

Commonwealth Education Fund

Tanzania

End of the Project Evaluation

Final Report

Suleman Sumra
Consultant

July 2008

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
List of Acronyms	3
1.0. Background	7
1.1. National Context	8
1.2. Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper	9
1.3. National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty	9
2.0. Commonwealth Education Fund Initiative	10
2.1. CEF Tanzania	11
3.0. Methodology	12
4.0. Findings	13
4.1. Strengthening Civil Society Organisations	13
4.2. Supporting local communities to monitor spending on education at both the national and local levels	21
4.3. Supporting the development of innovative approaches to educating the most marginalised children (especially girls and the most vulnerable) in a way that influences wider policy and practice	22
4.4. To promote/foster changes in government policy and practices regarding Early Childhood Development	22
4.5. Inter-agency collaboration & internal functioning of the CEF	23
4.6. Involvement of the Corporate Sector	25
5.0. Conclusion	25
References	28
Appendix A: Terms of Reference	29
Appendix B: people met	32

Executive Summary

This study is an end of the project evaluation of the Commonwealth Education Fund (CEF). CEF began operations in 2002 and ended in 2008. CEF should be seen as part of the national and international initiatives that are taking place in the last decade to ensure all children in developing countries either: can or have access to quality education. Funds were provided to CSOs to work in the following areas:

1. At the advocacy level by creating a social and political environment in which education becomes – and – remains the top national priority for developing countries. To bring changes to education policies to help all children get quality education.
2. Supporting local communities to monitor spending on education both at national and local levels
3. Supporting the development of innovative approaches to educating the most marginalised children (especially girls and the most vulnerable) in a way that influences a wider policy and practice.
4. To promote/foster changes in government policy and practice regarding Early Childhood Development

The Terms of Reference (TOR) for the End of the Project Evaluation required the consultant to assess performance, results, challenges and learning against the CEF objectives from the beginning to the end. The process is designed to encourage honest reflections and assessments of impact, outcomes the positive and the challenging as well as the lessons learnt. It will also enable CEF to learn the lessons from successes and mistakes so that together with its partners and the community groups with whom the programme has worked can improve on-going and future interventions.

Data for the study were collected through document review. The CEF secretariat provided the consultants with various documents related to the project. Earlier reviews of CEF were also consulted. Apart from documentary evidence, key stakeholders were interviewed.

To understand the role CEF played in the Tanzanian education sector, it has to be borne in mind that CEF was externally conceived and externally funded project. As an externally funded project, host countries had very little say in how the money would be used. It was another attempt by rich countries to provide funds for education in poor countries without involving host countries in decision making. Aim of CEF was to help build capacity of the Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) in poor commonwealth countries in Asia and Africa. It's aim was to bring together education stakeholders, such as teachers, parents, CSOs, Faith Based Organisations (FBOs), business community, the media and ordinary citizens with the aim of making their voices heard on the national and international stage and to implement educational reforms, track education spending and monitor progress. It is a moot point to say if this was the best use of resources at the disposal of rich countries. For example, would it have been better to use the money for providing textbooks for poor children, or providing mid-day meals to starving children in schools. There were many other deserving causes but they did not fall under CEF mandate.

For Tanzanian CSOs, it was another venue of obtaining funding for their activities. Performance of CEF was mixed. There were certain positives achieved and there were challenges faced. Perhaps the biggest achievement of CEF was support it provided to existing and newly formed networks. As CSO are not well developed in the country, the focus of CEF funding was to build coalitions and networks. This approach was based on the assumption that smaller, inadequately

resourced and poorly managed CSOs would benefit by working together, alongside better-resourced CSOs. The prime beneficiary was TENMET. CEF funding assisted TENMET to exist and carry out its activities when the organisation was in a financial bind. CEF support allowed TEN/MET to play a key role in Basic Education Development Committee (BEDC), the key decision making body of the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training. TEN/MET also played a key role in Education Sector Development Programme Reviews where it presented the CSO position paper outlining issues, which needed to be addressed. TEN/MET has gained respect for the work that it has been doing and is recognised as a key non-state organisation in the education sector. Another network that benefitted from CEF was Tanzania Early Childhood Care and Development network. ECCD network has existed only because of the full funding provided by CEF that including paying salaries of staff and providing funds to run the office. It is no exaggeration to state that without CEF support TECCD would not have survived.

In contrast to the TENMET experience, the experience with other networks has not been that positive. Traditionally most of the Tanzanian CSOs are small and starved of resources. As such any opportunity of funding attracts proposals even when they are not in line with their mandate. CEF funding created network where the need was not there. This was particularly true for some regional and district networks. These networks were formed because CEF funding was available and not because the CSOs felt that there was need for a network. Arumeru Education Network received limited funding which did not allow it to do credible work, which proved difficult for its survival. Similarly, the TAPHEN network could not continue once the research activity, funds for which were provided by CEF, ceased.

What has funding to existing networks and funds for formation of networks achieved? Has it achieved the aim of making the voices of CSOs and common man be heard on the national and international stage, and to keep education for all on the national agenda? Unfortunately CSOs have played only a minor role in the development of education policies in Tanzania. This has come about because historically CSOs have been marginalised in the education policy formation. Main players in policy debate and formation have been the development partners and the government, CSOs are only a minor player in influencing education policies. In recent years, the inclusion of CSOs in the policy debate has been accepted, however grudgingly, by the government through push by the development partners.

CEF also supported budget-tracking exercises by CSOs. The aim of the exercise was to track funds from the government and to see how these were utilised. Budget tracking exercises can be usefully done in countries that have laws on right to information. Unfortunately this right does not exist in many developing countries. The budget-tracking exercises carried out faced problems as a number of government officials at the district level were reluctant to release financial information to CSOs. However, despite that, the exercise can be termed as a moderate success. A high quality manual to carry out budget tracking has been produced by the three organisations supported by the CEF. However, budget-tracking exercises only make sense if they are implemented regularly. The CEF supported exercise was a one-off and did not seem to permit the CSOs to learn from the experience. The major weakness was that the budget tracking exercises were carried out by CSOs but little of the information was made available to public.

The Terms Of Reference for the evaluation also required the consultant to look at the management structure of CEF. The CEF represents a unique collaborative and strategic partnership between three international NGOs based in the United Kingdom: ActionAid International, Oxfam and Save the Children. Any of the three agencies can take a lead in a particular country. In Tanzania, for example, Save the Children is the lead agency for CEF. Overall, the three agencies worked well together and CEF profited from the strengths of each of these

organisations. The management committee of CEF provided structure for their cooperation. The Management Committee (MC) was the decision-making body where various proposals for funding were discussed and decisions were made. The three NGOs had a veto power and no proposal was funded without the agreement of these three organisations.

The MC was a top – heavy, international NGO and development partners forming the majority – nine of the thirteen members are from that group. Getting representation from national organisations such as the University of Dar es Salaam was difficult because of the practice in the country to expect “sitting allowances” for any meeting attended. CEF had a policy of not paying for attending meetings. The MC met regularly and its proceedings were recorded. There were several shortcomings in the way CEF functioned. One, the secretariat was short staffed. Consisting of only one person, who was responsible for monitoring all CEF funded activities. Secondly, the unpredictability of funding and lack of planned exit strategy affected the effectiveness of CEF. At times, the amount of funds received nationally was reduced without previous consultation and there was no proper plan in place for the efficient termination of CEF funded activities

Major Shortcomings of CEF:

1. CEF, was an externally conceived and funded project based on the assumption that one size fits all. The assumption was that providing funds to CSOs will achieve the goal of putting and sustaining the goal of achieving EFA agenda without considering national environment in which CSOs operate. In Tanzania there are only few strong CSOs, many are one person operations starved of resources. Their ability of sustained advocacy is limited. Secondly, many CSOs in Tanzania paradoxically do not have their roots in society. Their accountability lies with the funding agencies and not to the community. This is not to deny that there are many well intentioned individuals working hard in CSOs, but their work is driven by the providers of funds.
2. Operation of CEF was also affected by lack of predictability of funding in terms of amount, and timing. CEF coordinator faced operational difficulties in meeting funding deadlines and CSOs faced difficulties in implementing their programmes. This was a particularly serious period which impacted on its operations.

CEF had no exist-strategy. Any good project develops it's exist strategy at the same time as it develops its entry. In the case of CEF it ended its support suddenly leaving both the Tanzanian CEF coordinator and the supported CSOs in an unenviable situation.

3. Unfortunately CEF Tanzania put very little effort on advocacy strategy. Advocacy carried out by CSOs, especially by the TENMET was limited to putting CSO position to the government. There was no effort made to build public support on various issues. For example, findings from the research conducted on the education of children of pastoralist communities by TAPHEN, was not used for public debate. Creative use of media and public debate would have put the issue squarely in the public domain. There were several of these ‘opportunities lost’. Several reasons can be given for this lack of advocacy strategies.
 - It is likely that these activities carried out were not priority areas for CSOs concerned but were done because funds were available.
 - It is also true that many CSOs lack advocacy skills. TENMET has been in the process of developing a handbook on building advocacy skills among CSOs. However, production of a handbook is not going to solve the problem of advocacy, a much more concerted effort will be required.

- CEF was not media savvy. There was no media use to support CEF activities as a result hardly anyone knew of CEF outside the CSO sector. This despite the fact that some CSOs like Hakielimu have used media very effectively to support their advocacy agenda.
4. Failure to attract funding from corporate sector. This was a major failure of CEF Tanzania. The major concern of the Tanzanian corporate sector in recent years has been getting people of the right calibre. It will therefore be in the interest of the corporate sector to work with the government and CSOs to ensure that schools produce graduates with the right qualities. It is surprising that CEF has failed to motivate the private sector to contribute towards improving the education sector. A study was commissioned by CEF to The purpose of this study was to identify opportunities for collaboration between business corporations and civic organisations in fostering a more inclusive and effective public basic education system, and to advise the CEF on a strategy for promoting this. The report made several recommendations on how to get the corporate sector involved in funding education. It is unlikely that the recommendations were followed upon as the report came towards the end of CEF funding period.
 5. Finally, CEF failed to understand that interventions in any education activity, including supporting CSOs, takes a long time before its effects are seen. Education projects, of necessity, have to be long term and CEF commitments should have been for a longer period. It is appears that CEF was conceptualised and designed by politicians and not by educationalists.

What lessons can be learned from the CEF experience?

1. For effective and sustainable projects top-down solutions are not useful. Beneficiary involvement is essential in project design. This has become a cliché in development debate but not often followed.
 2. CEF London should have stipulated the amount and timing of funding available for Tanzania. This information should have been shared with the CSOs involved. Projects like CEF need transparency and accountability, and on this unfortunately CEF fell short. Sometimes CEF promised funding which did not come through.
- Lack of exist strategy was particularly critical. For CEF secretariat and CSO the project was abruptly brought to an end. It was essential for CEF to have developed an exist strategy at the time it was developing the entry strategy.
3. Advocacy is a skilled undertaking and considerable effort of the CEF should have been towards building strategies for it. Media, both electronic and print play an important role in informing public on various issues. It is important for projects like CEF to use media effectively to achieve its goals. It is unclear how EFA can be put on national agenda without the effective use of media.
 4. It is important to set modest policy change goals. Achieving three or four policy change goals and concentrating efforts for the purpose is more meaningful than broad support for CSOs. CEF efforts were not outcome based.
 5. Changes in education require long-term commitment. Project like CEF should have made longer term finding commitments to have made CSOs involved sustainable.

List of Acronyms

BvLF	Bernard van Leer Foundation
CARE	Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere
CASEC	Community Aid and Small Enterprise Consultancy
CEF	Community Education Fund
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DFA	Dakar Framework of Action
DFID	Department for International Development
ECD	Early Childhood Development
EFA	Education for All
FAWE	Forum for African Women in Education
FBO	Faith Based Organisation
GBP	Great Britain Pound
KEN/MEKI	Kilimanjaro Regional Network/Mtandao wa Elimu Kilimanjaro
KIDTF	Kamamma Integrated Development Trust Fund
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MORUNOFFE	Moshi Rural Network
NGO	Non – Government Organisation
NSGRP	National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty
PEDP	Primary Education Development Plan
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
TECDEN	Tanzania Early Childhood Development Network
TEN/MET	Tanzania Education Network/Mtandao wa Elimu Tanzania
TU	Tanzania Teachers' Union
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UPE	Universal Primary Education
WODESTA	Women Development for Science and Technology Association

1.0. Background:

The Commonwealth Education Fund (CEF) should be viewed as part of global efforts to encourage governments in the developing countries to ensure that all children have access to basic education. These efforts began with the World Conference on Education, which was held in Jomtien, Thailand. The conference set out a vision for Education for All (EFA) or achieving Universal Primary Education (UPE) by the year 2000. The Jomtien conference for the first time clearly spelt out EFA goals, objectives, and targets. It also clarified roles of governments, civil societies, communities and development partners (Alubisia: undated, 16). The conference declared that education was the key driver to achieve poverty reduction, empowerment of women, promoting human rights and democracy (UNICEF 1999: 13). Although the period following the Jomtien Conference resulted in marked increases in enrolment, many developing countries were far from achieving the UPE goals. The real impetus for achieving the UPE goals was provided during a conference for education ministers held in 2000 in Dakar, Senegal to assess the progress towards the EFA goal. The conference came out with the Dakar Framework of Action (DFA), which concretised targets to be achieved by all developing countries. Further impetus to achieving EFA was provided by the United Nations Millennium Conference, which brought together member heads of states. The conference set out Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to be achieved by all the member states. Box 1 shows both the DFA and MDG education related goals.

Box 1: The Dakar Framework of Action and Millennium Development Goals

EFA Dakar Goals

1. Expanding and improving comprehensive early childhood care and education, especially for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged children.
2. Ensuring that by 2015 all children, particularly girls, children in difficult circumstances and those belonging to ethnic minorities, have access to quality and *completely* free and compulsory primary education.
3. Ensuring that the learning needs of all young people and adults are met through equitable access to appropriate learning and life skills programmes.
4. Achieving 50% improvement in levels of adult literacy by 2015, particularly for women, and equitable access to basic and continuing education for all adults.
5. Eliminating gender disparities in primary and secondary education by 2005, achieving gender equality in education by 2015 With a specific focus on ensuring full and equal access to basic, quality education for girls.
6. Ensuring excellence and improving all aspects of the quality of education so that recognised and measurable learning outcomes are achieved by all, especially in literacy, numeracy and essential life skills.

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

Goal 2: Achieve Universal Primary Education.

Target 3. Ensure that by 2015, all children will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling.

Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women

Target 4. Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and in all levels of education no later than 2015.

Dakar goals are more education specific and broader and touch upon many aspects of education. MDGs are more narrowly defined. However, both EFA and MDGs specify universal primary education and eliminating gender inequities in basic education.

At national level, donor assistance was made conditional on all countries developing Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRPS). PRPS guided funding mechanisms by the development partners. Sectors identified as crucial in reducing poverty were seen as priority sectors for funding. The MDG and EFA goals were woven into the poverty reduction strategies.

1.1. National Context

Since independence, education was accorded top priority in the national development agenda and that has not changed. EFA is not a new concept in the Tanzanian history. In 1974, the National Executive Committee (NEC) of Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) at its meeting in Musoma *directed* the government to implement UPE by 1977. A bold decision by a poor country like Tanzania at a time when its economy was under stress. Despite short comings, the country managed to achieve a GER of more than 90% by early 1980s. This was done without high levels of external financing. How did the country achieve the UPE in the 70s? UPE was *a political* initiative, an initiative undertaken by the ruling party for ideological purposes. The role of the ruling party was crucial in making the UPE a success. There was strong belief that national development cannot take place if the population is illiterate. Therefore, education was seen as a key element in national development. Another feature of the UPE was the community mobilisation done by the party. Communities built most of the schools needed for the implementation of UPE.

Unfortunately, the gains of UPE could not be sustained. The mid- 1980s and early 1990s saw a decline in enrolment and stagnation of the education sectors. Schools became dilapidated and had few teaching and learning materials. Budgetary allocation was just adequate to cover the salary component.

Revamping of the sector started in the mid 1990s with various plans being formulated. The process, with encouragement from development partners, began by defining the national vision – vision which stipulated what kind of development was needed and how that would be achieved. The national vision on development was articulated in the Tanzania Development Vision 2025. The Vision sees education playing as crucial for moving Tanzania out of poverty.

Education should be treated as a strategic agent for mind-set transformation and for the creation of a well-educated nation, sufficiently equipped with the knowledge needed to competently and competitively solve the development challenges, which face then nation. In this light, the education system should be restructured and transformed qualitatively with a focus on promoting creativity and problem solving (URT 2000:19).

Subsequent government policies have been guided by the Vision. These policies include the 2004 Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRS) and, the 2005 National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP). Both PRSP and NSGRP see a strong role for education in reducing poverty in the country. The role of education is seen as to creating “a well-educated, knowledgeable, and skilled Tanzanian, able to competently and competitively cope with political, social, cultural, economical, and technological development challenges at national and international levels.”

1.2. Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP)

Basic education was seen as central to the reduction of poverty in PRSP and set targets to be achieved in three years of PRSP implementation. PEDP was formulated and implemented to achieve the targets set under PRSP. The success of PRSP led to the formulation of a much broader and much more ambitious National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP).

1.3. National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP)

For the education sector, NSGRP goals include achievements and quality as shown in Box 1. These achievements and quality targets difficult to monitor compared to enrolment targets of PRSP. NSGRP sets out targets for all the levels of education, from early childhood to tertiary. Some of the operational targets for basic education are listed in Box 2.

Tanzanian experience has shown that some targets are easier to achieve than others. The country achieved significant increases in enrolment in 2002 by abolishing school fees, mobilising communities and building more classrooms. It has proved much more difficult to get marginalised and excluded children, such as those in pastoralist communities, street children, children with impairment to enrol in schools. It will be difficult to achieve targets such as increasing proportion of children with disabilities enrolled from 0.1% in 2000 to 20% in 2010.

Box 2: Operational Targets for Goal 1, Cluster II of NSGRP	
A: Early Childhood	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Increase in the number of young children prepared for school and schools prepared and ready to care for children.
B: Primary Enrolment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Increased gross and net enrolment of all children in primary schools from 90.5% in 2004 to 99% in 2010.▪ Increased proportion of children with disabilities enrolled, attending and completing schools from 0.1% in 2000 to 20% in 2010.▪ Increased proportion of orphans and most vulnerable children enrolled, attending, and completing primary education from 2% in 2000 to 30% in 2010.
C: Primary Achievement and Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Achieved an average daily attendance in primary schools of at least 85%▪ At least 95% of cohort completed standard IV▪ At least 90% of cohort completed standard VII
D: HIV/AIDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Effective HIV and AIDS education and life skills programmes offered in all primary, secondary schools, and teachers' colleges.

Source: URT(2004) National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP), Vice – Presidents Office. October 2004, 31.

1.3. Primary Education Development Plan (PEDP): In 2001, the government decided to implement PEDP. The aim of PEDP was to revamp the primary education sector that had stagnated during the 1990s. The Main aim of PEDP was to ensure that all children in Tanzania have access to quality education. In this respect, PEDP can be seen to have the same goals as the UPE in the Tanzanian education history, which is to achieve universal primary education. PEDP, unlike the earlier initiatives in late 70s to achieve universal primary education, was a technical

initiative. Stakeholders involved in developing the PEDP were ministry bureaucrats, development partners, consultants, and civil society organisations. Politics were conspicuously absent from the PEDP debate. As PEDP was not a political initiative, there was little mass mobilisation to support it. Emphasis in PEDP was on inputs into the sector – more classrooms, more teachers, more teachers houses and less on improving the learning outcomes. The two major achievements of PEDP have been:

- Increased enrolment and,
- Improved infrastructures

Problems that still face the primary education sub-sector are:

- High Teacher Pupil Ratio (TPR), uneven deployment of teachers
- High rates of children repeating classes, dropouts
- Access still problematic among marginalised children (pastoralists, children with impairments)
- Gender differences in performance in PSLE

These issues provide rich ground for CSO interventions in terms of lobbying and advocacy.

PEDP does provide space for CSO involvement in the following ways:

space

- Effective participation in planning, implementing, and monitoring activities at all levels that support the PEDP and ESDP objectives.
- Participates as a joint stakeholder in the annual ESDP process of reviewing the education sector, including the primary and non-formal education programmes.
- Contribute their experience and knowledge, as well as human, financial, technical, and material resources towards the improvement and provision of primary education.
- Shares information with, and facilitates meaningful community participation in primary and non-formal education.
- Effectively collects and communicate educational information from and to schools, communities, government, and stakeholders.
- Conducts education policy analysis and advocacy.

In practice, however, CSO role in identifying issues for advocacy and lobbying was limited as will be shown in latter sections.

2.0. CEF Initiative

As discussed earlier, there is an international climate conducive to supporting education in developing countries. CEF should be seen as part of the national and international initiatives to achieve universal primary education. CEF is an externally conceived initiative *to help build capacity of the Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) in poor commonwealth countries in Asia and Africa*. It's aim was to bring together education stakeholders, such as teachers, parents, CSOs, Faith Based Organisations (FBOs), business community, the media and ordinary citizens with the aim of making their voices heard on the national and international stage and to implement educational reforms, track education spending and monitor progress. The basic parameters of how the funds should be used and for what purposes, was already defined. The aim of CEF was not to deliver services or to carryout advocacy on its own. Purpose of CEF was to provide funds for civil society organisations to advocate for EFA. As such, CEF funds targeted to organisations that had potential for advocacy work.

Focus of CEF initiative was to ensure that commonwealth countries achieve the two MDG targets set in the education sector. Achieving universal primary education by 2015 and eliminating all form of gender disparity in education. CEF aimed to work strategically in those low-income countries which were unlikely to achieve the *MDGs* targets. CEF's mission was to promote right to education by ensuring that governments fulfil their commitments through good education policies, transparent and accountable financial procedures and provision of quality education that reaches the most marginalised children. CEF worked by giving advice and funding to local and national civil society organisations (CSOs) in 16 countries: Bangladesh, Cameroon, The Gambia, Ghana, India, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia.

CEF started with a core grant of 10 million GBP provided by DFID. Several private firms complemented the core funding. These firms were: Zurich Financial Services, Citigroup, Goldman Sachs, Cadbury Schweppes, ICICI Bank, Standard Chartered Bank, Prudential, Warner Brothers, Transco, Puri Foundation.

The aim of CEF was to work at advocacy level through creating a social and political environment in which education becomes - and remains – the top national priority for developing nations.

The CEF was set up with three main objectives, these were:

1. To strengthen broad-based and democratically run national education coalitions, with active membership across the country, *to enable local voices and experiences to influence national-level policy and practice.*
2. To ensure that sufficient financing is available to make public schools work for all children, and that resources reach where they are most needed.
3. To promote innovative work and use the *evidence from the experience to influence policy and get all previously excluded children, particularly girls, into public schools.*

The advocacy work conceptualised by CEF was to be **evidence based**. Researches were to be carried out to find out factors that prevent children from attending school, and document *innovative* approaches which attempt to solve the problem. The CEF initiative was to bring about:

- Changes to education policies that ensured that all children received quality education,
- Improved and effective education spending, and,
- Identification of innovative ways to get excluded children into school.

2.1. CEF Tanzania:

Like other Commonwealth countries in Africa, Tanzania also benefited from the CEF funding. Each country was to develop a strategic plan to ensure that the broad goals of CEF were achieved. The overall objective of CEF Tanzania was to *ensure all children have access to quality and relevant basic education.*

Within the overall objective, CEF Tanzania set the following specific goals:

1. To work at advocacy level through creating a social and political environment in which education becomes – and – remains the top national priority for developing countries. To bring changes to education policies to help all children acquire quality education.

2. Supporting local communities to monitor spending on education both at national and local levels.
3. Supporting the development of innovative approaches to educating the most marginalised children (especially girls and the most vulnerable) in a way that influences a wider policy and practice.
4. To promote and foster changes in government policy and practice regarding Early Childhood Development

These four goals are broadly similar to the goals of CEF International except that ECD was not on the CEF International's agenda. ECD as a goal was added because of a stakeholders meeting held in Dar es Salaam. Although ECD is not one of the MDG goals, it was included because it features both in the EFA and MKUKUTA targets.

3.0. Methodology:

This study is an end of the project evaluation of the Commonwealth Education Fund (CEF). Terms of Reference (see Appendix A) for the evaluation, lists areas to be addressed. The following are the objectives of the evaluation:

- ❑ To account, learn and share learning from achievements and failures – in order to meet statutory requirements of the DFID, share experiences encountered and learning leading to sustaining the 'good practises' and leaving a legacy.
- ❑ To allow internal and external stakeholders to explore CEF Tanzania work and help it to assess impact, achievements and learning to increase synergy across CEF-supported work.
- ❑ To increase our accountability to domestic peers and external partners.

Data for the study were primarily collected through reviews of documents. CEF secretariat provided the consultants with various documents related to the project. However, CEF has not adequately documented its activities. This is understandable as for most part CEF has worked on the assumption that CSOs are dedicated organisations working for the good of the Tanzanian children. Unavailability of documents may have affected the preparation this study. Documents that were not available are:

- Activity reports by the partner organisations. Every grant-making organisation requires the benefiting organisation to submit technical and financial reports. There were no reports that summarised, at the end of project, the activities carried out.
- Outcome reports: KDPA for example, was given grant of 44 million shillings to implement girls' education and active learning programme in selected wards in Kigoma rural districts. There is no report which shows how this was done and what was achieved as a result. Similarly, Fawe was provided funds to hire a consultant to prepare a re-entry study. The report of the consultant was not available.
- In few cases, the partners' organisations failed to deliver what they had agreed to do.

Apart from documentary evidence, key stakeholders were interviewed. The list of people interviewed is shown in Appendix B. The number of people interviewed was limited, as most of these people were interviewed during the mid-term evaluation carried out by the consultant in 2005.

4.0. Findings:

The four goals became the basis of CEF strategic plan. The report broadly follows these goals and is guided by questions suggested in appendix 1 in the TOR.

4.1. Strengthening Civil Society

The first goal of CEF is to strengthen Civil Society Organisations in order for them to work at advocacy levels through creating a social and political environment in which education becomes and remains the top national priority. To bring changes to education policies to help all children get a quality education.

This section will look at the following:
space

- What are the main features of CSOs in Tanzania?
- What has been the CEF support to CSOs?
- What has been achieved because of CEF support?

4.1.1. Features of CSOs in Tanzania: In order to understand the extent to which CEF has strengthened civil society organisations, there is need to look at overall CSO situation in the country. Some of the features of CSOs are:

- **Low financial and technical capacity**: Although TEN/MET states that it has “more than 500 potential members composed of national and international non-governmental organisations (NGOs), most of the national organisations are small and lack resources to carryout meaningful interventions. Apart from few organisations such as Hakielimu, Maarifa, Kivulini, and Mkombozi, the others do not have regular sources of funding. Their human capacity is also low, many being one or two person setups. Vast majority of the 500 potential TEN/MET members are unable to pay their membership dues. Only about 20 organisations can be said to be active and pay dues regularly and most of these are international NGOs (INGOs).

Low financial capacity has also led to a “sitting allowance” culture. Even when training is conducted for the benefit of individuals and organisations, participants ask for allowances and if these are not paid, they stop attending. CEF found early that when they invited certain CSOs for meetings, there were demands for “allowances”. This was the main reason why some national organisations did not benefit from CEF support. Low financial capacity also led to some networks losing its members from rural areas. If these organisations were not refunded their costs, they stopped attending meetings of the networks.

Low technical capacity has meant that only a handful of CSOs managed to develop sufficiently credible proposals to attract funding from CEF. This accounts for low numbers of CSOs benefiting from the CEF funding.

- **Donor dependency**: Although most of the organisations are membership based, resources to run these organisations mostly come from donors. In recent years, the Foundation for Civil Society has become an important source of funding for many of the CSOs.

- **Disconnect between CSOs and Civil Society:** CSOs in Tanzania are not rooted in civil society. Their existence depends on donor support. As these are donor dependent, their accountability lies with the donor organisations rather than with the community. In fact, for many CSOs, mobilisation of communities is not central to their activities.
- **CSOs work *for* rather than *with* their stakeholders:** Many of the CSOs are either service delivery or advocacy organisations and some do both. The number of organisations that works with the people to bring about change is negligible.
- **Urban Based:** Vast majority of CSOs in Tanzania are urban based and based mostly in and around three centres – Dar es Salaam, Arusha, and Mwanza.
- **Lack of broad based community involvement:** Membership of most of the CSOs is limited to the educated elite. No efforts are made to involve the underprivileged people in these organisations. Although many of the CSOs target the underprivileged, and claim that they are working for their welfare,

4.1.2. *CEF Support to CSOs:* The major effort of CEF was to support CSOs in Tanzania to form and develop networks and coalitions. It is no exaggeration to state that some networks would not have started and those that did would not have been sustained was it not for the CEF support. As stated earlier, the majority of CSOs have weak financial bases. This has played both positive and negative roles in formations of networks and coalitions. This is positive because CSOs sees the formation of networks and coalition as a way to access funds for their operations. The financially weak organisations, through the networks, have managed to access funds to do work in their areas of operation. This has allowed these organisations to gain experience and benefit from their association with these networks. A clear example is the budget tracking exercise (discussed in detail in the next section) where small CSOs got training from TEN/MET for carrying out budget tracking exercises in their districts or schools. This would certainly have benefited these small organisations.

The only disadvantage of CEF focus on networks and coalitions was that it attracted organisations that were not formed to work in education. These organisations opted to work in the education area to tap into the CEF funding. Box 3, shows some of the members of the Arusha Education Network, which from their names clearly indicate that they were not formed to work in the educational area.

BOX 3: MEMBERS OF THE ARUSHA EDUCATION NETWORK

Maarifa ni Ufunguo; Women Development for Science and Technology Association (WODESTA); Tanzania Teachers' Union; Urban Environmental Developmental Association (UEDA); Life Counselling Trust (LICOT); Society for Family Poverty Alleviation (SOFAPA); Community Based Health Care Council (CBHCC); Green Arusha Society; Women Economic Groups Coordinating Council (WEGCC); Women in Agriculture Development and Environmental Conservation (WADEC); Community Environmental Conservation (COMECA); Kamamma Integrated Development Trust Fund (KIDTF); Informal Sector Trust; Community Aid and Small Enterprise Consultancy (CASEC)

Source: Sumra (2005:13)

Some of these organisations were not formed to work in the education area, but joined the network because of the possibility of getting funding. This is not a disadvantage in itself, as these organisations can provide fresh perspective to problems facing the sector. The disadvantage is

that as these organisations are not committed to work in the sector according to their charter, they will abandon the educational aspect once funding is ceased.

The number of CSOs that have been supported has been limited as shown in Table 1. However, many CSOs have benefited by working on issues such as budget tracking exercises. It is surprising that out of more than 500 CSOs, Community Based Organisations (CBOs) and Faith Based Organisations (FBOs) in the country working on educational issues, less than twenty have benefited from the fund. Why did such a small number of organisations benefit from the fund? Table 1 shows that over five years of CEF operation, more than half the funds have been used to support the two networks – TEN/MET and TECDEN (ECD). This is substantial support to these networks, an average of over GBP 30,000 per year for TEN/MET, and over GBP 20,000 per year for the ECD network.

The major problems with CEF intervention is that this was a foreign project, conceived and operationalised in United Kingdom. Ground realities in each country where the funds were to be provided seem not to have been considered. Reality is that the CSOs will work on the concerns of CEF as long as funds are available for the purpose but would change course if funds became available for other purposes. CEF funding could have been better targeted in the following ways:

Targeted interventions: CEF could have identified specific areas for advocacy and funded those organisations that worked in those particular areas. For this, there was need for carrying out situational analysis of the basic education sub-sector to identify areas for possible interventions. This approach would have targeted specific issues (such as education of children with disabilities, child rights, education for girls, education for children in pastoralist communities etc). Taking this route would have simplified monitoring of outcomes of CEF support. In order to avoid CEF directing interventions, a meeting of key NGOs could have decided areas for interventions. By focusing CEF funds to few key areas would have increased chances of success.

Proposal-based interventions: CEF used this approach to fund interventions. In the case of TEN/MET and TECDEN, CEF funded all the planned activities of these two organisations. Thus, resources of CEF were spread thinly and not targeted. Therefore, after five years of operations it becomes difficult to decide what was achieved as result of CEF interventions. What would not have happened if CEF funding was not there? As stated earlier, given the low technical capacity of many of CSOs, CEF did not receive many proposals for funding that were well articulated or which addressed serious issues. This has resulted in few CSOs benefiting from CEF funding.

Table 1: Partner Payments CEF Grant from 2002 to 2007

	PARTNER ORGANISATION	AMOUNT DISBURSED IN GBP	%
1	TEN/MET	168,763	33.8
2	MKOMBOZI	50,339	10.1
3	TANGA COALITION	26,499	5.3
4	FAWE	11,465	2.3
5	Information on Children's' Disability (ICD)	44,388	8.9
5	TAPHEN (MAARIFA NI UFUNGUO)	31,861	6.4
6	TECDEN (ECD)	100,566	20.1
7	KDPA	15,999	3.2
8	ANCEFA	840	0.2

9	KIDEREA	3967	0.8
10	PAMOJA	12,575	2.5
11	SAFINA	5,747	1.1
12	TGNP	6955	1.4
13	HAKIKAZI	13,138	2.6
14	CADECT	2,558	0.5
15	MORUNOFE	2,285	0.5
16	SNV	1326	0.3
17	KATE DYER (?)	491	0.1
	TOTAL	499,762	100.0

Source: CEF Secretariat

Developing and Supporting Networks and Coalitions:

As stated, the bulk of the CEF funding has been directed towards supporting networks. Funding has always remained critical to the existence of these CSOs. Many stagger along as funds become available. In such situations many of these organisations work in areas, often unrelated to their mandate – they follow the money. Many CSOs joined educational networks supported by CEF in order to tap into the CEF resources, when their primary interest was not education. This has been the key weakness of the CEF support to creating networks. Networks should arise from the realisation of common interest, in a belief that goals for which the organisations are working towards can be better achieved by working together.

The second problem with supporting networks is that the assistance has been used for purposes other than advocacy work. It has been used for their very existence. Support to ECD and TEN/MET included paying salaries for the staff, and meeting the running costs of these organisations. This has/could have a profound effect on the relationship between the network and the members forming these networks. Both TEN/MET and ECD have developed their own bureaucracy and funding venues – independent of the member organisations.

It is important to discuss why networks are formed. Networks should always arise from the realisation by their members that their individual strengths can be enhanced by working together for a purpose. The role of a network should be to bring the members together. Both TEN/MET and ECD have outgrown their members and have assumed autonomy that is beyond the structures of the networks. This has come primarily through CEF funding. Instead of these networks looking to its members for support, members now look to TEN/MET for support. *In principle, the running costs of any network, including salaries for its staff, should come from member contributions.* This is important for the purpose of sustainability of these networks.

CEF support has reversed the process of network formation. As stated earlier, a network is formed when *member CSOs feel a need for a network* to achieve a purpose. CEF supported the creation of networks, and then members joined in mostly when they realised that funding was available. Sustainability of networks that are formed “from above” can become problematic as evidenced from networks like TAPHEN, Arusha Education networks etc. As CEF funding has ended so has their existence. This is not to deny that some sound work that has been done by some of these networks.

CEF support to development of networks and coalitions has been selective. First, there are important CSOs that have remained out of the loop, and secondly the geographical coverage has

been limited mostly to the CSOs based in the urban areas. This has been a result of how CEF has operated. CEF Tanzania has operated as a grant-making organisation where proposals for funding are discussed and successful proposals are awarded grants. This process is problematic for two reasons. First, information on CEF funding is not readily available to rural CSOs because of poor communications (internet/newspapers/TV) in rural areas. Urban-based CSOs are at a clear advantage. Secondly, human capacity of CSOs in rural areas is low. Many do not have proposal writing skills. Part of CEF activity could have been to develop the capacity of rural based CSOs in proposal development.

It appears that CEF became operational without a clear strategic planning. The four objectives are broad and do not permit easy monitoring of outcomes. Instead, CEF could have worked to achieve specific targets and focused their funding to achieve these. This would have required CEF to carry out a thorough analysis of the basic education sub-sector to identify crucial issues. For example, CEF could have targeted education of children with disabilities and built up advocacy to achieve this. With the current strategic plan, CEF efforts have been widely spread and thus no clear outcomes can be detected.

As shown in Table 1, CEF has funded activities by 16 CSOs. Crucial questions to be addressed are:

- Are these the key CSOs in Tanzania to create a social and political environment that influence maintaining education at the top of the national agenda?
- What activities have been carried out because of CEF funding?
- What has been the outcome of the CEF support? Is it possible to list three things that have been achieved because of the CEF support in achieving education for all?

CSOs supported by CEF:

All the CSOs and networks supported by CEF are important organisations working in the area of education. However, there are other organisations, equally important, that did not become part of the CEF support. Perhaps the most important of these is the Tanzania Teachers' Union (TTU). TTU is an organisation with the widest reach in the country – every school in the country has TTU members. This potential has not been utilised by either by CEF or its partner organisations.

One can see clear opportunities for collaborating with TTU on various aspects. The re-entry policy could not succeed without having teachers onboard. Therefore, support of TTU would have provided the advantage to ensure the government implemented the policy. In other areas such as inclusive education, TTU support would have been invaluable. Similarly, the potential of Faith Based Organisations (FBOs) has not been fully utilised. FBOs have a ready constituency that could have been mobilised, through CEF, to ensure that the EFA agenda receives due attention. It is unfortunate that TTU was unwilling to cooperate with CEF.

Despite making serious efforts, CEF failed to get private sector onboard in support of EFA. Similarly, the media has not been fully utilised. However, there are CSOs, like HakiElimu, that have managed to make effective use of the media. TEN/MET and other CSOs could have learnt from HakiElimu to ensure that EFA is kept in the public arena all the time. CEF has worked with a small group of CSOs and has not achieved wider recognition of its existence. There was no clear strategy by CEF to mobilise communities in support of CEF activities in particular and EFA goals in general. Lack of this strategy will affect the sustainability of the CEF initiatives and long-term involvement at the grass root level.

In order to see what CEF has achieved, we will look at operations of TEN/MET, the major beneficiary of CEF funding. TEN/MET was established in 1999 by few organisations in the Moshi/Arusha areas. It moved to Dar es Salaam in May 2002 coinciding with the active period of Primary Education Development Plan (PEDP). PEDP provided space for CSO to work with other stakeholders in developing the PEDP. CSO representation was provided for by the PEDP at two levels. CSOs were represented in each of the five technical working groups and CSOs were represented in the Basic Education Development Committee (BEDC), perhaps the most important decision making committee that brought together the government, the development partners, and CSOs. TEN/MET played an important role, both in the technical working committees and in the BEDC.

As stated earlier, TEN/MET was the major beneficiary of the CEF funding. It is not an exaggeration to state that the existence of TEN/MET was a result of CEF funding. CEF provided funding at the most crucial period of TEN/MET. TEN/MET has now achieved presence at the national level to enable it to attract funding from other sources. Did providing funds to TEN/MET resulted in achieving the CEF goals? Did TEN/MET funding result in keeping education in the national agenda?

Despite having most of its funding from CEF, TEN/MET is a separate organisation whose agenda is driven by its Board and members' interests. There is no complete alignment of TEN/MET and the CEF agenda. This was expected. Keeping EFA on the national agenda is but one of the agenda of TEN/MET, and perhaps not the focus of its work. TEN/MET's programme consists of five components. These are:

- A: Communication and Information Sharing
- B: Capacity development
- C: Policy Debate and Advocacy
- D: Monitoring Impact of Policy
- E: Governance and Organisational Development

As the assessment report (Kassam and Mutakyahwa 2007:6) points out that results achieved by TEN/MET from 2004-2007 were limited in relation to the planned activities. TEN/MET work was concentrated on communication and information sharing, policy debate and advocacy and governance and organisational development. Success in two key components, capacity development of member organisations and monitoring impact of policy, was limited. TEN/MET ensured that CSOs were represented in various technical working groups and in Basic Education Development Committee (BEDC). Advocacy efforts of TEN/MET happen at the government level, trying to influence policy changes through dialogue. TEN/MET has also played an important role in the sector dialogue. For sector, reviews of 2006 and 2007 developed CSO position papers (TEN/MET: 2006 and 2007). In the 2006 position paper, several important proposals were made. These included revising the Education Sector Development Plan (ESDP) to bring it inline with the MDG. The position paper also pointed out to the need of revising the Education and Training Policy (ETP) of 1995 (URT: 1995). The government agreed to address both these issues.

One worrisome feature of TEN/MET is that the network leads the process without adequate support from constituent organisations. TEN/MET circulates various documents/drafts to its members, but hardly any member comments on these (TEN/MET: 2006, 19). One therefore wonders if the positions taken by TEN/MET are of the secretariat or of the members as a whole.

This situation has come about because TEN/MET has focused its attention upwards (interacting with the government and participating in various committees) rather downwards (building capacity of its members, building support among various communities over an issue). This is evident from the way the funding has been spent. For example, one of the four TEN/MET activity required its members to monitor and *document* the implementation and impact of policies and programmes in relation to education financing, exclusion and education quality and take advocacy action (TEN/MET 2007:22). This was not achieved, as the network did not focus on this aspect, although funds were available for the purpose. To do all these tasks would have required building the capacity of the members, which was not done. This has been the major weakness of TEN/MET, which may have affected its operation.

Apart from supporting TEN/MET, CEF has also supported *thematic* networks and coalitions. These are discussed below.

Tanzania Pastoralist and Hunter – Gatherer’s Education Network (TAPHEN): This network was formed by several NGOs, mostly based in Arusha coming together to address the issue of education for children of pastoralists and hunter-gatherers. The most visible outcome of the network was the research funded by CEF, titled *The Challenges of Educating Pastoralist in Tanzania, which* was carried out in five districts of Arumeru (now separate districts of Arusha and Meru), Monduli, Hanang, Kiteto, and Simanjiro. The study looked at reasons behind the failure of the government to address the issue of education for the pastoralist groups such as Maasai and the Barbeig. The study makes several recommendations to address the problem. However, the efforts of TAPHEN did not go much beyond the research. No clear advocacy strategy seems to have been developed.

Tanga Coalition: Tanga coalition deals with the issue of children with disabilities. Tanzanian education sector is not very friendly towards education of children with disabilities. Classrooms and toilet facilities were constructed without any consideration for the needs of children with physical disabilities. Majority of the teachers have not been provided with relevant training on how to teach children with disabilities. The Tanga coalition was formed to ensure that children with disabilities receive quality education. Members of the coalition were clear about what needed to be done. Their work focused at two levels: advocacy level – lobbying for policy change and at the community level to raise awareness. These two levels of their work are illustrated by the following quotations:

I was running a school for mentally retarded children at Majani Mapana. Major problem that I face is convincing parents that mentally impaired children can go to and benefit from schooling. Many parents hide their children in the house and do not allow them to play with other children. There is a stigma attached to have children who are mentally impaired. We are constantly discussing with parents that these children can benefit from education and they have right to education.

I am working for an organisation working for albinos. We feel that teachers do not understand or are not aware of the special needs of albino children. Not addressing needs of albino children can lead to serious problems for these children. We plan to work with the government to ensure that teachers receive instructions on how to handle albino children in school. Teacher training curriculum also needs to be revised to accommodate this.

Before analysing what the CEF has achieved, we will examine the above mentioned goal and see what it entails. It points out the need to create a *social and political environment* in which education becomes and remains the top state priority. CEF has placed a great deal of faith in the abilities of networks to create the social and political environment to place education at the top of national priorities in the country. Have the networks done this? In order to answer the question, we need to look at what drives change in Tanzania, is it strong evidence from research? Is it well-formulated arguments?

What has been achieved with the CEFs assistance? Many positives have resulted because of CEF intervention in the area of strengthening civil society organisations. These are:

- Networks like 'TEN/MET' would not have survived, or would have survived with lower levels of activities, without the CEF support. TEN/MET, through its work over the last few years has gained recognition at all levels – from development partners, CSOs, and the Government. CEF provided funds at crucial time of its existence and as a result, it has grown in stature. TEN/MET has received funding for the next four years.
- It is also likely that the thematic networks, such as Tanga Coalition, will be able to sustain its activities.

Attracting funds from other sources depends on the initiatives of the organisation and the calibre of its leaders. TEN/MET has an important role to build the capacities of its members to enable them to survive and sustain their activities.

What has not been achieved?

- Some, especially district-based networks, failed to sustain their activities after the ending of the CEF funding.
- The achievements in policy change have been limited. CSOs cannot point out to changes that have resulted because of their advocacy work.

Some of the failures of CSOs in Tanzania can be attributed to the unpredictability of CEF funding. CEF did not have sustained levels of funding during its operation in the country; this affected the levels of support to CSOs. Numbers of CSOs benefiting was reduced as the amount was reduced. Advocacy is rarely time bound. It takes time to build coalitions and develop appropriate advocacy strategies. CEF did not provide enough time to CSOs to build coalitions and work out strategies. Failure to effect policy changes is partly a result of failure by CSOs to understand how changes are influenced.

What drives change in Tanzania?

In order to understand what drives change in Tanzania, it is important to look at the history of education and change. The most important aspect of policy making in Tanzania is that it has been a *political* process. This was obvious during the time of the single party state.. All policies were formulated, debated and decided in the political arena. Ministry bureaucracy was *directed* to implement these policies. What made the ruling party Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) decide on a particular policy? Often policies were formulated to reflect desires of the general population as evidently politicians derive their legitimacy from the people. Every five years they have to go back to the people to be elected and therefore politicians are sensitive to the public opinion. Unlike politicians, the legitimacy of CSO leadership and that of the bureaucracies does not seem to be influenced by or dependent on public opinion.

Any policy change therefore needs to have broad public support. Despite overwhelming research evidence that children, learn best when they are taught in their mother tongue, there is no attempt by the political leadership to introduce education in the mother tongue. Similarly, despite evidence that English as a language of instruction at secondary school level is not working for the majority of students, the government is unwilling to introduce Swahili as language of instruction at the secondary and tertiary levels. When approached by the Faculty of Education to allow few secondary schools to experiment with Swahili as the language of instruction, Mr.

Mungai, the Minister of Education at the time replied, “Every day I get applications to start private secondary and primary schools. However, none of the people wanting to start private schools want to start Swahili medium schools, none at all. People want English medium schools. Parents would not allow me to permit you to play with the education of their children by teaching them in Swahili” Even during Nyerere’s time it was not possible to introduce Swahili as the language of instruction at the secondary school level. Similarly, there is no broad support on the issue of re-entry of pregnant girls to schools; in fact, there is strong opposition to the idea. Nearly everyone in the MOEVT may favour the idea but will not have the courage to change the policy unless there is broad support for it among the population.

The point is that for policy changes, CSOs have to work from the ground up with the community; to make people accept the idea and create pressure on the government to make changes. Focussing only within the upper levels will not result in achieving the desired goals. It is ironic that organisations calling themselves civil society organisations appear to have little faith in people power. In this respect, CSOs have to be well informed on use of the media to support their advocacy work.

4.2. Supporting local communities to monitor spending on education both at national and local levels

The purpose of this goal was to *support local communities to monitor spending on education*. The rationale behind this goal is to build the capacity of communities to ensure that schools receive and use the government funds as intended. Building the capacity of the community would ensure sustained monitoring. Implementing budget-tracking exercises is particularly difficult as the majority of people are not familiar with budgeting processes. Secondly, in Tanzania, there is no culture of transparency of information, especially information relating to money. Tracking of funds is also difficult because of the complex system of disbursement of funds from the central government to the councils with the process involving three ministries and regional authorities.

CEF supported TEN/MET, MORUNOFE, KIDEREA and REPOA to carryout budget tracking with the aim of seeing that the funds allocated for education reached its appropriate destinations and were used for the purpose for which they were allocated. All these efforts at budget tracking faced a similar problem: lack of transparency in accessing data. Although the government is keen to make financing of education transparent, officials at district level are reluctant to release information to the public about how much money was received and how it was spent. However, the process needs to be sustained. Currently, many districts display information on funds received from the central government on their notice boards. Schools also display funds received and expenditure similarly. The pressure on the government to ensure transparency needs to be continued.

TEN/MET carried out a study:

- To monitor how funds allocated for SCCD and INSET at national level were disbursed to districts and school levels;
- Whether spending took place as planned;
- If the training had an impact at local level resource management.

In order to carryout the study, 20 NGOs were trained on the basics of budgeting. The participating NGOs decided the track funding for school committee training and for in-service training of teachers. The study highlighted difficulty in carrying out budget tracking. Funding for various activities come from different Ministries. It was generally observed that there was a

problem with transparency and access to information. The study also found that available information was not user friendly.

MORUNOFFE carried out a study with the objective of enhancing accountability and transparency in the use of education finances to ensure equity, quality and inclusive education. MORUNOFFE monitored the disbursement of funds to the district level and tracked expenditure of funds at all levels. MORUNOFFE study aimed to look at disbursement and expenditure of capitation and development grants to schools. MORUNOFFE trained its partner organisations in carrying out the study. MORUNOFFE also faced problem of unwillingness of the district level officials to release information on funds received and disbursed.

The third network that carried out the budget tracking exercise was KIDEREA. KIDEREA carried out the exercise in ten villages in Kibondo district. The aim was to empower the stakeholders to know the budget processes and to hold the government accountable. Unlike the two other networks, KIDEREA trained 330 community members to do the budget tracking. Some of the participants in the exercise were school committee members, whose knowledge about budgeting processes should have increased their effectiveness in the school committees.

Perhaps, the most capacitated organisation to carry out budget tracking was REPOA and therefore the REPOA study attracted nationwide attention. REPOA had the expertise to carryout such study. The aim of REPOA Public Expenditure Tracking Study (PETS) was to follow the funds from the central government, through the district councils to the school level. The study found that the disbursement of the capitation and development grants from the central government to the council levels were in line with the PEDP.

The study found that the 84% of the development grant compared to 54% of the capitation grants reached schools. Major leakages were discovered in the money allocated for textbook purchases, where only 28% of the funds reached schools.

4.3. Supporting the development of innovative approaches to educating the most marginalised children (especially girls and the most vulnerable) in a way that influences a wider policy and practice

Tanzania is a graveyard of innovative approaches that have been tried. Some have worked and others have not. Even those approaches that worked have died after the project was completed. CEF has not supported many innovative approaches, perhaps because not many CSOs, especially local ones, have developed innovative approaches. The Mkombozi innovation is one of the few innovations that have been tried. Other NGOs such as Aga Khan Foundation have tried and succeeded in developing models that work to improve quality of education in the country. CARE Tanzania successfully implemented a project that focused on developing a reading culture among primary school children. Funding innovative approaches is risky because there is no guarantee that it will work as planned and therefore CEF should be commended for funding the project.

Mkombozi works with street children, most of these children have run away from home. Some of these children have been to school for one or two years and others have not been to school at all. Many of these children have been abused and are traumatised. These children would not benefit from traditional schooling or even regular MEMKWA classes as these children, after living on the street, are unable to cope with the authority structures that exist in schools. Mkombozi approach to NFE is different and more suited to the needs and situation of street children.

Mkombozi is one of the very few organisations that have been approved to provide MEMKWA. The conduct of the NEF at Mkombozi is based on their philosophy of education, which believes in the development of the whole child. Their programme is based on understanding individual, social, emotional and physical needs of the children both inside and outside the classroom. Teachers apply democratic teaching methods which are participatory, experiential, and creative and which promote active learning. Aim is to develop critical thinking, creativity and inquiring minds.

Teaching in Mkombozi NFE classes is different from normal classes. Children in Mkombozi centres have more freedom to attend. Children are not forced to attend, because that will not work. Street children attend NFE classes because they want to attend. They also attend because they find teaching and learning in these centres interesting and relevant. It is interesting because teaching is participatory and it is relevant because it meets the educational needs of the children. Mkombozi's NFE is based upon a child-centred, inquiry-based and value-based curriculum of the International Baccalaureate Organisation (IBO). This curriculum is used in many of the international schools. Learning activities are focused around key themes and not subjects as in traditional schools. Some of the themes that children learn are:

- Who we are?
- Where we are in place and time?
- How do we express ourselves?
- How does the world work?
- Etc.

Mkombozi has tried to encourage the Ministry to adapt their model and use it in the MEMKWA classes, without much success. Ministry officials were invited to observe the NFE classes and documents were shared with them. Although, all were impressed with the work that Mkombozi is doing, the approach was not taken up by the Ministry.

4.4. To promote/foster changes in government policy and practice regarding Early Childhood Development

Government of Tanzania recognises the importance of Early Childhood Care and Development (ECCD). This importance is reflected in MKUKUTA targets. This is very much in line with international research which suggests that a child's success in school and life is dependant on the quality of his or her formal and informal care and education from birth. MKUKUTA target is to increase in the number of young children prepared for schools and schools prepared ready for the children. The following strategies are proposed to achieve the target (URT 2005:13).

- Expand primary education system to develop quality pre-primary programmes that link with existing early childhood provisions – health, nutrition, parenting education etc.
- Promote community-based day-care/pre-school.
- Develop an inter-sectoral policy framework to guide early childhood development and promote pre-school learning.

Justification of forming the national ECD network is also derived from the first EFA Goal on Early Childhood Care and Development. This goal requires:

Government, across relevant ministries, has the primary responsibility of formulating early childhood care and education policies within the context of national EFA plans, mobilising political and popular support, and promoting flexible, adaptable programme for young children that are appropriate to their age and not mere downward extensions of formal school systems. The education of parents and other caregivers in better childcare, building on traditional practices, and the systematic use of early childhood indicators are important elements in achieving this goal.

There are no mechanisms set up in the country to encourage communities to establish day-care and pre-primary centres. This void can only be filled by CSO intervention. It was therefore right for CSOs to argue to have ECD included in areas for CEF support.

CEF support was crucial in the establishment of Tanzania Early Childhood Development Network (TECDEN). CEF funds also helped in the establishment of Morogoro ECD Network (MECDEN). TECDEN members debated reasons for having a network and agreed that a network was necessary:

The Tanzanian ECD Network is a group of individuals, organisations and government working in partnership to influence policies and practices related to ECD by sharing information, experiences and generating new knowledge and a shared understanding on early childhood development (TECDEN 2004:11)

CEF supported fully the establishment of TECDEN. Without CEF support, TECDEN would not have survived. CEF funds paid the salaries of all the staff, bought furniture and paid for the day-to-day operations of the network. An important question that arises is what the network would do to sustain itself now the CEF funding has ceased. Fortunately, TECDEN has managed to get support from Bernard van Leer Foundation (BvLF) which will sustain it for some time to come.

4.5. Inter-agency collaboration and internal functioning of the CEF

In this section, following issues related with the working of CEF will be discussed:

- Collaboration of three agencies
- Composition and functioning of the Management Committee
- Secretariat

Inter-agency Collaboration: The CEF represents a unique collaborative and strategic partnership between three United Kingdom based international NGOs - ActionAid International, Oxfam and Save the Children. In different countries, one of the three agencies takes the lead. In Tanzania, Save the Children is the lead agency for CEF. However, close collaboration is maintained with the other two organisations through mutual participation in the management committee (MC).

The three INGOs brought to CEF their strengths. The focus of each INGO differed; the aim of the Save the Children is on child rights, Oxfam is working on quality improvement and ActionAid works on involving communities. These different foci were the strength of the CEF management.

Management Committee: Overall, the management committee (MC) seems to have functioned well and has met regularly. MC is the decision-making body where various proposals for funding are discussed and decisions made. The three UK based NGOs have veto power and no proposal is funded without the agreement of the three NGOs.

Composition of the MC is in-balanced the international NGOs and development partners forming the majority – nine of the thirteen members are from that group. The MC consists of thirteen members, out of which two are from each of the three lead organisations, two members are from the development partners, one from European Union and one from the Canadian Cooperation Agency. Local NGOs are under – represented; only two members are from the local NGOs. The majority of the MC members were women. The MC meets once a quarter.

Minutes are kept and these are distributed to the members. It is surprising that the coordinator of TEN/MET is a member of MC. As TEN/MET has been a major beneficiary of the CEF funding, there are bound to be questions of conflict of interest. This concern was raised by the TEN/MET coordinator and was raised in the mid-term evaluation of the project.

There were several shortcomings in the way CEF functioned. First, the secretariat was small, consisting only of a coordinator. Although the coordinator was a capable person, it was expecting much for one person to monitor CEF funded activities. Therefore, at times NGOs benefiting from the funds did not deliver according to expectations. It also must have been difficult to monitor how the funds were used – mostly CEF had to depend on financial reports.

A major problem with CEF was that there was not a proper exit strategy in place. For many NGOs, the perception was that it came to an abrupt end. This is perhaps an unjustified criticism. Initially, CEF was to be a four-year undertaking and was extended by a year. It appears that decisions on how long CEF will operate were not effectively communicated to the partners.

4.6 Involvement of Corporate Sector:

One of the key components of CEF was for each country to raise additional funding through the corporate sector funding. CEF managed to raise very little additional funding, either from the corporate sector or from development partners. On the face of it, it will be in the corporate sector interest to have quality education as there are the end users of education outputs. However, there is no tradition of the corporate sector involvement in education sector apart from little ad-hoc support. A study was commissioned in 2006 (Waite and Mosha: 2006) to propose ways in which CEF can involve corporate sector in funding its activities. The study recommended several ways in which CEF can proceed to get the corporate sector to support CEF.

There are two major reasons why these recommendations were not acted upon. First, given the one man secretariat of CEF it was difficult for him to allocate time for the purpose. Secondly, this study came towards the end of CEF funding period. The usefulness of the study was affected by the timing of the study, it would have been much more useful to have commissioned the study at the beginning of the CEF initiative in Tanzania.

5.0. Conclusion

In this section the successes and shortcomings will be summarised. Overall the effectiveness of CEF on putting the EFA on national agenda has been limited. What did CEF achieve in five years of operation?

1. The major success of CEF was its support to existing networks. It is no exaggeration to state that it is through the CEF funding that TEN/MET and TECDEN survived and are in the position to attract funding from other sources.
2. CEF funding allowed NGOs to engage in budget tracking. For many CSOs this was the only time they carried out such an exercise. The process led to the development of skills among large numbers of organisations and individuals. However, the usefulness of the exercise was limited as the budget tracking exercise was not sustained. One can question the wisdom and usefulness of funding one time activities.
3. CEF funded an important research on education of the children of the pastoralist community by TAPHEN. However, the research findings were not widely disseminated.
4. CEF also funded an innovative approach to educating street children by Mkombozi Centre for Street Children. However, the approach was suffered from adequate

dissemination strategy and is yet to be mainstreamed by the government in its non-formal programmes.

Major Shortcomings of CEF:

The following were the major shortcomings of CEF implementation in Tanzania:

1. CEF, was an externally conceived and funded project based on the assumption that one size fits all. The assumption was that providing funds to CSOs will achieve the goal of putting and sustaining the goal of achieving EFA agenda without considering national environment in which CSOs operate. In Tanzania there are only few strong CSOs, many are one person operations starved of resources. Their ability of sustained advocacy is limited. Secondly, many CSOs in Tanzania paradoxically do not have their roots in society. Their accountability lies with the funding agencies and not to the community. This is not to deny that there are many well intentioned individuals working hard in CSOs, but their work is driven by the providers of funds.
2. Operation of CEF was also affected by lack of predictability of funding in terms of amount, and timing. CEF coordinator faced operational difficulties in meeting funding deadlines and CSOs faced difficulties in implementing their programmes. This was a particularly serious period which impacted on its operations.

CEF had no exist-strategy. Any good project develops it's exist strategy at the same time as it develops its entry. In the case of CEF it ended its support suddenly leaving both the Tanzanian CEF coordinator and the supported CSOs in an unenviable situation.

3. Unfortunately CEF Tanzania put very little effort on advocacy strategy. Advocacy carried out by CSOs, especially by the TENMET was limited to putting CSO position to the government. There was no effort made to build public support on various issues. For example, findings from the research conducted on the education of children of pastoralist communities by TAPHEN, was not used for public debate. Creative use of media and public debate would have put the issue squarely in the public domain. There were several of these 'opportunities lost'. Several reasons can be given for this lack of advocacy strategies.
 - It is likely that these activities carried out were not priority areas for CSOs concerned but were done because funds were available.
 - It is also true that many CSOs lack advocacy skills. TENMET has been in the process of developing a handbook on building advocacy skills among CSOs. However, production of a handbook is not going to solve the problem of advocacy, a much more concerted effort will be required.

CEF was not media savvy. There was no media use to support CEF activities as a result hardly anyone knew of CEF outside the CSO sector. This despite the fact that some CSOs like Hakielimu have used media very effectively to support their advocacy agenda.

4. Failure to attract funding from corporate sector. This was a major failure of CEF Tanzania. The major concern of the Tanzanian corporate sector in recent years has been getting people of the right calibre. It will therefore be in the interest of the corporate sector to work with the government and CSOs to ensure that schools produce graduates with the right qualities. It is surprising that CEF has failed to motivate the private sector to contribute towards improving the education sector. A study was commissioned by CEF to The purpose of this study was to identify opportunities for collaboration between business corporations and civic organisations in fostering a more inclusive and

effective public basic education system, and to advise the CEF on a strategy for promoting this. The report made several recommendations on how to get the corporate sector involved in funding education. It is unlikely that the recommendations were followed upon as the report came towards the end of CEF funding period.

- 5 Finally, CEF failed to understand that interventions in any education activity, including supporting CSOs, takes a long time before its effects are seen. Education projects, of necessity, have to be long term and CEF commitments should have been for a longer period. It is appears that CEF was conceptualised and designed by politicians and not by educationalists.

References:

AEN, TAPHEN (2006) The challenge of educating pastoralists in Tanzania: A Case Study of Hanang, Simanjiro, Monduli, Arumeru and Kiteto Districts of Northern Tanzania. Research Report

AEN, TAPHEN (2006) The challenge of educating pastoralists in Tanzania: A Case Study of Hanang, Simanjiro, Monduli, Arumeru and Kiteto Districts of Northern Tanzania. A study funded by CEF

AEN, TAPHEN (undated) Provision of Formal Education to Pastoralists: Is it a Challenge? Shorter version of the research report on pastoralist education.

Alubisia, Alex A. (undated) **UPE Myth or Reality: A review of experiences, challenges and lessons from East Africa.** A Report by Oxfam GB and ANCEFA

CEF (2004a) “Commonwealth Education Fund Stakeholders’ Forum: Proceedings of the Forum” Workshop held at the Karimjee Hall, Dar es Salaam, September 2004.

CEF (2004b) “Report of the Lesson- learning Workshop on Education Budget Tracking in Tanzania” Workshop held at the UNICEF Conference Hall, Dar es Salaam on November 10, 2004.

Kassam, Yusuf and Ruta Mutakyahwa (2007) “Pre – Core Funding/Institutional Assessment of the Tanzania Education Network/Mtandao wa Elimu Tanzania (TEN/MET) Prepared for SIDA/CIDA, Dar es Salaam

Policy Forum (undated) **A Resource Book for Trainers on Public Expenditure Tracking in Tanzania.** Created by Hakikazi Catalyst, REPOA and TGNP.

Sprechmann Sofia and Emily Pelton (2001) **Advocacy Tools and Guidelines: Promoting Policy Change** Atlanta: CARE

Sumra (2004) “Formative Evaluation of Commonwealth Education Fund” Consultancy report for the Commonwealth Education Fund (CEF), Dar es Salaam. August 2004.

Sumra (2005) “Commonwealth Education Fund (CEF) Tanzania: Review of CEF Tanzania Programme” Consultancy report for the Commonwealth Education Fund (CEF), Dar es Salaam January 2005.

TEN/MET (2006) **Strengthening Education in Tanzania: CSO Contribution to the Education Sector Review 2006** Dar es Salaam

TEN/MET (2007) **Strengthening Education in Tanzania: CSO Contribution to the Education Sector Review 2006** Dar es Salaam

URT(2000) **Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP)** Dar es Salaam

URT (2005) **National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP)** Dar es Salaam: Vice President’s Office

Waite, Mark and Mosha H.J. (2006) “Corporate- Sector Involvement in Basic Education in Tanzania” A consultancy report commissioned by CEF, Tanzania

Appendix A: Terms of Reference Commonwealth Education Fund – Tanzania Programme

Terms of Reference for Carrying out in-country CEF End-of-Project Evaluation (EPE)

Purpose of the End of Project Evaluation

The purpose of the CEF end of project evaluation is to assess performance, results, challenges and learning against the CEF objectives from the beginning to the end. The process is designed to encourage honest reflections and assessments of impact, outcomes both the positive and the challenging as well as the lessons learnt. It will also enable CEF to learn the lessons from successes and mistakes so that together with its partners and the community groups with whom the programme has worked can improve on-going and future interventions.

Specific Objectives

- ❑ To account, learn and share learning from achievements and failures – in order to meet statutory requirements of DfID, share experiences encountered and learning leading to sustaining the ‘good practises’ and leaving a legacy.
- ❑ To allow internal and external stakeholders to explore CEF Tanzania work and help it to assess impact, achievements and learning to increase synergy across the CEF-supported work.
- ❑ To increase our accountability to our domestic colleagues as well as external partners.

3. Approach and methodology to the review

The review will be approached in three phases:

Phase 1: Field data collection and analysis

This will involve the following processes:

- ❑ Meeting few key stakeholders with the view of getting responses to the key questions provided to guide the evaluation (find attached questions);
- ❑ Analysing relevant quantitative and qualitative information from other sources, e.g. new MoE policies and directives (PEDP, SEDP, ESR, MTEF); CEF partners’ plans and reports; CEF reports (quarterly, Mid-term review reports, coalition sustainability report, global log-frame, Driving the Bus report) and management communications;
- ❑ Analysis of these data in view of the CEF logical framework and the key review questions.

The consultant/facilitator is strongly encouraged to employ rigour in the analysis. Wherever possible/relevant, quantitative as well as qualitative information should be provided. The expected outcomes as set out in CEF Impact Evaluation Framework should be used as an indicative guide rather than a ‘blueprint’.

Phase 2: Workshop with key informants

This too, will be designed to discuss with key informants, including a wide spectrum of stakeholders including the alliances, networks and partners with whom the CEF fund works with, government representatives, and senior staff/education advisors from the CEF managing agencies, and donors working on education. The aim is to validate and challenge key issues in this report, thus improving the field-based information. Based on the evaluation framework and the initial information from the field, the consultant will facilitate the participants to rigorously respond to the key evaluation questions.

Phase 3: Collating field report and workshop data

Essentially, this phase will involve deskwork. The consultant will thus merge the field report and the new information generated during the stakeholders' workshop.

4. Place/venue and participants

Fieldwork

Since similar information had been sought through meetings with some CEF beneficiaries and education stakeholders during the CEF Mid-term review and Coalition Sustainability Study in Dar es Salaam, Arusha, Moshi, Korogwe, Handeni and Morogoro, the fieldwork for this evaluation will rely heavily on the contact database fieldwork maintained by CEF, focusing more on government and international stakeholders. Interviews with the CSOs will focus on those CSOs who benefited from CEF funding, international NGOs running education programmes in Tanzania and Faith-based organizations (FBOs).

Stakeholders' Workshop

In order to ensure availability and participation of government and international stakeholders, a workshop will take place in a Dar es Salaam-based venue for a maximum of one day. As indicated above, participants to this workshop will include key informants, especially partners and those working closely with vulnerable communities and learners including children (see list of participants appended).

5. Expected output of the review process

Like in all CEF countries, the final output of the evaluation process should be a short and succinct document. This document will be shared widely amongst the CEF countries and used to compile an overall Global CEF End-of-project Evaluation Report.

The evaluation report will cover progress, which is pertinent to the CEF work. It is important to ensure the evaluation and report-writing processes observe the following:

- the evidence from primary stakeholders should corroborate information on progress and outcomes;
- the document should include unanticipated outcomes (both positive and negative), new initiatives, and lessons learnt;
- the document should highlight where progress has not been made. We should particularly learn from our mistakes and share problems we have encountered;
- the report should give some sense of the scale and importance of CEF's contribution to bringing about significant changes. Other significant contributing factors should be briefly described and where possible, the sources of information and the rationale for claims explained;
- the report should examine the financial costs involved in relation to progress;
- the report should include stories, testimonies, pictures and diagrams where available;
- the report should not be more than 10 pages in length;

6. Timing

The CEF evaluation is time-bound, preferably in April but not beyond May 2008. Data collection and analysis processes are expected to take place in April so that the stakeholders' workshop can place sometimes in May. The evaluation process will be split into the following tasks:

Task	When	Days	Who
CEF Management discusses the evaluation ToR and decides way forward	3 rd - 14 th March		SC PM – Education
Terms and contract agrees with consultant	17 th – 21 st March		SC PM – Education
Documents review and inception report	24 th – 28 th March		Consultant
Field-work	31 st March - 12 th April	13	Consultant
Data analysis framework	14 th April	1	Consultant
Data analysis	15 th – 18 April	4	Consultant
Submission of 1 st draft report	21 st April	1	Consultant
Review of 1 st draft report	22 nd – 23 rd April	2	SC PM
Submission of 2 nd draft report	28 th April	1	Consultant
Preps for stakeholders' workshop	5 th – 15 th May	11	SC PM, Consultant
Workshop with stakeholders	16 th May	1	SC PM, Consultant
Collate country data	19 th – 20 th May	2	Consultant
Country report to London	23 rd May	1	SC PM
		35	

7. Line of reporting

For the purpose of this contract, the Consultant will be managed by Save the Children (UK)'s Country Director and the Education Programme Manager. On regular basis, the Consultant will have to update by both phone and email on the work's progress. At the end of the contract, the Consultant will produce a first drafts for revision and discussions as in the timing schedule above.

Appendix B: List of People met

Patrick Ngowi	CEF Coordiantor, Save the Children
Rose Mushi	Actionaid Tanzania
Chelechele Tobias	Director, Amani Early Childhood Development Center
Mwizarubi, Blastus	Program Officer, Education, CARE International
Missokia, Elizabeth	Chief Executive Officer, Hakielimu
Omari, Beatrice	Canadian Cooperation Office
Kisanji, Joseph	Coordinator, Tanzania Education Network/Mtandao wa Elimu Tanzania
Kisanga, S.	Tanzania Institute of Education
Massawe, J.	Tanzania Institute of Education
Mwenuka, S.	Tanzania Institute of Education
Seka, B.	Tanzania Institute of Education
Mushi, J	Tanzania Institute of Education
Mwaimu, Ali	Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (MOEVT)
Musoroche, L.	Commissioner/Ag. Chief Education Officer, MOEVT
Datoo, Sakina	Chairperson, Tanzania Editors Forum
Chaguto, Omari	Academic Officer, Moshi Urban
Kunda	District Education Officer
Kiwia, Sixtus	Head teacher, Kifumbu Primary School
Shayo, Mary	Teacher, Kifumbu Primary School
Shao, Jonas	Academic Officer, Monduli District
Shirima, Christopher	Head teacher, Naiti Primary School, Monduli Primary School
Raj, William	Ag. Executive Director Mkombozi
Mabagala, A.	Deputy Principal, Monduli Teachers' College
Mbuya, Monica	Tutor, Monduli Teachers' College
Shoo, Richard	Maarifa ni Ufunguo
Eatlawe, Nicodamus	Maarifa ni Ufunguo
Rosaline Castillo	Maadili Centre
Senya	Maadili Centre