

**Civil Society and the Governance  
of Basic Education**

## Executive Summary

Tanzania has made significant strides in education reform under its sub-sector programme, the Primary Education Development Plan (PEDP) (2002-2006). The major reforms include: abolishing school fees at the primary level, resulting in a radical increase in education access towards Universal Primary Education; decentralizing governance of education to the local level, with a greater financial role for school committees; and, expanding the space for civil society in policy dialogue. The basic education sector has become the Tanzanian government's poster child of success as a result.

The expansion of policy space for civil society organizations (CSOs) in the new education program is in part "created" by the CSOs themselves, through advocacy and research, the use of media, and leveraging international networks and actors. The earliest and most prominent example of this is the key role played by CSOs in the government's decision to abolish user fees, through the research of a subnational NGO, Maarifa ni Ufunguo, and the local campaigning and international connections of the Tanzanian Education Network (TEN/MET). CSOs have also been "invited" to the policy table by the government, and are allocated seats on the Basic Education Development Committee and its technical working groups, as well as at sector reviews and the design of up-coming ten-year whole-sector plan.

However, the government has also tried to contain criticism and contention from CSOs, favoring complementary service providers over watchdog and advocacy organizations. The rules for CSO engagement in the design of the sector program and its oversight are not transparent or formalized. In one case, a well-known national CSO, HakiElimu, was threatened with de-registration and prevented from publishing articles and participating in government meetings for its critical evidence-based stance on the quality of education (in contrast to the government's highlighting its achievements in access to education). Tanzania exemplifies the most contentious civil society-government relationships, in comparison to the three other case studies to which this research belongs (Burkina Faso, Mali, and Kenya); although the relationship varies between contention and complimentary relations within the case itself.

Civil society relations with donors (bilateral and multilateral) have also shifted as a result of the new sector programme. On the one hand, several CSOs noted the positive moral support provided by donors, contributing to a greater degree of CSO engagement in the policy process. Select donors were reported to be cautious but significant allies, exchanging information on policy discussions and keeping CSOs informed of government meeting reschedulings and relevant government-donor documents. On the other hand, CSOs report that there has been a decline in opportunities to meet with donors and to access NGO project finances, as donors have shifted towards providing pooled funding and direct budget support to the government. However, donors have recently begun to pool funding for a few networks and strong national CSOs, as well as providing support to the Foundation for Civil Society, through which CSOs can take-up policy and governance initiatives (although to date, there has been little evidence of the Foundation supporting education-related initiatives). Although positive, the current situation raises questions on the breadth and diversity of civil society actors supported in Tanzania.

Civil society in the education field has coalesced to form the Tanzanian Education Network (TEN/MET), which is widely recognized by donors, government and CSOs as the independent voice of civil society in education. TEN/MET is made up of a wide-range of CSO actors (from teachers' union to regional education networks), although it appears to be led in large part by NGOs. It struggles with communication challenges (as do most networks), but there is also considerable coordination among the group, which focuses its activities on advocacy, accountability and capacity building. Its common platform emphasizes equity and quality improvements, and holding the government accountable for the delivery of services. On the whole cooperative with the government, it has seen contention arise as a result of its steadfast support for its more critical members. Civil society capacity, in terms of popular mobilization and engagement with local authorities (including developing school committees), is just emerging, but shows promising signs.

## List of Acronyms

ANCEFA	Africa Network Campaign on Education for All
BEDC	Basic Education Development Committee
CCM	Chama cha Mapinduzi (main political party)
CEF	Commonwealth Education Fund
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CBO	Community Based Organization
EFA	Education for All
ESDP	Education Sector Development Plan
ESR	Education Sector Review
FCS	Foundation for Civil Society
GBS	General Budget Support (One example of a PBA)
GCE	Global Campaign for Education
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GER	Gross Enrollment Rate
HIPC	Highly Indebted Poor Country (IMF designation)
IMSC	Inter Ministerial Steering Committee
IO	International Organization (e.g. United Nations organizations)
LGRP	Local Government Reform Programme
MKUKUTA	Kiswahili term for the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty, following the PRSP (i.e. PRSP II)
MOEVT	Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (previously known as MOEC – Ministry of Education and Culture)
NGO	Non-Government Organization
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PAF	Performance Assessment Framework
PBA	Programme-Based Approach
PEDP	Primary Education Development Plan (I and II)
PER	Public Expenditure Review
PMO-RALG	Prime Minister’s Office, Regional Administration and Local Government
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Plan
SEDP	Secondary Education Development Plan
SWAp	Sector Wide Approach (One example of a PBA)
TWG	Technical Working Groups of the BEDC
TEN/MET	Tanzanian Education Network / Mtando wa Elimu Tanzania
UPE	Universal Primary Education
URT	United Republic of Tanzania

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary

List of Acronyms

1. Introduction.....	1
2. The Tanzanian Context.....	1
2.1 <i>Civil Society in Tanzania</i> .....	3
2.2 <i>Current Education Policy Landscape</i> .....	4
2.3 <i>Governance and Funding of the Education Sector Development Plan</i> .....	6
3. Civil Society Actors in Tanzanian Education.....	8
3.1 <i>International Nongovernment Organizations (INGOs)</i> .....	9
3.2 <i>National NGOs</i> .....	10
3.3 <i>Subnational NGOs and Grassroots Groups</i> .....	10
3.4 <i>Faith-based Organizations and Private Provider Groups</i> .....	11
3.5 <i>Parents Associations</i> .....	12
3.6 <i>Teachers' Unions</i> .....	12
3.7 <i>School Committees</i> .....	13
3.8 <i>Networks and Coalitions (National and Subnational)</i> .....	13
4. Activities of CSOs in Education.....	16
5. Civil Society in the Education Policy Process.....	18
5.1 <i>Key Players in Education Policy</i> .....	18
5.2 <i>Effectiveness of CSO engagement in policy</i> .....	19
5.3 <i>TEN/MET's Common Voice?</i> <i>Strengths and Challenges of an Education Network</i> .....	22
6. Relationships between Government and Civil Society Organizations .....	23
6.1 <i>Decentralization and Civil Society</i> .....	25
6.2 <i>Parliamentarians and Civil Society</i> .....	26
7. Relationships between CSOs and Donor Organizations.....	27
7.1 <i>Relations within the Basic Education Development Committee (BEDC)</i> .....	27
7.2 <i>Funding in the Context of SWAp</i> .....	27
8. Conclusion .....	29

### Tables

Table 1: Tanzanian Basic Statistics.....	3
Table 2: Tanzanian Education Statistics.....	5
Table 3: Establishment of Education CSOs in Tanzania by year and type.....	8
Table 4: Breakdown of Interview Data by type and group .....	9
Table 5: Which CSOs are doing what in Education.....	17

### Boxes

Box 1: The Trials of a Watchdog - HakiElimu & the Government .....	16
Box 2: Government Control and Network Response - The case of the Education Sector Review .....	21
Box 3: A new rural school committee .....	26

<b>Appendix 1: Documented Education CSOs in Tanzania</b> .....	32
--	----

## 1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Over the past decade civil society in Tanzania has increasingly been included in public policy making and in the country's plans for poverty alleviation and educational development. In the education sector, where the donor community adopted a Sector-Wide Approach (SWAp) of funding in 2001, it is now quite common to find government, donors and civil society representatives sitting together at the policy table. Most civil society organizations (CSOs) recognize that a fundamental shift has occurred in the availability of funding for CSO education activities, and many are attempting to take advantage of the heightened expectation of CSO participation in policy processes. However, relationships among government, donors and civil society organizations in Tanzania are not yet well institutionalized, and recent examples suggest that there are significant tensions among CSOs and between CSOs and government. CSO responses to recent changes in the education sector vary significantly, as do the capacities and opportunities enjoyed by different types of organizations.

In this case-study, we describe the key civil society organizations active in Tanzania's education sector, and explore their changing approaches to engagement in educational policy processes. To do so we draw from 64 semi-structured interviews with CSOs, government, and donor organizations conducted in Tanzania between June 25 to August 16, 2006 (see sampling Table 4 below), as well as from documentary evidence and background literature.<sup>2</sup> The case study begins by reviewing the historical, political, and economic contexts which have shaped the growth of formally organized civil society in Tanzania, and the factors that have led to recent shifts in Tanzania's education sector policies. We then present an overview of the key civil society groups active in Tanzania's education sector, drawing from our interviews to assess the range of their activities and their strengths. Following this, we look at civil society's involvement in specific aspects of contemporary education sector policy processes, detailing the key players and key interventions, and the changing nature of the relationships between CSOs, government, and donor organizations in Tanzania.

## 2. The Tanzanian Context

The changes taking place in Tanzania today - in the education sector, civil society and the political-economic environment - need to be seen within the context of the country's broader

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper is part of a multi-country study, covering Kenya, Burkina Faso and Mali, funded by the Comparative, International and Development Education Centre (CIDEDEC) of OISE-UT, the Canadian International Development Agency's (CIDA) Policy Branch and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC).

<sup>2</sup> Field research was conducted by Megan Haggerty and Caroline Manion in Dar es Salaam and Arusha, as well as with CSO representatives from Lushoto, Moshi, Mtwara and Longido. When possible, electronic and paper documents were also collected and analyzed, including annual reports, research papers, workshop manuals and media-focused advocacy campaigns. Limitations in our study include a bias towards the urban and more developed areas of the country, where most Tanzanian NGOs are located. Further studies should include perspectives from the less researched southern, central and western regions, which tend to be poorer, less externally-connected and have fewer NGOs. Other limitations were the summer timing of the study, which limited access to government (in its "quiet time") and school committees. In addition, this study focuses on main-land Tanzania, as semi-autonomous Zanzibar has different policies and SWAp development.

shift from socialism towards democracy and a liberal market system over the past twenty years. The East African country of the United Republic of Tanzania gained independence from Britain in 1961 and emerged under the leadership of the Julius Nyerere. His party, which eventually was named the Chama cha Mapinduzi (CCM), led the country under his guidance from independence to 1985, and has continued to lead the country to the present. During Nyerere's time, Tanzanian adopted a socialist development path, focused on national self-reliance and African values. Education became a focal point of Nyerere's leadership in the 1960s and 1970s. Through adult literacy programmes, the abolishment of school fees, and the introduction of Universal Primary Education (UPE) as a national policy as early as 1973, enormous gains in equity and access were achieved (Buchert, 1994; Kuder, 2004; Swai, 2004; Cooksey, Court & Makau, 1994). However, in other areas – particularly in terms of economic growth, Nyerere's leadership proved less successful. Several analysts argue that Nyerere's socialism created a widespread dependency on top-down reform, and reinforced patrimonial social relationships between political leaders and rural communities (Hyden, 1999; Barkan, 1994). At the same time, the focus on a uniquely Tanzanian form of development appears to have created a strong, widely shared sense of national identity (Miguel, 2004; Barkan, 1994).

Change came rapidly in the 1980s, when Tanzania was hit by an economic crisis, similar to that experienced by many developing nations in the aftermath of the oil crisis. Economic crisis was aggravated by Nyerere's decision to engage in war with Uganda. Education and other forms of social spending suffered in this environment. After having achieved universal primary enrollment in 1977, primary enrollment in Tanzania fell to a low of 63% (GER) by 1998 (World Bank, 2007). The reintroduction of school fees at the primary and secondary level in the early 1980s contributed to the decline in enrollments at the primary level. In response to demands for greater access to secondary level education, the Tanzanian government began to encourage the formation of private community secondary schools during the 1980s, so that by 1997, schools run by non-government providers accounted for more than a third of all schools in Tanzania (Lange et al., 2000). In the context of diminishing resources, the 1980s and early 1990s saw the government step back from educational planning and adopt a more *laissez faire* approach (Samoff, 2003; Kuder, 2004).

In 1985, Nyerere resigned and the CCM began a gradual shift from political and economic socialism to support for trade-oriented market liberalization and a multi-party democracy. Other political parties were allowed to exist in 1992, with the first multi-party elections in 1995. However, in this and subsequent elections, the CCM has maintained power, at both national and local levels. It has increasingly focused on market-led growth, public sector reform, corruption, and decentralization (Mercer, 2003). Elected in 2005, President Jakaya Kikwete of the CCM, is continuing these reforms, with added emphasis on the accountability of parliamentarians and the civil service to the ordinary citizen (Int. C13; C32; C36a; C56; D1a; D1b). These changes are indicative of Tanzania's historical trend of 'top-down democratization', whereby the highest level of the central government strongly directs the lower levels on how and when to participate (Hyden, 1999). With this comes the risk of a continuing lack of capacity for decision making at the lower levels, contrary to the rhetoric of democracy and decentralization in the country.

Today, Tanzania remains one of the poorest countries in the world, ranking 162/177 on the UNDP's Human Development Index in 2006 (UNDP, 2006). Despite consistent economic

growth from 1995-2005 (5.4% per annum), over a third of its population lives below the basic needs poverty line (URT, 2005), and some analysts have argued that the country's recent economic growth has not trickled down to the poor (UNDP, 2005). Poverty is concentrated in rural areas, but appears to be rapidly urbanizing as a result of economic growth and global integration (Hyden, 2005). Historically, Tanzania has been highly aid dependent, and, until recently, it had a high debt overhang. However, the country received significant debt relief in 2005 under the G8 debt relief initiative. This combined with the HIPC Initiative is expected to cut Tanzania's external debt by 90% by this year (AfDB/OECD, 2006).

**Table 1: Tanzanian Basic Statistics**

	1990	2004
GDP per capita (constant US\$)**	259	314
ODA as % of GDP	27.5	16.1
Total debt service (as % of GDP)	4.2	1.1
% of population on less than \$2/day (1990-2004)	..	89.9
Total population	16 million (1970)	37.6 million
Urban population (%)	11.2% (1970)	23.8%
Mortality rate, under 5 (per 1,000)**	218 (1970)	126
HIV prevalence % in adults [Female]*	..	6.5 [54.6](2005)
Children orphaned by AIDS	..	1.1 million*

Source: UNDP, 2006; \* UNESCO, 2007; \*\*World Bank, 2007

Poverty reduction is a centre-piece of the CCM's platform, and is elaborated in two Poverty Reduction Strategies, the PRSP 2000, and the 2005 National Strategy for Growth and the Reduction of Poverty (known in Kiswahili as MKUKUTA). Education is one of the main sectors addressed in MKUKUTA (URT, 2005). Civil society organizations played a role in the development of both PRSPs, although criticisms of the process have included the marginalization of non-government organizations with more radical views, and the suggestion that civil society is only included because of pressure from outside donors (Int. C9; C17; IO83; Gould & Ojanen, 2003; Evans & Ngalwea, 2001; Mercer, 2003; Igoe, 2004; Kuder, 2004).

## 2.1 Civil Society in Tanzania

Civil society in Tanzania is young, but growing quickly. Although formal, autonomous civil society organizations were major players in Tanzania's independence movement, almost all organizations, including unions and women's organizations, were absorbed into the CCM during Nyerere's rule. At the same time, this period was also defined by a 'self-reliance' ethos, consisting of substantial community participation at the grassroots. However, it was only in the context of the political and economic liberalization reforms of the late 1980s and 1990s that autonomous civil society organizations again emerged, partially due to the influx of funding from external sources (Lange et al., 2000). Between 1995 and 2000, the number of registered NGOs rose from 800 to 2900, although it is commonly held that many of these are either small or "brief-case"<sup>3</sup> NGOs (Mercer, 2003).

<sup>3</sup> "Brief-case" NGOs are NGOs that exist in name only, with no office or projects to their name. They are sometimes the start-up of hopeful new CSO entrepreneurs and other times used to divert funds.



Despite this growth, civil society in Tanzania is often described as quite weak. It suffers from a restrictive legal framework that has continued to allow the government substantial power over civil society. Dating back to British responses to the *mau mau* rebellion in Kenya, the Societies Ordinance permitted the government significant discretion to dissolve or refuse registration to societies it deemed unfit (Iheme, 2005). Despite the 1992 move towards multi-party democracy, calls for a new NGO policy and corresponding changes in law have been met with significant reluctance by the government. In 1996, the government used this Ordinance to deregister the well respected Tanzania National Women's Council, BAWATA, accusing it of being too political in its campaign to encourage more women to register to vote (Iheme, 2005; Hyden, 1999; Mogella, 1999; Nshala, 1997; Tripp, 2000).

However, an NGO Policy drafted in 1996 marked the first major Government-civil society policy collaboration in 30 years (Mogella, 1999). The fifth draft of the NGO Policy, developed in 2000, was eventually adopted, but did not formally touch the Societies Ordinance mentioned above. In particular, the new policy continued to allow the government the power to deregister NGOs for political activity (Iheme, 2005; Hyden, 1999; Mogella, 1999; Nshala, 1997). Following an unpopular NGO Bill proposed by the government, a heated public advocacy campaign was launched by NGOs in 2002 calling for a more positive legal environment for NGOs. This led to a period of quiet dialogue with the government, followed by a June 2005 Amendment to NGO laws. Under this Amendment, the Societies Ordinance is inapplicable to organizations defined as NGOs. As well, the Amendment ensures that NGOs cannot indiscriminately be refused registration, and allows for substantial NGO representation on the NGO registration board. Finally, it gives legal personality to registered NGOs (Iheme, 2005). This new act suggests a gradual shift in the government's approach to the legal autonomy of civil society organizations, in a move that is in parallel to broader changes in Tanzanian's political system, which Hyden (1999) describes as characterized by "creeping democratization"<sup>4</sup> (Duhu, 2005; Iheme, 2005). However, there remains significant suspicion among CSOs about the

The ESDP's Primary Education Development Plan 2002-2006 (PEDP), was accompanied by the abolishment of primary school fees in 2001/2002 (URT, 2001b). Access to primary education has significantly improved in Tanzania during this time, with the Gross Enrolment Rate (GER) rising from 66% in 2000 to 109% in 2005 (URT, 2005; Khainga et al., 2005). It is estimated that abolishing school fees<sup>5</sup> led to 1.6 million more children in schools (UNDP, 2005). In the same period, secondary education gross enrollment has risen from 5.9% (2000) to 11.7% (2004), with more expansion expected due to the introduction of the Secondary Education Development Plan (SEDP) from 2005-2009 (URT, 2004). Because 65% of the Education Budget goes towards primary education, the government's policies acknowledge an important role for non-governmental and community participation in secondary education and other sub-sectors, such as vocational and non-formal education. Both PEDP and SEDP programme documents cover expanding enrolment, improving quality, increasing equity, and strengthening education management.

Despite these gains, major challenges in quality, enrolment, basic resources and administration remain. At the primary level, a) enrollment is still a major issue for children with disabilities, orphans and other vulnerable children; b) the numbers of teachers and resources have not kept pace with enrollment; and, c) quality of education remains a major challenge, compounded by insufficiently trained teachers, and a lack of child-friendly, gender-sensitive pedagogies (HakiElimu, 2005a). At the secondary level, only 11.7% of children attended secondary school (GER) in 2004, low compared to neighboring Kenya (48%) and Uganda (19%) (World Bank, 2007). A mounting HIV/AIDS epidemic is increasingly impacting all levels of schooling, affecting both teachers and students (Vavrus, 2004). In the next four years alone, the government anticipates losing 14,460 primary teachers to HIV/AIDS (IRIN, 2006).

**Table 2: Tanzanian Education Statistics**

	2000	2004
Pre-primary Gross Enrollment Ratio (GER) (%)	27.7*	29.1*
Primary GER (%)	66.0	109.9* ('05)
Secondary GER (%)	5.9	11.7*
Tertiary GER (%)	0.7	1.2
Private Sector Enrollment Share – Primary	0.1	0.6
Gender Parity Index (GER in Primary and Secondary)	1.0	..
Primary completion rate (%)	52.5	56.5
Progression to secondary level (%)	19.8	33.2
Teacher to Pupil Ratio – Primary	41.4	58.3
Total education spending as % of GDP	2.2	..

Source: World Bank, 2007; \* Khainga et al., 2005

In addition to the PEDP and SEDP, the ESDP initiated several major changes in the organization of the education sector, in-line with core national reforms. Among two of the most significant changes are a) the inclusion of civil society and private sector stakeholders in the policy processes (as explored in this paper); and b) the decentralization of educational administrative structures and devolution of authority to local levels under the Local Government Reform Programme (LGRP). As part of this planned decentralization, *school committees* are now

<sup>5</sup> Other fees remain, such as uniforms, transportation, textbooks etc.

responsible for preparing budgets, financial reports and school plans. This has opened up new roles for NGOs in capacity building for school committees. Each school now receives a direct grant from the government, and is expected to open and control its own bank account. However, while school committees are responsible for the procurement of materials and ensuring that certain standards are met (such as constructing an appropriate number of latrines, classrooms, etc.), school level funds are carefully monitored by the district, and come with detailed instructions on how they should be spent. Teachers remain appointed to districts by the central government and paid by the district authority, with the District Education Officer monitoring school activities and disciplining problem staff (Int. C67; Therkildsen, 2000).

In 2006 the Tanzanian government announced that it was beginning to develop a 10 year national education sector development plan that would include all levels of education. It also requested donors to consider shifting their support from sectoral funding to direct budgetary contributions (Kenge, 2006). In line with these changes, all levels of education were included in the 2006 joint annual Education Sector Review's Aide Memoire (URT, 2006).

### ***2.3 Governance and Funding of the Education Sector Development Plan***

Tanzania's Education Sector Development Plan (ESDP) is the product of joint negotiations between government, international development partners and civil society organizations. It is managed at the highest level by the Education Sector Inter Ministerial Steering Committee (IMSC), a body consisting of the Prime Minister's Office, the permanent secretaries of the education sub-sector Ministries and the Advisory Committee, which includes the Ministries' directors of policy and planning and representatives from donors and civil society. Below the IMSC are the sub-sector development committees, including the Basic Education Development Committee (BEDC).<sup>6</sup> BEDC is composed of government representatives, CSOs and development partners (bilateral donors and international organizations). The BEDC is chaired alternately by the Permanent Secretaries of the two stakeholder ministries, the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (MOEVT) and the Prime Minister's Office – Regional Administration and Local Government (PMO-RALG) (URT, 2006).

The BEDC is responsible for key decisions such as formulating the education plans, budgets and issuing performance and audit reports. It encompasses pre-primary, primary, secondary, non formal and teacher education. The BEDC also played a large role in the first Education Sector Review (2006), a now annual event in which government, donor organizations and civil society representatives review progress in the education sector.<sup>7</sup> It oversees Technical Working Groups (TWGs) with donor and civil society members in such areas as: "Enrolment expansion";

and the PEDP, which has been the focus of recent education reforms. However, the BEDC has gradually expanded its focus to include all levels of basic education.

Since 2001, civil society representatives have been invited members of the BEDC and its TWGs. However, while the idea that civil society organizations should participate in the BEDC and its activities is acknowledged by both government and donor organizations, the precise nature of that participation has not yet been regularized, as we shall see below.

The Development Partner Group participating in the BEDC involves thirteen bilateral donors and several international organizations (e.g. UNESCO, World Bank, Unicef etc.) (Int. D11; D1). The European Commission is currently the Lead Organization of this group while the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) hosts the group's Secretariat. Different partners sit on the various Technical Working Groups. The Development Partner group is especially active in monitoring activities associated with the education sector programmes, including the annual sector review meetings and the preparation of a resulting Aide Memoire that assesses progress and provides recommendations for improvement (URT, 2006).

While it is impossible to measure, the Development Partner Group appears to wield considerable power in the education sector, particularly when compared to CSOs, not least because of the high levels of funding external donors provide to the education sector.<sup>8</sup>

education towards General Budget Support (GBS), in keeping with the recent policies announced by the Tanzanian government (Kenge, 2006).<sup>10</sup>

### **3. Civil Society Actors in Tanzanian Education**

Educational civil society in Tanzania is young. A few national education CSOs date back to the socialist era, particularly those dealing with disability issues and those that were originally



### **3.2 National NGOs**

Several national NGOs play a strong role in education in Tanzania – both in the field and at the policy table. Key national NGOs focus on a variety of issues. For example, HakiElimu monitors and advocates for quality basic education in general, while other key national NGOs focus on specific education issues, including the Tanzania Gender Networking Programme (TGNP), Amani Child (early childhood), Tanzania Book Trust (literacy) and Tecden (ICT). For many, access to funding has become an increasing concern in the SWAp environment. However, as an exception to the rule, some of the more powerful groups have been able to diversify their funding base and/or receive core funding from several bilateral donors or from international NGOs.<sup>12</sup> National NGOs are also very diverse in their activities – some are very active in advocacy, monitoring and input into the policy table, others engage the community or school committees,





organization (CSSC or BAKWATA). Although it currently has very limited personnel and resources, it currently engages in policy advocacy and would have the capacity to undertake research if it could secure funding beyond that of its membership dues.

These three CSO actors tended to have positive relations with the Ministry of Education, and received individual invitations to the policy table, outside of the TEN/MET group. These organizations were consulted by the Ministry of Education prior to the establishment of the Education SWAp (ESDP, PEDP and SEDP). At present, those interviewed indicated that the government was listening to their perspective and was cooperative at the policy table. Despite these positive relations, the groups interviewed felt that they had a right to receive at least some material or financial support from the government, in recognition of the large number of school services they provide on the government's behalf. In particular, TAMONGOSCO and CSSC felt that donors and the government wrongly generalized their members as rich, because they received funds from the "churches" or were "private schools", in contrast to the financial reality of many of their members.

weaknesses (Swai, 2004), or the tendency of the government and other CSOs to see the TTU as more linked to other unions and to wage disputes than to education advocacy issues (Int. C66; C73; C80). Since 2000, the TTU has increasingly collaborated with other CSOs and has become a TEN/MET member. It collaborated in research impacting teachers (HakiElimu, Sumra & TTU, 2004) and has co-led several Global Action Weeks (Int. C87; C79; C3; Maarifa, n.d.), using these opportunities to bring the government's attention to the connection between quality education and improved living and working conditions of teachers in Tanzania.

### **3.7 School Committees**

School committees are not purely civil society actors in Tanzania, as their organizations have been formed under the direction of the central government. However, they are an important interface for civil society involvement. Since 2002, school committees in Tanzania have been invested with new autonomy and responsibility in budget monitoring and community engagement, and as well as holding monitoring and accountability roles often associated with NGOs. Each primary school in the country now has its own bank account and school committee, comprised of the Head Teacher, teachers, parents, pupils and members from the Village/Mtaa Government (PMO-RALG, 2005). They are responsible for preparing budgets and school plans, managing funds and salaries and preparing financial reports.

Under PEDP, the schools are to directly receive funding from the Accountant General, under the direction of BEDC, in the form of: a) a *Capitation Grant* for books and materials; b) a *Development Grant* for new building construction; and c) a *Capacity Building Fund* to train school committees (URT, 2001b). There have been several challenges at the central level as to this disbursement, such as erratic disbursement of funds due to donor delays, as well as the three ministries involved in disbursing funds, contrary to PEDP policy (REPOA & MoF, 2004 cited in Yamada, 2005; HakiElimu, 2005a). However research indicates that school committees are managing these funds effectively and are transparent in publicizing accounts within the school, even though information is not posted on a notice board open to the general public (Mushi et al., 2004; HakiElimu, 2005a). Ninety percent of the school committees have received some form of training, even though the schools only received 50% of the intended *Capacity Building Fund* amount (HakiElimu, 2005a). It is of note that although decentralization policies suggest more autonomy in deciding budget allocations at the local level, this may not be the case in practice, with many of the decisions still made in a top-down manner (*see* Section 6.1 below).

School committees also have an opportunity to allow for increased parental and community engagement into local governance (Therkildsen, 2000). However, we did not find evidence of a national association for school committees to learn from each other or create a channel to collectively address common challenges with the central government.

### **3.8 Networks and Coalitions (National and Subnational)**

CSO education networks in Tanzania are both few and young, but they are an increasingly important and recognized part of the education landscape in the country. Prominent among such organizations is the Tanzanian Education Network (TEN/MET, est. 1999). TEN/MET is

recognized by donors, the government, member CSOs and non-member CSOs as the main representative of civil society organizations in education.

Launched in 1999 by 30 members, TEN/MET has grown to 171 members in 2006 of an estimated 400 CSOs in education in Tanzania (Int. C25; Ngowi, 2006; TEN/MET, 2006a). These include international, national, regional, and district NGOs as well as some faith-based organizations and the TTU. TEN/MET is a member of both the African Networking Campaign on Education for All (ANCEFA) and the Global Campaign for Education (GCE). The network is funded mainly through the Commonwealth Education Fund (CEF, 88%), with the remaining 12 percent coming from its members, notably HakiElimu (TEN/MET, n.d.). It has been seen as an example from which other networks in Africa can learn (CEF, 2005), and the founders have visited some West African networks to aid in their work (Int. C49).

TEN/MET is supposed to represent *all* education issues, but to date it has mostly focused on primary education (through PEDP), with current expansions into secondary, vocational and other sub-sectors, in order to contribute more fully to the upcoming 10 year education plan. TEN/MET members come together for events such as the GCE Global Action Week and policy input into PEDP, SEDP, the Education Sector Review (ESR), the Ten Year Plan, etc. Although TEN/MET has at least one representative NGO or branch in each of the 7 zones of the country, in some of the zones only one organization has the capacity to be this representative (Int. C68). The organization has evolved its modus operandi over the years to address previous challenges (Int. C9; C25; C49; C66; C68; C73; C87), such as:

- Policy of only 3 INGOs on the 10 member board, and more equitable distribution between those based in Dar-es-Salaam vs. the other regions.

- Independent office, so that the government, donors and other CSOs see the network as a separate entity, not representing one NGO.

- Payment for non-Dar board members travel expenses to Board meetings and the Annual General Meeting (AGM).

- Use of participatory methodology in meetings.

- 50% of the board changes every year at the AGM, for new blood and continuity.

- Demarcation of clear roles for Board and Secretariat.

- Policy of being a coordinator (but not implementer) on any project, so as not to compete with its members for funding.

- Development of collective documents, such as:

- a) TEN/MET Directory of Education CSOs (supported by JICA);

- b) Handbook of Models and Experiences of Civil Society (for better comprehension of who's doing what, and sharing innovations); and,

- c) Advocacy Handbook (to help build capacity in advocacy).

In accordance with its regional/Dar-es-Salaam, local/international balance, TEN/MET's 2006/07

overt tension between INGOs and national/subnational NGOs, which may be due to the internal policies of TEN/MET.

Two current TEN/MET members of note are Maarifa ni Ufunguo and HakiElimu. Established in 1998, the Arusha-based Maarifa ni Ufunguo housed TEN/MET in its early years. It is well-known for research on the negative effects of user-fees on poor children (Maarifa ni Ufunguo, 2000; 2003). The 2000 report was taken up by civil society internationally, including American NGOs who used it to successfully lobby their government to pass legislation prohibiting the U.S. from funding organizations supporting user fees. Following this, the World Bank removed user fees from its loan conditions, which in turn boomeranged back to Tanzania, where the government abolished school fees in 2003. The findings of the report were also presented at the 2003 World Bank workshop on 'School Effectiveness in Sub-Saharan Africa', and, through the newly formed TEN/MET, brought to the United Nations Assembly in New York and the Dakar conference on Education for All in 2000 (Int. C73; Maarifa, n.d.; CEF, n.d.).

HakiElimu, a prominent education watchdog, is widely respected by CSOs and most donors and international organizations in Tanzania. It has reached infamous status for its recently contentious relationship with the government (

### **Box 1: The Trials of a Watchdog - HakiElimu & the Government**

In the summer of 2005 HakiElimu received extensive media coverage on a report which highlighted the failure of the government to reach some of the targets stated in the PEDP, using the government's own documents (HakiElimu, 2005a). Reacting to this, the government placed an interdiction, preventing HakiElimu from "undertaking and publishing studies on Tanzania schools". It then progressively restricted HakiElimu's activities through: preventing distribution of publications to schools; withholding information and statistical data; and prohibiting media organizations from broadcasting HakiElimu adverts on PEDP and SEDP, stating that HakiElimu's activities were "contrary to public interest" and threatening "strict legal action" (Luhwago 2007; HakiElimu, 2007). Throughout 2006, the government prevented HakiElimu from representing civil society in education dialogue forums with the government, even when it had been elected by TEN/MET to represent CSOs (such as in the BEDC technical working group on Resource Allocation and Costs Efficiency; and, at the Education Sector Review – *see* Box 2). Efforts of HakiElimu to meet with the government and resolve the issue had been fruitless until HakiElimu brought the issue to the attention of the media in early 2007, which produced a wash of articles on the issue not seen since 2005. On February 6, 2007, following a meeting held between the Prime Minister and HakiElimu, the government and HakiElimu came to an agreement, and these restrictions are currently being lifted.

The case raises serious concerns about the space for dissent, independent civil society and government accountability in Tanzania. Speculation as to the rationale behind the government's harsh reaction ranged: a) Government angst at HakiElimu's extensive use of the media – "You can write any paper you want; as long as it's not in the media, no one would bother you" (Int. C10); b) Government feelings that HakiElimu had acted in bad faith, invited to the policy discussions but using insider information to discredit the government; c) What

**Table 5: Which CSOs are doing what in education?**

Type of Organization	Networks / Coalition	Subnational Network	Subnational NGO	National NGO	INGO	Membership Based	Faith-Based
<b>TOTAL Number of Orgs</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>11</b>
At the policy table	5	4	12	13	9	7	4
Advocacy	8	10	35	30	13	22	7
Monitoring	3	4	8	11	4	5	0
Research	5	4	11	18	10	10	0
Innovation (Self-professed)	2	2	21	11	9	11	0
Mobilizing Communities	5	10	39	21	12	22	0
Materials & Service Provision	4	3	74	29	15	36	4
Teacher Training	1	0	10	7	10	5	9
Capacity Building - for Members and NGOs	7	6	17	17	10	11	4
- for School/District Gov'nce	2	3	19	6	8	7	3

Source: TEN/MET Directory (2006a), supplemented by NGO websites, annual reports and interviews.

CSOs had diverse views of their own strengths and weaknesses, creating a very nuanced picture. Many networks and many national and international NGOs saw advocacy and monitoring (often paired) and their role in education policy as their greatest achievement. In particular, they used a strategy of making sure an issue is in the policy documents, that it has a budget line and indicators, and then track its progress (Int. C3; C14; C54). Other subnational and national NGOs, as well as networks, spoke of their strength in publishing ordinary language versions of government documents and organizing citizens' responses to the government (Int. C9; C14; C16; C26; C65). NGOs at all levels referred to their work in mobilizing communities or school

(Research on Poverty Alleviation)<sup>16</sup>, who researches certain issues, and then gives the information to national and subnational NGOs for their advocacy and policy work. A similar strategy had evolved with the only specifically media-based CSO, the Tanzania Media Women's Association (TAMWA), who provided information to journalists (Int. C3; C8; C65; Kiondo, 1999). In order to improve the effectiveness of CSOs research and its impact on policy, one INGO representative suggested creating a repository for reports and having them peer reviewed to ensure quality (Int. C72).

Most CSOs admitted they needed to make greater use of the media, but said that it was expensive, difficult to direct, and seen as a threat to the government (often citing the HakiElimu situation, Box 1). Media engagement occurred mostly at the national level, where national CSOs often strategically placed inserts in major newspapers or on television/radio as part of their campaigns (Int. C5; C9; C25; C65), encouraging citizens and parliament to ask questions and hold the government's Executive to account (Int. C9; C14; C66). Media was also used to stimulate action at the district level through radio, particularly for Public Expenditure Tracking (Int. C88).

## **5. Civil Society in the Education Policy Process**

The importance of civil society participation in policy is clearly articulated in Tanzania's poverty reduction strategy papers (URT, 2000; URT, 2005), and the related sub-SWAp documents for primary and secondary education (URT, 2001b; URT, 2004), particularly in the roles of "planning, implementation, and monitoring activities", "policy analysis and advocacy", "accountability", "shar[ing] information" and "mobilizing and enhancing community participation."

### **5.1 Key Players in Education Policy**

The key movers and shakers in education policy can be divided into three groups, based on our interviews. The most significant is TEN/MET and NGOs representing TEN/MET in BEDC, and BEDC's Technical Working Groups and Advisory Committee. TEN/MET representatives are appointed by the elected TEN/MET board, based on their expertise in the area and their location in Dar es Salaam, and constitute a purposeful mix of mainly national and international NGOs. NGOs most commonly mentioned across all interviews included two national (HakiElimu and TGNP), one subnational (Maarifa ni Ufunguo), and four international (Save International, Oxfam, ActionAid and Care International).

The second group, also present in BEDC meetings, consisted of those NGOs who had individual relations with the government, were mostly service providers and were mostly outside of the TEN/MET circle, such as the association of managers and owners of non-governmental schools

with the Ministry of Education (MOEVT) to take specific programmes for educational improvement to scale nation-wide.

The third group consisted of NGOs and networks that are working on policies other than basic education such as the NGO Policy Forum (budget tracking of education cluster in MKUKUTA),



Creation of the Tanzanian Early Childhood Development and Education Network (TECDEN), which after much dialogue, broke through the government department's "silo" style, and brought every ministry connected to early childhood development to a common table with civil society and donors. (Int. C33; C49; C54; C60)

Although still pending, advocacy for changing informal 'policy', in order to support the re-entry of pregnant teenagers into schools. (Int. C3; C8; C25; C65)

Despite interventions in poverty and education policy, CSOs and past research have spoken critically about civil society's participation in the policy processes (Mercer, 2003; Igoe, 2004; Kuder, 2004; Evans & Ngalwea, 2001). Education CSOs have indicated that they often do not feel heard in meetings with the Ministry (Int. C9; C18; C25; C66; C68; C78; C79; C87). In respect to the first PRSP, Evans and Ngalwea (2001) warned of the marginalization of NGOs with more radical views and the government's preference to opt for NGOs willing to "rubber-stamp" initiatives – both which appear to have played out at the Education Sector Review in January 2005 (*See Box 2*). At least one NGO also found it had a greater impact on policy through other forms of engagement than through what it saw as a dysfunctional consultation process (Int. C14). CSOs involved in education policy felt that the government had chosen too short a timeframe for civil society to get proper feedback from the regions (Int. C9; C26; C49; C87), reflecting recommendations that had been made to improve CSO involvement in MKUKUTA (IMG, 2005). As well, at least two participants suggested that there were more civil society voices involved in the policy process five years ago (Int. C4; C49), and that the NGOs who were smaller, quieter or working close to the ground had been "weeded-out". This is perhaps due to TEN/MET's dominance in the policy arena (Int. C4) or to the NGOs lack of time/resources needed to participate (Int. C54).

Several suggestions were given in order to increase the effectiveness of CSOs in education policy. Research is one area where CSOs have made an impact on policy, but they also acknowledge that only a few CSOs currently have the capacity to carry out good research. As mentioned earlier, a repository for peer-reviewed reports would aid in ensuring that good research was taken note of. CSOs were very critical of donors conducting research because of a home-country's interest in a certain area (such as school mapping or ITC), instead of based on local Tanzanian needs.

In fact, several CSOs felt that donors' subtle conditions on funding often had more of a direction in CSOs activities than the needs of local Tanzanians. One strategy that was used by several more successful organizations was to diversify their funding base so that one donor did not provide more than one-third of the total funding. This not only gave them greater freedom in meeting Tanzanian needs and covering administration costs, it also reduced their dependence on any one donor.

**Box 2: Government Control and Network Response -  
The Case of the Education Sector Review**

### **5.3 TEN/MET's Common Voice? Strengths and Challenges of an Education Network**

One reason why civil society has been able to affect education policies in Tanzania may be their ability to unite under a strong common voice. In our interviews, TEN/MET was seen overwhelmingly as representing the collective voice of education CSOs in Tanzania. Although most CSOs stated that they had diverse opinions and disagreed on many things, they also felt that the strength of a collective voice was extremely important in this work, because “If you want to dialogue with the government, you can’t dialogue with one organization, no matter how big it is. You need a strong voice, voices from all places” (Int. C54) – without a common voice, “they marginalize you” (Int. C66).

The downside of this common voice is that TEN/MET has become “the only voice that collectively speaks for civil society,” with other NGO voices “weeded out”, particularly smaller or quieter NGOs or those working on the ground (Int. C4). Some participants suggest that there were fewer voices involved in the policy process today than five years ago (Int. C4; C49). One central CSO/researcher commented on the current pressure for NGOs to be part of a network (Int. C48).

Outside of a core group of TEN/MET members, interviewees mentioned that many CSOs weren’t very active in contributing to TEN/MET’s national policy dialogue (Int. C4; C23; C24;

subnational CSOs usually had lower capacity in advocacy or policy, and were cash-strapped for communication. This resulted in a reduction of their input (Int. C27; C34; C38; C56; C85; IO81).

## **6. Relationships between Government and Civil Society Organizations**

The relationship between the Ministry of Education (MOEVT) and CSOs in Tanzania is a mix of contention and cooperation. All groups that we interviewed agreed that they are working towards the same goals of education, outlined by the MKUKUTA and PEDP. But they held different opinions on the role that civil society should play in achieving this end.

One government official told us that the main role of civil society was to “complement” the government’s efforts, stating that the Education Training Policy of 1995 clearly acknowledges that the government cannot be the sole *provider* of education (Int. G1). This official also saw the value of CSOs bringing information from the ground and expertise in certain areas to the BEDC and Technical Working Groups (Int. G1). Particular roles seen to be of value included service provision, teacher and committee training or materials contribution. CSOs that fit these roles, such as faith-based organizations and larger service-providing NGOs, generally spoke of positive relations with the government; many had relations with the government dating prior to 2000. Several INGOs with select innovations also fit this category, as they had been specially sub-contracted to train government or school officials. One INGO mentioned that this relationship gave them an added “strategic position” to advocate within the Ministry, because they can work cooperatively with the government (Int. C3). It is of note that these same CSOs were the ones

made them fearful of being critical of the government (Int. C78). One network noted that it is very important not to focus all of one's efforts on a relationship with the government, as the government's door may close at any time (Int. C9).

CSOs speculated that the government might purposely be trying to diminish civil society's voice: by limiting access to information (Int. C9; C18; C25; C68); by not sending official notice of meetings or changes to meetings (Int. C25; D11); by not giving ample time for networks to get feedback from their members and come up with credible responses (Int. C25; C49; C87); by taking decisions without reaching consensus from the donor and civil society stakeholders (Int. C18; C48; C66; C79)<sup>17</sup>; and by giving more credence to donor responses (Int. C6; C9; C25; C66; R71). Some CSOs felt that the government representatives only came to civil society meetings if there was not something better to attend (Int. C18), or if there was a sitting fee (Int. C66; C85). One CSO expressed that they felt like the "by-the-way" people (Int. C9) – that they were 'obliged' by government to produce reports on their activities, missions, resources, etc., but the government was not required to reciprocate this obligation in terms of sharing information. Communication was very much "One way traffic!" (Int. C18).

On the other hand, the government representative noted that although CSOs were generally "on plan", there were instances of CSO "non-adherence to national education standards" (Int. G1).<sup>18</sup> CSOs were felt not to be transparent in their activities, such that the government was unclear about which part of the education plan they were complementing. We learned from several key bilateral donors that the Tanzanian government also felt that CSOs were not transparent in their funding details (Personal correspondence, April 19, 2007).

All groups noted an increased lack of trust between civil society and the government since the HakiElimu affair started in the summer of 2005 (Int. G1; C18; C54; C66; D1; D21). The situation had improved slightly since January 2006. Given the government's very recent decision to lift its restrictions on HakiElimu, it is possible that the situation has improved since the time of our interviews.

CSOs receive almost no financial support from the central government and very little from the local governments (Int. C25; C50; C55; C56; C68; C74; C77; C78; C85). This was the case even when the policy indicated that local government should be funding CSOs, such as funding for the Teacher Resource Centres. The two nation-wide exceptions are where the government has sub-contracted to a few INGOs to take exceptional programmes to scale, and where the government has allocated funds for school committee training which can be undertaken by CSOs.

---

<sup>17</sup> This particular reference is to when the government implemented a Secondary teacher-training "Crash Course" of *one month* in order to address the up-coming shortage of secondary teachers, (caused by an increase of students able to attend secondary school, having received education because of PEDP). This course just popped into being – without being discussed with CSOs.

<sup>18</sup> One example given was when certain INGOs build classrooms without checking or negotiating changes to government building specifications.

## **6.1 Decentralization and Civil Society**

In contrast to the increased space for CSOs at the central level, albeit with questions around the



## **7. Relationships between CSOs and Donor Organizations**

### ***7.1 Relations within the Basic Education Development Committee (BEDC)***

In our interviews, donors' relations with CSOs within the BEDC were characterized as positive, although CSOs often felt that the government gave more weight to donors' opinions than to civil society (Int. C9; C63). A mutual exchange of information occurs between donors and CSOs, even though relations tended to be informal and ad hoc (Int. C73; D11). CSOs pass information from the grassroots, and sometimes use the donors "to push the issues" (Int. C66), while donors keep CSOs in the loop by making sure that CSOs are aware of government changes to meetings. Sometimes donors pass inside information and government reports along to CSOs. Despite this positive relationship, donors felt that they needed to be careful of not being accused by the government of interference – particularly when government relations with CSOs were strained due to HakiElimu and the boycott of the Education Sector Review (Int. D1; D11; D21). Donors were also critical of CSOs research capability, and wished for better policy input from CSOs.

### ***7.2 Funding in the Context of SWAp***

Although SWAps appear to have coincided with increased policy space for CSOs, many CSOs spoke about the negative affect that the sector programme has had on their funding. Whereas previously CSOs were able to approach donors directly for funding, many donors now told them







criticism and contention from CSOs at the policy table, favoring complementary service providers over watchdog and advocacy organizations.

The main voice of civil society in policy processes is the Tanzanian Education Network (TEN/MET), which is widely recognized by donors, government and CSOs as the independent voice of civil society in education. TEN/MET is made up of a wide-range of CSO actors (from the teachers' union to regional education networks), although it appears to be led in large part by NGOs. Although it struggles with communication challenges (as do most networks), there is considerable coordination among the group in the national policy arena. Its common platform emphasizes equity and quality improvements, and holding the government accountable for the delivery of services. On the whole cooperative with the government, it has seen contention arise as a result of its steadfast support for its more critical members.

Despite the common voice of TEN/MET, there continues to be considerable variation in CSO responses and capacities across the sector. Civil society organizations represent many different interests, of which only some form into a consensus and are brought up by TEN/MET. Overall, however, we found few examples of fissures between subnational, national and international NGOs and other groups, even though many CSOs stated that TEN/MET members came from disparate positions and disagreed on many points. Of those identified, some of the more challenging tension are between religious and secular education; and the uncertainty about the role of private (mainly faith-based) providers.

The reach and capacity of TEN/MET members, and education CSOs in general, varies widely between regions and between types of organizations. For example, the national parents' association appeared non-engaged in policy processes; while the teachers' union is slowly growing in research and advocacy capacity (even though it had been side-stepped early in the PEDP formation process). Civil society capacity, in terms of popular mobilization and engagement with local authorities (including developing school committees), is only just emerging.

Relations between civil society and the government in Tanzania are the most contentious of the four case studies to which this research belongs (including Burkina Faso, Mali and Kenya); although within the case itself the relations vary from complementary to contentious. The vision of civil society's role in education policy is at the heart of government-CSO relations: government, donors and CSOs all agree that CSOs have a legitimate role to play in national

consensus, as contention may arise from the very act of monitoring government implementation and holding the government to account.

Relationships between civil society and donors have also shifted as a result of the new sector programme, although CSOs exhibit a clear continued dependency on foreign funds for their operations. On the one hand, donors have positively supported civil society participation at the policy table, quietly notifying CSOs when the government has rescheduled meetings, and informally advocating for CSOs right to freedom of speech. On the other hand, CSOs report that there has been a decline in opportunities to meet with donors and decreased funding for civil society projects as donors shifted towards providing pooled funding and direct budget support to the government. In a positive light, donors have recently begun to pool funding for a few networks and strong national CSOs, as well as to provide support to the Foundation for Civil Society, through which CSOs can take-up policy and governance initiatives (although to date, there has been little evidence of the Foundation supporting education-related initiatives). However, funding for subnational NGOs located in underrepresented regions and for service provision and advocacy/monitoring CSOs targeting marginalized groups remains tentative. As well, although recently formed regional and thematic networks have potential to enhance their present role at the policy table, both their capacity to bring grassroots voices up to the table, and their financial sustainability will need to be addressed. Careful consideration should be given in how various funding arrangements affect the breadth and diversity, as well as the autonomy and freedom of expression, of civil society in Tanzania.

In conclusion, civil society engagement in basic education policy processes in Tanzania shows great promise for the future; particularly in the case of TEN/MET, its stronger members and related networks. However, the full potential of civil society is also dependent on the greater legal and political environment in which it operates – particularly the existence of clear and transparent terms of engagement with the government. Donors can also play a positive role in encouraging the voice of civil society, through both quiet support and financial means. Through the maturation of civil society engagement in education policy processes, civil society has the potential to achieve not only an improvement in the education system, but an increase in citizens' representation and pro-poor voice.

## Appendix 1: Documented Education CSOs in Tanzania

Type	Name	Location
<b>National Network</b>		
	FemAct	Dar es Salaam
	Global Network of Religions for Children (GNRC)	Dar es Salaam
	NGO Policy Forum	Dar es Salaam
	Tanzania Coalition for Social Development (TACOSODE)	Dar es Salaam
	Teachers Resource Centres Coalition (TRCC)	Dar es Salaam
	TECDEN	Dar es Salaam
	TEN/MET	Dar es Salaam
	Tanzania Pastoralists and Hunter-Gatherers Education Network (TAPHEN)	Arusha
<b>Subnetwork</b>		
	Aru-Meru Education Network / Mtandao wa Elimu Arumeru (MEA)	Arusha
	Arusha Education Network (AEN)	Arusha
	Manyara Early Childhood Education Network (MECDEN)	Arusha
	Meru Education Network	Arusha
	Monduli NGO Network	Arusha
	Kibaha Education Network	Coast
	Kilimanjaro Education Network	Kilimanjaro
	Same Education Network	Kilimanjaro
	Southern Highland Network (SHL NETWORK)	Mbeya
	Children Development Trust Fund Network (CDTFN)	Morogoro
	Morogoro Early Childhood Development Network	Morogoro
<b>International NGO</b>		
	Action Aid International Tanzania (AAITz)	Dar es Salaam
	Africare	Dar es Salaam
	Aga Khan Foundation (AKF)	Dar es Salaam
	Aga Khan Institute for Educational Development	Dar es Salaam
	Aide et Action	Dar es Salaam
	Care International in Tanzania (CARE)	Dar es Salaam
	Caritas Dar es Salaam (CARITAS)	Dar es Salaam
	Commonwealth Education Fund (CEF)	Dar es Salaam
	Education Development Centre (EDC)/RTI International	Dar es Salaam
	Forum for African Women Educationalists (FAWETZ)	Dar es Salaam
	Helen Keller International (HKI)	Dar es Salaam
	Netherlands Development Organization (SNV Tanzania)	Dar es Salaam
	Oxfam GB in Tanzania (Oxfam GB)	Dar es Salaam
	Plan International in Tanzania (PLAN)	Dar es Salaam
	Save the Children (UK), Tanzania Programme	Dar es Salaam
	Sight Savers International (SSI)	Dar es Salaam
	Voluntary Services Overseas Tanzania (VSO)	Dar es Salaam
	Water Aid Tanzania	Dar es Salaam
	World Food Programme/School Feeding Programme (WFP/SFP)	Dar es Salaam
	World Vision Tanzania	Dar es Salaam
	Farm Africa	Arusha
	MS-TCDC	Arusha
	Marcus Garvey Foundation Tanzania	Coast
<b>National NGO</b>		
	Amani Early Childhood Care and Development (AMANI ECCD)	Dar es Salaam
	Centre for School Improvement and Educational Innovation (CESIEI)	Dar es Salaam
	Child in the Sun Centre	Dar es Salaam
	Christian Social Services Commission (CSSC)	Dar es Salaam
	East African Student Service Organization - Tanzania Chapter (EASSO-TAN)	Dar es Salaam
	HakiElimu	Dar es Salaam
	Human Ecological, Moral Reformation Foundation (HEMOREFO)	Dar es Salaam
	Kapsel Education Centre Ltd. (KAECE)	Dar es Salaam
	Mwalimu Nyerere Foundation	Dar es Salaam
	National Muslim Council of Tanzania (BAKWATA)	Dar es Salaam
	Olof Palme Orphans Education Centre (OPOEC)	Dar es Salaam
	Promotion of Education Link Organization (PELO)	Dar es Salaam

## Tanzania - Civil Society and the Governance of Basic Education

St. Alban's Street Society (Tuamoyo Street Children Society)	Dar es Salaam
TADREG	Dar es Salaam
TAMWA	Dar es Salaam
Tanz. Assoc. of Managers and Owners of Non-Governmental Schools and Colleges (TAMONGOSCO)	Dar es Salaam
Tanzania Association of the Deaf / Chama cha Viziwi Tanzania (CHAVITA)	Dar es Salaam
Tanzania Association of the Disabled (TAD) / Chama cha Walemavu Tanzania (CHAWATA)	Dar es Salaam
Tanzania Association of the Mentally Handicapped (TAMH)	Dar es Salaam
Tanzania Book Support Trust	Dar es Salaam
Tanzania Education and Information Services Trust (TanEdu)	Dar es Salaam
Tanzania Episcopal Conference (TEC)	Dar es Salaam
Tanzania Gender Networking Programme (TGNP)	Dar es Salaam
Tanzania Home Economics Association (TAHEA)	Dar es Salaam
Tanzania League of the Blind (TLB)	Dar es Salaam
Tanzania Society for the Blind (TSB)	Dar es Salaam
Tanzania's Teachers' Union (TTU)	Dar es Salaam
Women Advancement Trust (WAT) - Human Settlements Trust	Dar es Salaam
Women's Legal Aid Centre (WLAC)	Dar es Salaam
Yatima Group Trust Fund	Dar es Salaam
Human Rights Education and Peace International (HUREP-TRUST)	Arusha
Community Development Research Foundation	Coast
Youth Partnership Countrywide (YPC)	Coast
Christian Council of Tanzania (CCT)	Dodoma



## Tanzania - Civil Society and the Governance of Basic Education

---

	Reste Youth Training Trust Fund	Dar es Salaam
	Shivyawata	Dar es Salaam
	Tanzania Albinos Society	Dar es Salaam
	Children for Children's Future	Arusha
	Children of the Street Welfare Association	Arusha
	Community Environmental Conservation and Preservation Association	Arusha







## Tanzania - Civil Society and the Governance of Basic Education

## Tanzania - Civil Society and the Governance of Basic Education

- Samoff, J. (1979b). Education in Tanzania: Class formation and reproduction [Electronic version]. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 17(1).
- Samoff, J. (1987). School expansion in Tanzania: Private initiatives and public policy [Electronic version]. *Comparative Education Review*, 31(3), 333-360.
- Samoff, J. (1990a). Decentralization: The politics of interventionism. *Development and Change*, 21.
- Samoff, J. (1990b). "Modernizing" a socialist vision: Education in Tanzania. In M. Carnoy & J. Samoff (Eds.), *Education and Social Transition in the Third World* (pp. 209-273). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Samoff, J. (1990c). The politics of privatisation in Tanzania [Electronic version]. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 10, 1-15.
- Samoff, J. (2003). Institutionalizing International Influence. In R. Arnove & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Comparative Education* (2nd ed.). Toronto: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Sekwao, N., & MOEC. (2004). *National report on the development of education 2001-2004*. Geneva Switzerland: United Republic of Tanzania.
- Seppala, P. (2000). Towards local partnerships: The social interfaces of aid in rural Tanzania. Helsinki: Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland. Retrieved August 15, 2005, from <http://global.finland.fi/julkaisut/towards.pdf>
- Stambach, A. (2000). *Lessons from Mount Kilimanjaro: schooling, community, and gender in East Africa*. New York: Routledge.
- Sumra, S. (2005). CEF Global Midterm Review: Tanzania Programme Report [Electronic version]. Commonwealth Education Fund.
- Swai, F. (2004). *Organize or die: Exploring the political and organizational activities of the Tanzania Teacher Union [Electronic version]*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.
- Tanzanian Coalition on Debt and Development.(n.d.) Lessons learned from TEN/MET's experience on monitoring the impact of cost sharing in primary school education. Hakikazi Catalyst. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from <http://www.hakikazi.org/tcdd/lesson.htm>
- TEN/MET. (n.d.) Our donors. Retrieved November 15, 2006 from <http://www.tenmet.org/our-donors.html>
- TEN/MET. (2005a). Tanzanian Education Network (TEN/MET) Newsletter. No. 1. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from <http://www.commonwealtheducationfund.org/downloads/Tanzania%20Tenmet%20newsletter%20no%201%202005.pdf>
- TEN/MET. (2005b). Tanzanian Education Network (TEN/MET) Newsletter. No. 2. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from <http://www.commonwealtheducationfund.org/downloads/Tanzania%20Tenmet%20newsletter%20no%202%202005.pdf>
- TEN/MET. (2006a). *Directory of Education CSOs, 2006: Civil society organizations working to improve education in Tanzania*. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: TEN/MET.
- TEN/MET. (2006b). *Strengthening Education in Tanzania: CSO contributions to the Education Sector Review 2006*. Dar es Salaam: TEN/MET.
- Therkildsen, O. (2000). Contextual issues in decentralization of primary education in Tanzania [Electronic version]. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 20, 407-421.
- Treichel, V. (2005). Tanzania's growth process and success in reducing poverty. IMF Working Paper, 5(35). Retrieved October 20, 2005, from <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/wp/2005/wp0535.pdf>
- Tripp, A. M. (2000). Political reform in Tanzania: The struggle for associational autonomy [Electronic version]. *Comparative Politics*, 32, 191-214.
- Tsikata, Y. M. (2001). *Owning economic reforms: A comparative study of Ghana and Tanzania*. Paper presented at the World Institute for Development Economics Research (UNU/WIDER). <http://www.wider.unu.edu/publications/dps/dp2001-53.pdf>.

