

## Review of Knowledge Economy

2015 Vol.2, No.2, pp.80-92

ISSN(e): 2409-9449

ISSN(p): 2412-3668

DOI: 10.18488/journal.67/2015.2.2/67.2.80.92

© 2015 Conscientia Beam. All Rights Reserved.



# EQUITY IMPLICATIONS OF THE UNIVERSAL PRIMARY EDUCATION FUNDING MECHANISMS IN UGANDA

Kiggundu Musoke Muhammad<sup>1</sup> --- Nicholas Itaaga<sup>2†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Lecturer in the Department of Humanities and Languages Education, School of Education, College of Education and External Studies, Makerere University, Buganda

<sup>2</sup>Lecturer in the Department of Foundations and Curriculum Studies, School of Education, College of Education and External Studies, Makerere University, Buganda

## ABSTRACT

*The study sought to establish whether or not the way Universal Primary Education (UPE) is funded in Uganda is equitable among the different socioeconomic groups, gender, religions and disability. This was based on the view that if the expenditure on education is to benefit the entire society, it must be equitably distributed. Furthermore, specific groups have special requirements that need specific attention. The study adopted a cross-sectional survey design and was majorly qualitative. Key stakeholders interviewed included officials at the Ministry of Education and Sports headquarters, District Education Officials, head teachers, teachers, parents, pupils, and opinion leaders in ten (10) districts in Uganda. The study findings revealed that although some elements of equity were evident, there were no deliberate efforts by the financiers of the UPE program to ensure equity. The study also revealed measures like increased funding, sensitization of key stakeholders, linkages between sectors and needs assessment for appropriate intervention in order to ensure equity in funding. The study recommended that the Government of Uganda and other stakeholders must put in place deliberate provisions to ensure equitable funding of the UPE program.*

**NB:** *The national currency in Uganda is the Uganda Shilling (Shs.) and the exchange rate at the time of conducting the study was 1US\$ = 2,650 Shs.*

**Keywords:** Economics of education, Education and religion, Education and society.

## Contribution/ Originality

The paper's primary contribution is the finding that although Universal Primary Education in Uganda is public funded it is not equitably distributed among identified groups like the male versus females, the rich and the poor, various religious groups; and funding bodies have not taken deliberate steps to ensure equity.

† Corresponding author

© 2015 Conscientia Beam. All Rights Reserved.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Expenditure on education the world over is justified on several fronts that revolve around social, political, and economic reasons among others. Some of such goals include, but not limited to: the widely accepted view that education is an investment in human capital; the view that education is one of the agents of modernization; the need to fight illiteracy particularly in the third world countries; the bandwagon effect; and the socio-political argument that education is one of the basic human rights. The way education is financed has far-reaching implications on equity (Ayot and Briggs, 1992; Natarajan, 1993; Abagi and Odipo, 1997; Itaaga, 2013). Equity in education is defined as the relative distribution of educational resources among the different social-economic groups such as the poor and the rich; the urban and rural dwellers; the male and female members of society; various religions and other ethnic groups (Psacharopoulos, 1994; Lerotholi, 2001).

## 2. PRIMARY EDUCATION

The importance of primary education cannot be overemphasized. Several economists have argued that at higher levels of education the social costs outweigh the social benefits but that at lower levels, the social benefits outweigh the social costs. By implication, the lower the level of education the higher the social benefits (Ayot and Briggs, 1992; Natarajan, 1993; Hillman and Jenkner, 2004). Although this has been criticized by several educational economists, it needs to be considered particularly in the developing world. Given that society benefits more from primary education, several funding agencies including the World Bank have since shifted attention from funding higher education to funding primary education, of course with several associated implications. It is for such reasons that governments all over the world have implemented universal access to primary education. In Uganda, the primary education section takes seven (7) years and children are supposed to enroll at the age of five (5) years. Promotion to the next class in Universal Primary Education schools is automatic, while in the private schools, promotion to the next class depends on performance in the end of year examinations (Ministry of Education and Sports, 2004). At the end of the primary cycle of education, pupils are subjected to public examinations – Primary Leaving Examinations (PLE), performance in which examinations will determine admission to the next level which is senior secondary.

### 2.1. Funding

In Uganda, primary education is funded by the Government of Uganda, parents, pupils themselves, private individuals, Non-Governmental Organizations, school foundation bodies, foreign donors, and other sympathizers both local and international (Bategeka and Okurut, 2005). In 1997 the Government of Uganda launched the Universal Primary Education (UPE) program and pledged to meet the costs of schooling for all children of primary school-going age and any interested adults (Ministry of Education and Sports, 2004). However, according to UNESCO

(2000), primary education in Uganda now faces three main challenges: access, equity, and efficiency. Primary education refers to the formal education that takes place in primary schools from Primary one (P1) to Primary seven (P7) in Uganda. This study sought to find out whether or not the current funding mechanisms of the UPE program enhance equitable access and/or participation of all children from the above-identified socioeconomic groups in Uganda.

### 3. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Several entities spend heavily on education. This venture also takes much of the time and aspirations of many parents/guardians and their children in anticipation for economic and social betterment and all other associated benefits of education. The principle of equity demands that all identified groups in society equally benefit from a given opportunity, particularly if it is provided by society (Psacharopoulos, 1994). It is, however, not known whether in funding the UPE program, the various key players take into consideration the principle of equity. It would be disastrous if after several years of such heavy investment, it is realized that not all sections of the intended beneficiaries were catered for after all.

The problem of this study therefore was to establish whether or not the current funding mechanisms of the UPE program cater for the poor, the various religious groups, the girl child, and those from the rural settings. This was on the recognition of the fact that such groups have specific needs and requirements that call for special measures that target them. The study was guided by two objectives namely:

1. To find out whether or not the current UPE funding mechanisms are equitable
2. To establish practical ways of funding UPE equitably.

### 4. METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a qualitative approach using a cross-sectional design. The research team conducted interviews with the following: the Commissioner Educational Planning and Policy Analysis at the MoES; the Commissioner Pre-Primary and Primary Education at the MoES; the District Education Officers of Kamuli, Jinja, Iganga and Wakiso Districts; nine head teachers of primary schools in the above Districts; the Coordinator of Action Aid; the General Secretary Uganda National Teachers' Association (UNATU); the Program Manager, Education Local Expertise Center; and the Coordinator of African Rural Development Initiative. A cross-section of pupils were also interviewed to get their views on the topic. Two of the stakeholders were interviewed on telephone while all the rest were interviewed from their offices by the research team. All interviews, including those conducted on phone were captured using a voice recorder, and thereafter transcribed for ease of analysis. 32 percent of the respondents were female and 68 % were male. The study findings are presented and discussed in the next section.

## 5. PRESENTATION OF THE STUDY FINDINGS

The study sought to establish whether or not policy makers consider equitable access to education for marginalized groups when allocating UPE funds. The study initially investigated how the UPE program is funded and the following responses were obtained.

100% of the respondents were agreed that there are several players when it comes to funding Universal Primary Education in Uganda and that the funding is in various forms. The following were singled out.

- The government of Uganda is the major provider and that it does so by constructing schools, paying staff salaries, and provision of the school capitation grant.
- The parents/guardians provide mid-day meals, school uniforms, scholastic materials like exercise books, pens, pencils to the children.
- Non-Governmental Organizations donate as and when they wish and deem necessary and can afford. Some of the items mentioned included textbooks, games and sports equipment, furniture, sinking boreholes to tap clean water. Some of the NGOs mentioned include Save the Children, Plan International, World Vision, and Site Savers among others.
- International bodies, particularly the World Bank was singled out as having financially supported the UPE program.
- Other sources of funding mentioned included Members of Parliament, well wishers, and the local communities which provide labor, and local construction materials for school buildings.

### 5.1. Equity in Funding of UPE

The researcher then went on to find out whether in the above arrangements, there are any provisions to cater for equity. This was investigated by conducting interviews with the stakeholders using probing questions about any provisions for specific needs of pupils from different socioeconomic backgrounds, religious groups, gender, regions, and disability.

The majority of the respondents had mixed responses to this area depending on the dimension of equity under consideration. However, the following excerpts indicate that there is no consideration of equity. One head teacher explained as follows:

*They do not consider equity at all. The figure (UPE capitation grant) given is uniform dependent only on the number of children you have in the school. It does not even cater for first aid provisions in a school; not sanitary pads for girls, the money is very little: Shs.700 per term per child is rather ridiculous!*

Interestingly, however, different respondents gave different figures of the amount of money that the Government sends to the schools as capitation grant, for example Shs. 100,000 versus Shs. 150,000 per school per month for nine months; while for the UPE grant some respondents reported Shs. 700, others Shs. 1,000; while others said Shs. 1,600; and yet another one reported

Shs. 7,000 per pupil per term for the three terms in a year. The General Secretary of UNATU however summarized the situation as follows:

*No head teacher will tell you for sure how much they get/are supposed to get because they do not know; it keeps varying all the time; they only find this money on their schools' bank account*

Another head teacher had the following view concerning the disbursement of the UPE funds.

*It has no formula as to when it will come. You can even reach the middle of the term without money. By the time it comes you are in arrears. Basically the money is never enough to meet all the requirements.*

However, on the other hand some respondents indicated that there is some degree of equitable provision as one respondent explained that by the Government sending UPE grant to schools it is fully aware that all marginalized groups are supposed to attend UPE schools so they feel they have all been catered for. Another respondent, at policy level gave the following explanation:

*We consider equity in allocating funds for construction whereby schools on a hilly terrain are given more money; and similarly for schools on soft soils the rates are higher; those schools on ordinary soils that are conducive, they get the normal rates.*

Researchers then probed for responses on specific dimensions of equity and the responses are presented in the next subsections.

#### **5.1.1. Socioeconomic Background**

All respondents (100%) were agreed that there is a problem of poverty affecting participation of many would be schools pupils. One of the head teachers interviewed summarized the effect of poverty as follows:

*Poverty affects the girl child most because when they reach P5 or P6 the girls are sent to work as house girls, or they get pregnant. On the other hand the boys are sent to look after goats or to go to the lake to catch fish; others go to the nearby citrus farm to work on the farm. So after P5 the enrollment is low because of those factors that lead to dropping out of school.*

Some of the respondents indicated that the program has benefitted the poor in a number of ways. One of the head teachers gave the following testimony:

*Yes the program caters for the poor because before UPE, many children were out of school but with the program in place, the poor are also taking their children to school and this is what led to the increased enrollment. If a child is clever, even the head teacher is forced to let such a child to attend school even when the parent cannot afford some of the requirements.*

A respondent at the policy level said:

*UPE by itself is pro-poor i.e. it targets the poor because parents in the rural areas are very poor they may not even afford Shs.2,000 or they feel they shouldn't pay any money. That is why we emphasize that head teachers do not send away children due to lack of school uniform, exercise*

*books, mid-day meals, pencils etc. Whoever has a descent dress and has even one exercise book should come to school and use that.*

It was also revealed that in some schools parents are given a chance to take maize flour instead of money to the schools and this constitutes the only contribution that they make to school towards the education of their children hence benefiting the poor. Some head teachers even go personal in ensuring that children stay in school as explained by one of them:

*It is worse for girls, we go to the extent of getting some clothes from our children at home and give them to some of the girls when you really see that the girls is almost naked. As for boys they fetch water, firewood etc and earn some money to buy some of their requirements.*

Some of the head teachers interviewed indicated that they have sensitized parents to stop sending their children to gardens, emphasized the value of education, and the need to provide school requirements for their children, and that in some cases they even allow children to attend school in non uniform. A policy maker respondent had the view that:

*Where the poor have not responded to UPE, it is due to ignorance about the value of education: if a man can look after a family, how can he fail to pay the little money that the UPE schools ask for?*

Another head teacher gave the analysis that there is a problem of big families. A man can bring 12 children to one primary school and if the school asks him to pay Shs.1,000 per child, that translates into Shs 12,000 from this family head which is too much particularly in a poverty-stricken rural setting.

The commissioner planning summarized the UPE funding scenario as:

*For UPE, funding is done using a single formula and we handle it at macro-level. We used to determine what we give to schools depending on enrollment. However we realized that there are areas like Kalangala district where schools have small numbers so depending on enrollment would translate into very little money for such a school. We now first establish a threshold of Shs. 150,000 per school per month for 9 months. We then add the UPE grant which comes to about Shs 7,000 per child per year as an average or unit cost.*

The researchers then sought to establish whether schools have a say in the way the UPE capitation grant is spent. Respondents revealed that head teachers get directives from the MoES as to how to apportion the UPE grant as follows:

The money that schools receive as UPE grant comes with guidelines from the MoES stipulating the percentages as follows:

- i) Stationery/Scholastic materials     35%
- ii) Co-curricular activities             20%
- iii) Management                            25%
- iv) Administration                        10%
- v) Contingency                              10%

One respondent, however, observed that:

*These guidelines were set so many years ago but they have never been revised.*

There were, however, mixed feelings about the money remitted to the schools as UPE grant. One head teacher expressed the situation as follows:

*It has no formula as to when it will come. You can even reach the middle of the term without money. By the time it comes you are in arrears. Basically the money is never enough to meet all the requirements.*

The above findings point to the fact that the few manifestations of equity regarding socioeconomic background are not deliberate efforts by the funders but rather expected developments because the UPE program is considered free hence the increase in enrollment. The principle of equity would demand that the government or other funding organizations would have special arrangements to cater for children of the poorest background by say giving them scholastic materials, uniform or any other requirements or by giving their families money to cater for income foregone as advanced by Natarajan (1993) and Bategeka and Okurut (2005). The study therefore concluded that the way UPE is funded does not take into consideration the needs of the poor, hence it is not equitable.

#### **5.1.2. Gender Consideration**

The majority (96%) of the respondents revealed that this is another aspect of equity that has been grossly neglected. Head teachers were particularly touched by the fact that their schools have not been able to put in place facilities to cater for the needs of the girl child particularly during their menstrual period. They attributed this to lack of money and support from the School Management Committees (SMCs). One of the head teachers lamented as follows:

*We want to cater for everybody but the money is not enough. Government has turned a deaf ear. I have been having one latrine in St. Jacob primary school for over 10 years for teachers, boys, girls, villagers and the nursery section until Plan international donated one latrine this year.*

Another head teacher explained what the school provides amidst lack of money as follows:

*We provide a first aid box that has paracetamol which is a pain killer and septrin which is an antibiotic tablets, water, cotton wool, but we do not provide any sanitary pads; we also counsel the girls separately. We advise them to see the senior woman teacher. We wrap the cotton wool in toilet paper and that acts as sanitary pads for the day.*

Another respondent gave the following explanation:

*We have tried to encourage schools to provide separate washrooms for the girls and even provide sanitary pads. This was being done as an additional component of PIASCY and there after it had become a culture but later it ended. We had encouraged head teachers to get some money from the UPE grant and buy sanitary pads, but they get overwhelmed by the numbers and they cannot sustain this. So they leave this to the parents and the girls themselves; of course many cannot afford.*

Another head teacher reported that:

*We have intervened by providing a conducive environment as far as sanitary support is concerned; psycho social support for the girl child, providing a house for the senior woman teacher, providing a counseling room, sanitary facilities that the girls can access. This has led to increased girl retention, and concentrating in school.*

As regards girl child education, there is the girl's education movement supported by UNICEF housed at the MoES headquarters. It is a movement that encourages girls to go to school, stay in school and complete school. There is also UNGEI (United Nations Girl's Education Initiative) which also advocates for girl child education. We also have a gender unit established at the ministry and supported by the ministry of gender and partly by Irish Aid. They aim at mainstreaming gender issues in education. They look at the strategic plan and see how gender issues can be mainstreamed.

However, some respondents were of the view that the strategic plan does not cater for equity as explained in the following quotation from one of the respondents:

*There is absolutely nothing in the funding that takes care of the specific needs of the girl child who is disadvantaged. It is only donors that once in a while come in and cater for girl child education. Similarly, there is equally no provision to take care of the children from poor families. And lastly there is no specific allocation of money to cater for areas where the pupil teacher ratio is high.*

Much as the above responses indicate some degree of intervention to cater for the girl child, it is unfortunately inadequate and in several instances has not yielded significant results as far as girl child facilitation is concerned. Furthermore, the above intervention measures are on individual school/head teacher initiative BUT NOT from the funding organizations. By implication, in schools where head teachers have not had such initiatives, there is nothing in place to cater for the girl child's requirements. Equity would demand that schools are facilitated to put in place sanitary facilities for mature girls in school, separate stances on the pit latrines for girls, counseling facilities for girls in order to increase their enrollment and retention in schools (Kagoda, 2011). By implication, there is no deliberate provision in the funding to cater for gender as far as UPE is concerned therefore the researchers concluded that the way UPE is funded is not equitable as far as socioeconomic background of the pupils is concerned.

The research team then probed the policy makers who participated in the study and they revealed that priorities are set by the government. The order of priorities was identified as:

- ❖ Defense funding takes first priority
- ❖ Road construction takes second priority
- ❖ Health provision is in third place
- ❖ Education expenditure is in fourth position

One of the respondents put the situation as follows:

*It is actually the president who determines the priorities. Ministries prepare their wishful lists but finally the priorities are set by the president and of course defense takes priority.*

### 5.1.3. Religion

Religion is one of the factors that impact on educational theory and practice. In Uganda, it is basically taught to instill moral values in the young generation. Various religious denominations do exist in Uganda including: Anglican Church, Catholicism, Islam, Seventh Day Adventists, and there are several born-again churches in the country. Ssekamwa (1997) indicates that education in Uganda was introduced on religious lines and such influence exists up to now. The research team consequently sought to establish whether or not religion is a factor in determining funding under the current arrangements.

Respondents revealed that religion is not at all considered in funds allocation at primary school level; it is only at secondary level where the Government may consider that such a religion does not have a school in a given locality and put up a school; but that is as far as it goes, thereafter funds allocation is uniform. This was revealed by the MoES officials that participated in the study.

However, another respondent indicated that religion has instead boosted equity through the school foundation bodies as follows:

*Religious groups have been supportive of education as foundation bodies, supporting the schools and bringing in donors to support the schools and the girl child, the destitute. Many institutions are set up by those religious bodies and also they use their pulpits to preach the gospel of sending children to school.*

One of the head teachers indicated that in their school equity in terms of religion is considered in the following ways:

*For scholastic we cater for religion by buying say a Bible, and a Koran, then we invite imams, sheiks, reverends who come and talk to the pupils and we pay them for that.*

The above findings are indicative of a system that does not take into consideration the different requirements of the pupils from the religious point of view. If this was to be done, there would have been special funding targeted at spiritual needs of the pupils. Funders ought to have put in place places of worship for the different religions in each school, hired religious leaders and paid them for each religion in all schools. The study therefore drew the conclusion that the funding mechanisms currently in place for the UPE program do not cater for equity in terms of religion.

### 5.1.4. Disability

Respondents equally indicated that special needs children are not getting an appropriate dose of education because their needs are not catered for hence they are not at the same footing with other normal children.

One of the DEOs indicated that districts are supposed to get subvention grant to cater for children with disabilities but this has never been remitted to the districts at all; the center (MoES) is not consistent in this area. One of the head teachers explained as follows:

*Much as we would have considered children with special needs, we cannot do so because the money comes late, and it is little; it is not enough for all the schools' needs. Government has not bothered to cater for children with special needs. There is only one school in the whole of Kamuli District – Maria's Care – that caters for children with special needs but it is not enough.*

As regards availability of teachers for special needs education, the respondents indicated that they never get teachers for special needs. One head teacher revealed that:

*There is a teacher for special needs who visits some of the nearby schools teaching teachers how to handle children with special needs. This teacher submits reports to the district and he is given some allowance for that. This is the only way that UPE is catering for special needs.*

The head teachers also noted that "Sight savers" an NGO has helped to cater for children with special needs; an official visit the schools to identify children with special needs and sends a report to government to help such children but they do not visit all schools and not all districts.

There is also the issue of unequal distribution of the schools/facilities as revealed by one of the DEOs interviewed in the following words:

*We have special schools for children with disabilities; e.g. Kitezi center for the disabled; Kireka home for the disabled; St Mary's Kira is a private school for children with disabilities. There are three Government- aided schools for the disabled.*

In SFG there is some consideration for the disabled, as one of the DEOs explained below:

*In construction of school buildings, we emphasize that each must have a ramp to enable those on wheelchairs to access the building. This targets those with physical disabilities. As for the blind, we have tried to provide certain materials like brail machines but these are expensive equipments in which case we cannot cater for the whole country.*

It was revealed by one of the respondents that the MoES has a budget for special needs education which money is allocated to the special needs education department, they then determine which materials to provide to the disabled children and they consider even non-government schools. This facility covers the whole country but since resources are not enough, not all schools have actually benefitted. Several forms of disability were observed by the researchers during the study, some of which included several forms of physical disability, the deaf, and the blind. These do need wheel chairs, spectacles, guides, Braille machines, special needs teachers, special access to buildings among others to facilitate their studies. The government and the identified funders do not have special arrangements in this area and the reason is lack of funds according to official from the MoES. This led to the conclusion that the current funding mechanisms in place do not cater for disability, hence not equitable.

## **5.2. Measures to Improve on Equity in Funding UPE in Uganda**

Respondents were asked to suggest possible measures to improve on equity in funding UPE in Uganda. The following were the responses obtained.

One respondent at the policy making level observed that the president of Uganda is of the view that we need to review the performance of UPE and the entire system of education. It is envisaged that parents might be asked to contribute to the running of UPE because the indicators of poverty show that on average there are fewer Ugandans below the poverty line than what it was 15 years ago. When UPE was introduced, 54% of the population lived below the poverty line; today, the figure is 22%. In the peri-urban areas people are contributing.

The majority of the teachers were agreed that there is need to identify the OVCs (Orphans and Vulnerable Children), have their statistics then put in place provisions to cater for their specific needs. One respondent gave an example of Karamoja region where school children are given food to take home which is based on the fact that the region is famine and poverty stricken. This has helped bring more children to school in Karamoja.

The most common recommendation was about increased funding. One head teacher had this to say:

*There is need for increased funding if we are to reach out to the marginalized groups. Shs. 1,000 per child per term is ridiculously low. The Government should increase from Shs. 1,000 to say Shs. 10,000 per child per term and this should be released at the beginning of the term. If the money was enough we would be able to cater for all the requirements of the marginalized groups*

Another respondent indicated that:

*Government as a matter of urgency must increase funding of UPE. This will cater for furniture, infrastructure, textbooks, teachers sealing in recruitment etc all these need money and impact on equity.*

Policy level respondents suggested a sector-based approach whereby the Ministry of Gender develops an appropriate policy for the girl child; Ministry of Agriculture develops a policy to cater for food security; and several others. To them this would establish linkages between sectors and to conduct policy level meetings to determine who should do what.

NGOs should help where the government has not been able to act. For example Action Aid has constructed buildings but this is not enough. It should provide more buildings and then increase on funding. Government and her development partners should increase the income base for the locals. The parents are really poor; government should place income generating activities for the locals and target the poor. For example the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) activities should be geared towards benefitting the poor.

Respondents also observed the problem of attitude of parents towards the girl child and children with disabilities: “a parent will tell you that I have 4 children and a lame one” Teachers observed that most parents prefer that their daughters work as house girls and the money they earn is ironically used to pay fees for the boys. As regards people with disabilities, some parents take them to signify evil spirits (*isejja*), mishaps.

It was also suggested that there is need to realign the guidelines of UPE grant expenditure to cater for the specific needs of specific localities and individuals or contexts. It was observed

that subvention grant is supposed to cater for special needs education and schools are supposed to get this money but it is never sent to them.

One respondent was inclined on the contribution of NGOs towards achieving equity:

*Government must bring on board more NGOs and donors to help provide education. E.g. VAD is a small NGO but it has done much in terms of infrastructure and sanitation in the schools; and even supporting some children with food. Where the NGOs have come in strongly, they have done a good job.*

One head teacher indicated that:

*If NGOs are to help, there is need to develop a proposal and then present it to the NGOs to for consideration and assistance.*

Distribution of donor support was also noted as worsening the inequity problem. One of the head teachers interviewed had this to say:

*The donors/NGOs do not reach all districts; they only select a few and only cater for some activities of their choice which unfortunately may not be the priority for the particular schools, communities, pupils etc. This scenario in itself is inequitable. Plan needs to cover other areas instead of concentrating on sensitization alone.*

It was also observed that the donors do not carry out a needs assessment before they intervene. It was therefore suggested that they should start with the communities to know their needs then put in place appropriate measures to address these issues.

Although the MoES has an education sector strategic plan, the view of the respondents was that on paper, the plan addresses equity but in practice there is nothing to show:

*The education sector plan is supposed to address equity but it is one thing to say and another to act. It talks about equity, accessibility, affordability; those are the slogans but there are several challenges they face. In Wakiso District they have scored in the area of accessibility in because each LC1 zone/region/division has a primary school. As for equity there is a long way to go to achieve equity.*

It was also noted that the strategic plan also considers equity to some extent in regard to paying teachers' salaries. The MoES considers hard to reach areas and pays teachers in the gazetted areas some extra money as an incentive to work in such areas like Kalangala district which is basically on the islands. The Government should increase training of teachers in special needs education so that there are enough teachers to cater for special needs pupils. Government could also put up special centers/ schools with all the necessary infrastructure to cater for special needs pupils so that these are well known and special needs pupils could be taken there.

## 6. CONCLUSION

Development demands that all sections of society participate not only in the process but also in sharing the benefits. If educational funding is not equitably distributed then some sections of society will be left out in the development process. Primary education being the foundation of

education is key to the development process and therefore all stakeholders must ensure that it is equitably distributed among all identified groups and sections. Funding must therefore be equitable since it affects education more than any other factors and must equitable.

## REFERENCES

- Abagi, O. and G. Odipo, 1997. Efficiency of primary education in Kenya: Situational analysis and implications for educational reform. Nairobi Kenya: Institute of Policy Analysis and Research.
- Ayot, H.O. and H. Briggs, 1992. Economics of education. 1st Edn., Nairobi, Kenya: Educational Research and Publications.
- Bategeka, L. and N. Okurut, 2005. Universal primary education. Uganda. Policy brief 10. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Hillman, A. and E. Jenkner, 2004. Educating children in poor countries. Economic Issue NO. 33. IMF Publication.
- Itaaga, N., 2013. The role of stakeholders and Its implications on the internal efficiency of the Universal primary education programme in Eastern Uganda. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Makerere University.
- Kagoda, A.M., 2011. Gender sensitivity among head teachers and teachers in primary education in Uganda. A case for Kamuli District. In Mach.H, Falrenwald.F and Bauer. Q.J. (Eds) Gender and education. Towards new strategies of leadership and power. Berlin: Verlagsgrupee Geog von Holtzbrinck.
- Lerotholi, L., 2001. Tuition fees in primary and secondary education in Lesotho. The levels and implications for access, equity, and efficiency. UNESCO Paris: Published by International Institute for Educational Planning.
- Ministry of Education and Sports, 2004. Universal primary education (UPE). Kampala,Uganda: Enhancing UPE: A Stakeholder's Handbook.
- Natarajan, S., 1993. Introduction to economics of education. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers.
- Psacharopoulos, G., 1994. Returns to investment in education: A global update. World Development Elsevier, 22: 1325 – 1342.
- Ssekamwa, J.C., 1997. History and development of education in Uganda. Kampala: Fountain Publishers.
- UNESCO, 2000. The EFA 2000 assessment: Country reports. Available from [http://www.unesco.org/education/wef/countryreports/uganda/rapport\\_1.html](http://www.unesco.org/education/wef/countryreports/uganda/rapport_1.html).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- UNESCO, 2005. Education for all in Africa: The evolution of primary education. UNESCO BREDIA Publication.

*Views and opinions expressed in this article are the views and opinions of the author(s), Review of Knowledge Economy shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability etc. caused in relation to/arising out of the use of the content.*