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Project Background

In collaboration with the Strengthening Evidence for Programming on Unintended Pregnancy (STEP UP) Research Programme Consortium, the Population Council has implemented a project since 2014 to increase the demand for secondary school education in Homa Bay County, Kenya – an area characterized by high, unintended teenage pregnancy and female school drop-out rates.

The main strategy employed for achieving this goal involves drawing on various communication channels for enhancing awareness in schools and communities of Kenya’s school re-entry policy for out-of-school teenage mothers. This policy was introduced in 1994 to facilitate pregnant learners’ re-entry into the school system after childbirth. It is undergirded by the country’s National School Health Policy, which permits pregnant learners to remain in school for as long as possible.

The communication channels employed under the project to increase awareness of the school re-entry policy include: dialogues with school principals; an interactive media campaign targeting schools and communities; and evidence-based advocacy\(^1\) for stakeholder adherence to the policy implementation guidelines. The overall strategy is expected to lead to the following changes in Homa Bay County:

- revitalization of Kenya’s school re-entry policy among stakeholders (e.g., Ministry of Education officials, out-of-school teenage mothers, schools, communities);
- improved implementation of Kenya’s school re-entry policy; and
- enhanced demand for, and access to, secondary school education for out-of-school teenage mothers.

To foster awareness of the school re-entry policy in Homa Bay County schools, the Population Council collaborated with the Homa Bay County Department of Education (Ministry of Education) to convene a policy dialogue for all principals of public, day, girls-only, and co-educational secondary schools in Homa Bay County. The policy dialogue was held on August 1, 2014 in Kisumu, Kenya. This report details the proceedings of the meeting.

---

Box 1: Guidelines for Implementing the School Re-entry Policy

- Girls who become pregnant should be admitted back to school unconditionally.
- Head teachers, District, and Municipal Education Officers should assist such girls to join other schools to avoid psychological and emotional suffering.
- Intensive guidance and counseling should be provided to affected girl, parents, teachers, and other girls in school.
- Once a girl is sent home, the parents should be summoned to the school and receive some counseling, after which they should take their daughter home. Head teachers and other teachers should be understanding and patient while handling cases of this nature.
- The school should keep in touch with such girls and their parents so as to monitor what is happening and provide the necessary moral, emotional, and spiritual support. Counseling for both the girl and the parents should not be discontinued.
- The parents should seek readmission of their daughter to school after the baby is weaned. Head teachers should provide the necessary help in this regard. In case of any problem, the Provincial, District and Municipal Education Officers should assist.
- Other girls in the school should be counseled on consequences of irresponsible behavior, adolescent sexuality, boy/girl relationships, negative peer influences, building self-confidence and self-esteem.
- Those who make girls pregnant should be exposed. For example, teachers and other adults should face legal action. Boys should be given counseling so that they can take responsibility for their actions.


---

\(^1\) ‘Advocacy’ is defined here as ‘the continuous and adaptive process of gathering, organizing and formulating information and data into an effective argument, which is then communicated to policy-makers through various interpersonal and mass media communication channels. Through advocacy, [we seek] to influence policymakers, political and social leaders, to create an enabling policy and legislative environment and allocate resources equitably’ (UNICEF, n.d., p. 12.).
Participation and Objectives

Nearly two hundred participants attended the one-day meeting, representing the Homa Bay County Department of Education; the Population Council; the Centre for Social Sector, Education, and Policy Analysis; and 171 school principals (see Appendix 1 for a participant list).

The policy dialogue was guided by the following specific objectives:

- Provide a forum for school principals to be reminded of, and to deliberate upon, existing education policies developed to ensure continued schooling for pregnant/parenting learners;
- Gain a sense of the prevailing attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions about such policies among school principals;
- Gain insight into facilitators and barriers to implementing such policies from the perspective of school principals; and
- Identify good practices in the implementation of these policies by school principals.

The meeting provided an opportunity for experience-sharing, lesson-learning, and problem-solving among participants. For the Homa Bay County Department of Education, the policy dialogue was also a forum for taking stock of progress in regard to school re-entry policy implementation.

The meeting was structured around plenary sessions (which included presentations and discussion) and small group discussions (see Appendix 2 for the agenda).

Opening Remarks

The policy dialogue event was officially opened by Mr. Stephen Barongo, Homa Bay County Director of Education. Mr. Barongo cordially welcomed participants and thanked them for their contributions toward girls’ education in the county. He reminded them that education is a basic right within the Constitution of Kenya, and highlighted early marriage as being one of several key issues plaguing Homa Bay. Mr. Barongo also pinpointed the issue of unsafe abortion in Homa Bay, urging school principals to counsel pregnant learners compassionately in order to avoid this circumstance. Emphasizing that the fifth Education for All goal has to do with eliminating gender disparities by 2015, Mr. Barongo affirmed the commitment of the Government of Kenya to achieving this goal. He enumerated several relevant policy responses that demonstrate this commitment, including:

- Development of the Gender in Education policy;
- Development of a gender-responsive curriculum as recommended in the Gender in Education policy;
- Implementation of affirmative action, involving the incorporation of male teachers into early childhood development;
- Provision of sanitary pads, school bags, uniforms, and shoes, to learners;
- Establishment of low-cost boarding schools, particularly for girls;
- Provision of separate toilets in schools for girls and boys;
- Advocacy against retrogressive cultural practices (e.g., female genital cutting); and
- Enforcement of the re-admission of girls who dropped out of school due to pregnancy.
The Homa Bay County Director of Education urged participants to demonstrate their commitment to the county by supporting the implementation of the school re-entry policy. He concluded by saying, ‘When you educate a man, you educate an individual. When you educate a woman, you educate the community.’

Following the opening remarks, a framing presentation was given by the Population Council to situate the issue of unintended pregnancy in schools in the context of Homa Bay County. The presentation drew on available statistics for Homa Bay around teenage pregnancy, compared to the national picture; outlined Kenya’s policy responses to school pregnancy; and delineated the contents of the school re-entry policy and the National School Health Policy. Subsequently, interactive sessions commenced via the plenary and small group discussions. The latter were guided by the following question prompts:

- What are your opinions regarding the school re-entry policy?
- What are your opinions about permitting pregnant learners to remain in school for as long as possible, as stipulated in the National School Health Policy?
- To what extent have you been able to implement the re-entry policy in your school?
- What barriers/factors have prevented or hindered the implementation of this policy in your school?
- What factors have helped you to implement the re-entry policy for girls in your school?
- What are some of the best practices in implementing the school re-entry policy that you can share from personal experience?

Highlighted in the remainder of this report are the key themes and discussion points that emerged from the plenary and small group discussions.

**Emerging Issues**

Issues arising from the dialogue session enabled school principals to reflect on the history behind Kenya’s school re-entry policy, their designated role in implementing the policy, and their challenges and successes in doing so. The presence of Ministry of Education representatives at the meeting also provided an opportunity for principals to specify their support needs in order to ensure optimal implementation of this policy in the future.

Critical issues emerging from the one-day policy dialogue are detailed below.

- **Unintended pregnancy among learners is a key concern of school principals.**

  Repeat pregnancies by parenting girls re-entering school were continually highlighted by participants during the meeting as a major concern. School principals noted with consternation that many re-entering girls (who initially left school due to unintended pregnancy) ended up having multiple pregnancies. Some therefore regarded it as futile to promote school re-entry for teenage mothers. Furthermore, participants voiced concerns about pregnancy-related illnesses and dietary needs of pregnant learners, and pointed out that they were ill-equipped to attend to such matters in their school contexts. Unsafe abortion by students was also a recurrent theme of these discussions. A number of principals viewed early and proactive detection of student pregnancy by schools as a means of mitigating unsafe and late-stage abortions, which could adversely affect the health of students.

  *I have had fifteen pregnant girls in my school in one term.*
  – Participant comment
As a result of these issues, some principals raised the need for accessible contraceptive services for students in general. On the other hand, a number of principals pointed out that some of their female students were married and therefore ‘needed’ family planning. However, the majority of school principals remained silent on the issue of contraception during this plenary discussion, and one only one principal publicly argued against making contraception accessible to students. A few participants opined that having special schools solely for pregnant learners would enhance the implementation of the school re-entry policy by helping to ensure that the specific needs of such learners can be attended to. Discussions around this topic clarified the need for further dialogue with principals on this issue, and for context-appropriate interventions for mitigating unintended pregnancy in schools.

- **Efforts must be made to reframe unintended pregnancy in schools as a ‘rights’ issue, as opposed to a ‘disciplinary’ issue.**

Plenary and group discussions demonstrated the tensions that participants experienced in viewing unintended pregnancy in schools beyond the traditional, disciplinary framework with which the phenomenon has historically been associated. Despite the school re-entry policy’s clause on the unconditional readmission of parenting students, many school principals were of the opinion that parenting girls (who left school due to pregnancy) should only be readmitted if they demonstrated remorse for falling pregnant. Participants noted that parenting students were more likely to be readmitted by schools if they were known to be well-behaved, showed academic promise, or were particularly talented in some area.

Sending a pregnant girl away from school was also seen by some principals as a measure to help ensure that their peers ‘learn a lesson’ and refrain from becoming pregnant themselves. The concern that readmitting teenage mothers into schools would have a negative influence on other students was a prevalent one among participants. These concerns plausibly derive from the training of school personnel, which frames school-based, unintended pregnancy as a disciplinary issue, deserving or requiring disciplinary measures. However, in the era of education rights and inclusive education, such training must be adjusted to emphasize the right of even pregnant and parenting learners to education. Importantly, such training should target both the pre-service and in-service levels.

- **Reputational risks for schools and school principals are an under-investigated aspect of the school re-entry implementation process.**

There is a need to understand the reputational risks that implementing the school re-entry policy poses for school principals. Participants devoted a considerable amount of time to discussing this subject. Schools’ reputations were perceived to suffer as a result of unintended pregnancy, partly because of principals’ conceptualization of pregnancy as disability. School principals were of the opinion that pregnant learners (who are presumed to be perpetually ill) would affect their schools’ ‘Mean Grade’ (an average score/ranking given to each school annually, based on the combined average grade of its students). School principals felt pressurized to ensure that as many students as possible had strong grades so that their schools could maintain respectable ‘Mean Grades.’ A respectable score would draw the positive attention of prospective parents and students, and would ensure that the school concerned remained in demand. Balancing the Ministry of Education’s expectation for schools to produce good grades with its expectation for schools to keep pregnant learners (who were perceived to perform poorly) in school was seen as a major challenge by many principals.

> Until education is all-round (holistic), rather than focused on 'The Mean,' this [school re-entry] policy will never move anywhere.

--Participant comment
Principals explained that, in addition to their schools’ reputations, they also had their own professional reputations to protect. Some participants who had tried to encourage school continuity for pregnant learners suffered damage to their reputations, being accused by the community of promoting immorality in school. Maintaining their professional reputation before prospective parents when visibly pregnant learners are present in school was noted to pose a formidable challenge for principals. Others voiced concerns about the prevalent assumption that principals are often perpetrators of sexual violence and responsible for the pregnancies experienced by their students. These concerns provided further incentive for school principals to ensure that pregnant learners did not feature in their school environment.

- **Engagement of key stakeholders in policy development is essential for avoiding policy misalignment and ensuring effective implementation.**

The lack of involvement of school principals in developing the school re-entry policy was highlighted by participants as a barrier which led to a lack of understanding of the policy, its rationale, and implementation procedures. Indeed, out of the 171 school principals in attendance, none had ever seen an actual copy of the school re-entry policy. As one participant explained: ‘We have gone through hard life because of policies that we were not involved in. … We were never inducted. We were never told what to do.’

As the dialogue provided space for principals to consider the policy, questions arose during the meeting about the proper timing of readmission for parenting girls returning to school. While the school re-entry policy implementation guidelines indicate that readmission should be sought ‘after the baby is weaned’ (see Box 1), the National School Health Policy stipulates that ‘[n]ewborn babies must be allowed the benefit of breastfeeding as much as possible including exclusive breastfeeding for six months and introduction of complementary feeding at 6 months of age while continuing breastfeeding’ (MOPHS & MOE, 2009, p. 23). However, these instructions imply that all parenting girls will want to breastfeed, and for the same length of time – or that all pregnant learners will carry their pregnancies to term. Participants agreed that the timing of readmission should be decided on a case-by-case basis, and should depend on several factors, including the point at which the student left school, the duration of her time away from school, and her own perceived capacity to cope academically at a particular stage of readmission. Part of the discussion centered on the fact that, while the school re-entry implementation guidelines indicate that pregnant learners should be ‘sent home,’ the National School Health Policy states that such learners ‘shall be allowed to continue with classes for as long as possible’ (ibid.). This instance of policy misalignment left school principals uncertain of how to effectively implement the school re-entry policy. The discussion underscored the need to institutionalize the periodic sensitization of principals by the Ministry of Education, in addition to making actual policy documents available to new cohorts of stakeholders.

- **Parents are important stakeholders in the school re-entry process.**

A common refrain during the discussion sessions centered on the need to bring parents on board as part of the school re-entry process. School principals pointed out that while schools are often accused of having inadequate responses for mitigating unintended pregnancy, the roles and responsibilities of parents and homes are usually overlooked. Parents were noted to have several capacity-building needs, including: parenting classes

---

We’ve been asked [by parents] if our schools are maternity wards or pregnancy centers.

--Participant comment

I think the principal is a lone-ranger in the fight against teenage pregnancy.

--Participant comment

Let’s start with the parents. … A lot of the factors that lead to pregnancy should be addressed at home.

--Participant comment
to provide support and know-how for raising teenage girls; knowledge of how to maintain strong relationships with school administrations (which was said to facilitate easier access to school re-entry support); and sensitization on the fact that a girl’s pregnancy should not spell the end of her education.

The issue of childcare for teenage mothers was also raised in the context of this discussion. While there was agreement that some parents would be willing to help out with childcare, meeting participants pointed out that a considerable proportion of pregnant and parenting learners in Homa Bay happen to be orphans. Finding ways for secondary schools to forge links with the Early Childhood Development and Education arm of the Homa Bay County Department of Education was a recommended action for attending to this issue.

- **While it is an important issue, stigma is not always a factor in girls’ re-entry decisions.**

There was a perception among some participants that parenting girls prefer to be readmitted to other schools (rather than to the ones in which they fell pregnant) to avoid stigma and discrimination. Some principals spoke from personal experience with pregnant learners in their schools, who opted for readmission elsewhere. Meeting participants also pointed out that pregnant girls’ self-stigma was often responsible for their leaving school, as opposed to coercion by school principals. Nonetheless, a number of principals also had personal experiences with girls who preferred to return to their original schools after pregnancy, and actually did so.

The school re-entry policy implementation guidelines presume that parenting students would want to re-enter different schools ‘to avoid psychological and emotional suffering’ (see Box 1), and offer instructions for supporting such students to find new schools as a result. Although well-intentioned, it is imperative to also encourage and support students who are still comfortable in their original school environment to re-enter these settings. Such efforts should be coupled with concrete efforts to address school-based stigma and discrimination against pregnant/parenting learners.

- **Cultural realities in Homa Bay can serve to strengthen responses for parenting students.**

Participants drew attention to certain cultural issues in Homa Bay County which need to be considered and understood to ensure optimal responses for parenting girls wishing to re-enter school. For instance, participants noted that childbirth is celebrated in the community. The experience of childbirth raises a teenage girl’s status and that of the newborn’s father in the eyes of the community. While this cultural reality may pose challenges for girls’ education, school principals noted that it could also be helpful in ensuring that school re-entry by parenting girls is not hindered by a sense of ‘shame’ (due to early pregnancy) on the part of parents. Participants also indicated that parents who take pride in their daughters’ pregnancies would be more likely to provide childcare support.

The school re-entry policy guidelines include a counseling stipulation for boys ‘so that they can take responsibility for their actions’ (see Box 1). Furthermore, the National School Health Policy indicates that ‘[c]hild-fathers (boys less than 18 years) shall receive counseling and rehabilitation’ (MOPHS & MOE, 2009, p. 23). School principals questioned the utility of these counseling and rehabilitation requirements, given that such boys are regarded as ‘heroes’ in their communities due to their fatherhood status. It was agreed that the targets and content of such counseling would have to be carefully determined in order to ensure it is beneficial for all concerned. Several participants voiced the opinion that there should be penalties for boys and men responsible for school girls’ pregnancies. However, the goal of keeping both girls and boys in school, despite their complicity in school-based unintended pregnancy, was emphasized.
Principals also raised the cultural taboo of parents sharing a dwelling unit with daughters of reproductive age. As a consequence of this taboo in Homa Bay County, adolescent girls often share dwelling units with their much more lenient grandmothers. Consequently, parents are less able to monitor activities that could lead to unintended pregnancy. Looking forward, this reality would be important to consider in pregnancy prevention programs.

- **Despite minimal resources, principals are innovating with good practices to respond to unintended pregnancy in schools.**

  Although none of the school principals in attendance had ever seen a copy of the school re-entry policy, and a considerable proportion (20%) had not heard of it, many principals were responding to girls’ school re-entry needs in useful and inspiring ways. Small group and plenary sessions were devoted to giving participants an opportunity to share their individual practices with one another, and to ask/answer questions about modalities for implementing them. A summary of good practices being implemented by principals in their individual schools is provided here:

  ✓ Using parenting students as resources: e.g., having such students talk to other girls in school about the realities of being pregnant or a teenage mother, as a means of steering them away from teenage pregnancy.
  ✓ Introducing flexi-time for parenting students: e.g., giving such students longer break periods in order for them to return home to nurse their babies.
  ✓ Setting up a ‘nursing zone’ for parenting students, rather than having them return home to nurse, thereby taking away from learning time.
  ✓ Making arrangements with selected teachers for extra tutoring for parenting students, who often miss parts of classes when they return home to nurse.
  ✓ Granting special permission to married, parenting students to leave school for a few hours in order to attend a family planning clinic.
  ✓ Inquiring about pregnant learners’ expected due dates, and advising them to leave school two months prior to prepare for delivery.
  ✓ Maintaining contact with pregnant learners’ parents after they have left school, to ensure that school re-entry occurs.
  ✓ Providing proper guidance and counseling.

  These positive, independently-implemented practices demonstrate a great extent of willingness on the part of school principals to play a key role in implementing the school re-entry policy. Such efforts can and should be encouraged, supported, and built upon to ensure optimal implementation of the policy.

- **Additional stakeholders must be involved to holistically address unintended pregnancy and foster school re-entry at the secondary school level.**

  Sub-County Directors of Education expressed concern over the fact that boarding school principals were not included in the policy dialogue. They noted that boarding schools are equally affected by unintended pregnancy, and that principals of such schools are actually more likely to prohibit the re-admission of parenting girls. They also highlighted the need to involve primary schools in school re-entry responses, given that school drop-out due to unintended pregnancy occurs at this level of schooling as well. While the importance of boarding schools in school re-entry processes is not debated, participants were informed that the current project focuses on secondary schools which benefit from Free Secondary Education (i.e., public day schools), to help minimize financial barriers for girls wanting to re-enter school.
An additional concern emphasized by Sub-County Directors of Education had to do with motorcycle transporters (boda-bodas). The latter were strongly perceived by Directors and school principals alike as being responsible for a considerable proportion of unintended pregnancies among school-going girls, given their ubiquitous presence in the community as transportation providers between the home and school. However, recent findings from the baseline survey conducted to assess interventions under the current project are not clear on the complicity of boda-bodas in school pregnancy (Undie, Birungi, Odwe, & Obare, 2015). The vast majority of out-of-school teenage mothers (89%) reported being impregnated by their ‘boyfriends’ – 37 percent of whom happened to be their fellow students when they were in school. The remaining 52% were reported to be boyfriends who were not fellow students (ibid.). It is unclear whether any boda-bodas fell in this category of non-student boyfriends, and were therefore not referred to by respondents as motorcycle transporters. Only 6 percent of out-of-school teenage girls specifically reported that ‘boda-bodas’ were responsible for the pregnancy that led to their school dropout.

Sub-County Directors of Education asked that future interventions to promote school re-entry for girls include Information, Education, and Communication materials based on the school re-entry policy and associated reproductive health issues. Importantly, school principals commented on the influence of Sub-County Directors of Education, noting that if the latter decided to prioritize the implementation and monitoring of the school re-entry policy, this would automatically become a priority for principals.

**Conclusion**

The policy dialogue event helped to create visibility around the issue of unintended pregnancy in schools and the need for a clear, strong education sector response to it. The event also fostered a sense of dignity and ownership among attendees, some of whom previously felt overlooked and unsupported by earlier processes of introducing the school re-entry policy. Additionally, the meeting deliberations underscored the need to update current policies based on issues emerging from the dialogue. To avoid policy misalignment, it would be essential for all related policies to be reviewed simultaneously.

Lessons learned from the policy dialogue will be incorporated into future interventions under the project, including an interactive media campaign that will target schools and communities, and advocacy activities with stakeholders to promote adherence to the school re-entry policy implementation guidelines.

Participants came to the end of the meeting inspired to redouble efforts collectively in Homa Bay County and in their individual schools based on lessons learned at the meeting. Feedback from school principals regarding the policy dialogue was overwhelmingly positive, and included written statements such as the following:

*Thank you very much for the workshop; it was an eye-opener. Quite a number of us were not aware of the policy. Now, I want to believe that our girls will be handled properly in our schools when they seek re-entry after delivery.*

*Thank you abundantly for the wonderfully-conducted dialogue in Kisumu … It is only with this degree of commitment that our girl child and indeed all children will have a more assured brighter future. The exposure has opened up my eyes at both a personal and administrative level and things will never be the same again for all kinds of vulnerabilities in the school set-up.*

*I wish to thank you sincerely for your encouragement for the girls who had dropped out of school to be given chance at school. Sincerely, I know the workshop was most useful to us principals*
of secondary schools of Homa Bay. Thanks so much, for I know if the program is intensified, it will save many girls from our community.

This was good. Keep it up.

It was so well-organized … We are looking forward to a follow-up session.

The policy dialogue was brought to an official close by the Homa Bay County Teachers Service Commission Director, Mrs. Diosiana Ahindukha. She implored the school principals in attendance not to overlook the issue of unintended pregnancy in schools and the need for girls' school re-entry. In her words: ‘Let us not bury our heads in the sand as principals.’ She urged meeting participants to begin to use learnings from the policy dialogue to effect change in their individual schools, and within the Homa Bay County education system as a whole. Mrs. Ahindukha also asked that the Population Council take the concerns of the meeting participants seriously and use the evidence emanating from the project to provide guidance for ensuring the reincorporation of out-of-school teenage mothers into the education system. She concluded her speech with the following words: ‘Thank you, Population Council, for the inclusive approach you have used in engaging us.’
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   St. Andrew’s Got Rabuor Secondary School

50. Thomas Otieno  
   St. Elizabeth Koyo Secondary School

51. Kennedy Nyando  
   St. Francis Anding’ O M Secondary School

52. Martin Awi  
   St. John Kabok Secondary School

53. Richard O. Odhiambo  
   St. Matthew’s God Bondo Secondary School

54. Silas Agira  
   St. Paul’s Aoch Muga Secondary School

55. Obere Yunita  
   Sero Mixed Secondary School

56. Daniel O. Obongo  
   Wiga Mixed Secondary School

57. James H.O. Billa  
   Wi’ Koteng Secondary School

58. Ogwayo John Otieno  
   Wioibiero Mixed Secondary School

**Mbita Sub-County**

59. Opere Martin  
   Father Tillen Secondary School

60. Ogweno P.C. Okoma  
   Kamasengre Secondary School

61. Onyango Sana Z.  
   Kamato Mixed D. Secondary School

62. Bernard Anyango Ochieng’  
   Kayanja Mixed Secondary School

63. Peter O. Ochieng  
   Mauta Secondary School

64. Tom O. Ochola  
   Ndhuru Secondary School

65. Collins D. Okeyo  
   Ngodhe Secondary School

66. Stephen Ngesa Ogwel  
   Nyakwei Secondary School

67. Walter O. Otie  
   Nyandenga Secondary School

68. Arthur A. Nyawara  
   Otieno Kajwang Nyamaji Secondary School

69. Peter J.O. Ouma  
   Prof. Karega Mutahi

70. Maurice Ochieng  
   Rapora Secondary School

71. Herine Abijah  
   Rusinga Girls Secondary School

72. Agnes Juma  
   St. Stephen Kirindo Secondary School

73. Ongong’a Pius Owuor  
   St. William’s Osodo Secondary School

74. Meshack Awino Nyakado  
   USAO Secondary School

75. Clement Ogweno Midam  
   Wakula Secondary School

76. George O. Sewe  
   Waware Secondary School

**Ndhiwa Sub-County**

77. Andrew Mbogo Wigwa  
   Abura Mixed Secondary School

78. Otuka Charles  
   Andiwo Mixed Secondary School

79. Benter A. Akendo  
   Apoche Mixed Secondary School

80. Pamela Achieng Ageyo  
   Bishop Ochiel Nyagidha Girls Secondary School

81. Hellen Awuor Opiyo  
   Bongu Girls Secondary School

82. Ochieng Onyango  
   Gina Mixed Secondary School

83. Daniel Waga Osanya  
   Got Rahar Ojode Ndere Secondary School

84. Paul Nyawade Opiyo  
   Joshua Ojode Ndere Secondary School

85. Janet Akoth Otieno  
   Katanga Girls Secondary School
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Kabaka E. David</td>
<td>Koduogo Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Tom Okatch</td>
<td>Kome Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Thomas O. Oyamo</td>
<td>Langi Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Dickson Keta</td>
<td>Mban Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>John Omolo Ouko</td>
<td>Ojode Pala Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>John Odongo</td>
<td>Ojode Unga Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Auma Vincent Ouma</td>
<td>Ongako Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Martin Owino</td>
<td>Osure Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Victor N. Kibwana</td>
<td>Otange Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Otwande Andrea</td>
<td>Rapedhi Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Joako J. Phillip</td>
<td>Sagama Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Monica A. Omolo</td>
<td>St. Lucy’s Odhiambo Rambo Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Joseph O. Odhiambo</td>
<td>St. Peter’s Rambusi Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Marystella Ogol</td>
<td>Wanyara Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rachuonyo North Sub-County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Joram Osarehongo</td>
<td>Akwakra Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Abel Odira Ogola</td>
<td>George Agola Owuor Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Vincent Andare Okumu</td>
<td>Kamolo Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Tom O. Omolo</td>
<td>Kamwala Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Tobias Omolo</td>
<td>Kanam Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Makokha Zackary</td>
<td>Karabondi Bidii Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Charles O. Gunu</td>
<td>Kendu Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Isaac O. Ouko</td>
<td>Kobila Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Naftal J. Obiero</td>
<td>Kodhoch Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Mathews Lunalo</td>
<td>Koredo Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>John Okwanyo</td>
<td>Kotonje Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Reuben O. Kodiango</td>
<td>Kowuour Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Samuel Wasiwa</td>
<td>Lieta Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Jack Odongo</td>
<td>Miyuga Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Malala Martin O.</td>
<td>Ngeta Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Nyachira Odhiambo</td>
<td>Nyakech Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Ouma O. Richard</td>
<td>Ojijo Oteko Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Dennis Ochieng</td>
<td>Omboga Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Daniel Gaya</td>
<td>Osondo Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Omolo Nyakong</td>
<td>St. Innocent Jonyo Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Belia M. Onjala</td>
<td>St. John Seka Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Edith A. Ong'ore</td>
<td>St. Joseph Kobuya Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>George O. Omondi</td>
<td>St. Joseph Miranga Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Ambonya Job</td>
<td>St. Martins Oluti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Aloice O. Obonyo</td>
<td>St. Mary’s Nyakango Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Oningu Moses O.</td>
<td>Samanga Lutheran Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Joshua A. Amadi</td>
<td>Siburi Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Ben Odiango</td>
<td>Wagwe Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Philomena A. Osolo</td>
<td>Wikondiek Secondary School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suba Sub-County
129. Peter Wandera Wao Kiabuya Mixed Secondary School
130. Jacob Otieno Dibogo Kiembe Mixed Day Secondary School
131. Dominic Sure Kisaku Secondary School
132. Aggrey O. Mbori Kisegi Mixed Secondary School
133. Samwell Gogo Nyakiya Secondary School
134. Margaret A. Jamba Nyenga Mixed Secondary School
135. Fanny F. Odera Magunga Township Secondary School
136. Shelemiah O. Wagaluwa Mark Matunga Kiwa Secondary School
137. Alphonce Odero Obanga Secondary School
138. Francis Okinyi Ombaka St. Marcelline Kigoto Secondary School

Rachuonyo South Sub-County
139. Vitalis A. Adega Mixed Secondary School
140. George Riwa Agoro Sare Mixed Secondary School
141. Hezbon Ombuyanyakong Apondo Mixed Secondary School
142. Rose A. Omolo Atela Mixed Secondary School
143. Aninda D. Otieno Atemo Mixed Secondary School
144. Jared Owgemo Buoye Mixed Secondary School
145. Kungu A. Mereza Danish Obara Mixed Secondary School
146. Arthur Oketch Dol Mixed Secondary School
148. Ojuok Justus Okoth Got Agulu Mixed Secondary School
149. Omino M. Michael Harambee Mixed Secondary School
150. Apaka Leonard Okoth Kachieng Secondary School
151. Odoyo Tubman G.B. Kadie Mixed Secondary School
152. Merab A. Obonyo Kakelo Mixed Secondary School
153. Eunice Tubman G.B. Kalanding’ Mixed Secondary School
154. Okeyo Okuto Kilusi Mixed Secondary School
155. Ogutu Christopher Kolweny Mixed Secondary School
156. Pamela A. R. Kosele Mixed Secondary School
158. Mabel Aludira Kowidi Mixed Secondary School
159. George M. Abongu Lwanda Mixed Secondary School
160. Charles O. Ailla Mithiu Mixed Secondary School
161. George O. Boro Nyabola Mixed Secondary School
162. Samuel Oluch Owuor Nyafare Mixed Secondary School
163. Martin E. Onduto Nyakiya Mixed Secondary School
164. Daniel Owaka Nyalenda Mixed Secondary School
165. Okelo Samwel Nyambare Mixed Secondary School
166. Ochiewo Kenyatta Nyamwaga Mixed Secondary School
167. Eunice A Otieno Nyandiwa Mixed Secondary School
168. Ouma Godfrey Nyasore Mixed Secondary School
170. Oyoo Tabu Nywango Secondary School
171. Daniel Ouma Odoyo Obisa Mixed Secondary School
172. Ogola Jorim Ogilo Mixed Secondary School
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>School Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Akumu</td>
<td>Ombek Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orinda John</td>
<td>Ongoro Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Kapere</td>
<td>Orera Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose O. Edna</td>
<td>Orinde Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Amolo</td>
<td>Otel Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elly Otieno</td>
<td>Otondo Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roche S. Onyalo</td>
<td>Owiro Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medrine K. Libaiga</td>
<td>Pala Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hezron A. Ayal</td>
<td>Ponge Lutheran Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Odongo Olielo</td>
<td>St. Linus Umai Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desmond O. Odongo</td>
<td>St. Paul’s Oriang Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobias Gor Okeyo</td>
<td>St. Peter’s God Agak Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Olonde</td>
<td>St. Phillip’s Nyabondo Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouma Frederick</td>
<td>St. Teresa’s Nyalgosi Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Onoka</td>
<td>St. Thomas Omiro Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses O. Ayieko</td>
<td>Siany Mixed Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belliah O. Odero</td>
<td>Yala Kotieno Secondary School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 2: Meeting Agenda

## Homa Bay County Secondary School Heads Dialogue on Kenya’s School Re-entry Policy

**Imperial Hotel, Kisumu**

**Friday, August 1, 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>Population Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Opening Prayer and Introductions</td>
<td>Mr. Caleb Omondi - CQASO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Brief Survey</td>
<td>Population Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Opening Remarks</td>
<td>Mr. Barongo - Homa Bay County Director of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>Introduction to Program</td>
<td>Chi-Chi Undie - Population Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45</td>
<td><strong>TEA BREAK</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15</td>
<td>School Re-entry Policy</td>
<td>Chi-Chi Undie - Population Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Best Practices &amp; Barriers</td>
<td>Francis Obare - Population Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td><strong>LUNCH</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Best Practices &amp; Barriers Cont’d</td>
<td>Francis Obare - Population Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Next Steps and Way Forward</td>
<td>Chi-Chi Undie - Population Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Final Thoughts</td>
<td>Mr. Barongo - Homa Bay County Director of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Closing remarks</td>
<td>Mrs. Ahindukha – TSC Director of Education, Homa Bay County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Minister of Education, Homa Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td><strong>TEA BREAK</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Issues &amp; Departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>