



Association for the Development of Education in Africa

**Biennale on Education in Africa
(Libreville, Gabon, March 27-31, 2006)**

Effective ECD Programs that can be scaled up

**Parallel Session C-4
The Cost of ECD
Interventions**

**A Costing Model
of the Madrasa Early Childhood Development
Program in East Africa**

*by Shireen Issa
Costing Study Consultant*

**Working Document
Draft
PLEASE DO NOT DISSEMINATE**

DOC C-4.3

This document was prepared by ADEA for its Biennial Meeting (Libreville, Gabon, March 27-31, 2006). The views and opinions expressed in this volume are those of the authors and should not be attributed to ADEA, to its members or affiliated organizations or to any individual acting on behalf of ADEA.

The document is a working document still in the stages of production. It has been prepared to serve as a basis for discussions at the ADEA Biennial Meeting and should not be disseminated for other purposes at this stage.

© Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA) – 2006

Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA)

International Institute for Educational Planning

7-9 rue Eugène Delacroix

75116 Paris, France

Tel.: +33(0)1 45 03 77 57

Fax: +33(0)1 45 03 39 65

adea@iiep.unesco.org

web site: www.ADEAnet.org

Table of contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| LIST OF TABLES..... | 4 |
| LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS | 6 |
| ABSTRACT | 7 |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 8 |
| CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND ON THE MADRASA EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME..... | 11 |
| CHAPTER 2: COSTING STUDY METHODOLOGY..... | 15 |
| CHAPTER 3: PARAMETERS OF THE COSTING MODEL | 19 |
| CHAPTER 4: OVERVIEW OF COSTING FOR THE MADRASA PROGRAMME IN EAST AFRICA | 22 |
| CHAPTER 5: LESSONS LEARNT AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 25 |

List of Tables

| Table | Page |
|--|-------------|
| Table 1: Primary beneficiaries of Madrasa Programme | 12 |
| Table 2: Community profiles | 19 |
| Table 3: Cost of 5-year phased approach for Madrasa pre-schools in Kenya | 23 |
| Table 4: Community/Government partnerships in ECD | 25 |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is the result of a month-long site-based study of the Madrasa Program of the Madrasa Resource Center (MRC), East Africa, a project of the Aga Khan Foundation. The report would not have been possible without the cooperation and effort of MRC staff many of whom devoted countless hours to detailing MRC activities and resources expended and also accompanied me on several community visits, which often took place during the weekends.

Special thanks to: Juliana Nzomo, Regional Program Officer, AKF for guidance and support and especially for producing the initial draft of the section on Programme Background; the MRC Project Directors for their support throughout; the Monitoring, Evaluation, Research, and Liaison Officers (MERLOs) for compiling data according to the study's specifications; the MRC financial staff for their assistance with all financial dimensions of the study; and the administrative staff of AKF East Africa and all MRCs for much valued logistical assistance.

List of acronyms and abbreviations

| | |
|-------|--|
| ADEA | Association for the Development of Education in Africa |
| AKF | Aga Khan Foundation |
| CM | Community Mobilizers |
| CRT | Community Resource Teams |
| ECD | Early Childhood Development |
| ECERS | Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale |
| GA | Graduate Association |
| GE | General Expenses |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MERLO | Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Liaison Officer |
| MRC | Madrasa Resource Centre |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organization |
| PGSS | Post Graduation Support for Sustainability |
| SMC | School Management Committee |
| SWAP | Sector Wide Approach |
| PRSP | Poverty Reduction Strategy Policies |
| MDGs | Millennium Development Goals |
| WGECD | Working Group on Early Childhood Development |

Abstract

Research findings (e.g. Young, 2002) suggest that early childhood development programs can make a highly cost-effective contribution, not only to learning in school but also the overall development of a child into a balanced adult that contributes positively to a nation's development. These effects are particularly strong for children with disadvantaged home background due to poverty or low levels of parental education. The Working Group on Early Childhood Development (WGECD) promotes the integration of ECD interventions as viable strategies to meet the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) through inclusion in on-going national development processes such as Sector Wide Approaches (SWAPs) and Poverty Reduction Strategy Policies (PRSPs).

There is increasing international recognition (Jomtien, Dakar) that it is in one's early years that the foundations are laid for physical, cognitive, emotional and social development. However, despite the recognition and willingness to invest in ECD, governments find it difficult to afford major investments that would allow expansion of services, within a context of many priorities and only limited resources.

The aim of the costing study is to formulate policy options for governments that are willing to invest in ECD interventions as a major strategy to meet the Millennium Development Goals in health and education. This case study focuses on the Madrasa Early Childhood Development Programme (hereafter Madrasa Programme), a community-based initiative of the Aga Khan Foundation, currently operates in the three countries which comprise East Africa -- Kenya, Tanzania (Zanzibar), and Uganda.

The first chapter gives an introductory background to the Madrasa Early Childhood Development Programme, its current status as well as implementation process and programme impact. The second chapter focuses on the study methodology while the third chapter dwells on the parameters of the costing model. Chapter four then focuses on the costing of the programme and links that to implications on government. Chapter five concludes with lessons learnt and recommendations.

Executive Summary

This case study focuses on the Madrasa Early Childhood Development Programme (hereafter Madrasa Programme), a community-based initiative of the Aga Khan Foundation, currently operates in the three countries which comprise East Africa -- Kenya, Tanzania (Zanzibar), and Uganda.

The programme is currently supporting 203 community pre-schools in East Africa (66 in Kenya, 53 in Uganda and 84 in Zanzibar), the majority of which are located in rural areas (about 80%) while others are primarily located in peri-urban areas. Currently, 153 communities have graduated and are receiving post-graduation support from the MRC and its affiliate, the Graduate Association, while 50 communities (which were mobilized in 2003/04 and joined the program in early 2005) are receiving intensive support in preparation for graduation.

The current costing of the Madrasa Programme in East Africa is the result of a detailed month-long in-country study of the Madrasa Programme including week-long site visits to each of the 3 Madrasa Resource Centers (MRCs). These visits enabled data collection from a variety of quantitative and qualitative sources.

The costing model for the Madrasa Program breaks down costs first into two major categories: MRC contribution and community contribution and then further divides costs into four sub-categories: direct costs, indirect operational costs, indirect infrastructure and set-up costs, and hidden costs.

Direct costs are those borne by MRC in direct connection to activities undertaken for establishing and operating the preschool. These costs have been identified as part of an activity-based costing model which involves costing of each process/task associated with the three major phases of setting up and operating a community-based pre-school. The three phases involve: Community Mobilization, Initial and On-going Training and Support, and Post-graduation Support for Sustainability (PGSS).

Indirect Costs, commonly referred to as General Expenses (GE), Overhead, Operational Costs. This costing model uses a broader definition of indirect/operational costs because of the specific nature of the direct costs identified above. Further more, only 60% of indirect costs (which reflect 2005 actuals) are currently applied to direct community implementation. As explained above, the MRCs also undertake activities outside the purview of direct implementation in a batch of 12-15 communities, to which activities the remaining 40% of indirect costs have been allocated.

Infrastructure and Setup Costs: In the interest of capturing the true cost of establishing preschools, initial capital expenditure related to office set-up have been included in the costing model. However, depending on the purposes for which this costing model is utilized, inclusion of infrastructure/setup costs is at the discretion of the end user.

Hidden Costs: This category of costs refers to community contribution (cash and in-kind) which has heretofore not been measured or quantified as part of a systematic process. As noted, the success of the Madrasa Programme rests on an assumption of community contribution and ownership. Hence, it has been considered essential to include community contribution as part of the overall costing model for the Madrasa preschools.

Overall, the direct costs associated with 5-year phased implementation of the Madrasa Programme are in the range of USD 15, with MRC contributing USD 10 and the community

contributing USD 5, while the overall unit costs including indirect hidden costs as well as initial set up and overhead costs came to about USD 24.

The high unit cost associated to the programme came as a surprise, and this calls for the need to re-visit the processes and determine the levels of efficiencies of processes. A possible explanation is that the programme reach is not wide-spread and there are therefore no economies of scale. There would be cost effectiveness if the programme scaled up to more communities, but this would be at a risk of compromising quality – which is where the trade-offs between quality and quantity comes in.

Among the recommendations is the need to consolidate findings from various case studies and determine a realistic unit cost of community based ECD initiatives; demonstrate to governments that commitment towards ECD support would be easily manageable and would help government utilize some idle capacity within the system in a cost effective manner, with increased efficiency. It is also noted that community ownership of ECD programmes is critical.

Introduction

This case study focuses on the Madrasa Early Childhood Development Programme (hereafter Madrasa Programme), a community-based initiative of the Aga Khan Foundation, currently operates in the three countries which comprise East Africa -- Kenya, Tanzania (Zanzibar), and Uganda.

The Madrasa Programme was initiated in the 1980s at the request of Muslim communities in Mombasa, Kenya made to His Highness the Aga Khan to assist in improving the educational status of children in these communities. Considering its humble origins, the programmatic scope and documented impacts of the Madrasa Programme in 2006 speak volumes for the success of community-driven service provision.

The linchpin of community-driven enterprises of this nature is the participation of the community and the vested interest which drives them to not only benefit from the services provided by government or non-government agencies but also to contribute substantially (their time, financial resources, and/or other material resources) to the project during initial phases and over the long-term. Historically, studies that record and document the quantum of this contribution by the community itself have not been undertaken. Along similar lines, traditional costing methodologies of community-based ECD service programs do not provide a comprehensive understanding of direct and indirect costs borne by the service provider on a per-community basis for the duration of active service provision and support. When examining cost efficiencies and prospects for replication/expansion of such program models, accurate costing data is critical for informing potential improvements and/or expansion of service delivery. This recognition is the driving force behind the costing study of the Madrasa Programme.

This case study is part of a larger exercise initiated by the Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA) and co-sponsored by the World Bank and UNICEF. As part of ADEA's Biennale of Education to be held in March 2006 in Gabon,¹ this exercise aims to develop and put forward policy options for governments interested in investing in Early Childhood Development (ECD) interventions by highlighting ECD interventions that operate across Africa at reasonable costs while producing positive results and by defining the parameters of the costing models which determine the "true" costs associated with such interventions.

In accordance with the objectives of ADEA's Biennale, this report:

- (i) Provides a description of the Madrasa Programme -- its organisational structure, context, objectives, target groups, age group of children, activities carried out and output / outcome / impact;
- (ii) Identifies parameters of the costing model for the programme which include an assessment of capital/recurrent costs; direct/indirect costs; hidden costs (who amongst partners contributes which costs); start-up costs, and long term operational costs; and
- (iii) Determines the costs (per child per month in one community) associated with the establishment and operation of community-based pre-schools in rural, peri-urban, and urban communities by each of the three Madrasa Resource Centers (MRCs) in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda.

¹ The principal objective of ADEA's Biennial Meetings is to foster discussions between African ministers of education, development agencies, and other education professionals. The 2006 Biennale will be held in Libreville, Gabon, March 27-31, 2006 with the following theme *Characteristics, Conditions and Factors underlying Effective Schools and Literacy and Early Childhood Development Programs*. The meeting will build on lessons learned during the previous Biennale and will continue to explore how African education systems can improve the quality of education. http://www.adeanet.org/biennial-2006/en_index.html

Chapter 1: Background on the Madrasa Early Childhood Development Programme

1.1. Preamble

As a community-based initiative, the Madrasa Programme has benefited from considerable corporate and individual good-will, time, effort and money. Over time, these investments have facilitated the establishment of quality, affordable, culturally appropriate and sustainable community-based early childhood development and education centres among Muslim communities of low socio-economic status in East Africa. The programme was initiated in response to the East African Muslim community's desire for fostering a grounded understanding of the Islamic faith and local culture in their children while also increasing their readiness for, access to, and success in later schooling.

The Madrasa Programme's main objective is therefore to increase access to and retention in primary school for children of marginalized communities by improving their overall well-being through ensuring a child-friendly and supportive household and pre-school environment in their early developmental years. The program aims to develop a replicable approach for community-based early childhood education and development which is relevant to the local context and is sustainable.

The Madrasa Programme was initiated in the Coast Province of Kenya in 1986 and expanded to Zanzibar's two Islands (Unguja and Pemba) in 1990 and to Uganda in 1993. The Madrasa Resource Centres (MRCs) in Kenya (Mombasa), Uganda (Kampala with a satellite office in Mpigi District), and Tanzania (Zanzibar) work with disadvantaged urban, peri-urban, and rural Muslim communities to support the establishment of community-owned and managed pre-schools (see Annexure A for Regional and Country Organograms). The existing national ECD frameworks and/or curricula, the Swahili culture (on the Coast of Kenya and Zanzibar Islands) and the majority Luganda culture in Uganda, as well as core Islamic values and beliefs underpin the curriculum and overall ethos of the programme.

1.2 Current status of the programme

The programme is currently supporting 203 community pre-schools in East Africa (66 in Kenya, 53 in Uganda and 84 in Zanzibar), the majority of which are located in rural areas (about 80%) while others are primarily located in peri-urban areas. Currently, 153 communities have graduated and are receiving post-graduation support from the MRC and its affiliate, the Graduate Association, while 50 communities (which were mobilized in 2003/04 and joined the program in early 2005) are receiving intensive support in preparation for graduation. Annexure B provides detailed information on all schools.

Since its inception, the programme has served approximately 30,000 children in East Africa (including those currently enrolled), trained over 4,000 community-based teachers and 2,000 School Management Committee (SMC) members. The table below gives a summary of beneficiaries.

Table 1: Primary beneficiaries of Madrasa Programme

| | Kenya | Zanzibar | Uganda | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------|----------|--------|-------|
| Number of preschools contracted | 66 | 84 | 53 | 203 |
| Number of school graduated | 51 | 64 | 38 | 153 |
| Number of children graduated | 4795 | 11064 | 3963 | 19822 |
| Number of children enrolled in 2005 | 3035 | 4743 | 2331 | 10109 |
| Percentage of girls enrolled in 2005 | 47.6 | 50.4 | 49.2 | 49 |

| | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|------|------|
| Number of MRC teachers trained in 2-year course | 479 | 593 | 189 | 1261 |
| Number of other teachers trained through short courses | 920 | 587 | 1495 | 2902 |
| Number of SMC members trained (including those being trained currently) | 797 | 849 | 271 | 1917 |

1.3 Future plans for the programme

The next 5-year phase of the Madrasa programme (2007-2011) will focus on consolidating programme components and on enhancing community support for a holistic and integrated approach to ECD. Therefore, rather than taking on additional communities, the MRCs will concentrate and dedicate their support to communities that are currently part of the programme. The MRCs will simultaneously continue to sharpen their knowledge for greater effectiveness in integrating the health, nutrition, parenting and HIV/AIDS components into the programme. Further definition of this plan is expected to occur during the course of 2006.

1.4 Programme impact

With growing interest on the part of governments in creating national policies that guide and validate the provision of a broad range of early childhood development and family support activities, the Madrasa Programme's contribution to ECD policy development is becoming recognized on a larger scale. Efforts to address wider developmental issues of importance to young children and their families have brought about increased awareness among parents and community members of their young children's health and education needs, and is equipping them to respond more effectively. The programme experience over the years is beginning to demonstrate that ECD does indeed make a difference and is critical in working toward a rights-based approach to children overall development enabling them to become healthy, competent individuals who are able to meaningfully contribute to their social and cultural contexts. Intensive and on-going support to teachers and parents is enhancing their knowledge and skills so that they are able to better attend to the needs of marginalized children. Specifically, quantitative and qualitative studies undertaken by the Research Office of the Madrasa Programme indicate that:

- ◆ Compared to other normative preschool programmes existing in East Africa, the Madrasa Programme's preschool children enjoy a better learning environment. The Madrasa Programme preschool were found to be better in all the aspects of the environment and significantly better in 73% of the environmental dimensions assessed through the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS). The human interaction between the adults and the children was much better in the Madrasa Programme preschools than in the other preschools in East Africa.
- ◆ The value added in the intellectual development of the children was found to be significantly higher for the Madrasa Programme preschoolers than both those who did not attend preschool and those that attended other preschools in East Africa. Madrasa preschool children had a margin of 42% higher value-added mean scores when compared to children who did not attend pre-schools.
- ◆ The divergence between preschool attending children's intellectual performance and the home (those who do not attend preschool) children was evident as early as after sixty days of children attending preschool. While more data collection and analysis is required on the retention rate of preschool and home children in the school system, the initial analysis indicate a higher rate of retention of preschool experience children in school system than those who did not attend preschool.

- ◆ It is clear that the process of establishing pre-schools in communities has unleashed forces of change within these communities. Where Madrasa Programme has established preschools, women's participation in community life and decision making outside the home has increased, even in the most traditional of communities, because of the MRC policy of ensuring women's participation in all aspects of school management. It is often noted for example that the training process inculcates a sense of confidence within the teachers.

1.5 Implementation process and activities

Direct Implementation in communities occurs as part of a three-phase process typically over the course of five years (assuming that staff is reasonably well-versed in ECD methodologies).² The process of establishing and running community-owned preschools is targeted towards awakening the community's consciousness of existing community needs and their individual and collective responsibility and ability to intervene, to empower the community to participate in the process, to develop indigenous capacity in relation to knowledge, practice, and skills; and to foster self-reliance. In a nutshell, the process is designed to facilitate sustainability of the programme technically, organizationally, and financially.

Accordingly, the first phase of implementation phase involves **community sensitization and mobilization**. The process is aimed at assessing community needs and creating a cadre of individuals within the community who are conscious of their individual and collective needs, their responsibilities with respect to meeting these needs, and the sustainable strategies required to address these needs. This phase also involves initial mobilization to prepare community residents for formally joining the Madrasa Programme which includes activities that focus on meeting MRC's selection criteria for contracted schools such as:

- (i) selection of the School Management Committee (SMC) which must include at least two women members given an average of a 8 members total
- (ii) opening of bank account as an incentive for communities to be proactive in managing school finances
- (iii) initiation of school registration with the relevant Ministry
- (iv) enrollment of children and recruitment/selection of teachers in accordance with MRC guidelines for teacher/children ratio
- (v) Preliminary improvement of existing school structure which is usually part of the community madrasa (most often communities need to cement the flooring, plaster the walls so as to fortify the structure, fix windows, and build or repair a latrine). It also involves creation of a quality teaching and learning environment.
- (vi) In Zanzibar, orientation training for SMCs and teachers also occurs during this period whereas Kenya and Uganda initiate training after formal contract signing between communities and MRC

The second phase of implementation follows the contract signing and incorporates typically two and sometimes even three years of intensive **Training, Monitoring and Evaluation, Operations, and Support**. This phase involves training, ongoing support, and mentoring for the School Management Committees and teachers (provided by the Community Development Officer (CDO) for the SMCs and by the Trainer for teachers). Awareness-raising for parents and other community residents also occurs during these years.

² In 2002, when MRC decided to formally introduce the "D" for Development component into its existing ECE program, significant staff time and MRC resources were required over a period of 6 months to build staff capacity with respect to introducing integrated ECD methodologies into the existing Madrasa curriculum and other support services. This investment has not been included as part of the current costing model.

Also, during this time, communities who choose not to set up a permanent base in the existing madrasas, expend considerable time and resources (obtained through community donations and other fundraising efforts) in constructing and furnishing a new pre-school area (typically one classroom and one office/storage room accompanied by a bathroom and an outdoor play area; in the case of Zanzibar, schools are mostly two-classroom structures). Communities also spend considerable time with MRC to develop materials and teaching aids, funds for which are mostly provided by the seed grant of USD 1,000 provided by the MRC to each school community.

As the school approaches “graduation” from the MRC program, the community is mobilized to form a Community Resource Team (CRT) which is comprised of two teachers (the head teacher and the lead teacher) and a Community Mobiliser (CM). The CRT is then provided training and support from the time of formation and during the two years as part of post-graduation support provided by MRC. The CRTs are envisioned to be the core community resource group responsible for staying abreast of the community’s ECD-related needs going forward and strategies for addressing these needs in collaboration with the SMC, the Graduate Association, and MRC.

The graduation phase involves evaluating the programme to assess the extent to which the schools have satisfied the community involvement, teaching and learning environment, and management criteria set in the contract. It is a validation mechanism helps evaluate whether or not the schools are operating at an acceptable quality standard, with the management and financial systems required to ensure the sustainability of the school technically, financially, and organizationally. The Madrasa Programme’s monitoring and evaluation system (which starts with a baseline study that is conducted prior to contract signing and continues throughout the post-signing and post-graduation period) is geared towards assisting schools to achieve a sustainable level of teaching standards, a well-developed and quality learning environment, effective management and financial systems so as to ensure maximum benefit for the children being served.

Following graduation, the preschool has the option of joining the national association of graduated preschools – the Graduate Association (GA) -- AMKE in Kenya, XX in Zanzibar, and XX in Uganda. The post-graduation phase which is formally referred to as the **Post-Graduation Support for Sustainability (PGSS)** phase involves a continuation of support to SMCs, CRTs, and teachers via on-site mentoring visits, refresher courses, or training on new topics to support the upcoming needs of the SMCs and CRTs. MRC also provides support to the GAs with the aim of building their capacity to eventually take on the majority of MRC’s role of ongoing support provision to graduated schools. (This envisioned role of the GA and the continuing involvement of the MRC in providing support to graduated schools beyond the two-year PGSS phase is under discussion and requires greater strategic thinking during 2006 as part of future planning sessions).

Chapter 2: Costing Study Methodology

The current costing of the Madrasa Programme in East Africa is the result of a detailed month-long in-country study of the Madrasa Programme including week-long site visits to each of the 3 Madrasa Resource Centers (MRCs). These visits enabled data collection from a variety of quantitative and qualitative sources including:

- (i) Working group sessions with technical staff to gain an understanding of the processes involved in and activities being undertaken for the different phases of the program as well as to assess the amount of staff time and other MRC resources that were/are being allocated to each required activity on a per community basis for an average community;
- (ii) Meetings with the Graduate Association (GA) Coordinator and relevant members of the GA Executive Committee to gain insight into the post-graduation support provided by the GA to the communities and the support provided by the MRC to the GA;
- (iii) Working sessions with the Monitoring, Evaluation, Research, and Liaison Officer (hereafter, MERLO) to discuss quantitative data requirements pertaining to the costing study and to obtain relevant data on programme statistics, such as number of schools, total enrollment, child-to-teacher ratios, fee structures, dates of joining, signing, and graduation, socio-economic classifications, etcetera. In some cases, data was readily available for immediate use whereas in other instances data was compiled using primary sources such as community files and other relevant MRC records;
- (iv) Working sessions with financial staff (accountants) for an in-depth study of quantitative data including budgeted and actual activity-based expenditures over the years and to allocate appropriate costs to the activities described by the technical staff;
- (v) Meetings with Project Directors and, where possible, with the MRC's Board Chairperson to discuss the costing strategy, especially with respect to indirect and hidden costs, gain a more comprehensive understanding of Madrasa activities and plans going forward, and to assess the time and resources contributed by the Project Directors and the voluntary board;
- (vi) Semi-structured focus group discussions with community residents including School Management Committee (SMC) members, teachers, parents/grandparents, and other local leaders as part of community/site visits to 2-3 representative³ urban, rural, and peri-urban communities per MRC. On average, each community visit (to a total of 10 communities) entailed a 2-3 hour meeting and included a review of community records such as SMC meeting minutes, community participation records, student and teacher attendance records, etcetera;
- (vii) To the extent possible, information sources were triangulated by using several different data sources (representing the MRCs and the community) for each aspect of the study and through reliance on informal discussions (participants were informed of the potential for use of such discussions as part of this study);

³ The concept of representativeness underlies the costing model. As such, with respect to communities selected for site visits and for gaining an understanding of resources utilized during each activity, every attempt was made to capture the typical/average scenario which is representative of an average community.

(viii) Communities were selected on the basis of the following criteria:

- a. **Length of affiliation with MRC:** Selection of communities kept in mind the community's length of affiliation with MRC. Where ever possible, "newer" communities were given preference during selection to facilitate an understanding of most recent processes and associated costs. (Furthermore, newer communities' recall (of events and processes as well as associated time and resources expended) is expected to be more reliable in the absence of detailed records).

Ideally, it would have been best to select communities in each MRC that had graduated only two years ago which would have provided a good picture of MRC's support to communities from the initial point of contact through to signing and continuing till at least 2 years after graduation/certification. However, since the MRC approach to mobilization has evolved over the last three years, the study attempted to capture the most current process by accessing a combination of communities representing the most recent batch of schools to be mobilized (in 2003) so as to provide a representative picture of the resources involved during mobilization and the first year of signing as well as some graduated/certified schools to obtain information on resources expended post-signing and post-graduation.

- b. **Demographic status of community:** as determined by urban/peri-urban/rural classifications. Urban, rural, peri-urban classifications of communities have been based on the relative infrastructure strength in each community, the primary mode of income generation, and proximity to towns. In general, the majority of schools being catered to by the MRCs regionally are classified as rural, with two schools per batch of 15 on average (i.e. about 13%) classified as being peri-urban or urban (see Annexure B). In the planning phase for this study, it was agreed that site visits would attempt to cover at least one urban and one rural school per MRC. However, given ground realities, this was not considered to be the ideal plan of action. As such, the communities visited were agreed upon between the consultant and relevant MRC staff with the overarching criteria being one of representativeness of demographic status per MRC.

It may be argued that the kind of resources expended vary by demographic status, i.e urban communities may tend to contribute primarily via cash donations rather than time and other in-kind contributions such as building materials whereas rural community contribution would tend to take the form of time and in-kind donations. This has been accounted for by costing out (i.e. assigning financial values to) both monetary and in-kind contributions.

Also, it was previously assumed that rural community costs for building construction and on-going repair and maintenance may be considerably lower than such categories of costs for urban and peri-urban communities because of a heavier reliance on low-cost local materials by rural communities. However, over time, it has been determined that while differences arise in such costs across the three countries, within each country the cost variation is not significant since rural communities are showing preference for more commercial materials because of the associated durability.

As such, the differences between rural and urban communities, not just with respect to construction and maintenance costs but also for costs associated with school fees, teacher salaries, and feeding program have been adjusted for by taking weighted averages (leaning toward rural estimates because of the higher proportion of rural communities being served).

- c. **Socio-economic status of the community:** In 2001, a year-long study of the MRC Mini-Endowment Pilot Fund for graduated schools relied on school fees as a proxy

for categorizing school communities as “wealthy, middle, or poor.”⁴ School fee standards of classification, which were developed by MRC in 2001, have been reviewed to reflect current realities. Accordingly, in *Kenya*, a school charging fees of USD 4 per 3-month term (KShs 300 per term) is considered poor, schools charging fees upwards of USD 8 per term (KShs 600 per term) are classified as being wealthy. In any case, the Madrasa programme targets poor communities and it should be understood that any classifications with respect to socio-economic status is simply an indication that some communities are poorer than others, and those categorized as ‘wealthy’ still fall below the poverty line. For this reason, Table 2 on community profile does not include the socio-economic status, but uses tuition fees to give an indication of variations between communities.

- d. **School size:** Typically, the number of teachers per school serves as an indicator for school size and average number of children. On average, with respect to all three MRCs, a small school is staffed by 2 teachers for 30-35 children, a medium school by 3-4 teachers for 40-60 children, and a large school with 5 or more teachers. The child-to-teacher ratio is on average 15:1. A review of enrollment data for the newest batches of schools mobilized across the region (see Annexure B) reveals that, typically, the schools in Uganda tend to be smallest in size with an average of 45 children, schools in Kenya tend to show an average enrollment of 55 children, whereas schools in Tanzania (Zanzibar – Pemba and Unguja) tend to be the largest with an average enrollment of 68 children. Attempts were made to visit communities that represented (or fell closely within) the average enrollment figures as calculated for the most recent batch of schools.
- e. **Physical school structure:** Historically, the Madrasa Programme has propagated the use of existing madrasa structures for purposes of providing preschool education, that being the lowest cost method of providing educational services within the community. Hence, most of the older schools associated primarily with the MRC in Kenya have relied on a one-room setup in the community madrasa. However, more recently, communities have chosen to construct dedicated pre-school structures where the play materials and set up would remain intact. In Zanzibar and Uganda, construction of structures has been a historical trend. Hence, even while some new communities rely on the existing madrasa space during the first one to three years (during mobilization and up to graduation,) most communities initiate construction of a new structure, often after officially joining the Madrasa Programme (i.e. after signing the contract).

For the purposes of this study, because of costs and community contribution associated with building, repair, and maintenance, it was important to interview communities which have utilized existing Madrasa space in the past and are planning to or have already constructed a new structure as well as communities who have relied principally on madrasa space. Another issue that was considered when selecting communities (for the purposes of representativeness) was the number of rooms in the preschool (typically one classroom and one office in Kenya and Uganda, and two classrooms and one office in Zanzibar).

⁴ Hughes, S. (2001). Final report on the mini-endowment pilot test. Madrasa Resource Centre (MRC) Regional Office, Mombasa, Kenya.

(ix) The below table provides a profile of the communities visited.

Table 2: Community profiles

| No | Community Name | Location | Tuition USD/term | Rural/Urban/ Peri-urban | No. of teachers | No. of children |
|----|---------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1 | Rahma Majaoni | Bamburi, Mombasa | 8.33 | Rural | 2 | 48 |
| 2 | Khairat Mwembe Kuku | Mwembe Kuku, Mombasa | 20.83 | Urban | 3 | 58 |
| 3 | Khairat Mwaembe | Mwaembe, Mombasa | 6.25 | Rural | 3 | 78 |
| 4 | Zam Zam | Unguga, Zanzibar | | Peri-urban | 2 | |
| 5 | Jadid Bweleo | Unguga, Zanzibar | 1.78 | Rural | 5 | 46 |
| 6 | Chwaka | Unguga, Zanzibar ⁵ | | Rural | 2 | |
| 7 | Nakasozi | Kampala | 6.50 | Peri-urban | 4 | 53 |
| 8 | Jumaiyat Islamia | Kampala | 5.50 | Rural | 3 | 52 |
| 9 | Anonya | Kampala | 6.50 | Rural | 3 | 32 |
| 10 | Bwerojerere | Kampala | 10.95 | Urban | 3 | 72 |

⁵ Only communities in Unguga were visited because of time constraints.

Chapter 3: Parameters of the Costing Model

The costing model for the Madrasa Program breaks down costs first into two major categories: MRC contribution and community contribution and then further divides costs into four sub-categories: direct costs, indirect operational costs, indirect infrastructure and set-up costs, and hidden costs. The actual costing model reflects figures in real terms as of 2006 wherever possible and, where not feasible, in terms of 2005 Actuals. Some issues that bear mention before launching into specific cost inclusions in the above cost categories are:

- ◆ **Comparative Salary Scales:** In the interest of drawing useful comparisons with government agencies at all levels of contribution, and when considering human resource contributions on the part of MRC staff (which have been allocated as part of direct and indirect operational costs), it is considered important to provide some information on the variation (if any) between MRC staff salaries inclusive of all benefits and government salaries including benefits. The situation varies across the three countries. When considering government classifications of salaries – national, provincial, divisional, district, zonal – the majority of MRC technical staff salaries would best be compared to those of district and zone level officers within the government. In relation to government salaries (including benefits), MRC staff salaries (including benefits) in Kenya appear to be somewhat higher at roughly 1.5 times government salaries and those in Zanzibar tend to be significantly higher by about 2.0 to 2.5 times whereas MRC salaries in Uganda tend to be at par with their government counterparts. Specific country costings for MRC contributions should be viewed in light of these comparisons, if replication on the part of government agencies is being considered.
- ◆ **Voluntary Time Contributed by Governance Board:** Voluntary time contribution, which is a key feature of many Aga Khan Foundation-funded projects and other NGOs, adds not only tremendous value to the daily operations and overall vision of the Madrasa Programme, but also represents a significant number of person hours that may be reasonably allocated as costs associated with direct community implementation. However, in the absence of such a structure at the government levels and considering the significant variation in rates per hour across the Board, costing of board time was not considered to be a critical component of the costing model.
- ◆ **Other activities undertaken by the Madrasa Programme:** Activities that involve (a) trainings for teachers who are not representing Madrasa preschools and other such activities that fall into the purview of Resource Center responsibilities rather than direct community implementation; (b) capacity building that is not critical for direct community implementation; and (c) support to preschools that have completed the two-year post-graduation phase with the Madrasa Programme, constitute roughly 40% of Madrasa resources. These activities have not been included in the costing model for the Madrasa preschool.
- ◆ A detailed breakdown of the costing categories is as follows:
 - (i) **Direct Costs:** Direct costs are those borne by MRC in direct connection to activities undertaken for establishing and operating the preschool. These costs have been identified as part of an activity-based costing model which involves costing of each process/task associated with the three major phases of setting up and operating a community-based preschool. The three phases involve: Community Mobilization, Initial and On-going Training and Support, and Post-graduation Support for Sustainability (PGSS).

These activities were defined in collaboration with MRC staff in each country as a means of gaining a clear understanding of processes undertaken and of thinking through costs and resources associated with one community (rather than a batch of 12-15 communities). The

activities vary somewhat (primarily in terms of time sequence) across the 3 MRC programs but are essentially similar enough across the 3 programs to justify the definition of costs along these lines (highlighting differences when they occur). For each source of contribution, direct costs are further divided in terms of direct financial contributions, other in-kind contributions that have been assigned a financial value, and human resource input.

Human resource input for MRC staff has been measured in terms of person hours expended per activity. Person hours per activity have then been assigned a financial value by costing them at the average market rate per hour (based on 2005 actuals). In Kenya for example, this methodology has resulted in an average rate per hour for MRC staff of KShs 275 (USD 3.81). Given the variation in salary scales between other technical staff and Project Directors of MRCs, the Project Directors salaries have been allocated across communities as part of indirect costs.

(ii) **Indirect Costs – Ongoing operational costs:** This category of costs is also commonly referred to as General Expenses (GE), Overhead, Operational Costs. This costing model uses a broader definition of indirect/operational costs because of the specific nature of the direct costs identified above. Further more, only 60% of indirect costs (which reflect 2005 actuals) are currently applied to direct community implementation. As explained above, the MRCs also undertake activities outside the purview of direct implementation in a batch of 12-15 communities, to which activities the remaining 40% of indirect costs have been allocated. Indirect costs include:

- a. Core management and administrative salaries: for the Project Director, Accountant, Secretary, and Administration Officer and other support staff such as drivers and office messengers. Salaries for these positions are not readily allocable as direct costs because these positions serve most communities equally and in the specific case of the Project Director are high enough in comparison to other technical staff to upwardly skew the average rate per hour.
- b. Operational costs: Which include, among other costs, categories such as rent, utilities, maintenance, equipment maintenance, security, audit fees, vehicle fuel (in addition to the direct fuel costs associated with specific implementation activities), vehicle maintenance and other associated costs, and local travel costs (on public transport). With respect to rent, it should be noted that in some cases (Kenya), MRC is paying rent at a subsidized rate to its grantor, AKF. For the purposes of costing because such a subsidized rate is artificially low, the true cost of rent in real terms has been costed.
- c. Other Indirect Programmatic Costs: These include costs for educational materials, meeting expenses, and staff capacity building. Based on discussions with Project Directors, only those capacity building activities that are viewed as being critical to direct implementation in communities have been included as part of the costing. These include, but are not limited to, a Technical Staff Forum three times a year, curriculum development and content review workshops once a year, curriculum review sessions that take place once every two years, monitoring and evaluation trainings for MERLOs, and annual financial training for financial staff.

(iii) **Infrastructure and Setup Costs:** In the interest of capturing the true cost of establishing preschools, initial capital expenditure related to office set-up have been included in the costing model. However, depending on the purposes for which this costing model is utilized, inclusion of infrastructure/setup costs is at the discretion of the end user. It should be noted that spreading these costs over a batch of 12-15 communities over 5 years results in a minimal addition of roughly USD 1.00 per child per month.

(iv) **Hidden Costs:** This category of costs refers to community contribution (cash and in-kind) which has heretofore not been measured or quantified as part of a systematic process. As noted, the success of the Madrasa Programme rests on an assumption of community

contribution and ownership. Hence, it has been considered essential to include community contribution as part of the overall costing model for the Madrasa preschools. Community contribution most often takes the form of:

- a. admission (one-off registration) and tuition fees (on a termly basis) paid by parents;
- b. income generating activities initiated by SMCs the income from which is used toward the schools operational costs;
- c. funds and materials donated by community residents during all stages which may be made available on an ad-hoc basis or via a scheduled fundraising activity organized by the SMC;
- d. cash or in-kind contributions made by ex-community residents or government representatives; and
- e. time spent by SMC members, teachers, community leaders, parents, and other interested residents on all issues related to the establishment and operation of the preschool (human resource input for communities, as is the case with MRC staff time, has been measured in terms of person hours expended per activity and has been costed assuming current casual unskilled labour rates which are approximately KShs 20 (USD 0.27) in Mombassa.

Chapter 4: Overview of Costing for the Madrasa Programme in East Africa

A comprehensive picture of costing for all 4 categories of costs for the 3 MRCs is attached (Annexure D-F). Briefly, the costing model demonstrates that costs across MRCs are somewhat different considering slight differences in activities undertaken and larger variations in salary.

Overall, the direct costs associated with 5-year phased implementation of the Madrasa Programme are in the range of USD 15 for Kenya, with MRC contributing USD 10 and the community contributing USD 5.

Table 3: Cost of 5-year phased approach for Madrasa pre-schools in Kenya

| Madrasa Pre-schools in Kenya: Cost of 5-year phased approach (Initiation, graduation, post-graduation) | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Contributions (in USD) | MRC Contribution | Community Contribution | Total Contribution |
| 1 | Direct Costs | | | |
| 1.1 | Year 1 -- Community Mobilization | 3,324 | 1,760 | 5,085 |
| 1.2 | Years 2 and 3 -- Training, Support, M&E | 20,291 | 8,958 | 29,249 |
| 1.3 | Years 4 and 5 -- Post-graduate Support for Sustainability (PGSS) | 9,273 | 7,242 | 16,515 |
| 1.4 | Cost per child per month over 5 years (Direct MRC costs and hidden costs borne by community) | 10 | 5 | 15 |
| 2 | Indirect Costs -- 5-year operational costs including repair and maintenance of capital equipment | | | |
| 2.1 | Cost per child per month over 5 years (Indirect MRC costs) | 25,541 | 0 | 25,541 |
| 2.1 | Cost per child per month over 5 years (Indirect MRC costs) | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| 3 | Sub-total Contributions (Direct and Indirect (Annual operational costs only) | 58,430 | 17,960 | 76,389 |
| 3.1 | Cost per child per month over 5 years (Direct and Indirect MRC and Hidden Community) | 18 | 5 | 23 |
| 5 | Indirect Costs -- One-time Infrastructure and Setup Costs | | | |
| 5.1 | Cost per child per month over 5 years (Indirect MRC infrastructure and setup costs) | 3,282 | 0 | 3,282 |
| 5.1 | Cost per child per month over 5 years (Indirect MRC infrastructure and setup costs) | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 6 | Total Contributions (Direct and Indirect Annual operational costs and initial capital outlay)) | | | |
| 6 | Total Contributions (Direct and Indirect Annual operational costs and initial capital outlay)) | 61,712 | 17,960 | 79,672 |
| 6.1 | Cost per child per month over 5 years (All direct, indirect, and hidden costs) | 19 | 5 | 24 |

The overall cost per child (direct and indirect) came to USD 24 per month, with communities contributing USD 5. This includes infrastructure and set up costs as well as operational costs including repair and maintenance of capital equipment.

It should be noted here that the MRCs put in all their time on the programme, and the study went as far as costing time spent on planning for activities as well as preparation of training materials. The study revealed that planning took plenty of time as it was done both at the institution level as well as at the community level. In general, there is a high level of intensity in support to the programme by the MRCs. It is therefore no wonder that the monthly unit cost appears high over the five year cycle. It is however expected that as the programme implementation process stabilizes with communities taking full responsibility in running their pre-schools with defined government support, the unit cost would decline substantially.

4.2 Cost implications for government

The government of Kenya's allocation to ECD has remained around one percent of the total budgetary allocation to education, and this has mainly gone into administrative support. With the increasing commitment by governments to provide greater support to this sub-sector, it will be critical that the support is well targeted to relieve communities the burden of meeting the cost of teachers' salaries, which has been the main issue challenging sustainability.

Governments are well placed to provide meaningful support to ECD in a cost effective manner using the existing, multi-sectoral structures and personnel from national to local levels. This would however require streamlining of systems to create efficiency and coordination in delivery of services. There are opportunities for partnerships, both within the various sectors of governments and between governments and non-governmental organizations in providing ECD services. NGOs could take up certain tasks in which they have developed a niche, for example, community mobilization and empowerment towards building ownership as well as on-going teacher mentoring, while governments could take up the responsibility for teacher training, teacher's salaries, quality assurance and M&E. The area of teacher training at ECD level is one that requires combined efforts and partnerships between governments and NGOs if a critical mass of ECD teachers has to be developed.

The table below gives an indication of some of the responsibilities that governments could take on within the existing structures. The table gives a good indication that governments have the capacity to intervene at a multi-sectoral level through the various departments. However, the need to bridge capacity gaps particularly at technical level on ECD interventions. This would include imparting knowledge and understanding on how children learn, the concept of active learning and creating friendly learning environments.

The table demonstrates possible community/government partnerships in support to ECD with defined roles and responsibilities for each partner. The table could be extended to include other non-governmental actors with shared responsibilities.

Table 4: Community/Government partnerships in ECD

| Activity | Responsibility | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| | Community | Government |
| Community mobilization | Community mobilizers | Community health and social workers |
| Physical infrastructure/set up costs | Communities | |
| Teacher Training and support | | District Centres for Early Childhood Education (DICECEs) |
| Quality assurance | | District and Zonal inspectors ⁶ |
| Material Development | Communities contributing play materials | Kenya Institute of Education to provide curriculum support materials |
| Teachers salaries | | Central and Local Governments |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | SMCs | Ministry of Education (MOE), Planning department |
| School feeding | Parents | MOE – School feeding/World Food Programme ⁷ |
| Health and nutrition | | Ministry of Health (MOH) Community health workers; Agricultural extension officers |
| Growth monitoring | | MOH Community health workers |
| Immunization | | MOH – health department |
| Birth registration | | Office of the President – registration of births departments at District level |
| | | |

⁶ There is need for Government to train ECE Quality Assurance Officers

⁷ As part of the primary school feeding programme

CHAPTER 5: Lessons Learnt and Recommendations

5.1 Lessons Learnt

This costing study went into great depths accounting for literacy every minute spent on the programme as indicated in the detailed annexure. It was surprising to note the high unit cost associated to the programme, and this calls for the need to re-visit the processes and determine the levels of efficiencies of processes. A possible explanation is that the programme reach is not wide-spread and there are therefore no economies of scale. There would be cost effectiveness if the programme scaled up to more communities, but this would be at a risk of compromising quality – which is where the trade-offs between quality and quantity comes in.

With the relatively high unit cost, the question of sustainability arises. Experience has shown that as long as the governments do not take on certain responsibilities (e.g. teachers' salaries), sustainability will remain a dream. It is however important to note that technical sustainability (empowering communities with knowledge, appreciation and skills on ECD) is easily attainable and moves communities to a different level.

5.2 Recommendations

- Need to consolidate findings from various case studies and determine a realistic unit cost of community based ECD initiatives;
- Demonstrate to governments that commitment towards ECD support would be easily manageable and would help government utilize some idle capacity within the system in a cost effective manner, with increased efficiency;
- Community ownership of ECD programmes is critical, and government interventions would not mean taking responsibility away from communities;
- Need to clearly define roles between the different players as well as determine areas and modalities of partnerships

ADEA Biennale 2006 –A Costing Model of the Madrasa Early Childhood Development Program in East Africa

Appendices D

| Annexure D: Madrasa Early Childhood Development Programme: a project of the Aga Khan Foundation | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----|---------------------|-------------------------|----------|--|-----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------------|
| Madrasa Preschools Statistics -- Regional Data | | | | | | | | | | |
| KENYA | | | | | | | | | | |
| Batch Number | No | School | Urban/Rural/ Peri-Urban | District | Tuition Fees per term (local currency) | Tuition fees per term (USD) | Enrolment | | | No. of Teachers |
| | | | | | | | Boys | Girls | Total | |
| | | | | | KShS | 72 | | | | |
| Batch 1 | 1 | Rayyana | Urban | Mombasa | 1 800 | 25 | 12 | 13 | 25 | 2 |
| Batch 1 | 2 | Shubbanu | Peri-urban | Mombasa | 600 | 8 | 47 | 38 | 85 | 6 |
| Batch 1 | 3 | Al-Haq | Urban | Mombasa | 1 700 | 24 | 47 | 29 | 76 | 3 |
| Batch 1 | 4 | Khairat Mwembe Kuku | Urban | Mombasa | 1 350 | 19 | 28 | 27 | 55 | 3 |
| Batch 1 | 5 | Jomvu Kuu | Rural | Mombasa | 400 | 6 | 22 | 16 | 38 | 2 |
| Batch 1 | 6 | Irshad Magongo | Peri-urban | Mombasa | 1 000 | 14 | 16 | 13 | 29 | 2 |
| Batch 1 | 7 | Taqwa | Peri-urban | Mombasa | 800 | 11 | 20 | 25 | 45 | 3 |
| Batch 1 | 8 | Azhar Shariff | Peri-urban | Mombasa | 1 500 | 21 | 17 | 20 | 37 | 4 |
| Batch 1 | 9 | Azhar Kongowea | Peri-urban | Mombasa | 1 000 | 14 | 13 | 19 | 32 | 4 |
| Batch 1 | 10 | Swalihina | Peri-urban | Mombasa | 1 000 | 14 | 15 | 20 | 35 | 3 |
| Batch 1 | | Sub-Total | | | 11 150 | 155 | 237 | 220 | 457 | 32 |
| Batch 1 | | Average | | | 1 115 | 15 | 24 | 22 | 46 | 3 |
| Batch 2 | 11 | Istimrar | Peri-urban | Mombasa | 600 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 16 | 2 |
| Batch 2 | 12 | Istiqama | Peri-urban | Mombasa | 600 | 8 | 37 | 43 | 80 | 5 |
| Batch 2 | 13 | Swiratwi | Peri-urban | Mombasa | 300 | 4 | 13 | 12 | 25 | 2 |
| Batch 2 | 14 | Firdaus | Peri-urban | Mombasa | 600 | 8 | 9 | 14 | 23 | 2 |
| Batch 2 | 15 | Ridhwaa Magongo | Peri-urban | Mombasa | 400 | 6 | 31 | 24 | 55 | 2 |
| Batch 2 | 16 | Rasulil Akram | Rural | Kwale | 400 | 6 | 22 | 30 | 52 | 3 |
| Batch 2 | 17 | Likoni Azhar | Peri-urban | Mombasa | 500 | 7 | 18 | 13 | 31 | 2 |
| Batch 2 | 18 | Al-Khairiya | Peri-urban | Mombasa | 600 | 8 | 16 | 16 | 32 | 2 |
| Batch 2 | 19 | Fat-hil Islamiya | Peri-urban | Mombasa | 1 000 | 14 | 22 | 21 | 43 | 2 |
| Batch 2 | 20 | Ridhaa Mrima | Rural | Mombasa | 450 | 6 | 14 | 11 | 25 | 2 |
| Batch 2 | 21 | Tawba | Rural | Mombasa | 150 | 2 | 22 | 8 | 30 | 3 |
| Batch 2 | | Sub-Total | | | 5 600 | 78 | 212 | 200 | 412 | 27 |
| Batch 2 | | Average | | | 509 | 7 | 19 | 18 | 37 | 2 |
| Batch 3 | 22 | Hibatul-ilm | Rural | Kilifi | 300 | 4 | 23 | 43 | 66 | 3 |
| Batch 3 | 23 | Illahi Mwagosi | Peri-urban | Mombasa | 600 | 8 | 7 | 13 | 20 | 3 |
| Batch 3 | 24 | Tawfiq | Rural | Kilifi | 600 | 8 | 28 | 34 | 62 | 4 |
| Batch 3 | 25 | Rasul Tsunza | Rural | Kwale | 150 | 2 | 29 | 31 | 60 | 4 |
| Batch 3 | 26 | Swafaa | Rural | Kilifi | 300 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 1 |
| Batch 3 | 27 | Itiswaamy | Rural | Kilifi | 450 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 17 | 1 |
| Batch 3 | 28 | Rahma Majaoni | Rural | Mombasa | 600 | 8 | 29 | 22 | 51 | 2 |
| Batch 3 | 29 | Anwar Mishomoroni | Peri-urban | Mombasa | 600 | 8 | 8 | 20 | 28 | 2 |
| Batch 3 | 30 | Abuzaidan | Rural | Kilifi | 300 | 4 | 20 | 18 | 38 | 2 |
| Batch 3 | 31 | Nur | Rural | Kwale | 600 | 8 | 28 | 21 | 49 | 3 |
| Batch 3 | 32 | Markaz Irshad | Peri-urban | Kwale | 750 | 10 | 17 | 11 | 28 | 3 |
| Batch 3 | 33 | Bararabu | Rural | Kwale | 450 | 6 | 46 | 34 | 80 | 2 |
| Batch 3 | 34 | Furaha | Peri-urban | Mombasa | 750 | 10 | 7 | 3 | 10 | 2 |
| Batch 3 | 35 | Mwinyjeuri | Peri-urban | Mombasa | closed | | | | | |
| Batch 3 | | Sub-Total | | | 6 450 | 90 | 260 | 269 | 529 | 32 |
| Batch 3 | | Average | | | 496 | 7 | 20 | 21 | 41 | 2 |

ADEA Biennale 2006 –A Costing Model of the Madrasa Early Childhood Development Program in East Africa

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|----|------------------------------|------------|---------------|---------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Batch 4 | 36 | Answar Mwabungo | Rural | Kwale | 360 | 5 | 39 | 28 | 67 | 3 |
| Batch 4 | 37 | Juma Bin Mzee | Peri-urban | Mombasa | closed | | | | | |
| Batch 4 | 38 | Islamiya Bokole | Peri-urban | Mombasa | 400 | 6 | 17 | 11 | 28 | 2 |
| Batch 4 | 39 | Neema | Rural | Kwale | 450 | 6 | 30 | 32 | 62 | 2 |
| Batch 4 | 40 | Bumbani | Rural | Kwale | 280 | 4 | 17 | 8 | 25 | 1 |
| Batch 4 | 41 | Fauz | Rural | Kwale | 300 | 4 | 27 | 22 | 49 | 3 |
| Batch 4 | 42 | Mwambara | Rural | Kwale | 240 | 3 | 15 | 8 | 23 | 2 |
| Batch 4 | 43 | Tazamia | Rural | Kwale | 300 | 4 | 11 | 9 | 20 | 2 |
| Batch 4 | 44 | Siraj Nur | Rural | Kilifi | 300 | 4 | 16 | 13 | 29 | 2 |
| Batch 4 | 45 | Rasul Mtwapa | Rural | Kilifi | 900 | 13 | 8 | 9 | 17 | 2 |
| Batch 4 | 46 | Ithad | Peri-urban | Mombasa | closed | | | | | |
| Batch 4 | 47 | Fauz | Rural | Kwale | 300 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 15 | 1 |
| Batch 4 | 48 | Nuru | Rural | Kwale | 650 | 9 | 28 | 32 | 60 | 3 |
| Batch 4 | 49 | Khairat Gasi | Rural | Kwale | 450 | 6 | 12 | 13 | 25 | 2 |
| Batch 4 | 50 | Khairat Mwaembe | Rural | Kwale | 450 | 6 | 41 | 37 | 78 | 3 |
| Batch 4 | 51 | Marwa | Rural | Kwale | 300 | 4 | 20 | 19 | 39 | 2 |
| Batch 4 | | Sub-Total | | | 5 680 | 79 | 289 | 248 | 537 | 30 |
| Batch 4 | | Average | | | 406 | 6 | 21 | 18 | 38 | 2 |
| Batch 5 | 52 | Rahma Mazeraz* | Rural | Kilifi | 250 | 3 | 37 | 34 | 71 | 3 |
| Batch 5 | 53 | Safina Tiwi | Rural | Kwale | 300 | 4 | 34 | 21 | 55 | 3 |
| Batch 5 | 54 | Noor Tiwi* | Rural | Kwale | 150 | 2 | 35 | 40 | 75 | 4 |
| Batch 5 | 55 | Ithad | Peri-urban | Kwale | 600 | 8 | 24 | 34 | 58 | 3 |
| Batch 5 | 56 | Ummulquraa* | Rural | Kwale | 300 | 4 | 20 | 23 | 43 | 2 |
| Batch 5 | 57 | Taqwa Muhaka | Rural | Kwale | 150 | 2 | 30 | 14 | 44 | 2 |
| Batch 5 | 58 | Rahma Tulah | Rural | Kwale | 150 | 2 | 22 | 31 | 53 | 4 |
| Batch 5 | 59 | Mkomani* | Rural | Kilifi | 210 | 3 | 15 | 21 | 36 | 3 |
| Batch 5 | 60 | Answar Mikomani | Rural | Kilifi | 210 | 3 | 26 | 28 | 54 | 3 |
| Batch 5 | 61 | Mpirani | Rural | Kwale | 150 | 2 | 52 | 49 | 101 | 3 |
| Batch 5 | 62 | Kaza Moyo | Rural | Kwale | 150 | 2 | 24 | 19 | 43 | 2 |
| Batch 5 | 63 | Ngoloko | Rural | Kilifi | 400 | 6 | 45 | 65 | 110 | 4 |
| Batch 5 | 64 | Muhinat | Rural | Kilifi | 300 | 4 | 15 | 18 | 33 | 3 |
| Batch 5 | 65 | Shamu | Rural | Kwale | 400 | 6 | 31 | 24 | 55 | 3 |
| Batch 5 | 66 | Sidiq Majaoni* | Rural | Mombasa | 600 | 8 | 22 | 16 | 38 | 3 |
| Batch 5 | | Sub-total | | | 4 320 | 60 | 432 | 437 | 869 | 45 |
| Batch 5 | | Average | | | 288 | 4 | 29 | 29 | 58 | 3 |
| | | * EMACK Schools | | | | | | | | |
| | | GRAND TOTAL | | | 33 200 | 461 | 1 430 | 1 374 | 2 804 | 166 |
| | | Average Batch 4 and 5 | | | 345 | 5 | 25 | 24 | 48 | 3 |
| | | Average Batches 1-5 | | | 527 | 7 | 23 | 22 | 45 | 3 |
| | | Average to be used | | | 500 | 7 | | | 50 | 3 |
| ZANZIBAR | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Unguja | TShs | 1175 | | | | |
| Batch 1 | 1 | Answariya | Rural | Paje | 3 000 | 3 | 33 | 34 | 67 | 5 |
| Batch 1 | 2 | Banina Walbanat | Rural | Uzi | closed | | | | | |
| Batch 1 | 3 | Fisabilil Llaah | Rural | Dongongwe | 2 100 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 11 | 2 |
| Batch 1 | 4 | Islamiya | Rural | Mgeni Haji | 3 000 | 3 | 36 | 31 | 67 | 4 |
| Batch 1 | 5 | Iman Islamiya | Peri-urban | Kibweni | 6 000 | 5 | 104 | 109 | 213 | 10 |
| Batch 1 | 6 | Iman C | Urban | Jumbi | closed | | | | | |
| Batch 1 | 7 | Muawanat | Rural | Paje | 3 000 | 3 | 39 | 52 | 91 | 5 |
| Batch 1 | 8 | Nurul Abswaar | Peri-urban | Kiembe Samaki | 6 000 | 5 | 37 | 38 | 75 | 6 |
| Batch 1 | 9 | Suufiya | Rural | Tindini | 3 000 | 3 | 22 | 25 | 47 | 3 |
| Batch 1 | 10 | Tawfiq | Peri-urban | Mombasa | 6 000 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 3 |
| Batch 1 | | | | Pemba | | | | | | |
| Batch 1 | 11 | Arafa | Rural | Mjimbini | 2 100 | 2 | 30 | 36 | 66 | 5 |
| Batch 1 | 12 | Qamariya | Urban | Wete | 6 000 | 5 | 132 | 156 | 288 | 24 |
| Batch 1 | 13 | Rahmatul Islamiya | Rural | Mtambile | 1 500 | 1 | 20 | 18 | 38 | 4 |
| Batch 1 | 14 | Tarbiyatul Islamiya | Rural | Kengeja | closed | | | | | |
| Batch 1 | | Sub-total | | | 41 700 | 35 | 460 | 514 | 974 | 71 |
| Batch 1 | | Average | | | 3 791 | 3 | 42 | 47 | 89 | 6 |
| | | | | Unguja | | | | | | |
| Batch 2 | 15 | Iman Islamiya | Peri-urban | Chumbuni | 6 000 | 5 | 90 | 110 | 200 | 7 |
| Batch 2 | 16 | Nurul Islamiya | Rural | Mchangani | 3 000 | 3 | 47 | 43 | 90 | 4 |
| Batch 2 | 17 | Nunuu | Rural | Mahonda | closed | | | | | |
| Batch 2 | 18 | Rahman | Rural | Upinja | closed | | | | | |
| Batch 2 | 19 | Sirajatil Munira | Rural | Jambiani | 3 000 | 3 | 35 | 44 | 79 | 5 |
| Batch 2 | 20 | Safynat Ssalaam | Rural | Maungani | 3 000 | 3 | 20 | 20 | 40 | 3 |
| Batch 2 | | | | Pemba | | | | | | |
| Batch 2 | 21 | Almutaqina | Rural | Pandani | 3 000 | 3 | 32 | 36 | 68 | 4 |
| Batch 2 | 22 | Hidayatul Atfaal | Rural | Mitamani | 3 000 | 3 | 8 | 23 | 31 | 2 |
| Batch 2 | 23 | Nurul Ayni | Rural | Kizimbani | 3 000 | 3 | 90 | 86 | 176 | 14 |
| Batch 2 | 24 | Ulwiya | Rural | Mbuzini | 1 800 | 2 | 16 | 8 | 24 | 4 |
| Batch 2 | | Sub-total | | | 25 800 | 22 | 338 | 370 | 708 | 43 |
| Batch 2 | | Average | | | 3 225 | 3 | 42 | 46 | 89 | 5 |

ADEA Biennale 2006 –A Costing Model of the Madrasa Early Childhood Development Program in East Africa

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|------------------------------|------------|-----------------|----------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | | | Unguja | | | | | | |
| 25 | Alkarim | Rural | Fumba | 3 000 | 3 | 23 | 26 | 49 | 5 |
| 26 | Azhar | Peri-urban | Kilima Hewa | 3 000 | 3 | 39 | 32 | 71 | 5 |
| 27 | Chukwani Pre-school | Peri-urban | Chukwani | 3 000 | 3 | 27 | 38 | 65 | 5 |
| 28 | Hidayatul Islamiya | Peri-urban | Mwanyanya | 3 000 | 3 | 38 | 30 | 68 | 3 |
| 29 | Islamiya | Rural | Shakani | 3 000 | 3 | 15 | 11 | 26 | 3 |
| 30 | Iman | Rural | Cheju | closed | | | | | |
| 31 | Iman | Rural | Dimani | 3 000 | 3 | 28 | 15 | 43 | 4 |
| 32 | Istimraar | Rural | Muungoni | 3 000 | 3 | 29 | 24 | 53 | 6 |
| 33 | Mangapwani | Rural | Mangapwani | 3 000 | 3 | 44 | 30 | 74 | 6 |
| 34 | Rawdha | Peri-urban | Jang'ombe | 3 000 | 3 | 18 | 16 | 34 | 3 |
| 35 | Tahdhib | Rural | Michungwa Miwa | 3 000 | 3 | 24 | 21 | 45 | 4 |
| 36 | Tarbiyatul Islamiya | Peri-urban | Mto Pepo | 3 000 | 3 | 29 | 31 | 60 | 6 |
| | | | Pemba | | | | | | |
| 37 | Mulku Islamiya | Peri-urban | Chanjaani | 4 500 | 4 | 16 | 23 | 39 | 3 |
| 38 | Nurul Atfaal | Rural | Ole Simaongwe | 1 500 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 11 | 2 |
| 39 | Rahman | Rural | Makombeni | 2 100 | 2 | 13 | 14 | 27 | 2 |
| 40 | Shemsiya | Rural | Nyali Mtambwe | 1 500 | 1 | 19 | 13 | 32 | 3 |
| 41 | Ziwani Muslim | Rural | Ziwani | 3 000 | 3 | 28 | 29 | 57 | 2 |
| | Sub-total | | | 45 600 | 39 | 399 | 355 | 754 | 62 |
| | Average | | | 2 850 | 2 | 25 | 22 | 47 | 4 |
| | | | Unguja | | | | | | |
| 42 | Aljamil | Rural | Donge Mchangara | 3 000 | 3 | 32 | 15 | 47 | 7 |
| 43 | Al-Najaat Islamiya | Rural | Kae Bona | 2 400 | 2 | 18 | 18 | 36 | 4 |
| 44 | Akhwan | Rural | Nungwi | 3 000 | 3 | 23 | 21 | 44 | 6 |
| 45 | Hidayat L-Islamiya | Rural | Donge Mtambile | 3 000 | 3 | 12 | 14 | 26 | 5 |
| 46 | Kawthar | Peri-urban | Fuoni Meli tano | 3 000 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 15 | 3 |
| 47 | Maamur | Rural | Chwaka | 3 000 | 3 | 32 | 31 | 63 | 3 |
| 48 | Millat Ibrahim | Rural | Jambiani | 3 000 | 3 | 32 | 25 | 57 | 5 |
| 49 | Munawar | Rural | Nyamanzi | 3 000 | 3 | 19 | 16 | 35 | 4 |
| 50 | Riyadhatul Atfaal | Peri-urban | Kilima Hewa | 6 000 | 5 | 58 | 56 | 114 | 6 |
| 51 | Sirati Nnabii | Peri-urban | Karakana | 3 000 | 3 | 32 | 40 | 72 | 7 |
| 52 | Siratul Mujtahidi | Rural | Pete | 3 000 | 3 | 18 | 11 | 29 | 3 |
| 53 | Tawfiq | Peri-urban | Kijito Upele | 3 000 | 3 | 25 | 28 | 53 | 5 |
| | | | Pemba | | 0 | | | | |
| 54 | Hidayatul Ikhwan | Rural | Kangani | 2 100 | 2 | 15 | 19 | 34 | 6 |
| 55 | Imanil Islamiya | Rural | Mchanga Mdogo | 1 500 | 1 | 22 | 8 | 30 | 2 |
| 56 | Nurudin | Rural | Kinyasini | 1 500 | 1 | 22 | 35 | 57 | 6 |
| 57 | Nurul Islamiya | Rural | Msuka | 1 500 | 1 | 24 | 22 | 46 | 3 |
| 58 | Raudhatul Atfaal | Rural | Mzambarau Taka | 3 000 | 3 | 22 | 18 | 40 | 4 |
| 59 | Siratul Huda | Rural | Vilima Vitatu | 2 100 | 2 | 44 | 34 | 78 | 10 |
| 60 | Swafaa | Rural | Ukutini | 1 500 | 1 | 32 | 23 | 55 | 2 |
| 61 | Tahdhib Lawlad | Rural | Tumbe | 1 500 | 1 | 22 | 11 | 33 | 4 |
| 62 | Taqwa | Rural | Bubujiko | 3 000 | 3 | 36 | 51 | 87 | 8 |
| 63 | Tariq Islamiya | Rural | Finya | 1 500 | 1 | 15 | 29 | 44 | 4 |
| 64 | Wakfu Fuisabili Llaah | Rural | Mwambe | closed | | | | | |
| | Sub-total | | | 57 600 | 49 | 562 | 533 | 1 095 | 107 |
| | Average | | | 2 618 | 2 | 26 | 24 | 50 | 5 |
| | | | Unguja | | | | | | |
| 65 | Al Rahma | Rural | Kidimni | 3 000 | 3 | 43 | 28 | 71 | 6 |
| 66 | Jadid | Rural | Bweleo | 3 000 | 3 | 26 | 29 | 55 | 5 |
| 67 | Najjah | Rural | Mkokotoni | 3 000 | 3 | 34 | 48 | 82 | 8 |
| 68 | Nuraaniya | Rural | Kiomba Mvua | 3 000 | 3 | 33 | 27 | 60 | 6 |
| 69 | Nuru | Rural | Banda Maji | 3 000 | 3 | 22 | 23 | 45 | 6 |
| 70 | Nurul Islamiya | Rural | Jendele | 3 000 | 3 | 39 | 41 | 80 | 6 |
| 71 | Nuwariyat | Rural | Kiboje Mkwajuni | 3 000 | 3 | 34 | 36 | 70 | 6 |
| 72 | Sabila Rashad | Rural | Mwanyanya | 3 000 | 3 | 16 | 20 | 36 | 6 |
| 73 | Tahfidh | Rural | Pale | 3 000 | 3 | 38 | 24 | 62 | 7 |
| 74 | Tarbiyat Islamiya | Rural | Kidoti | 3 000 | 3 | 20 | 25 | 45 | 5 |
| 75 | Tuwaa | Peri-urban | Mtoni Kigomeni | 3 000 | 3 | 39 | 45 | 84 | 6 |
| 76 | Zam Zam | Peri-urban | Mtoni Mazrui | 3 000 | 3 | 35 | 35 | 70 | 3 |
| | | | Pemba | | | | | | |
| 77 | Habli Llaah | Rural | Kidodi, Wingwi | 2 100 | 2 | 50 | 70 | 120 | 7 |
| 78 | Hudaa | Rural | Kitambuu | 3 000 | 3 | 57 | 46 | 103 | 6 |
| 79 | Madrasatu Nuur | Rural | Junguni | 3 000 | 3 | 24 | 31 | 55 | 7 |
| 80 | Nurul Huda | Rural | Mjini Ole | 3 000 | 3 | 33 | 22 | 55 | 6 |
| 81 | Nurul Yakin | Rural | Kisiwani | 3 000 | 3 | 18 | 26 | 44 | 5 |
| 82 | Selemul Islamiya | Rural | Selem | 3 000 | 3 | 46 | 36 | 82 | 8 |
| 83 | Darul Khairia | Rural | Mkwajuni | 1 500 | 1 | 16 | 32 | 48 | 7 |
| 84 | Tarikul Janna | Rural | Chokocho | 2 250 | 2 | 53 | 44 | 97 | 7 |
| | Sub-total | | | 56 850 | 48 | 676 | 688 | 1 364 | 123 |
| | Average | | | 2 843 | 2 | 34 | 34 | 68 | 6 |
| | GRAND TOTAL | | | 227 550 | 194 | 2 435 | 2 460 | 4 895 | 406 |
| | Average Batch 4 and 5 | | | 2 725 | 2 | 29 | 29 | 59 | 5 |
| | Average Batches 1-5 | | | 2 955 | 3 | 32 | 32 | 64 | 5 |
| | Average to be used | | | 2 955 | 3 | | | 60 | 5 |

ADEA Biennale 2006 –A Costing Model of the Madrasa Early Childhood Development Program in East Africa

| UGANDA | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----|------------------------------|---------------------|---------|----------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | | | | Ushs | 1830 | | | | | |
| Batch 1 | 1 | Namwongo | Urban | Kampala | 25000 | 14 | 20 | 15 | 35 | 3 |
| Batch 1 | 2 | Kiritale | Urban | Kampala | 30000 | 16 | 26 | 30 | 56 | 4 |
| Batch 1 | 3 | Seguku | Peri-urban | Wakiso | 20 000 | 11 | 12 | 14 | 26 | 2 |
| Batch 1 | 4 | Kiti | Urban | Kampala | 25 000 | 14 | 51 | 42 | 93 | 5 |
| Batch 1 | 5 | Kabunga | Urban | Kampala | 20 000 | 11 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 2 |
| Batch 1 | 6 | Takuba | Peri-urban | Kampala | 35000 | 19 | 64 | 47 | 111 | 5 |
| Batch 1 | | Sub-total | | | 155 000 | 85 | 175 | 153 | 328 | 21 |
| Batch 1 | | Average | | | 25 833 | 14 | 29 | 26 | 55 | 4 |
| Batch 2 | 7 | Wakiso | Peri-urban | Wakiso | 18000 | 10 | 29 | 20 | 49 | 4 |
| Batch 2 | 8 | Lubugumu | Peri-urban | Wakiso | 15 000 | 8 | 27 | 40 | 67 | 3 |
| Batch 2 | 9 | Usaama | Urban | Kampala | 25 000 | 14 | 38 | 34 | 72 | 2 |
| Batch 2 | 10 | Bujuuko | Rural | Mpigi | 10000 | 5 | 24 | 31 | 55 | 2 |
| Batch 2 | 11 | Namungoona | Peri-urban | Kampala | 22 000 | 12 | 95 | 83 | 178 | 6 |
| Batch 2 | 12 | Sophia | Rural | Wakiso | 12000 | 7 | 22 | 18 | 40 | 3 |
| Batch 2 | 13 | Bweyogerere | Urban | Wakiso | 17000 | 9 | 29 | 36 | 65 | 3 |
| Batch 2 | 14 | Hassan Tourabi | Urban | Wakiso | 25000 | 14 | 48 | 38 | 86 | 5 |
| Batch 2 | 15 | Nnakyanzi | Rural | Wakiso | 10000 | 5 | 8 | 12 | 20 | 2 |
| Batch 2 | 16 | Kasangati | Peri-urban | Wakiso | 17000 | 9 | 13 | 8 | 21 | 2 |
| Batch 2 | 17 | Kkyanja | Peri-urban | Kampala | 12500 | 7 | 25 | 11 | 36 | 2 |
| Batch 2 | 18 | Biina | Peri-urban | Kampala | 25000 | 14 | 23 | 41 | 64 | 4 |
| Batch 2 | 19 | Maganjo | Peri-urban | Wakiso | 15000 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 14 | 1 |
| Batch 2 | | Sub-total | | | 223 500 | 122 | 387 | 380 | 767 | 39 |
| Batch 2 | | Average | | | 17 192 | 9 | 30 | 29 | 59 | 3 |
| Batch 3 | 20 | Nakasozzi | Peri-urban | Wakiso | 17000 | 9 | 27 | 25 | 52 | 3 |
| Batch 3 | 21 | Kasubi | Peri-urban | Kampala | 24000 | 13 | 23 | 19 | 42 | 3 |
| Batch 3 | 22 | Bbanda | Peri-urban | Kampala | 20 000 | 11 | 31 | 29 | 60 | 2 |
| Batch 3 | 23 | Nalinya nkinzi | Rural | Wakiso | 20 000 | 11 | 26 | 19 | 45 | 3 |
| Batch 3 | | Sub-total | | | 81 000 | 44 | 107 | 92 | 199 | 11 |
| Batch 3 | | Average | | | 20 250 | 11 | 27 | 23 | 50 | 3 |
| Batch 4 | 24 | Jamiyatul islamia | Rural | Wakiso | 12000 | 7 | 28 | 24 | 52 | 2 |
| Batch 4 | 25 | Hadija nawatti | Rural | Wakiso | 7000 | 4 | 20 | 22 | 42 | 4 |
| Batch 4 | 26 | Kikuuta | Rural | Mubende | 4000 | 2 | 9 | 15 | 24 | 2 |
| Batch 4 | 27 | Kwezi | Rural | Mpigi | 3000 | 2 | 17 | 28 | 45 | 2 |
| Batch 4 | 28 | Bumoozi | Rural | Mpigi | 5000 | 3 | 14 | 21 | 35 | 2 |
| Batch 4 | 29 | Seeta-bweya | Rural | Mpigi | 15 000 | 8 | 22 | 18 | 40 | 2 |
| Batch 4 | 30 | Kakonge | Rural | Mpigi | 5 000 | 3 | 18 | 18 | 36 | 3 |
| Batch 4 | 31 | Kibibi | Rural | Mpigi | 15 000 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 28 | 2 |
| Batch 4 | 32 | Bubanzi | Rural | Mubende | 3000 | 2 | 19 | 19 | 38 | 2 |
| Batch 4 | 33 | Good Foundation | Rural | Mpigi | 3 000 | 2 | 38 | 33 | 71 | 2 |
| Batch 4 | 34 | Buyenga | Rural | Mpigi | 7 000 | 4 | 13 | 19 | 32 | 2 |
| Batch 4 | 35 | Bunyenye | Rural | Mpigi | 5000 | 3 | 18 | 31 | 49 | 3 |
| Batch 4 | 36 | Hilal | Rural | Wakiso | 8500 | 5 | 23 | 26 | 49 | 2 |
| Batch 4 | 37 | Nabweru | Rural | Wakiso | 15000 | 8 | 15 | 12 | 27 | 2 |
| Batch 4 | 38 | ImaamNawawi | Rural | Wakiso | 8000 | 4 | 26 | 26 | 52 | 3 |
| Batch 4 | | Sub-total | | | 115 500 | 63 | 292 | 328 | 620 | 35 |
| Batch 4 | | Average | | | 7 700 | 4 | 19 | 22 | 41 | 2 |
| Batch 5 | 39 | Busabala | Rural | Wakiso | 6 000 | 3 | 14 | 22 | 36 | 4 |
| Batch 5 | 40 | Kkungu | Rural | Wakiso | 15000 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 19 | 4 |
| Batch 5 | 41 | Ibun Masoudi | Rural | Wakiso | 27 000 | 15 | 10 | 6 | 16 | 3 |
| Batch 5 | 42 | Ssumbe | Rural | Wakiso | 10000 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 3 |
| Batch 5 | 43 | Nsaggu | Rural | Wakiso | 7000 | 4 | 26 | 17 | 43 | 2 |
| Batch 5 | 44 | Muntungo | Rural | Wakiso | 15000 | 8 | 20 | 10 | 30 | 2 |
| Batch 5 | 45 | Kireka | Peri-urban | Wakiso | 12000 | 7 | 8 | 3 | 11 | 2 |
| Batch 5 | 46 | Naalya | Peri-urban | Wakiso | 20 000 | 11 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 3 |
| Batch 5 | 47 | Najeera | Peri-urban | Wakiso | 25 000 | 14 | 9 | 4 | 13 | 2 |
| Batch 5 | 48 | Buloba | Rural | Wakiso | 10 000 | 5 | 21 | 29 | 50 | 5 |
| Batch 5 | 49 | Anoonya | Rural | Wakiso | 12 000 | 7 | 22 | 10 | 32 | 4 |
| Batch 5 | 50 | Ansvar | Rural | Wakiso | 5 000 | 3 | 16 | 12 | 28 | 3 |
| Batch 5 | 51 | Fatuma | Rural | Wakiso | 10 000 | 5 | 9 | 14 | 23 | 4 |
| Batch 5 | 52 | Mayirikite Hidaya | Rural | Wakiso | 7 000 | 4 | 29 | 21 | 50 | 3 |
| Batch 5 | 53 | Seeta | Rural | Wakiso | 15 000 | 8 | 14 | 15 | 29 | 4 |
| Batch 5 | | Sub-total | | | 196 000 | 107 | 216 | 183 | 399 | 48 |
| Batch 5 | | Average | | | 13 067 | 7 | 14 | 12 | 27 | 3 |
| | | GRAND TOTAL | | | 771 000 | 421 | 1 177 | 1 136 | 2 313 | 154 |
| | | Average Batch 4 and 5 | | | 10 383 | 6 | 17 | 17 | 34 | 3 |
| | | Average Batches 1-5 | | | 14 547 | 8 | 22 | 21 | 44 | 3 |
| | | Average to be used | | | 10 500 | 6 | | | 40 | 3 |
| | | 32% | urban and periurban | | | | | | | |
| | | 6% | urban | | | | | | | |
| | | 26% | periurban | | | | | | | |