

# **Improving Quality Basic Education in Ghana: Prospects and Challenges of the School Performance Improvement Plan**

**Joseph Ghartey Ampiah, Christopher Kwaah, Kofi Tsivanyo Yiboe  
and Bethel Tawiah Ababio**

(University of Cape Coast, Ghana)

## **1. Introduction**

Ghana has undergone significant and ambitious educational reforms in her post-colonial period. As the end of the colonial era approached demand for education became more pressing and the government in 1945 proposed a 10-year plan for further expansion of educational provision. In this plan, universal primary education was targeted to be achieved within 25 years (i.e. by 1970). The next wave of the expansion plan was the 1951 Accelerated Development Plan (ADP) for Education, which also aimed to achieve universal primary education (UPE) for all. The main ADP strategy to improve access to basic education was to abolish tuition fees. After independence in 1957, the new government still considered it a priority to make basic education free and introduced the 1961 Education Act to support this vision. These policies helped expand access to elementary education very rapidly. This review of the educational system is quoted extensively from two documents (Akyeampong et al., 2007; Ampiah et al., 2005) on education in Ghana.

By 1970 Ghana had one of the most highly developed education systems in Africa (World Bank, 2004). Gross enrolment ratios increased dramatically, 60% of teachers in primary schools were trained, and the Ministry of Education (MOE) projected that all untrained teachers would be eliminated from the education system by 1975. The late 1970s and early 1980s, however, saw a sharp economic decline and the real value of government financing for education fell sharply from 6.4% of GDP in 1976 to 1.4% in 1983, and resulted in a near collapse of the education system.

In 1987, an Education Reform Programme (ERP) to reverse the decline in the education system was launched in partnership with the World Bank and other international agencies. The major goals of the ERP were to expand 'access to basic education, to improve the quality of basic education, to make education more relevant to Ghana's socioeconomic needs', and to ensure sustainability of the reform programme after the economic adjustment period. To date, the 1987 reforms have benefited the most in terms of investment to improve the access to and quality of basic education. Although this huge financial investment into the Ghanaian educational system has made an impact on educational performance in Ghana, many educational indicators suggest that growth has not been sustained.

An Education Reform Review Committee (ERRC) was set up in 1994 to review the

achievements of the 1987 ERP. Following this review, in accordance with the World Bank and other international donors, in 1996, the 'free compulsory universal basic education' (FCUBE) reforms were introduced to address the weaknesses in the 1987 reforms. The FCUBE aimed to achieve UPE by 2005. UPE could however, not be achieved in 2005. Additionally, FCUBE sought to improve girls' enrolment and has generally succeeded in achieving this target (MoESS, 2006). Implementation of the FCUBE was supported by the World Bank Primary School Development Project (PSDP). According to the World Bank (2004) report two main areas of activity of the PSDP were identified:

- Policy and management changes: (i) increasing instructional time, (ii) reducing student fees and levies, (iii) improving the skills and motivation of head teachers, (iv) community involvement in the selection of head teachers, (v) providing orientation for district officials and community leaders, (vi) supporting to school supervision, and (vii) conducting school mapping
- Investment in physical infrastructure: (i) construction of classrooms, (ii) construction of head teachers' housing, (iii) provision of roofing sheets. Communities were to be responsible for building the external walls ("cladding") for pavilions constructed by the project

(World Bank, 2004, p.26)

By 2003, over US\$ 500 million of donor funding had been injected into Ghana's education sector. Funding from the World Bank, the principal donor from 1986 to 1994 was used for school infrastructure development and rehabilitation, instructional materials for training pre-service teachers including the production of teacher materials and textbooks in primary and JSS. Other support from the World Bank went into head teachers' housing (World Bank, 2004). DFID, USAID, and the European Union also supported various aspects of the reforms.

The FCUBE programme met with several problems and constraints. Management weaknesses have undermined its impact which included poor supervision both at system and school levels (Fobih et al., 1999). According to the FCUBE 1999 implementation report, one of the important lessons learnt in the implementation of the FCUBE programme is that, 'continuing to expand access to basic education and increasing physical inputs into the system are not effective unless the quality of activities at the school level improves significantly' (MOE, 1999, p.4).

However, the World Bank's assessment of its role in improving educational access and quality through its support to both the 1987 and 2007 reforms is generally positive. It concludes from analysis of its contributions to the reforms that this had led to reversing the deterioration of the educational system, as the number of schools increased from 12,997 in 1980 to 18,374 in 2000, and that the basic school enrolment rate increased since the beginning of the reforms by over 10 percentage points between 1988 and 2001 (World Bank, 2004).

Despite these appreciable gains reported by the World Bank, analysis of access indicators show that there continue to be difficulties in reaching a significant proportion of children who do not enroll at all. In particular, gains made in enrolment have been difficult to sustain throughout

the 9-year basic education cycle. The World Bank admits that, improving the quality and quantity of education infrastructure (i.e. classrooms) is an important strategy but is not by itself adequate. More needs to be done to ensure equitable access to quality basic education.

In 2003, the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) issued an Education Strategic Plan (ESP) for the period 2003-2015. The new ESP focused on the achievement of Universal Basic Completion, whose aim was for all enrolled students to complete 6 years of Primary and 3 years of Junior Secondary education. This is a more ambitious goal than mere Universal 'Primary' Completion (UPC). Accordingly, the government's goals have been revised to 100% completion for primary education to be achieved in 2012 so that UBC would be attained by 2015 (MoES, 2006). Gender Parity was scheduled to be achieved by the end of 2005. This target could however not be achieved.

A major achievement in the Ghanaian education system is that 18 months after the inception of the ESP, good progress had been made in terms of access across many areas of the sector. In particular, enrolment rates have risen in primary, JSS and post basic sub-sectors (Ministry of Education Science and Sports, [MoESS], 2004). These have, in general, led to improved Gender Parity Indicators (GPI), Gross Enrolment Rates (GER), and survival and completion rates at the national level. Primary school enrolment growth was sustained at 3.5% in 2003-04, with an overall growth of 8.6% between 2001-02 and 2003-04. This resulted in a significant increase in students enrolled from 2.72 million to 2.96 million over the period from 2001-2004. Primary enrolment growth for girl students was particularly positive with increases of 3.2% in 2003-04 and 9.3% over the period 2001-02 to 2003-04. The significant increases in enrolment outstripped the projected population growth, estimated at 2.7% per year, and as a result the Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) increased from 84% to 86% (female increase from 80% to 83%, male increase from 87% to 90%) over the two year period.

Overall, a significant increase in enrolment at basic level was achieved partly due to the introduction of Capitation grants. However, there appeared a large demand for education infrastructure, classrooms, textbooks and trained teachers which had to be met before quality of education could be achieved. From 2005, the Participatory Learning Action (PLA) programme has provided schools with the assistance to identify their needs in delivery of the educational services, such as upgrading and examination of school performance. So far, the programme has been implemented in 16 districts. Communities are encouraged to draw School Performance Improvement Plans (SPIP) to be able to manage their school effectiveness. To improve the quality of instruction, teacher training, especially at the JSS (junior secondary schools) level, was held with special science tutors dispatched to Colleges of Education (COE).

According to the Government of Ghana (GES, 2006), one of the main reasons that children in Ghana do not attend school is that their parents simply cannot afford to pay the levies charged by the schools. Despite the policy of fee-free tuition in basic schools, many districts charge levies as a means of raising funds, for example, for school repairs, and cultural and sporting activities. This has the effect of deterring many families, particularly the poorest from sending their children to school. The Ministry of Education has therefore set up a Capitation Grant

Scheme through DFID funding for all public schools, which commenced in the 2005/2006 academic year, whereby every Basic School receives an amount of GHS3.00 per pupil enrolled which has now been increased to GHS4.50. It is the belief of the Government of Ghana (GoG) that this would serve to remove the financial barrier created by these levies, and more than compensate the schools for any loss of revenue they face as a result.

The utilisation of the Capitation Grant has been designed to empower the schools to effectively use financial resources to plan and carry out school quality improvement activities under the “School Performance Improvement Plan” (SPIP). It is the expectation of the GoG that the process of planning activities would be participatory (involving head teachers, teachers, SMCs and PTAs) and transparent. The grant is therefore expected to serve as an opportunity to help build school level capacity to effectively implement fiscal decentralization - which is a long- term goal of the Government of Ghana -as well as help implement the SPIP to improve the quality of education in schools. The SPIP was therefore introduced as a condition for the allocation and utilization of money to the schools.

The results of this study are envisioned to be constructive in the following ways:

- (1) Provide evidence on how the Capitation Grant is being used to improve the quality of education in the selected schools and hence give an indication as to how the SPIP is being implemented. This will hopefully enable the MOE and the Mfantseman Municipality Directorate of Education to plan and implement appropriate measures to address any shortcomings in schools with similar characteristics. Such evidence has been lacking, as so far the issue of Capitation Grant has been studied on its own without looking at how it is being used to implement the SPIP.
- (2) Findings will generate interest in quality of education in schools and hopefully lead to further studies exploring community/household-, classroom - and school-level factors which influence and promote the quality of education in schools.

The study concentrates only on Capitation Grants as the source of funds to implement the SPIP. Other sources of school funding (e.g. district assembly common fund, internally generated funds, donations, etc.) fall outside the purview of this study. Quality education in the context of this study excludes indices such as the nature of the curriculum, teaching methods, pupils’ background, in-service training for teachers, quality of infrastructure, etc. The results of this study cannot be generalized to all Junior High Schools in the Mfantseman Municipality or beyond. The results will however, give an indication of how schools are using Capitation Grants to implement the SPIP and may give a signal as to what could be happening in other schools.

### **1.1 Objectives of the Research**

The general aim of the study is to investigate the policy measure and to evaluate its effectiveness on the Capitation Grant Scheme that is linked to the production of SPIP for each school. More specifically, the study is premised on the following objectives. To

1. find out how schools and their SMCs prepare the SPIP.
2. identify the challenges faced by the schools in preparing the SPIP.

3. find out how schools use the SPIP to access the Capitation Grant.
4. investigate how schools implement the SPIP and the challenges.

## **1.2 Research Questions**

1. How do schools and SMCs prepare their SPIPs?
2. What challenges do schools and SMCs face in the preparation of the SPIP?
3. How do schools use the SPIP to access the Capitation Grant?
4. How do schools implement the SPIP and what are the challenges?

## **2. Literature Review**

The review of related literature is in two parts: the conceptual and the empirical reviews. The latter covers actual studies done on (a) the disbursement of the Capitation Grant and its impact on Basic Education in Ghana, e.g. Osei et al. (2009) and Centre for Democratic Development (2010) and (b) Special Government Funding for the improvement and development of Basic Education in other African countries such as Burkina Faso, Uganda and Malawi. The conceptual review covers the following key issues: Quality of Education and Decentralisation.

### **2.1 Quality of Education**

The quality of education has over the years been measured by the quality of teachers, pupil-teacher ratios, pupil-textbook ratios, and pupils' cognitive achievement in the form of examination results.

#### ***Quality of Teachers***

The Ministry of Education aims at providing quality teachers through the upgrading of teachers at the basic school level to at least a Diploma status. Teacher development as a vehicle to increase quality education has become more prominent in Ghana in recent years. Table 1 shows the proportion of classroom teachers with proper professional training at the different levels in Basic Education. At the KG level, the percentage of trained teachers increased from 35.3% in 2006/07 to 42.9% in 2007/08. At the primary level, generally the percentage of trained teachers in public schools decreased both nationally and for the 53 deprived districts between 2003/04 and 2007/08. The disparities between the deprived districts and the national averages increased over the same period. The situation is similar at the Junior High School level. These trends can at least partially be explained by the increased number of national youth employment placements in schools.

**Table 1. Percentage of Trained Teachers at the Basic School Level**

	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08
Kindergarten				35.3%	42.9%
Primary National	73.9%	72.4%	70.8%	62.1%	59.4%
Primary Deprived	55.3%	53.2%	55.9%	42.8%	37.2%
Junior High National	84.2%	83.5%	85.5%	77.2%	76.4%
Junior High Deprived	75.9%	73.9%	77.7%	64.2%	62.9%

Source: MoESS (2008)

The 10 districts with the lowest percentages of trained teachers are all deprived districts. Since trained teachers are a key aspect for the delivery of quality education, the Teacher Education Division (TED) has developed a number of programmes to upgrade the qualifications of teachers.

### ***Pupil-Teacher Ratio***

Having fewer children per teacher promotes increased attention to individual pupils in the class. This gives the teacher the opportunity to pay more attention to pupils with learning difficulties and to assist them. The pupil teacher ratio (PTR) is therefore another key indication of quality and efficiency in Ghanaian schools. The target PTR at the KG level is 25:1, at the primary level 35:1 and at the Junior High level 25:1. These targets are much lower than established international norms.

Table 2 shows that in kindergartens, there was a sharp increase in PTR between 2006/07 and 2007/08, mainly owing to the large increases in enrolment in kindergartens. The PTR is now 51:5. The new policy of compulsory kindergarten is relatively new and hence the number of trained teachers is not high enough to keep pace with enrolment in kindergarten.

The national average at the primary level is now 34:1. This has almost reached the target of 35:1. However, in the deprived districts, even though the PTR is decreasing, it is still higher than the national level, which is 34:1. The national PTR average at the Junior High level is 17.4:1. Again, in the deprived districts the PTR is higher but is decreasing, towards the national goal.

**Table 2. Pupil-Teacher Ratio at the JHS Level**

	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08
Junior High National	18.6	19.0	19.4	17.6	17.4
Junior High Deprived	20.9	22.0	22.5	18.9	19.1

Source: MoESS (2008)

There is much disparity in the pupil-teacher ratio between urban and rural districts. The PTRs in all the major metropolitan districts are in the low twenties. The PTRs in very rural and deprived areas are in the region of 40-60:1. The PTRs demonstrate poor deployment of teachers, over-supply of teachers in response to reported vacancies and very light subject teaching loads

(MoESS, 2008).

### ***Pupils' Cognitive Achievement***

The MOE has put in the following assessment tools at the school level for assessing the performance of schools:

- (a) School Education Assessment (SEA)
- (b) Basic Education Certificate Examination (BECE)

The SEA is an assessment intended for school-level diagnostic use. Designed as a multiple choice and constructed response examination, the assessment measures how well students can complete core objectives in mathematics and English language. Results of the SEA at the school level are not intended for comparison across schools and regions. Rather, the assessment results highlight the areas of English language and mathematics which need to be addressed.

Parents in each community can also be provided information through School Performance Appraisal Meetings (SPAM) on how their school performed on each of the assessments. The results of the SEA are meant to help teachers and school leaders improve the focus and content delivery in the classroom. The results are therefore not intended to serve as an overall measure of student achievement.

The SEA examination was implemented for the first time in Ghana in July 2006. Approximately 515,000 students participated in the examination across 10 regions of the country. The examination was administered at the Primary 2 and Primary 4 levels in mathematics and English language. Overall results on the Primary 2 English examination indicated that students were able to use appropriate greetings, tell time, read words and phrases, as well as read short sentences with mean scores ranging from 55.0% to 77.8%. In the case of Primary 4 pupils the mean scores ranged from 40.6% to 64.0%. In the case of mathematics the overall performance of students was high. In Primary 2, with the exception of two items, student performance was above the proficiency level of 55%. In Primary 4, students' scores were above a mean of 50% on 20 out of 30 items.

The Basic Education Certificate Examination (BECE) is the examination taken at the end of the basic education cycle, which determines whether or not a pupil is able to progress on to second cycle education. The BECE examination is structured so as to ensure that approximately 60% of students who take the examination each year obtain aggregate 6-30, and so little variation is to be expected. The results of the BECE give more of a relative ranking of students since each subject test score is reported in stanines, a statistical measure derived by dividing the normal bell curve into nine intervals for purposes of standardized reporting. Since the top mark in a subject is reported as having a score of one, the best aggregate score a student can have from taking six subject tests is a six.

### ***Pupils' Performance in SEA***

The SEA examination was implemented for the first time in Ghana in July 2006 and was to be repeated in 2008. Approximately 515,000 students participated in the examination

across ten regions of Ghana. The mathematics and English language examinations were administered to pupils in the Primary 2 and Primary 4. The results show that Primary 2 pupils had difficulty with listening comprehension and higher order analysis skills, particularly reading comprehension. Pupils encountered difficulties in reading a passage and answering questions where the answers were not directly stated in the text – but required a level of understanding and abstraction. Scores on these types of items showed that 40% to 50% of pupils were able to select the appropriate answers. In the Primary 2 mathematics test, pupils appeared to be learning basic addition and subtraction well. The results showed that more instruction time on multiplication, fractions and ordinal numbers is needed (see MoESS, 2008).

Primary 4 pupils struggled with the correct use of subject-verb agreement and, similar to Primary 2 pupils, reading passages and correctly responding to questions which required inference were also difficult for them. The results of the test suggest that Primary 4 pupils require remediation and additional support in fractions, writing numbers in words, and concepts of basic geometry. These results cut across schools, districts and regions in the country.

### ***Pupils' Performance in the BECE***

Table 3 gives the proportion of students obtaining an aggregate score of 6-30 on the BECE from 1998-2008. An aggregate score of 6-30 is considered a passing score. It is clear from the table that the pass rate has been hovering around 60.0% which is an indication that this is the proportion of candidates who can get admission into SHS and vocation/technical schools.

**Table 3. BECE Results-Percentage Pass with Aggregate 6-30 1998-2011**

Year	% Pass (Aggregate 6 to 30)
1998	60.4
1999	60.2
2000	60.5
2001	60.4
2002	60.5
2003	60.8
2004	61.2
2005	61.6
2006	61.9
2007	61.3
2008	62.2
2009	50.2
2010	49.1
2011	46.9

Source: Provided by MoESS EMIS Unit

## **2.2 Decentralisation Policy in Ghana**

Decentralisation of educational administration, finance, and management is one of the two policy initiatives which stand out in the attempt to achieve UPE. The 1951 Accelerated



Educational Development Plan provided the foundations for decentralised educational management in Ghana. In the 1951 plan, local councils were responsible for the provision and maintenance of educational facilities, while the central government took responsibility for teachers' salaries. The decentralisation process was further strengthened by the Education Act of 1961, which reaffirmed control and management of education at the local level to local councils. However, poor managerial capacity and the weak financial resource base of the local councils undermined the decentralisation process. Both the 1987 Reform and the 1992 Constitutional Provision echoed and re-emphasised the need for decentralisation. The Ghana Education Service was one of the 22 departments to be decentralized under the Local Government Act. Consequently, the Ghana Education Service (GES) in 1998 started a process of de-concentration of pre-tertiary education management by shifting some of its responsibilities and powers in the management of resources, services and staff to district and school levels.

Basically, decentralisation of education is intended to improve operational efficiency and promote a more responsive approach to educational needs at the district, community and school levels, the lower rungs of the educational service delivery system. Under the decentralisation process, there have also been growing demands on the district education offices to play bigger roles in preparing budgetary plans and sharing the financial burden. As part of the Education Strategic Plan implementation process, districts have to prepare District Education Work Plans (DEWP) reflecting projections and targets up to 2015. Districts are also expected to prepare 3-year Annual District Education Operational Plans (ADEOP) to help in the preparation of district budgets. By the Local Government Act 462 of 1993, devolution of responsibilities was legislated. The law assigns resources, responsibilities and decision-making powers on financial prioritization to District Assemblies. District Assemblies receive funding from the Central Government Common Fund allocation of 5% revenue, which they are free to spend in accordance with their priorities. One of the few conditions was that twenty per cent of this fund was to be allocated to improving education in the area of providing infrastructure.

In order to strengthen school governance and community engagement, all schools are required to form School Management Committees (SMCs). SMCs include representatives from local communities, parents and teachers. These committees are expected to support the head teacher in the general management of the school and assist in identifying priority areas for school development, and mobilising community support. However, the figures for SMCs in public basic schools show that by the end of the 2003-04 academic year, less than two-thirds of schools had established SMCs, which may imply that many head teachers and communities do not see the necessity of SMCs. In addition to SMCs, all schools are required to produce School Performance Improvement Plans (SPIP) on an annual basis, which outline the key actions the school will take to improve school management, the school environment, and more effective teaching and learning practices.

In 2004, the Government of Ghana introduced a Capitation Grant scheme for school operating budgets for basic schools as part of the strategy to decentralize education provision. The introduction of Capitation Grants is another major initiative to achieve universal basic

education. Originally, it was introduced in 40 districts and later extended to 53 districts designated as deprived. In 2005, the scheme was extended nationwide. Currently the Capitation Grant per child is GH¢4.50 (approximately US\$3.00) per enrolled child in a year. Initial evidence indicated that its introduction led to massive increases in enrolment (overall about an additional 17 per cent rise). As a percentage of unit cost per primary school child, however, this amount is small. Schools are expected through the SMCs and headteachers to produce their SPIP in order to access the Capitation Grant. The effectiveness of this policy is yet to be assessed. How schools use the Capitation Grant to implement the SPIP and to what extent they are successful have not been investigated.

### **3. Methodology**

#### **3.1 Area of Study**

The study was conducted in the Mfantseman Municipality located in the Central Region of Ghana and is one of 170 administrative districts in the country. The Mfantseman District covers a land area of 612 sq. kilometres, with fishing and farming as the main economic activities. It shares boundaries with two other districts (Abura-Asebu-Kwamankese, Gomoa Districts) and is bounded on the south by the Gulf of Guinea. The headquarters of the District is Saltpond. The occupational distribution indicates 51% fishing folks, 30% farmers and 19% commerce. The municipality has a total population of 152,855 (70,212 males and 82,643 females) constituting 9.6% of the region's population and located in 168 settlements (GSS, 2005). The Mfantseman District has 49.8% of the population living in areas classified as urban thus making Mfantseman a semi-urban district (GSS, 2005). Even though not considered as one of the 40 deprived districts, it was located in the fourth poorest region of the country (GSS, 2000). Of the 12 administrative districts in the Central Region, the Mfantseman Municipality has been identified as one of the poorest with about 60% of its total population considered to be living below the poverty line of one dollar per day (GSS, 2000). The district is divided into eight educational circuits: Saltpond, Mankessim, Eyisam, Yamoransa, Essarkyir, Dominase, Anomabo and Ekumfi Narkwa. Mfantseman District has a total of 413 educational institutions, made up of 134 pre-schools, 154 primary schools, 120 JHS and 5 senior high schools (SHS). The district is noted for poor school enrolment, high school dropout and low standards of educational achievement and these are the reasons why it was chosen for the study.

#### **3.2 Participants**

The participants for this study were made up of six schools (one urban, two semi-urban and two rural) from five out of the eight circuits. The six schools had 48 teachers making an average of 8 teachers per school. All the teachers were professionally trained except four teachers who had only completed senior high school. Nine of the teachers had a first degree, 24 with a diploma and 10 with Teacher's Certificate 'A'. Most of the teachers had considerable experience ranging from 2 to 18 years. Two of the headteachers had been in their school for only one year whilst the

others had been in the school between 2 to 6 years. Thus only two of the headteachers had been heads of their respective schools for 5 or 6 years and the rest had been in their schools between 1-3 years. However, apart from one headteacher who was new, the rest had been headteachers in other schools before being transferred to their present school. Hence it can be said that five out of the six headteachers had had considerable experience in the preparation of SPIP.

### **3.3 Instruments**

The three main instruments are questionnaires and interview schedules. The instruments were developed by the research team from the University of Cape Coast. These were the Questionnaire for Basic School Headteachers, Headteachers' Interview Protocol, and Focus Group Interview Protocol for Teachers. The Questionnaire for Basic School Teachers was made up of five sections. Section A sought biographic information about the headteachers and teachers and basic statistics information about the schools. The other sections sought information relevant to answering the five research questions formulated to guide the study. The Headteachers' Interview Protocol sought detailed information on how the Capitation Grant was used to implement the SPIP. The Focus Group Interview Protocol was designed to discuss issues emerging from the data collected using the other two instruments.

To ensure validity, the instruments were pre-tested in the Cape Coast Metropolis. To ensure reliability, we used only teachers and headteachers who had been in the schools for at least three years in order to ensure that the preparation of their SPIP was informed by what they had done previously in the school.

### **3.4 Procedure for Data Collection**

Data was collected by a team of researchers involved in the study during the months of June and July 2011. In each school the headteachers were given the questionnaires to complete after which they were interviewed. In each school, all teachers at the JHS level participated in the focus group interviews. The interviews were not recorded but rather notes were taken by members of the research team. It took one week in each school for all the data to be collected.

## **4. Results and Discussion**

### **4.1 Background Information of Schools**

The sample consisted of six schools with 48 teachers making an average of 8 teachers per school. All the teachers were professionally trained except five teachers three of whom had HND with the remaining having completed senior high school. Nine of the teachers had a first degree, 24 with a diploma and 10 with Teacher's Certificate 'A'. The schools therefore had adequate numbers of teachers at the JHS level with over 85% as trained teachers.

### **4.2 School Enrolment**

Table 4 shows school enrolment from 2008-2011. The trend shows there was overall

growth in enrolment from 2008 to 2011 even though this was not steady except for school D. This situation is mainly due to the transfer and dropout of students from the schools. Since a Capitation Grant to schools is based on enrolment, generally, school F receives the highest amount of Capitation Grant whilst school C receives the lowest amount per academic year. This also means that the amount of Capitation Grant given to the schools has been fluctuating over the years.

**Table 4: School Enrolment, 2008-2011**

School	2008	2009	2010	2011
A	152	206	218	213
B	53	85	83	81
C	30	25	56	39
D	87	113	122	141
E	179	187	219	208
F	277	280	335	301

Source: EMIS records, Mfantseman Municipality

In terms of academic performance, Table 5 shows that apart from school A which shows continuous decline in BECE results, the other schools do not show any consistency in performance over the years under review. The idea of using results of schools (including the BECE results) does not seem to be working as examination results of the schools do not show any consistent improvements across the years. In fact two schools (B and C) obtained 0% in 2011. In both 2010 and 2011, school C obtained 0% pass in the BECE and is also the school that receives the lowest amount of Capitation Grant. School F which receives the highest amount of Capitation Grant is also not the best performing school in the BECE.

**Table 5: BECE results of participating schools, 2008-2011**

		2008	2009	2010	2011
		%	%	%	%
A	Urban	100	62.8	56.3	31.4
B	Rural	0.0	26.6	78.6	0.0
C	Rural	-	5.2	0.0	0.0
D	Rural	30.7	84.7	31.7	59.3
E	Urban	65.0	89.0	36.3	26.6
F	Semi-urban	74.1	42.6	85.7	51.7

Source: EMIS records, Mfantseman Municipality

### 4.3 Preparation of SPIP by Schools and SMCs

All the six schools had School Management Committees (SMCs) and Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs). In one school the PTA and SMC had been in existence for 20 years, the youngest PTA and SMC being 7 years old. All the schools described their SMCs and PTAs as either active or very active. From headteachers' accounts the steps used in the preparation of the

SPIP are generally as follows:

1. Fixing a date convenient for teachers, SMCs and PTAs to discuss the SPIP
2. Listing items needed by the school (e.g. TLMS) and knowing the unit price of each item and on the meeting day, discussing thoroughly the items to be captured on the SPIP and budget projections for the various items.
3. Estimating the total cost of items to be bought and other expenditures
4. Vetting and signing of the SPIP by the circuit supervisor, SMC, headteacher and staff secretary/all teachers as the case might be.
5. Submitting the final SPIP to the District Education Officer for approval

Focus group interviews with teachers revealed that SPIP is prepared every year through the collaborative effort of the headteachers and teachers in the school. In some cases this takes the form of a SPIP committee with one of the teachers acting as the secretary. The headteacher requests inputs from teachers as the starting point in the preparation of the SPIP. In some schools, teachers prepare a first draft of the SPIP which is then discussed with the headteacher. Sometimes teachers are assigned specific roles to make budget projections for some of the major items to be captured on the SPIP for the academic year. Generally, teachers bring out the needs of their various classes to be captured in the SPIP. These inputs are discussed and fed into the SPIP. However, this process of preparation of the SPIP was not followed in school C until a new headteacher was appointed who then followed what has been described above. These observations by teachers were collaborated in headteachers' interview sessions. Also, SMCs and PTAs offer suggestions on the budget allocations of individual items on the SPIP. All six headteachers indicated through interviews that they involved SMCs, PTAs and teachers in the preparation of the SPIP. In addition to these three groups of people, two of the headteachers included Circuit Supervisors responsible for their schools in the preparation of the SPIP. After the preparation of the SPIP the headteacher discussed the final SPIP with the teachers before it was submitted to the District Education Office for approval. Thus, teachers were very familiar with the SPIP and its preparation. This is summed up by what teachers said during focus group interview in one of the schools:

We are very familiar with the SPIP because of the individual roles assigned to us by the head teacher before and during preparation of the SPIP. The environment in this school can be described as democratic and each and every teacher is given opportunity to contribute to make projections and do proper budgeting of the major and minor items of the SPIP. (Teachers, School A).

The major components of the SPIP are prescribed by the MOE and schools have to follow them in preparing the SPIP. The components are as follows:

- Improving Access
- Provision of Teaching and Learning Materials
- School Management
- Examination
- INSET

- School Facilities
- Transportation
- Sanitation
- Minor Repairs

Table 6 is an example of a SPIP for school A. The table illustrates the components of the SPIP and how school A allocated funds amounting to GHS 162.00 of Capitation Grant received for one term of the academic year. Since the main items on the SPIP are pre-determined by the Ministry of Education, there is very little variation in the way schools allocate funds for the improvement of school performance. For example, the levies which go to the district Assemblies are calculated using the number of pupils. Table 6 shows that most of the funds (56.5%) were returned to the District Assembly as levies for sports, culture and mock examinations. Of the amount of GHS 70.28 left, 45.6% (less than half) was given to items which can be said to have direct bearing on improving quality of teaching and learning. In effect, more than half of the money was spent on items other than for teaching and learning. It seems that the Capitation Grant and the SPIP are to improve the school in general and not the quality of teaching and learning. It is therefore not surprising that the performance of the schools in this study continue to fluctuate from year to year with some schools recording abysmal performances of zero percentage pass.

**Table 6: An example of a SPIP for school A**

Component/Target	Action to be Taken	Item	Amount (GH¢)	% of CG
Levy I	Pay sports levy to district (deducted at source)	Sports levy	52.8	32.7
Levy II	Pay culture levy to District Office (deducted from source)	Culture levy	19.2	11.9
Levy III	Pay mock exams to District Office	Mock level	19.2	11.9
T & T of pupils	Inter-school sports festival	T & T	5	3.1
T & T of pupils	Purchase of first aid for pupils	Gention violet, paracetamol, plaster, spirit, scissors, T&T	22.08	13.7
Managing teaching and learning	Provide teaching and learning materials	Posters, colours, brushes, school stamp, markers, stapler etc.	33.2	20.6
School Management and effective administration	In-service training for teachers	In-service training for 5 teachers and sitting allowance	10	6.2
			161.48	100

Number of pupils on roll (108) multiplied by 1.5= (GH¢ 162.00)

#### **4.4 Challenges Faced by Schools in Preparing of the SPIP**

Although the SPIP has been designed to empower the schools to effectively manage the Capitation Grant, its preparation does not lie solely on the Headteacher and other teachers serving under him. All members of the SMCs are brought together in the preparation of the SPIP thereby making the group heterogeneous as regards classroom needs. In line with this, one could envisage some challenges of disagreements related to the preparation of the SPIP and uncooperative attitudes of some members of the group. Coupled with these is the number of items to be captured, the ability to make projections, and item estimation, among others. Reasons for the challenges are also discussed here including measures taken to curb them and the most significant impact of the SPIP.

Just as in any human institution, members engaged in the preparation of the SPIP disagreed with each other on a number of issues. In school D, there was no consensus on items to be bought for the year since all listed items were priorities. Prioritizing items could therefore turn into a lengthy debate lasting for hours. Similar to this was the mismatch between the needs of the schools and the budget. Respondents from school C said school needs outweighed the annual budget approved for the school. Consequently, disagreements delayed the process of the preparation of the document. Parallel sentiments were echoed by respondents from other schools and this constituted a major challenge in the preparation of the SPIP.

It should be noted that quality education, the primary goal of SPIP, as perceived in the Ghanaian context is measured by the quality of teachers, pupil-teacher ratios, pupil-textbook ratios, and pupils' cognitive achievement. However, turning out quality learners does not rely on only the above factors. Teachers need to be well equipped with appropriate teaching and learning resources capable of facilitating co-construction of knowledge in the classroom. They are faced with varied and different needs to be provided by the Capitation Grant. The preparation of SPIP could therefore be engulfed by disagreements which could constitute setbacks for the initiative.

Another challenge was the difficulty of getting a suitable day and time for all members to meet. Respondents stated that the composition of the team that prepared the SPIP did not consider the preoccupations of members. Some were self-employed while others were salaried workers. Moreover, members were scattered all over the catchment area of the schools. Consequently, some members of the team attended meetings late or did not turn up at all for scheduled meetings.

This challenge was raised in all the schools in the study. For instance, schools B and C complained that it was very difficult to get in touch with the SMC chairmen. Others lamented that some members were less enthusiastic and absented themselves from the preparation. These called for postponements, potential factors that militate against the smooth preparation of the document.

The question that emerged from these observations had to do with the effects of late preparation of the SPIP. On one hand, the financial management of the school could be seriously affected since monies needed in the day to day administration of the school could only be received after the SPIP is presented to the authorities. On the other hand, teaching/learning could

become less effective in view of the fact that teachers are not allowed to pre-finance any basic items such as chalk or whiteboard markers.

Another challenge was the number of items to be captured on the SPIP. Not only did members have to write down a very long list of items, but also they had to break down some of the items into smaller units. According to respondents, the breakdowns were extensive rendering the process very tedious and energy sapping. They added that this exercise was not carried out easily as members of the group lacked professional competence. Compared with the earlier challenge, it could be concluded that some of the beneficiary schools might not meet their annual budget requirements on time.

Furthermore, the ability to make projections constituted a major challenge in preparing the SPIP. For instance, school heads and teachers could not predict the uncertainties of future events. It was not possible to foresee emergencies and project towards them. Neither was it financially prudent to budget for particular items in abundance without meeting the demands of various teachers. According to respondents, people were sent out to verify prices of items, but prices for the same items differed from one shop to the other. Projections as required by the SPIP were therefore not easily identified though they constitute a very essential component in preparing the SPIP.

In addition, item estimation was not left out of challenges identified by the respondents. This had to do with prices of commodities /items under consideration. Should this be wrongly done, one could imagine the resultant dire consequences for the entire project. Thus, the instability of the Ghanaian economy was a crucial element worthy of consideration in such affairs. The team was therefore prudent in estimating the total annual budget. Members were reluctant in taking decisions as regards estimates for all items captured under the SPIP. Respondents described this challenge as a thorny issue, a necessary evil that could not be ignored in the preparation of the document. The estimation of items had two dimensions for the beneficiary schools. Firstly, if the estimate was on the high side the schools would be forced to review the entire document. That is, they would have to review almost the whole process which was characterised as tedious and energy consuming. The review process could constitute an obstacle for early disbursement of the Capitation Grant which could contribute to the failure of the project. Secondly, when the cost of the items was under- estimated, the schools were forced to make up for the difference. This was not easy for schools which had no other source of financing their needs.

Nonetheless, some measures had been put in place by schools to limit the negative effects of the above challenges in the preparation of the SPIP. Notably among them is the inclusion of a competent professional to help in the preparation. Respondents from school A suggested they had to seek professional advice in the budget preparation. Those from school D thought it was necessary to seek assistance from skillful colleagues who were not necessarily teachers.

The lukewarm attitude of some members of the group was one of the challenges. Respondents from all schools raised the issue of motivation. Colleagues who were less enthusiastic were encouraged to participate actively in the preparation of the SPIP.



Again, all members were consulted in fixing favourable meeting days and time. As such, meeting days ceased to conflict with people's personal preoccupations. Teachers were also given prior briefing before meetings in order to eliminate the unnecessary disagreements.

Finally, respondents suggested asking parents to pay levies in order to help supplement the budget for projects earmarked in the SPIP. They explained that the grant from the central government was inadequate for the smooth administration and financial management of the schools. However, they catalogued some improvements in the various schools under investigation.

Respondents from three schools, that is, schools A, B and C raised school enrolment as the major impact of the SPIP. They explained that the Capitation Grant had increased school enrolment in all schools because the policy placed less financial burden on parents. Unlike in the past when parents had to meet all the basic needs of their wards before sending them to school, the grant could now cater for basic needs of school-going Ghanaian children. Other impacts identified include, the provision of teaching/learning resources, enough stationary to conduct examinations at regular intervals, rapid action on maintenance of minor repair work and the improved standards of schools. These brought to light the rationale of the decentralization policy in Ghana.

#### **4.5 How Schools use SPIP to Access the Capitation Grant**

The headteachers in the various schools in which the study was carried out indicated that some of the teachers were asked to do a draft of the SPIP for screening before a final SPIP was drawn up for the headteacher's approval. This was done after some teachers had been assigned specific roles to make budget projections for some of the major items to be captured in the SPIP for that academic year. The final SPIP was then assigned by the headteacher, the SMC chairman and the Circuit Supervisor for approval. This approved SPIP went to the District Director for scrutiny and approval.

Headteachers are informed by the District Education office when funds have been released for the capitation for the various schools. The headteachers are required to submit a completed Form B to access the Capitation Grant. This form B is signed by the headteacher and the assistant, then the SMC chairman and finally by the Circuit Supervisor. The form is then sent to an officer at the District Education office who will go through it to make sure the proper procedures have been followed before the District Director signs it. An authority note and a cheque are then issued to the headteacher to obtain the money at the bank.

The interview data from the various heads of the sample schools expressed serious misgivings in accessing the Capitation Grant from the District Education office. They recounted the bureaucracy involved in signing form B and the issuance of the authority note to the bank. Headteachers sometimes have to make several journeys to and from the District Education office since it is only the District Director of Education who is authorised to issue the authorisation note. This is how two headteachers expressed their frustration in accessing the Capitation Grant:

‘...due to the persistent absence of the Director of Education to sign the Form B,

procedures to cash the money are too cumbersome' (School B, Headteacher X).

'the procedure is so lengthy and it involves a lot of travelling to the office which sometimes means that transportation uses up a sizeable part of the money' (School E, Headteacher Y).

This bureaucratic procedure comes as a result of measures that have been put in place by authorities to check embezzlement and misappropriation of the funds by school heads.

#### **4.6 Implementation of SPIP and its Challenges**

This study therefore identified procedures followed in implementing the SPIP, shortfalls in the implementation process and some suggestions for improving the SPIP in the following year. In the first place, respondents from schools A and B indicated that in implementing the SPIP, they followed strictly plans outlined in the document. Though respondents from the other schools were silent on this issue, we could conclude that all schools followed strictly the steps outlined in the SPIP. Our position could be justified in view of the fact that authorities in the districts would not accept procedures that deviated from laid down rules in implementing the SPIP.

Secondly, respondents from school A explained that in the implementation process proper supervision was put in place as regards the purchase of items captured in the SPIP. Also, the supervision was extended to the execution of projects as outlined in the SPIP. They added that the strict observation of rules and regulations governing the implementation process did not allow them to undertake projects that were not captured under the SPIP. Interestingly, they argued that even unforeseen emergencies not captured were not catered for in the implementation process.

Furthermore, respondents from school C indicated that teachers who pre-financed some of the items or projects were reimbursed as soon as monies were released. This was contrary to views expressed by others. We were made to understand that projects were not supposed to be pre-financed not even basic items such as chalk or whiteboard markers. This raised doubts as to whether rules were duly followed in the implementation process.

Finally, the implementation process had to deal with accountability. Individuals or spending officers were directly accountable to the headteacher. In the absence of the headteacher, teachers who spent monies on projects were expected to submit payment vouchers to the Assistant Headteacher. Vouchers were submitted to the Head immediately on his return. Despite these implementation regulations, the process is not without shortfalls. Four major shortfalls were identified: inadequate funds, lack of knowledge in book keeping, irregular flow of Capitation Grants and payment of extra monies to the district office.

To begin with, all the four schools in this study raised the issue of inadequate funds. It should be re-emphasized that the primary aim of the Capitation Grant was to assist schools to manage their own finances. These cover, among other things, the purchase of teaching and learning resources, minor repairs, and first aid drugs. Though respondents did not explain further, we could deduce that funds released to schools were not sufficient to meet all the

financial obligations of the said schools. Inadequate funds could therefore constitute a major obstacle in implementing the SPIP.

Another important shortfall was lack of knowledge in book keeping. In other words, members involved in preparing and implementing the SPIP were less competent in clerical duties and financial administration. Most of the teachers in charge of the SPIP preparation and implementation raised the issue in all the schools. Respondents lamented over this all important point on challenges faced in the preparation of the SPIP. This shortfall would therefore demand critical attention in order to facilitate the implementation process.

The irregular flow of the Capitation Grants was the next shortfall mentioned by respondents from all the schools. They pointed out that money was not always available to purchase some important items captured in the SPIP. Respondents explained that the preparation process was not as cumbersome as its implementation. Delays were caused by frequent absence of some signatories to the SPIP. As a result, the grant could not be released at regular intervals thereby worsening the plight of schools with no other source of income.

Finally, respondents were of the view that payment of extra monies to the district assembly could be judged the most serious shortfall in the implementation process. In school A, respondents reiterated not only the undue delay of funds, but also the exorbitant district education office charges. These charges were normally not budgeted for in the SPIP, but are demanded by the district education office. The charges were therefore deducted from the grant and the rest released to schools.

Some suggestions were made to mitigate the shortfalls and help improve the SPIP in subsequent years. In the first place, respondents emphasized the need for a comprehensive preparation of the SPIP with the necessary breakdowns. Secondly, appeal was made for regular and timely flows of funds. Thirdly, charges from district offices must be known and circulated to all schools so that provisions would be made to include them in the SPIP. Fourthly, advanced information should be given to teachers and SMCs for the preparation in order to avoid unnecessary delays. Also, those in charge of the preparation should make sure that materials not covered in a particular year's budget are given priority in the subsequent one. It was suggested that SMCs and PTAs should be encouraged to show greater commitment towards the success of the policy. Finally, respondents were of the view that if some of the procedures were eliminated and expert advice was sought, the preparation and implementation processes could become very effective.

The interview data from the headteachers indicated that PTA, SMC and teachers are involved in the disbursement of the Capitation Grant to ensure that the process is transparent and all items purchased are within the budget meant for the capitation. They all alluded to the fact that SMC chairmen in the various schools do inspect some minor repairs and projects to make sure that the money is being put to good use. Two of the headteachers, however, indicated that when the Capitation Grant gets to the schools, all stakeholders sit down to do the disbursement for the sake of transparency. All headteachers indicated that the Capitation Grant was needed to purchase all items on the SPIP.

Two of the headteachers indicated that post office bills, light and water bills and sometimes some minor repairs were not covered by the Capitation Grant. Even though they would have preferred to spend the money on only pressing items and what was relevant, sometimes expenses not included in the budget of the Capitation Grant inevitably rise.

The headteachers and teachers of the sampled schools indicated various challenges that had besieged the schools in the use of the Capitation Grant. These challenges have been summarised in Box 1.

**Box 1: Challenges faced by schools in the use of the Capitation Grant**

- There is limited printing of end-of-term examination papers, twice for JHS and once for primary school in the academic year affects students.
- Delays in accessing the Capitation Grant affect academic work
- The bureaucratic system is a major concern; the SPIP must be accepted by the teachers, the head, SMC, the circuit supervisor and finally the District Education office.
- The perception that basic education is free in the Capitation Grant scheme is making parents relax in providing basic needs for their children in school.
- Exorbitant district education charges in the Capitation Grant per pupil reduces the funds for the schools
- The lukewarm attitude of PTA and SMC members are a result of political affiliations
- Some headteachers are not transparent when it comes to the issue of Capitation Grants.

## **5. Conclusion**

Basically, decentralisation of education is intended to improve operational efficiency and promote a more responsive approach to educational needs at the district, community and school levels (the lower rungs of the educational service delivery system). Decentralization of educational administration, finance and management policy therefore shifts some of the responsibilities to the districts, communities, schools and parents. The initiative also gives districts, communities, schools and parents powers in the administration of schools. It is envisaged that this will in turn help provide quality education to all Ghanaian children at the basic level. To a large extent decentralization of educational administration, finance and management policy have been implemented by the Ministry of Education through the use of SPIP and the provision of Capitation Grant funds. This is a laudable achievement by the Ministry of Education. This means that part of the responsibility of ensuring the delivery of quality education has been given to the schools and districts education offices and they are living up to it.

However, this laudable objective faces some serious challenges that could derail its success. These have been highlighted in this study. In spite of implementation regulations, there were major shortfalls such as inadequate funds, lack of knowledge in book keeping, irregular

flow of Capitation Grants and payment of extra monies to the district office. Challenges faced in the preparation of the SPIP if carefully addressed could ease the preparation process. This presupposes that the initial step in accessing the Capitation Grant would not be characterized with unnecessary obstacles. Thus the financial management of basic schools would become effective.

The BECE results of the schools do not show a consistent improvement in students' performance. The idea of improving school academic performance through the preparation of the SPIP and the provision of Capitation Grants is therefore not being realised. Teachers' assertion that results of schools have improved due to the Capitation Grants is not supported by the findings of this study. The fact that pupils can no longer write all the end-of-term examinations in print form due to the inadequate amount of the capitation grant to schools is a drawback to helping pupils get used to answering multiple-choice questions. This is because teachers cannot write all the items on the chalkboard if the multiple-choice format is used. This is why in some cases parents are made to contribute to end-of-term examinations even though this funds for this is captured under the Capitation Grant scheme.

Finally, the irregular flow of the Capitation Grants means that money is not always available to purchase some important items captured in the SPIP for school improvement. The plans of the schools through the SPIP can only be effective if money is available to execute the SPIP. Perhaps the quality of education in some other respects is being achieved by the schools but this is yet to be seen in terms of pupils' academic performance seven years after the introduction of the SPIP and Capitation Grant.

## **6. Suggestions**

1. The Ghana Education Service and the Ministry of Education must organise periodic workshop to improve the capacity of SMCs, head teachers and teachers to improve the preparation of SPIP.
2. The District Education Office must ensure that bottlenecks and bureaucracies associated with the approval of SPIP and the delivery of Capitation Grants to schools are removed.
3. District Assemblies must not levy the schools for sports, culture and mock examinations as this reduces the amount needed for school improvement.

## **References**

- Akyeampong, K., Djangmah, J. Oduro, A. Alhassan, S. & Hunt, F. (2007). *Access to basic education in Ghana: The evidence and the issues*. CREATE Country Analytic Review, University of Sussex, Brighton.
- Ampiah, J.G., Mankoe, J.O. & Beecham, R.A. (2005). *Current situation of basic education in Ghana*. Paper presented at a Workshop on Promoting a Self-Reliant Approach to Basic

- Education Development in Africa through Research and Dialogue. CICE, Hiroshima University. 21 February – 15 March 2005.
- Centre for Democratic Development (2010). *Ghana Centre for Democratic Development Annual Report*. Accra: Centre for Democratic Development.
- Fobih, D., Akyeampong, K.A. & Koomson, A. (1999). *Ghana primary school development project: Final evaluation of project performance*. Accra: Ministry of Education.
- Ghana Education Service [GES] (2006). *Report on implementation of capitation grant in 2005/2006*. Accra: GES.
- Ghana Statistical Service [GES] (2000). *Ghana Living Standards Survey*. Accra: Ghana Statistical Service.
- Ghana Statistical Service (2005). *Ghana demographic household survey*. Accra: Ghana Statistical Service.
- Ministry of Education [MOE] (1999). *A background paper prepared for the Ministry of Education: National education forum*. Accra: Ministry of Education
- Ministry of Education, Science and Sports [MoESS] (2004). *Preliminary education sector performance report*. Accra: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education, Science and Sports [MoESS] (2006). *Preliminary education sector performance report*. Accra: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education and Sports, Ghana [MoES] (2006). *Report on the education sector annual review (ESAR) 2006*. Accra: MoES.
- Ministry of Education, Science and Sports [MoESS] (2008). *Education sector report*. Accra: MoESS
- Osei, G & Brock, C. (2009). Decentralization in education, institutional culture and teacher autonomy in Ghana. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 21 (4), 437-458
- World Bank (2004). *Books, buildings and learning outcomes: An impact evaluation of World Bank support to basic education in Ghana*. Washington, DC: World Bank Report No. 28779.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR BASIC SCHOOL HEADTEACHERS

**SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION**

1. Name of school: .....
2. Location: urban [ ] semi=urban [ ] rural [ ]
3. School enrolment

Class	Male	Female	Total
JHS1			
JHS2			
JHS3			

4. Teachers at Post

Class	Male	Female	Professional teacher	Highest Academic qualification
JHS1				
JHS2				
JHS3				

5. School Results

BECE

Year	male	female	Total	% pass
2006				
2007				
2008				
2009				
2010				

6. Head teacher's background

Sex	Highest academic qualification	No. of years of Teaching Experience	No. of years as Head teacher

**SECTION B: PTAs AND SMCs**

7. Does the school have (a) PTA Yes [ ] No [ ] (b) SMC Yes [ ] No [ ]
8. If Yes, how long has it been in existence? (a)PTA.....  
SMC.....
9. (a) How active is the PTA?  
very active [ ] active [ ] not active [ ] not very active [ ]

- (b) How active is your SMC?  
 very active [ ] active [ ] not active [ ] not very active [ ]

**SECTION C: PREPARATION OF SPIP BY SCHOOLS AND SMCS AND THE CHALLENGES FACED**

10. For how many years have you been preparing the SPIP as a head teacher?.....
11. Who do you involve in the preparation of the SPIP?  
 (a).....(b).....(c).....(d).....
12. What roles do the following play in the preparation of the SPIP?  
 (a) PTA.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 (b) SMC.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 (c) Teachers.....  
 .....  
 .....
13. Outline the steps used in the preparation of the SPIP.  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....
14. State the three most difficult challenges you face in the preparation of the SPIP.  
 (i) .....  
 (ii) .....  
 (iii).....
15. Why do you have these challenges?  
 (i) .....  
 (ii) .....  
 (iii).....
16. What measures have you put in place to address these challenges?  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....



17. What has been the most significant impact of the SPIP?

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

**SECTION D: HOW SCHOOLS IMPLEMENT THE SPIP AND THE BOTTLENECKS FACED**

18. What procedures does your school follow in implementing the SPIP?

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

19. Which of these shortfalls leads to poor implementation of the SPIP (circle as many as apply)

- (a) inadequate funds
- (b) lack of book keeping knowledge
- (c) irregular flow of Capitation Grant
- (d) payment of extra monies to the district office
- (e) other(s) [please state].....

20. What suggestions do you have for improving the SPIP?

- (i) .....
- (ii) .....
- (iii).....
- (iv).....
- (v) .....

**SECTION E: HOW SCHOOLS ACCESS THE CAPITATION GRANT AND THEIR LEVEL OF SUCCESS**

21. What procedures does your school follow when accessing the Capitation Grant?

.....  
.....

22. What difficulties (if any) does your school face when accessing the Capitation Grant?

.....  
.....

**SECTION F: HOW SCHOOLS USE THE CAPITATION GRANT AND THE CHALLENGES FACED BY THEM**

- 23. What roles do the following play in the disbursement of the Capitation Grant?
  - (a) PTA.....
  - (b) SMC.....
  - (c) Teachers.....
- 24. In which areas of the SPIP do you need the Capitation Grant?  
.....  
.....  
.....
- 25. Are there areas of the SPIP which are not covered by the Capitation Grant?  
Yes [ ] No [ ]
- 26. If no what are they?

APPENDIX B

**INTERVIEW OF HEADTEACHERS AFTER AUDITING THE SPIP**

- 1. Find out which areas money is being spent on using the Capitation Grant.
- 2. Which areas of the SPIP have been covered by Capitation Grant and what monies were allocated in the past 5 years?
- 3. (i) Which areas of last academic year were covered in the SPIP which were achieved? How much was spent in achieving those areas?  
(ii) Which areas were not achieved? How much money was devoted to those areas which were not achieved?  
(iii) Why were some of the areas of the SPIP not achieved? Look at the SPIP for the last five years.
- 4. (i) Compare last academic year's SPIP with this academic year's SPIP.  
(ii) What are the similarities and differences in the areas covered?  
(iii) What budget allocations have been made to the various items in the SPIP in the 2010/2011 academic year?
- 5. (i) What processes does your school follow when accessing the Capitation Grant?  
(ii) Do you find the process cumbersome? If yes, explain why you find it cumbersome?  
.....  
.....  
.....