115. Higher Education Fund (HEF) Students Resources mobilization in higher education

Elias Kinoti Kithuri and Simon Thuranira
[1]Meru University of Science and Technology
Corresponding author's email: ekithuri@gmail.com

Sub-theme: Education- the role of social sciece and educational institutions in climate change mitigation

Abstract

This paper analyzed financing Tertiary education in Kenya with specific attention to the new public university funding model unveiled by the Kenya Kwanza government in 2023. Methods, utilized are that of a secondary data method literature review and policy analysis. The study makes recommendations on a viable financing framework for University education and research. Kenya's models have metamorphosed over years, 1990s The Kenya Government was financing the entire University education, including giving students' stipends. The Kamunge Report of 1988 entitled; introduced cost-sharing where the Government was to pay Ksh. 70,000 for every student admitted to University, while the parents or guardians were to pay Ksh. 16,000 as tuition fees. The students received Ksh. 50,000 from Higher Education Loan Board (HELB) as loans for their upkeep, accommodation and book allowance (HELB, 2023) The government grant per student also increased over time to a high of Ksh. 242,000 per student by 2016, with disparities within Universities. The direct tuition fees component paid by students, however, remained the same, although households continued to meet other associated costs. In FY 2017/2018 Government introduced Differentiated Unit Cost (DUC) as a model for funding public Universities. This funding model has been in place till this year (HELB, 2023). New model Proposed by The New Higher Education Funding Model, unveiled by President William Ruto on May 3, 2023, aimed to address challenges encountered by public universities and Technical and Vocational Education (TVET) institutions due to massive enrollment and inadequate funding. The framework replaces the Differentiated Unit Cost (DUC) prioritizing a student's financial need and separates placement from funding. Conclusion the funding method has great potential if and when well utilized, especially reaching out on families and students who have been left out of high education because social economic characters of poverty, no parents, and support system. However, no scientific method determines a student's level of neediness, raising concerns that students requiring scholarships and loans might not be appropriately classified for awards. Additionally, the distribution of funds lacks transparency. Details such as loan terms, interest rates, repayment conditions, and the process for appealing declined scholarship requests are not disclosed. Furthermore, the funding model excludes students under 18.The study recommends a longitudinal study that Progressive can follow funding HEF for some years step wise eligibility follow up of students applying and actual financial reception and payment in order to strongly argue for or against expected outcomes These outcomes are yet to show as indicators in a student's life being a less than 2 years old model being budget in progress.

Keywords: *Access to Higher Education, Teachers' Support, HIGH education funding, HELP Education funding models.*