.00%	115	100

Cumulatively, 81.7% of those (10.1% of the total sample) who asserted that they know pupils who were banned from school due to parents' failure to pay extra contributions argued that this occurred at least sometimes. Although it is not a major proportion, it reveals that education up to 9 year basic level in Rwanda is not entirely free despite the CG. Kicking out pupils over the failure to pay contributions constitutes a violation of pupils' right to free education and a violation of Rwandan law.

The issue of extra contributions was analyzed in depth with the resource persons who were interviewed in the framework of the present research project. Officials from both Ministries and development partners agree that the amount of the CG is not enough to cover all school-related expenses, even though Rwanda complies with international standards of devoting at least 20% of the State budget to education. For this reason, Minecofin explain that the limited amount of the CG is a consequence of Rwanda's financial constraints. Also, the officials interviews agreed that requesting extra contributions is acceptable provided that no pupil is excluded from school because his/her parents cannot afford to pay such sums, as provided by the law. While interviews confirmed, in line with the finding of the research, that there are only very few cases of exclusions, other forms of discrimination emerged, such as pupils from poor families who do not get any food in those schools where food is purchased with extra contributions. Another concern which emerged is that extra contributions might potentially lead to inequalities between schools in urban areas, where parents can afford to pay higher sums, and schools in poor rural areas. Aware of these challenges, Mineduc is considering new instructions to promote harmonization among schools and avoid cases of discrimination, while Minecofin representatives pointed out that the PTAs can be used by parents as a complain mechanism in case of abuse. Moreover, more information would be needed on the amount of extra contributions requested and on what these contributions are used for.



TI-Rw representatives meeting with Mr. Hugh Delaney from Unicef

It is worth mentioning that extra contributions are sometimes requested in the form of "non-conventional contribution", meaning that the local community is demanded to provide their skills – be it simple manpower or specific technical capacities – to support the local school or to build a new school. Some interviews identified some potential concerns linked to this approach, as normal procurement procedures are not followed, outcomes might be of lower quality and it is not clear to which extent this poses a burden on communities.

However, all interviews actors acknowledge that such approach has led to very good results, for example in terms of new schools being built, has been cost-effective and has not lowered quality (for example schools built this way still comply with "child friendliness" standards set by the Government and Unicef, while construction costs were significantly lower). In any case, all actors in the education sector are fully aware that, in spite of the great reduction of costs achieved thanks to the 9YBE programme, education in Rwanda is still not entirely free.

8. PERCEIVED IMPACT OF CAPITATION GRANT

Table 41: Perceived impact of the CG (1 to 4 scale score and % agreement)

	Parents		Pupils		Teachers	
	Score	%	Score	%	Score	%
The capitation grant has contributed to improve the enrolment rate in this school	3.6	90.10%	3.66	91.6%	3.51	87.80%
The capitation grant has contributed to reduce school drop-out rate in this school	3.46	86.50%	3.32	83.1%	3.3	82.50%
The capitation grant has contributed to reduce teachers' absenteeism rate in this school	2.89	72.20%	2.95	73.7%	2.5	62.60%
The capitation grant has contributed to reduce the teachers' lateness in this school	2.82	70.60%	2.84	71.0%	2.38	59.40%
The capitation grant has contributed to reduce teachers' turn-over rate in this school	2.74	68.50%	2.83	70.7%	2.27	56.80%

Most respondents agree that the CG contributed to improve the enrolment rate in recipient schools and to reduce the drop-out rate. More than 82% of respondents including teachers, parents and pupils share this view. Participants in interviews maintained that given that education in public schools was declared free of charge for the first 9 years, thanks to the CG, families, particularly poor ones, were relieved of the burden of paying for their children's education. Parents should no longer pay school fees and some school materials such as text books. Thus, this has improved the enrolment rate, while reducing at the same time the drop-out rate.

The positive impact of the CG was also perceived as far as teachers' absenteeism, lateness and turn-over are concerned, although with lower scores. However, the effect of the CG on the motivation of teachers is perceived more among pupils and parents than among teachers themselves and this might be a consequence of the fact that teachers feel that the amount they receive as motivation is very limited. Indeed, the effect on the reduction of teachers' absenteeism is scored 72.2% by parents, 73.7% by pupils but only 62.6% by teachers. Moreover, the effect of the CG on reduction of teachers' lateness is scored 70.6% by parents, 71% by pupils and only 59.4% by teachers, while its effect on the reduction of the teachers' turn-over is scored 68.5% by parents, 70.7% by pupils and 56.8% by teachers.

Table 42: Perception on various aspects of the capitation grant

(score over 4)	Parents		Teachers	
	Score	%	Score	%
Benefits covered by the capitation grant	2.48	62.10%	2.36	59.00%
The amount of money allocated to teachers' motivation grants	2.15	53.80%	1.86	46.50%
The amount of money allocated to teaching materials	2.42	60.50%	2.4	60.00%
The amount of money allocated to classrooms repairing and extension	2.27	56.70%	2.14	53.60%
The amount of money allocated to school-based continuing professional development	2.11	52.70%	1.94	48.60%

Although the impact of the CG is perceived by the grant stakeholders (see the previous table), it is shown that the same stakeholders feel that not only the items/benefits covered by the grant are not sufficient to cover their needs, but also that the amounts of money allocated to its different components are insufficient (teachers' motivation allowances and school-based continuing professional development). Others are just perceived as sufficient. This calls upon the GoR to reconsider the amount allocated to the CG. The table above suggests however a slightly higher satisfaction of parents with the amounts allocated to different components of the CG compared to teachers.

9. Conclusion and Recommendations

9.1. Conclusion

The Public Expenditure Tracking Survey on the 9 Year Basic Education Programme used both quantitative and qualitative approaches. Data was collected using a structured questionnaire, interviews and desk research. A sample drawn from teachers, parents, pupils participated in the survey. Head-teachers, DEO, MoE and MoF were also considered in this study.

The desk research carried out in 15 schools indicated that a total of Rwf 7,3 billion that was requested by Districts for Districts Schools have been received as capitation grant by the latter. This indicates that there is no leakage between the amount requested by Districts and the amount received at school level, i.e. the amount transferred by the Ministry of Finance. The lack of leakage is due to the MOF's good public expenditure policy of transferring the capitation grant directly to the individual accounts of the schools without transiting through Districts accounts.

The Ministerial Order provides that the Capitation Grant for each pupil is Rwf 875 per quarter and Rwf 12,500 per teacher per month. Desk research indicates that there is no difference between the Capitation Grant provided by the Ministerial order and no leakage between the amount disbursed by the Ministry of Finance and what is received by District Schools per pupil and teacher.

The survey reveals a very high level of awareness of all categories of respondents with regard to the fact that the Government of Rwanda provides capitation grant/ money per each student for the first 9 years at school, i.e. 98.8% of teachers, 98.4% of parents and 91% of pupils are aware of this. Also, the same survey indicates that 99.2% of teachers, 98.9% of parents and 93.8% of pupils have heard about the 9YBE programme and that basic education is free in Rwanda. However, in both cases there is a slight discrepancy between the level of awareness of the pupils (lower) and that of teachers and parents (higher). A tentative explanation for that discrepancy may be that the latter two categories are not only adult but are also more familiar with government policies than the pupils.

The research shows that the CG is fairly received as requested: 41.6% of respondents declared that over the last three years the amount of the CG received by the schools matched with the funds requested, while 21% maintained that the amount received is smaller than requested and a remarkable 36% declared that they did not know.

Materials for teachers and pupils emerged as the items most commonly purchased thanks to the CG according to all respondents (81.4%) followed by school construction/infrastructure (65.3%), and teachers' motivation allowance (56.1%). Other items such as supply of clean water supply, electricity and telephone are significantly covered by the CG.

The Ministerial Order above in his art 6, title 2 provides that 50% of the CG should be spent for the functioning of the School, 35% for infrastructure and sanitation and 15% for training, However, only one of five selected schools comply with such guidelines, while two schools spent more for functioning and one spent more for infrastructure; interestingly, three out of five schools spent for training less than the 15% stated in the ministerial Order.

The desk survey on the third quarter of 2009, shows that some schools received the capitation grant with a significant delay: out of 15 schools visited, six received the capitation grant with a delay between 40 and 60 days. This has a serious negative impact in the functioning of schools. Out of 15 schools, 9 have received the capitation grant on time. The analysis of the first quarter of 2010 shows that the same schools received the capitation grant with a significant delay. 14 out of 15 schools visited received the capitation grant with a delay between 17 and 97 days. This shows a decrease in the effectiveness of the management of the capitation grant, with serious negative consequences for the functioning of schools.

Overall, the survey shows a high satisfaction (75.7%) vis-à-vis the capitation grant, with pupils (82.2%) and parents (79.8%) being more satisfied than teachers (67.04%). This situation may be partly explained not only by the fact that the teachers' motivation allowance is sometimes paid late, but also by the fact that the teachers' economic conditions in Rwanda remain difficult.

The current PETS has collected respondents' perceptions on the level of transparency and related tendering processes. Overall, the level of transparency is perceived to be high (above 72%). Parents tend to find the process transparent more than teachers: tendering for school materials and repairing / extension is considered transparent by 80.4% and 79.8% of parents respectively, and by 72.7% and 73.1% of teachers respectively.

Finally, the survey has revealed some issues that are highlighted below and should be carefully considered by the Rwandan

Education Authority and stakeholders in the education sector:

a) Some Heads of schools do not comply with the Ministerial order that provides that they must submit the number of pupils and schools bank account numbers to Districts within 15 days from the beginning of the school year. Indeed, some Heads of Schools submit their report with a delay ranging between 17 and 97 days. Some others do not indicate the date (see appendix 4) of submission of their reports, making it impossible to evaluate the delay. In addition, or as a consequence, in some cases the MOF delays the disbursement of the CG by up to 60 days.

b) There are no regular quarterly inspections from District or sector authorities to confirm the numbers of pupils submitted to by Heads of Schools.

c) The financial reporting format used by schools is not uniform (see appendix 7).

d) In some schools, there is inaccurate and incomplete recording of transactions.

e) In some schools, the filing system is very poor.

f) All Heads of Schools complained that the capitation grant of the second quarter of the year 2011 had not been received yet.

In sum, the research portrays the 9YBE as a programme with many strengths and some challenges. The main strengths emerged in the survey include the fact that no leakage of funds was identified, a very high awareness of the existence of the programme, high satisfaction with how the money is spent and good involvement of stakeholders in developing action plans on CG use. Interviews with key resource persons permitted to add other strengths, namely the great reduction of costs for education, increase in the enrolment rate and transition rate from primary to secondary school, reduction of dropout rate as well as clear guidelines on CG use.

The survey also identified a number of challenges, particularly delays in requesting and disbursing the CG, poor compliance with Ministerial guidelines of CG use and need to request parents to pay extra contributions as the CG is often insufficient to cover all costs. Interviews confirmed these issues and allowed to identify other challenges, such as weak reporting, lack of standard reporting templates, limited knowledge of tendering procedures by some head teachers, lack of skills in PFM, and partial understanding of all 9YBE-related rules. Officials at Mineduc and Minecofin are already working on measures, such as training of school staff in management, provision of transport to DEOs and appointment of education officers at the Sector level, which are likely to contribute to address some of these challenges.

9.2. Recommendations

The recommendations below are addressed to the Rwandan Education Authority and other stakeholders in the field of education (MoF, Districts and Local administration Authorities), in order to improve the public expenditure of capitation grant:

a) The Heads of Education Districts should enforce the implementation of and the compliance with Ministerial order no 001 of 30/01/2007, in its art 6, title 6 and ensure that the reports submitted to them are accurate, complete, signed and transmitted on time.

b) The Ministry of Education should ensure that the requests of capitation grant by Districts are accurate, complete, signed and submitted to Ministry of Finance on time; consequently, the Ministry of Finance should make sure that the capitation grant is disbursed on time.

c) The Ministry of Finance should put in place a standard format of reporting of capitation grant expenditure for all schools and at District level.

d) The Ministries of Education and Finance should make sure that the capitation grant is used in all schools according to the proportions and purposes stated in the relevant Ministerial Order; at the same time they should carefully evaluate whether a certain degree of flexibility could be introduced to help schools tackle their own specific needs.

e) The Heads of schools should encourage all teachers to have their own bank accounts and avoid to pay a group of teachers on a single account.

f) The Ministry of Education should organize regular quarterly school inspections in order to ensure that the number of pupils submitted to Districts by Heads of Schools are equal to the actual number in the schools.

g) The District Mayors should ensure that internal audits on capitation grant expenditure are conducted twice a year.

h) The District Education Officer should make sure that the schools in their District have proper recording and filing systems.

i) The Ministries of Education and Finance should disburse the capitation grant of the second semester 2010

j) The Ministry of Finance should provide capacity building for head teachers on PFM and tendering procedures.

k) The Ministry of Education should make sure that requesting parents to pay extra contributions does not lead to exclusion of pupils, discrimination of pupils or difference between schools in rich and poor areas

10. BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. The Ministerial Order no 001 on Capitation Grant , Year 2007
2. The Ministerial Order modifying the ministerial order no 001 on Capitation Grant , Year 2008
3. Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, Capitation Grant transfer's to all Districts schools, Year 2009/2010
4. School Term I Report on pupils statistics of Year 2009
5. School Term I Report on pupils statistics of Year 2010
6. Schools Reports on Capitation Grant Expenditure, year 2008
7. Schools Reports on Capitation Grant Expenditure, year 2009
8. Schools Reports on Capitation Grant Expenditure, year 2010
9. Quarterly Districts Reports (requests) on Capitation Grant, year 2008
10. Quarterly Districts Reports (requests) on Capitation Grant, year 2009
11. Quarterly Districts Reports (requests) on Capitation Grant, year 2010

DEVELOPED BY:



TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL RWANDA

P.O. Box 6252 Kigali - Rwanda
Tel: +250788309583 / Toll free: 2641
www.transparencyrwanda.org
Email: info@transparencyrwanda.org

