Civil Society and the Governance
of Basic Education

Tanzania Country Field Study

October 25, 2007

By: Megan Haggerty, Masters Candidate (lead author)
Caroline Manion, PhD Candidate
& Karen Mundy, Associate Professor

Comparative and International Development Education Centre, OISE/UT
civilsocietyandeducation@gmail.com

Country case studies are available on the project website:
http://cide.oise.utoronto.ca/civil_society/

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]

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 Tanzanian between June 25 to August 16, 2006 (see sampling Table 4 below), as well as from documentary evidence and background literature.[2] 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

---

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

[2] 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"[3] NGOs (Mercer, 2003).

---

[3] "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"[4] (Duhu, 2005; Iheme, 2005). However, there remains significant suspicion among CSOs about the government's willingness to allow CSOs to play autonomous and critical roles within Tanzanian society.

2.2 Current Education Policy Landscape

The government of Tanzania has achieved much in education during the last 10 years, in contrast to the deterioration that occurred in the education system during the 1980s and 1990s. The 'Education and Training Policy' (URT, 1995), which remains the overarching policy on education today, was the government's first national education plan since Nyerere's era (Kuder, 2004). In 2001, the international donor community and the Tanzanian government embarked on a Sector-Wide Approach (SWAp) for education, with the establishment of the Education Sector Development Programme (ESDP) (URT, 2001a). Initially, however, only the primary and secondary education sub-sectors developed comprehensive, costed implementation plans.

---

[4] "Creeping Democratization" refers to the slow and top-down process of democratization, with no rush on the part of the government. As Hyden writes, the government "prefers to manage the process of transition carefully, balancing the pursuit of political liberalization with concerns about its effects on the prospects for civil peace and social harmony, two values that are very important to most Tanzanians" (Hyden, 1999, p. 146).

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[5] 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

---

[5] 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

Tanzanian'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).[6] 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.[7] It oversees Technical Working Groups (TWGs) with donor and civil society members in such areas as: "Enrolment expansion"; "Quality improvement"; Institutional arrangements"; "Resource Allocation, Cost Effectiveness and Funding; and "Cross-cutting issues" such as gender, environment and HIV/AIDS (Dyer, 2005; Mushi et al., 2004). Until recently, the BEDC mostly dealt with the primary sub-sector

---

[6] The two other sub-sector committees are the Tertiary and Higher Education Development Committee (THEDC) and the Folk and Vocation Education Development Committee (FVEDC).

[7] The Education Sector Review is hosted by the IMSC. It culminated in the Aide-Memoire (URT, 2006), which considered inputs from all education fields, and documents such as the Education Sector PER (Khainga et al., 2005); the Joint Review of PEDP (Mushi et al., 2004); Education Sector Situation Analysis (Carr-Hill & Ndalichako, 2005); and, Education Sector PAF (Pfaffe & Smith, 2005).

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.[8] Foreign aid constituted 26% of the education sector budget in 2005/06 (mainly allocated in the development budget) (Khainga et al., 2005). Funding for education comes through several modalities, including pooled funding support for the PEDP from the "like-minded donors"[9]; and sector support for the PEDP and SEDP from the World Bank (Dyer, 2005). In addition, project support is still prevalent for teacher education, classroom construction and school mapping (mainly from the U.S. and Japan). However, following a programme-based approach, these major projects also increasingly harmonized with the government's overall education plan.

External funding for education, particularly primary education, has been given under the funding and organizational rubric of a sector-wide approach (SWAp), whereby donors, the government and civil society/private sector actors coordinate to support a government-led and locally-owned education sector plan. Technically, Tanzania's case was considered "SWAp-like" or a "sub-SWAp", as it originally addressed only the primary education sub-sector. The education SWAp is one example of a more general donor trend towards "Programme-Based Approaches" (PBAs) in Tanzania and abroad, which are similar to SWAps but can include broader initiatives encompassing multi-sectors, thematic areas of intervention or entire national poverty reduction strategies (Lavergne & Alba, 2003). Tanzania is one country in which the PBA approach is quite advanced, with considerable effort aimed at donor harmonization and coordination. Since 2006, a large number of donors have signaled their willingness to move away from a sector approach in

---

[8] Recent policy analyses agree that, in general, domestic political considerations determine the speed and direction of reform, not donor pressure (*see* Mmari, Sundet & Selbervik, 2005; Lawson & Rakner, 2005). However, our research indicates that in the tripartite relationship of government, donors and CSOs at the policy table, donor influence clearly outweighed CSO influence.
[9] Including Canada, the Netherlands, United Kingdom, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Ireland, Finland and the European Commission.

education towards General Budget Support (GBS), in keeping with the recent policies announced by the Tanzanian government (Kenge, 2006).[10]

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 connected to the ruling CCM party, including the Tanzanian Teachers' Union (TTU), the Tanzanian Parents' Association (WAZAZI) and the National Muslim Council of Tanzania (BAKWATA). Most international NGOs significantly active in education were established prior to 1996; whereas local and national NGOs show a reverse trend, ballooning in the late 1990s. The majority of networks (national and subnational), and membership-based organizations have only emerged since 1999, even though they play a significant role in education policy today. The most prominent network in the education sector is the Tanzanian Education Network (TEN/MET), which plays an important role in organizing civil society responses to national education policies. Table 3 below, drawn from interviews, websites and the TEN/MET Directory (2006a), shows the dates when education sector CSOs were established in Tanzania.

Table 3: Establishment of Education CSOs in Tanzania by year and type

	Total	1955-1984	1985-1989	1990-1994	1995-1999	2000-2005
Networks/Coalitions (Nat'l, Sub-Nat'l)	16 (7,9)	1 (1,0)	0	0	2 (2,0)	13 (4,9)
INGO/Regional	22	7	1	5	4	5
National NGO (Membership, Faith)	21	4	1	5	5	7
National Membership-based Organizations	13	3	2	2	2	4
National Faith-based Organizations	4	3*	0	1	0	0
Subnational NGO* (Membership, Faith)	71 (28, 5)	3 (2,1)	3 (2,1)	8 (2,0)	26 (9,1)	31 (13,2)
TOTAL	148	21	7	21	39	60

Source: Reported years in TEN/MET (2006a), supplemented by NGO websites, annual reports and interviews.
*Including Membership-based and Faith-based groups, estimates based on available data.

Although dates of establishment were found for 148 active education civil society organizations in Tanzania, interviewees offered a much larger estimate of approximately 400 CSOs in the education sector (Int. C25) of which 202, documented in the TEN/MET Directory[11], are in

---

[10] Donors who now give most of their aid through General Budget Support include Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Norway, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the World Bank and the African Development Bank. The European Commission's support will be in the form of sector-specific budget support, but complementary to the General Budget Support (Int. D2). Several agencies are continuing support for the education sector only through projects and programmes, such as JICA, USAID, UNESCO and UNICEF. The World Bank continues to be the largest supporter of Secondary Education through a sector-specific loan.
[11] A list of Education CSOs in Tanzania can be found in Appendix 1.

contact with the network. Our research covered 52 civil society organizations. Table 4 below gives a breakdown of our informants by type and level of organization. While our sample was clearly biased towards organizations with an urban, coastal base, we did manage to cover most types of civil society organizations. We used a snowball methodology, attempting to meet with any organization mentioned as significant during our interviews with CSO, government and donor representatives.

Table 4: Breakdown of Interview Data by Type and Group

Type	Organizations	Participants	Interviews
Networks/coalitions (National, Subnat'l)	7 (5,2)	8	6
Subnational NGOs	13	19	13
National NGOs	13	17	15
INGO/Regional NGOs	13	13	13
Faith-based Organizations	2	5	4
Teachers' Unions	1	2	1
Parents' Associations	..	..	..
Researchers	3	3	3
School Committees	1	6	1
Community Schools	..	..	..
Development Partners (Donors & IOs)	9 (5, 4)	14 (7, 7)	9 (5, 4)
Government	2	2	1
TOTAL	64	89	66

3.1 International Nongovernment Organizations (INGOs)

International NGOs are a strong and active part of civil society in Tanzania. Key INGOs in the education field in Tanzania include Oxfam, Save the Children, ActionAid, PLAN, CARE, World Vision, Aga Khan Foundation and University, and volunteer sending organizations such as VSO and CUSO. The regional NGO, FAWE, is also active in the area of gender. These groups have diverse funding arrangements, and are less threatened than other NGOs by the changes in funding under a SWAp. Through their international connections and sister-organizations, they are able to directly and indirectly access funds from Northern governments, foundations and private donations (such as child-sponsors), or are made aware of various grants in the North to apply for funding. In what national and subnational NGOs consider an anomaly, two INGOs (FAWE and the Aga Khan Foundation) receive funding directly from the Ministry of Education to mainstream their innovations. The other INGOs in Tanzania covered a wide range of activities, from the capacity building of local citizens and community based organizations, to inservice or preservice teacher training, to training individuals in the school system such as school committees, District or Ward Education Officers, and head-teachers. Most are involved in advocacy activities in these areas. All INGOs spoke of their national policy engagement in terms of collaboration with other NGOs, particularly through TEN/MET. Those involved in BEDC and the Technical Working Groups stressed that they represented the common voice of TEN/MET at these meetings.

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.[12] 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, while others provide services, materials and training. Many are involved in more than one of these areas. The national NGOs we spoke with were active in the national networks, particularly TEN/MET, and several were vocal participants at the policy table.

3.3 Subnational NGOs and Grassroots Groups

The subnational NGOs we interviewed were as diverse in their activities and their issues as the national NGOs. However, there was a much greater discrepancy between the strong and well-funded subnational NGOs and those who were younger or smaller. This group was most affected by the reduction in funding to NGOs due to SWAps, as they found it increasingly difficult to get funds from past sources, either international NGOs or bilateral donors, and unviable to get funding from the local communities they worked with. Several of the NGOs we met, despite being well-organized and having relevant programmes, were struggling to survive. Some of the service- and materials-provision NGOs indicated that the local and central governments should fund their activities, as the NGOs provided core services to the Tanzanian people.

In contrast to the national NGOs, the majority of subnational NGOs focused on either materials/service delivery or on advocacy and community engagement – few were engaged in both due to their size and capacity. Almost all were members of TEN/MET, but this group was also the most likely to either not know the policy changes at the central level or to speak critically about TEN/MET's stance on issues. Those who had been TEN/MET board members were more aware of the issues, spoke more highly of the organization and were more likely to give feedback on TEN/MET policy documents. Many of the others found it difficult to actively input into the policy dialogue at the national level – due to limited staff time, communication costs and/or lack of knowledge – although some were engaged with their district and ward levels of government.

---

[12] See HakiElimu, below, as one example of this.

In our research, traditional civil society groups,[13] local parent associations, and community based organizations were rarely mentioned as active in education, although this may have been due to gaps in our sampling.

3.4 Faith-based Organizations and Private Provider Groups

Faith-based organizations and proprietors of private schools in Tanzania are the most prominent service-provision CSOs active in the education sector, and as such, share similar interests in the education sector, in contrast to TEN/MET and other NGOs.

The most widely known and representative faith-based groups are the National Muslim Council of Tanzania (BAKWATA) and the Christian Social Services Commission (CSSC), reflecting a Tanzanian population that is roughly a third Muslim, a third Christian and a third holding indigenous beliefs. BAKWATA, like many of the older CSOs in Tanzania, was originally an arm of the ruling CCM party. BAKWATA represents a large number of pre-primary madrasahs across the country, as well as 18 secondary schools, several primary schools, and a teachers college; and is responsible for providing Islamic education curriculum content and teachers to the government system. As the main Muslim organization in Tanzania, its influence goes beyond the schools it represents. However, although BAKWATA has a larger mandate than CSSC, it appears to have fewer resources available for input into education policy, and is less organized to receive input from the zonal levels.

Although the Christian Social Services Commission (CSSC) was formed in 1992, much more recently than BAKWATA, it has built on an impressive historical legacy. The oldest CSO found in our research, the Christian Council of Tanzania, dates back to 1934. During Nyerere's era, church-based groups were exempt from cooptation into the national ruling party, and they continued to have strong roots in Tanzanian communities and to provide educational services. Fifteen protestant and catholic churches came together under the CSSC in 1992 to address the mounting crisis of the education and health services at that time. Today, the CSSC represents 200 secondary schools, over 150 vocational education centres, as well as numerous pre-primary and post-secondary institutions established by various churches in Tanzania. The CSSC estimates that Christian churches provide 24% of education services in Tanzania. Although CSSC receives input from its Zonal Policy Forums, it recognizes the need to develop Christian district level boards, given decentralization in the country. The CSSC has also developed in-house capacity for undertaking applied research, monitoring, and policy advocacy, as well as disseminating the information and developing the capacity of its members to further these activities.

The Tanzania Association of Managers and Owners of Non-governmental Schools and Colleges (TAMONGOSCO), was formed in 2001. TAMONGOSCO represents the owners and managers of 600 non-government secondary schools, 350 primary schools and 18 teachers colleges. It was originally established on the request of the government, so that the government would not need to deal with individual schools. Non-government school owners and managers run by Christian and Muslim associations often belong to TAMONGOSCO and their respective faith-based

---

[13] Traditional civil society groups all but disappeared under socialist rule (Lange et al., 2000). Whether they have made a small revival since 1985 in the area of education is unknown.

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.

3.5 Parents' Association

WAZIZI, the Tanzanian Parents' Association (WAZAZI) was once an influential player in the education system, because of its past position as an arm of the CCM party. However, we were unable to establish contact with the group and were told that it now operated more as a loose network of community secondary schools, rather than as a fully functioning national organization. It is now headed by a senior politician. We did not find representatives of WAZAZI at the district level, and the school committees appeared to be unrelated to WAZAZI.

3.6 Teachers' Union

Dating back to World War I, teachers' unions in Tanzania have existed in many different forms, first playing an active part in the independence movement and then being incorporated with all other unions into a monolithic trade union in close association with the ruling CCM party. In 1991, the Tanzanian Teachers' Union (TTU) was again able to assert its independence from the CCM, after a struggle with the government.[14] By 1998, nearly 90% of the estimated 120,000 teachers in Tanzania were due-paying members of the union (Swai, 2004). A more recent report shows that the majority of its members were satisfied with the performance of the TTU, although as of 2004 there was no forum within the TTU where teachers could express their views on policy matters and curriculum development (HakiElimu, Sumra & TTU, 2004).

The union's capacity for policy advocacy and independent research has been weak but is growing. Whereas other CSOs were consulted in the formation of PEDP, the TTU was not brought in until the final 'implementation stage' (Int. C79; Kuder, 2004). In addition to government preference, this lack of involvement may have been due the TTU's organizational

---

[14] The actual independence of the union from the government may be questioned. Although our data did not reveal any connections, the report by HakiElimu, Sumra and the TTU (2004) noted that teachers expressed concern that some of the top TTU leaders were also employees of the Ministry of Education. In addition, the current Minister of Education, Margaret Sitta, was previously the head of the TTU, which some participants saw as an excellent opportunity for teachers' issues to be pushed forward.

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 elected Board of Directors consisted of *a) non-Dar-es-Salaam-based* BEDF (Bagamoyo), LUDEA (Ruvuma), MIICO (Mbeya), Pamoja Trust (Kilimanjaro),WOWAP (Dodoma Women); *b) Dar-based* TEC (Episcopal Conference), Mzeituni (disability focused); and *c)* three *Dar-based INGOs*: Aide et action, Save the Children UK and VSO. Of note, we did not find any

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 (*see* Box 1). Established in 2001 by 13 prominent Tanzanian educationalists, the NGO is involved in Community Governance, Public Engagement and Policy Analysis and Advocacy. Participants often highlighted its translation of important government documents for ordinary citizens and its controversial media spots which encouraged citizens to ask questions about the type of education they were receiving. In contrast to many other national and subnational NGOs, it funding is ample and diversified[15] – allowing it to fulfill its mandate without catering to particular donor interests.

Other national networks dealing with education-specific issues include the Feminist Coalition (FemAct) formed in 1995, and the Tanzanian Early Childhood Development and Education Network (TECDEN) formed in 2003. There are also several subnational networks, mainly located in the north-eastern parts of the country, such as the Arusha Education Network (est. 2002), the Aru-Meru Education Network (est. 2004), and the Tanga Coalition of Disability and non-Disability CSOs (est. 2004). The networks we spoke with all knew each other and cooperated on some education issues. For example, when TEN/MET was not on the best terms with the government over the HakiElimu affair (*see* Box 1), the girls' education NGOs strategically decided to use FemAct in order to ensure their best chances at policy change (Int. C3).

All networks, national and subnational, require resources beyond their membership base. A few networks have emerged organically, such as the Arusha Education Network, FemAct and TEN/MET, while several of the regional networks (Aru-Meru Network and the Tanga Coalition) have evolved out of funding made available from the Commonwealth Education Fund (CEF). All networks are sensitive to possible reductions in funding as donors move towards funding the government's general budget and sectors, without provision for CSO funding; and as the CEF winds up its network-funding programme. One informal street children's network has all but disappeared, because the costs of information sharing were too high to sustain it (Int. C77).

---

[15] HakiElimu receives general budget funding for its multi-year programme from the Embassies of Sweden, Norway and Ireland, the Dutch organizations Oxfam Novib and Hivos, and the Ford Foundation.

<div style="border: 3px solid blue; padding: 10px;">

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 was described as a personality conflict between the past Minister of Education and HakiElimu's Executive Director, highlighting the greater importance of informal politics in Tanzania (Int. C25, *see* Duhu, 2005; Kelsall, 2002; Hyden, 1999). As one participant put it: "If you have issues with the minister, you have issues with the whole ministry" (Int. C9). d) Government fears that HakiElimu was associated with the opposition, especially prior to the 2005 election. This last point is similar to the rationale given for deregistering the women's organization BAWATA in 1996, as mentioned above. Regardless of the reasons for the government's reaction, the case suggests that further work needs to be done within Tanzania on ascertaining the proper relationship between the citizens and the state, the role of civil society, and the extent to which freedom of expression is protected.

</div>

4. Activities of CSOs in Education

CSOs in Tanzania contribute to a wide range of activities for improving education (Table 5). Many CSOs were involved in more than one area, although most CSOs engaged in either advocacy/monitoring or materials/service provision. This was particularly noticeable at the local level, where organizations tended to be involved in only one activity.

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
TOTAL Number of Orgs	**8**	**10**	**87**	**40**	**23**	**44**	**11**
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 committees to speak for themselves (Int. C3; C4; C14; C26; C32; C36; C66; C73; C87). Service provision organizations often spoke about the importance and necessity of their work – non-government schools stated that they provide between 20-25% of education. It was generally acknowledged that some of these organizations provide a higher standard of education than government schools, while others provided questionable quality but much needed opportunities for disadvantaged children. Citations of innovations as a strength came from select INGOs (Int. C4; C49; C66; C87), however several interviewees noted that innovations at the local level often "fly under the radar of government and donors"(Int. C48), and some donors and government participants pointed out that innovations are rarely taken to scale (Int. D57; G1).

Weaknesses included research, engaging media, subnational NGO engagement and a lack of watchdog organizations (except HakiElimu). Although some subnational research had shifted education policy direction and some subnational NGOs had great capacity for analysis (Int. C26; C36; C49; C18), research at the subnational level was a weakness (Int. C9; C31; C49). An effective strategy appeared to be that of the independent, non-profit research group, REPOA

(Research on Poverty Alleviation)[16], 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 (TAMONGOSCO), and the faith-based organizations (CSSC and BAKWATA). FAWE and the Aga Khan Foundation, although members of TEN/MET, were significant in that they partnered

---

[16] Funded by the Netherlands, Norway, the United Kingdom, Sweden, Finland, and Tanzania.

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), the early childhood development network (TECDEN), and the feminist coalition (FemAct). Several development partners indicated these groups may become increasingly important in light of the up-coming full-sector 10 year education plan (Int. D57; IO22).

Smaller NGOs and community-based organizations, key in service provision and community engagement, were not recognized as important in the policy process; as one international organization stated, "they cannot do policy" (Int. IO81). When interviewed, these smaller organizations were the least likely to know about policy changes in the country.

5.2 Effectiveness of CSO engagement in policy

On the whole, civil society participation in education policy has made significant strides at the national level, from almost no participation prior to 2000, to expected participation today. At the same time, CSOs noted how difficult and slow it was to achieve change. CSOs have managed to make several notable interventions in this period of time.

The most mentioned intervention was:
  ➢ Research on the negative effects of user-fees on poor children by Maarifa ni Ufunguo, which helped abolish school fees in Tanzania and other African countries. (Int. C16; C25; C26; C36; C48; C49; C73; C87; IO22; R10)

Interventions mentioned by both government and civil society actors included:
  ➢ Shaping the wording of the PEDP through their participation in the BEDC and its technical working groups. This included writing CSOs into the framework and making sure issues like education quality were addressed. (Int. G1; D1; D21; C25; C32; C49; C66; C67; C73)
  ➢ Advocacy for primary schools to receive a capitation grant of $10 per child, to assist in facility repairs; textbook, teaching guides and materials procurement; and training for school committees. (Int. G1; C14; IO22)
  ➢ Advocacy in PEDP for schools to be able to procure their own materials, instead of procurement at the central level. Now also in SEDP. (Int. G1; IO22; C73)

The government representatives also mentioned civil society contributions in:
  ➢ Increased government consultation with grassroots organizations, school committees and citizens. (Int. G1; D21; D57)
  ➢ School-mapping research that was carried out by CSOs, funded by JICA. (Int. G1; D1)
  ➢ Advocacy for more resources for in-service teacher training, in order to have more classroom-friendly teachers, which culminated in a creation of a programme called "Interactive Teaching" – an example of "innovation sharing". (Int. G1)

Interventions highlighted by several CSOs:

> ➤ 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

In February 2006, TEN/MET boycotted the Education Sector Review (ESR), now an annual event at which donors meet with the government to review progress and make decisions about continued funding. The decision to boycott this one event, even though CSO input had been substantial in the lead up, was taken when the government sent a letter to TEN/MET, indicating that it was reducing the number of seats for civil society at the ESR from twenty-three to eleven (in order to allow more space for district officials, even though donor spaces were not reduced), and stating, in bold, that did *not want HakiElimu to be present.*

TEN/MET members hotly debated their response - should they focus on their right to a free civil society; or ensure that important education issues were heard and addressed in the ESR? What would be the result of this confrontational approach with the government, in light of actions taken against HakiElimu? According to one civil society participant, those who supported the boycott tended to have a long history of involvement and viewed this as a final straw and principle issued, while those who sided with participating tended to be the newer actors with limited experience of engaging with the government in such matters (Personal correspondence, April 19, 2007). Taking the decision to boycott, they a) wrote a letter stating that civil society should be able to freely decide whom should represent their voice and that an appropriate number of seats is needed to represent the various positions of education CSOs; and b) put together a statement outlining their joint position on key issues, to be delivered at the ESR (TEN/MET, 2006b).

According to participants, the day of the actual event the government claimed that civil society was present, arguing that the ESR could get its "satisfactory" stamp for funding to go ahead (Int. C9; C25; D11; D57). The government had sent out separate invitations to a select few NGOs, such as the private schools group (TAMONGOSCO), the faith-based organizations (BAKWATA and CSSC). A few active members of TEN/MET were also present – namely FAWE and the Aga Khan Foundation - as they were not aware of TEN/MET's decision, and had new relations with the government as sector-wide service providers. The event put donors into a precarious position as well, as they did not want to get involved in internal political matters, but realized both the human rights and funding ramifications. In the final ESR document, it was carefully worded that since this was the first ever review, it was impossible to give a satisfactory rating (Int. D57). However, it is interesting that parts of the TEN/MET statement (2006b) were incorporated into the final document – particularly about making sure that the venue chosen was large enough to hold all stakeholders.

Even though TEN/MET boycotted the *event*, the coordinator was part of the team in the next stage, when the results of the ESR were drafted into the Aide Memoire. As a result, issues presented in TEN/MET's ESR statement (2006b) were incorporated into the Aide Memoire. Since the Aide Memoire team plays a central role in drafting the 10 year education plan, TEN/MET will have a say in this as well (Int. C25; C54). However, the government's displeasure with the HakiElimu remained until 2007.

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; C27; C34; C37; C18; C33; C38; C56; C66; C68; C73; C77; C78; C85; C87). However, some of the subnational organizations were involved in discussions at the district level. Analysis of the interviews suggests that whether an organization was active or not could be broken down into whether or not it was well-established and well-funded, and had the time, capacity, geographic location and initiative to participate. Less active CSOs did not have the time or resources to contribute, they did not feel they could contribute due to limited skill or organizational capacity, or they did not see how contributing would benefit them. They did, however, see the value of remaining a TEN/MET member.

According to our informants, lack of an adequatecommunication infrastructure in Tanzania was a huge impediment for TEN/MET members, making communication "very slow" with "limited response" (Int. C23; C25; C68). One participant said that only 20% of all NGOs have access to internet in their offices; and cell phones, although ubiquitous, are costly for long distance. Many district NGOs, local NGOs and CBOs may only communicate slowly through post or by traveling into a larger centre to use the internet café where printing is costly, reducing their ability to comment on time-sensitive government and TEN/MET documents (Int. C4; C68; C87). Although district organizations are on the TEN/MET board, they were not directly active in the BEDC meetings, due to distance of travel to Dar es Salaam.

In addition, in every sector including education, NGOs appear to be concentrated in the richer (and more educated) North and Coastal regions. Described as a "spill-over effect" (Int. C87), the result was that the poorer areas, with less NGO representation and less education, receive less funding. In TEN/MET, this has meant that some regions do not have as great a voice, and issues highlighted tended to be Dar-biased (Int. C73; C73; C87). As earlier stated, TEN/MET has tried to address this through subnational representation on its Board (Int. C25; C73). Smaller

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 that received separate invitations to the Education Sector Review (Box 2), when other NGOs, invited through TEN/MET, had decided to boycott the event.

In general, civil society's role as advocates for education appeared to be accepted by government, development partner and civil society actors. A government representative informally commented that "sometimes the government is not very good at initiating and spearheading issues on quality of education...civil society is good at that." (Int. G1).

The different perceptions of government and CSOs hinged around civil society's monitoring and 'watchdog' roles – roles that CSOs, through TEN/MET, strongly defended. As one CSO explained:

> *"On the one hand you have the government, which is responsible for the development of its people; on the other hand you have civil societies, which are like a watchdog to what the government is doing. Now, in what terms can the implementer and the watchdog be partners of equal interests?"* (Int. C54)

Since the government's interdiction on HakiElimu's activities (*see* Box 1), and TEN/MET's boycott of the Education Sector Review (*see* Box 2), both donors and CSOs noted that the relationship between CSOs and the government had regressed from a very communicative one (2000-2003) to a more confrontational, but still effective, dialogue today (Int. D21; IO22; C25; C9). Smaller CSOs have taken a lesson from HakiElimu's predicament, acknowledging that it

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)[17]; 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).[18] 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.

---

[17] 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.

[18] 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 efficacy of dialogue, civil society's interactions with local governments presents a much cloudier picture in respect to both space and dialogue. Under the government's educational decentralization plan, the local government is supposed to be more open to working with NGOs and more accountable to the community (URT, 2001b). We found evidence of some subnational, national and international CSO involvement at this level, particularly in capacity building of the local District Education Officers, Ward Education Officers, school committees, and head teachers (Int. C4; C18; C32; C66). Hyden (2005), however, emphasizes that the government is taking a gamble in expecting that decentralization will produce better participation and a change in power relations, a point that deserves note in light of the following.

CSOs told us that the central government's policy of collaboration with CSOs and accountability to local citizens has not yet trickled down to many local governments (Int. C32; C50; C78; C88). Local governments were still felt to be more accountable to the centre than to its citizens, with decisions made in a top-down fashion (Int. C88; Mkombozi, 2005). As at the national level, there was *mistrust* between subnational CSOs and regional/district governments, because according to the CSOs, the local authorities saw civil society in "conflict" with them, "interfer[ing] with government roles" (Int. C18). It was also felt that local governments saw CSOs as having greater access to funds, and therefore able to fill in the local government gaps. In line with this, one newspaper article in a national paper documents a district official suggesting that his local government purposely did not fund the education sector sufficiently, relying on NGOs "to oversee the sector" (Ndaki, 2007). A lack of communication between the local governments and CSOs was still a barrier (Int. C18), as was CSO access to local government information (Int. C78; C88).

In Tanzania, CSOs engage with school committees predominantly through providing capacity building in budgeting and providing supplies (books, desks), or building materials. In line with research, some participants raised concerns about the capacity of school committees to manage funds or challenge superiors (Int. C10; C18; C33; Lange, 2005; Galabawa et al., 2002). However, participants also stressed that local school committees can be very effective with good training, and saw NGO's capacity building with school committees as an important contribution (Int. C18; C33; C25; C73; R59). This is in line with the Joint Review of the PEDP (Mushi et al., 2004) which states that in the current decentralized system, well-trained school committees increasingly have a voice, demanding transparency and improvement in the regularity of receiving funding.

CSOs highlighted that despite these positive achievements, a clear distinction needs to be made between school committees capacity to manage school funds versus their autonomy. In reality school committees still have little autonomy in deciding how funds are spent, as most disbursements still come with detailed instructions on their expected allocation. This may reflect a continued top-down nature of the education ministry, where decisions are still made at a central level. Perhaps as Mmari et al. (2005) suggest, it also shows a reluctance of the central government to fully carry through with decentralization/devolution of authority. One suggested outcome of this may be that the activities of school committees will tend to focus on construction

and the procurement of textbooks, to the detriment of other issues of quality. The school committee we visited (Box 3) showed similar tendencies, being an effective active group, but focusing overwhelmingly on construction activities to fulfill central requirements of the number of latrines and classrooms, while not examining issues of quality. This may serve to further undermine the decentralization initiative. Raising equity issues, two participants indicated that some school committees were able to receive more money or training than others, because they were geographically located in areas with a higher concentration of CSOs who could mobilize support on their behalf (Int. C66; C87).

Box 3:   **A new rural school committee**

The one rural school committee we visited was a brand new school attended by children of local farmers and migrant workers employed to grow flowers for export. According to the committee and based on observation, the school lacked an appropriate number of latrines, did not have teacher housing nearby, and was short a classroom for the upcoming Grade 5 and 6 students. The committee expressed their frustration at the assumption of relying on community contributions for materials and buildings, when they felt that the migrant workers were not in a position, nor attached enough to the community, to contribute. The role of a small local CSO in helping with materials and training was essential, although, like others, the local CSO found that locating money for these activities was increasingly difficult with many donors moving towards funding advocacy initiatives (Int. C34).

6.2 Parliamentarians and Civil Society

The role of the parliament has traditionally been weak in Tanzania. With decision making concentrated in the hands of the Executive and Ministries[19], it had not been effective for CSOs to engage parliamentarians for change. In fact, one donor we interviewed suggested that policy processes such as the Education Sector Review were developed because of this weakness, to take the place of the checks and balances Members of Parliament might provide in Northern countries (Int. D57). However, MPs are now increasingly active and engaged with CSOs and the Ministries, due to both the direction of President Kikwete and donor sponsored "capacity building for parliamentarians" programmes (Int. D57; C25). Individual MPs and the parliamentarian Social Services Committee are increasingly approaching CSOs for information, at both the national and subnational level (Int. C3; C88). Questions asked in parliament often echo the main questions that civil society poses (Int. C14; D12). As one CSO told us: "We use them when we want to, and push issues to them. We give them a lot of materials, which they use in debates" (Int. C3). However, some INGOs did not work with parliamentarians, because of some MPs insistence on charging "sitting fees" (Int. C66).

---

[19] It was suggested that a lack of discussion in parliament has been especially the case since the introduction of multi-party democracy. This is because the CCM has tried to have a united voice in order to face the opposition (Int. C5; C9).

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 that they were funding the government's SWAp, and had no funds available for individual NGOs (even though some donors selectively still supported NGOs). USAID and JICA, who have stayed in a project mode of aid, were spoken of positively because of their continued support to NGO initiatives (Int. C73).

In the context of the SWAp, bilateral donors related mostly to CSOs that had an understanding of the issues at the national level, particularly those represented in the BEDC. This may have biased donors' financial support towards these groups, especially those involved in advocacy (Int. C9; IO22). Some participants felt that some strong NGOs received disproportionate amounts (Int. IO22; IO81; C48), causing smaller NGOs to flounder in the lack of funding (Int. C88). In contrast, INGOs, although affected by the changes in funding under the SWAP and concerned about their ability to continue innovations in education, appeared to still have some access to funds through their international connections.

The groups most adversely affected by the paucity of funding to CSOs were subnational service provision NGOs, particularly those who worked in areas receiving less attention at the policy table, such as helping schools in marginalized communities gain access to materials, and service provision for street children and children with disabilities (Int. C34; C56; C77; C85). Although these groups agreed that advocacy was important, and that long-term nation-wide change required the government's intervention, they felt the urgency of addressing these children's needs now. Many of the donors stressed that a balance needed to be sought between giving money to the government and to civil society.

A few donors suggested that funds could be given to CSOs through the government, when General Budget Support (GBS) is in place. Many CSOs felt trepidation at this suggestion,

because they doubted that the money would reach the NGOs most in need of it. As mentioned, the government has subcontracted some INGOs to undertake particular training nation-wide, but this is the exception more than the rule. Even the Teachers Resource Centres, which are supposed to receive money from their respective districts as promised by the central government, have had extreme difficulty in receiving funding. In addition, one network leader highlighted that under GBS, education funding will depend on the ability of the Ministry of Education to advocate to the Ministry of Finance for funding, and may bypass the input of both civil society or donors involved in the BEDC (Int. C25).

Some donors reported that like-minded donors[20] were pooling money for CSOs in the Foundation for Civil Society (FCS). However both civil society and donors noted that the FCS's funding is restrictive, as it concentrates on advocacy and governance issues and does not allow for capital purchases[21] (Int. D57b; C23). From the CSO perspective, there was a lack of transparency in the awarding of funds, as well as a more general lack of awareness of the organization on the part of some of the CSOs we spoke with. The FCS has worked with comparatively few education NGOs to date (Kassam & Mutakyahwa, 2006; Ngowi, 2006), and only one of our CSO participants had received a grant from the foundation. The FCS was mentioned by a few other CSOs only in reference to being refused funding.

Over the past few years, the Commonwealth Education Fund (CEF) has provided funding and capacity building support to networks such as TEN/MET, TECDEN, Tanga Coalition on Disability, Mkombozi Centre for Street Children, the Arusha Education Network and the Aru-Meru Network. Similar to their 2006 report (Ngowi, 2006), our findings indicate that the national and issue-based networks supported through CEF have had a substantial impact on the education civil society landscape (while the subnational networks have had less impact). However, CEF plans to wrap up its funding over the next few years may pose serious challenges for several of these organizations, dependent as they are on this external funding.

We were also told that NGOs tended to "smell the wind of donors" (Int. D1), with some issues receiving inordinate funding and NGO attention (Int. D21; D62; IO20; IO22; IO81; C8; C9). This created an environment where international needs risked taking precedence over local needs. It was felt that sometimes donors were responsible for creating a competitive environment that decreased CSOs willingness to cooperate with each other (Int. C48; IO22). Both CSOs and international organizations commented on the lack of donor's transparency in sharing information about which NGOs they supported (Int. C48; IO22; IO81). Several CSOs suggested that donors should recognize that pretending they are not influencing policy and that all groups are equal players hides and exacerbates the problem (Int. C72; C87).

Although CSOs were generally united in their trepidation of donors' increasing concentration of funds in the government and move towards GBS, they held uncertain views on what they saw as

---

[20] Like-minded donors funding FCS included U.K. (DFID), Switzerland (SDC), Netherlands (RNE), Ireland (DCI), Canada (CIDA) and the embassies of Norway and the Netherlands (Kassam & Mutakyahwa 2006).
[21] For example, this was particularly detrimental to one ICT NGO that helped bright disadvantaged youth receive computer and research training (and had been successful in securing overseas University scholarships for these children). In order to continue its programme, it needed to buy a generator to deal with current nation-wide power-shortage, but funders such as the FCS did not allow for this type of purchase.

ideal next steps for funding civil society. They were common in their view that CSO funds should not go through the government, particularly through General Budget Support, as this risked further government control of CSO activities and a reduced focus on the education sector as decisions were made by the Ministry of Finance, not the Ministry of Education. It was felt that the government would certainly fund its own initiatives before funding civil society. Many CSOs were also concerned with donors maintaining the status quo, as this led to the current scenario where stronger NGOs still have access to resources whereas the weaker are left behind, effectively thinning out civil society. Some CSOs felt that donors should return to their previous bilateral funding of CSOs. Several CSOs felt that the best option would be for the donors to create two baskets of funding, one for the government and one for civil society – perhaps through an organization like the FCS, the CEF, or creating a funding branch within TEN/MET. These options are explored in the CEF's report on "Sustaining Funding for Civil Society Advocacy in Education in Tanzania" (Ngowi, 2006). Going beyond this report, many CSOs we met with recognized that this type of funding needs to be balanced between advocacy and service provision, and the need for district-level CSOs to equitably access funding.

8. Conclusion

Tanzania has made significant strides in education reform under its sub-sector programme, the Primary Education Development Plan (PEDP) (2002-2006). The major reforms undertaken during this period 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; and, expanding the space for civil society in policy dialogue. Through these changes, particularly the increase in access to primary education, the education sector has become the Tanzanian government's poster child of success.

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 subnational NGO Maarifa ni Ufunguo and the national and transnational advocacy of the Tanzanian Education Network (TEN/MET), thereby contributing to mounting evidence compelling the international community to change its stance on user fees. CSOs have also been "invited" to the policy table by the government, with representatives on the Basic Education Development Committee and its technical working groups, as well as through sector reviews and the up-coming ten-year whole-sector plan.

However, the current education reforms pose challenges for CSOs. The decentralization of education means the need for greater grassroots reach, as the data shows considerable variation on how effectively Tanzanian CSOs engage their grassroots. Decentralization also calls for increased engagement of civil society at the district and regional level. In an opposite trend, the centralization of donor resources in the sector programmes means the need for greater national level strengths in advocacy and monitoring, which are currently limited to the capacity of only a few strong national and international NGOs. In addition, the government has also tried to contain

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 education policy. However, whereas the government envisages CSO roles as "complementary" to the government, contributing primarily through service provision, CSOs see their contribution as much broader, including advocacy and watchdog activities as legitimate roles. On the whole, the rules for CSO engagement in the design of the sector program and its oversight are not transparent or formalized, reflecting historical legal and political constraints on CSOs in broader Tanzanian civil society. In one case, a well-known national CSOs, 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 limelight on achievements in access). The case highlights that achieving partnership between civil society and government should not assume automatic harmony and

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
National Network		
	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
Subnetwork		
	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
International NGO		
	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
National NGO		
	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

	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
	Kituo cha Maadili Kwa Jamil (Maadili Centre)	Kilimanjaro
	Universal Academy	Morogoro
	Kuleana Centre for Children's Rights (KULEANA)	Mwanza
	Tanzania League of the Blind (TLB)	Mwanza
	Youth Advisory and Development Council (YADEC)	Shinyanga
	Global Education Partnership (GEP)	Tanga
Subnational NGO		
	Amana Youths Centre	Dar es Salaam
	Chama Cha uzazi Na malezi Bora Tanzania - Kituo cha vijana Temeke	Dar es Salaam
	Children in Crisis Africa (CICA)	Dar es Salaam
	Children's Book Project for Tanzania	Dar es Salaam
	Dogodogo Centre Street Children Trust (DCSCT)	Dar es Salaam
	Environment, Human Rights Care and Gender Organization (ENVIROCARE)	Dar es Salaam
	Foundation for Community Resources	Dar es Salaam
	Friends of Don Bosco (FDB)	Dar es Salaam
	Information Centre on Disability (ICD)	Dar es Salaam
	Malezi Association Centre for Poverty Reduction	Dar es Salaam
	Mbagala Street Girls Home	Dar es Salaam
	Msimbazi Centre	Dar es Salaam
	Street Childrens Care and Development Trust (SCCADET)	Dar es Salaam
	Taaluma Women Group (TWG)	Dar es Salaam
	Tandika Youth Handicraft Group (Youth Programme for Drug Addicts)	Dar es Salaam
	Tukolene Youth Development Centre	Dar es Salaam
	Youth Empowerment and Sustainable Development Foundation (YES Foundation)	Dar es Salaam
	Youth Entrepreneurship Development Programme (YEDP)	Dar es Salaam
	Advisory Charity Programme	Arusha
	Catholic Montessori ECD group	Arusha
	Child Hope Co. Ltd.	Arusha
	Christian Youth Spiritual Ministry (CYSM)	Arusha
	Community Action for Development Economic and Enviro. Conservation Trust (CADECT TRUST)	Arusha
	Community Based Health Care Council (CBHCC)	Arusha
	Dinkwa Women Trust (DIWOT)	Arusha
	Green Arusha Society (GAS)	Arusha
	Hakikazi Catalyst	Arusha
	Informal Sector Trust (INSERT)	Arusha
	Jifunze Project	Arusha
	Kamamma Integrated Development Trust Fund (KIDTF)	Arusha
	Maarifa ni Ufunguo	Arusha
	Maasai Advancement Association (MAA)	Arusha
	Shirkia La Maendeleo Engutoto (SHIME)	Arusha

	Women's Economic Groups Coordinating Council (WEGCC)	Arusha
	Bagamoyo Education and Development Foundation (BEDF)	Coast
	Community Development for All (CODEFA)	Coast
	Jumuiya Endelevu Bagamoyo (JEBA)	Coast
	Mlandizi Women Association (MLAWA)	Coast
	Outreach Training Programmes	Coast
	Tumaini Orphans Care Centre (TOCC)	Coast
	Dodoma Micro Project Programmes (DMPP/SNV)	Dodoma
	WOmen WAke uP (WOWAP)	Dodoma
	CCS Voluntary Services	Iringa
	Lugarawa Trust Foundation (LTF)	Iringa
	Ruhanga, Makongora and Mafumbo (RUMAMA)	Kagera
	Kigoma Development Promotion Agency	Kigoma
	Centre for Informal Sector Promotion (CISP)	Kilimanjaro
	Consolidated Education Foundation (CEF)	Kilimanjaro
	Evaline Women Group	Kilimanjaro
	Ilaramatak-Lorkonerei, Same Programme	Kilimanjaro
	Karibu Tanzania Association (KTA)	Kilimanjaro
	Kifumwa Garden	Kilimanjaro
	Kilimanjaro Environmental Youth and HIV/AIDS Care (KEYAC)	Kilimanjaro
	Mkombozi Centre for Street Children	Kilimanjaro
	Mkombozi Vocational Training and Development Centre	Kilimanjaro
	Pamoja Trust (PAMOJA)	Kilimanjaro
	Pastoralist Development and Education Trust (PADET)	Kilimanjaro
	Poverty Africa (POA)	Kilimanjaro
	Qoheleth Foundation Tanzania	Kilimanjaro
	Self Reliant Participatory Empowerment and Development Reform (SPIDER)	Kilimanjaro
	Village Education Project (VEP)	Kilimanjaro
	White Orange Youth (WOY)	Kilimanjaro
	Foundation Help	Mara
	ADP Isangati Trust Fund	Mbeya
	Chunya District Education Trust (CHUDET)	Mbeya
	Ileje Rural Development Organization (IRDTF)	Mbeya
	Mbozi Illeje and Isangati Consortium (MIICO)	Mbeya
	Galilaya Youth Organization (GAYO GROUP)	Morogoro
	Kidete Community Development Group	Morogoro
	Kilosa Mission to the Needy (UKUWE)	Morogoro
	Peace, Love and Action for Childcare and Education (PLACE)	Morogoro
	Telecoms and Electronics Technicians Association (TETA)	Morogoro
	Adilisha Child, Youth Development and Family Preservation (ADILISHA)	Mwanza
	Education Development Foundation (EDFO)	Mwanza
	Fight against Fraud, Crimes and Corruption Organization (FFCC)	Mwanza
	Green Hope Youths Organization (GH)	Mwanza
	Kivulini Women's Rights Organization (KIVULINI)	Mwanza
	Mwanza AIDS orphans Ministry (MWAOMI)	Mwanza
	Mzeituni (Disability focused)	Mwanza
	Rafiki Family	Mwanza
	St. Therese Orphans Foundation (STOF)	Ruvuma
	Tunduru Academic Forum (TAF)	Ruvuma
	Rafiki Social Development Organization	Shinyanga
	LUDEA	Songea
	Free Pentecostal Church of Tanzania (FPCT)	Tanga
	Peace Action for Child Care and education	Tanga
	Youth with Disabilities Community Programme (YDCP)	Tanga
Unknown		
	Afircan Disabled Community Development	Dar es Salaam
	AIDS Orphans Support and Training Centre	Dar es Salaam
	Campaign for Good Governance	Dar es Salaam
	Fungamano La Kujiarjiri, Elimu, Afya, Mazingira, Ufundi Na udumishaji amani Endelevu	Dar es Salaam
	Good Samaritan Social Service Trust	Dar es Salaam
	ISWT Trust	Dar es Salaam
	Operation and Projects from the African Solidarity Trust	Dar es Salaam

	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
	Disabled Survival Programme	Arusha
	IRAQW Cultural Group	Arusha
	Kinnapa Development Programme	Arusha
	Society of Family Poverty Alleviation (SOFAPA)	Arusha
	Talented Artist	Arusha
	Tanzania Girl Guide Association	Arusha
	Tanzania Social and Economic Trust (TASOET)	Arusha
	Tanzania Water and Environmental Sanitation	Arusha
	UDW	Arusha
	Urban Environmental Development Association (UEDA)	Arusha
	Women and Children Development	Arusha
	Women Initiative for the Street Working Children Welfare	Arusha
	Youth Education and Development (YED)	Arusha
	Dodoma Environment Management Trust	Dodoma
	Amanai Group	Iringa
	Mufindi TRC	Iringa
	Tanzania Research Education and Environmental Care	Iringa
	Faiders	Kagera
	Christian Outreach Relief and Development	Kigoma
	Kibondo Development and Relief Agency	Kigoma
	Kitandu Shinga Coffee and Animal Project	Kilimanjaro
	KIWAKKUKI	Kilimanjaro
	Kiwamwamko	Kilimanjaro
	Malezi Society (MESO)	Kilimanjaro
	Marangu Development Foundation (MDF)	Kilimanjaro
	Morunofe	Kilimanjaro
	Shengena Action	Kilimanjaro
	Talanta Club	Kilimanjaro
	Vision Interegent Post (VIPO)	Kilimanjaro
	Open Heart Tanzania	Mbeya
	Hifadhi Ya Mazingira Na Jamii	Mwanza
	Poverty Alleviation Project	Songea
	Ruvuma Orphans Association (ROA)	Songea
	WACCA	Songea
	PIRO	Zanzibar
	Umoja wa Walemavu Zanzibar	Zanzibar

Bibliography

AfDB/OECD (2006). *African Economic Outlook 05/06.* Retrieved December 10, 2006 from http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/11/26/36749727.pdf

Barkan, J. ed. (1994). *Beyond Capitalism and Socialism in Kenya and Tanzania.* London: Lynne Rienner.

Braathen, E., Chaligha, A., & Fjeldstad, O. H. (2005). *Local governance, finances and service delivery in Tanzania: A summary of findings from six councils [Electronic version]*: Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research (NIBR).

Buchert, L. (1994). *Education in the development of Tanzania 1919-90.* London: J. Currey.

Burke, K., & Beegle, K. (2004). *Why children aren't attending school: The case of Northwestern Tanzania [Electronic version]* (Vol. 13).

Carr-Hill, R. & Ndalichako, J. (2005, November 26). *Education Sector Situation Analysis: Final Draft Report Revised.* Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

Chediel, R. W., Sekwao, N., & Kirumba, P. L. (2000). Private and community schools in Tanzania (Mainland). *Mechanisms and Strategies of Educational Finance* Retrieved August 2, 2005, from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001224/122460f.pdf

CIDA. (1997). *Let us work together: Canada's ODA programming framework for Tanzania [Electronic version]*: Government of Canada.

Civicus. (2005, October 13). *Tanzania: Ban on NGO violates civil society's freedom of expression.* Retrieved October 22, 2005 from http://www.civicus.org/new/content/BanonNGO.htm

Clarke-Okah, W. (2003). *Partnerships in sector-wide programming in education in Tanzania: Narratives of experience.* Unpublished PhD dissertation, McGill, Montreal.

Commonwealth Education Fund (CEF). (n.d.) *Commonwealth Education Fund: Investing in the next generation.* Retrieved November 14, 2006 from http://www.commonwealtheducationfund.org/downloads/cef_brochure.pdf

CEF. (2005). *Tanzania country plan: April 2005 - March 2007.* Retrieved August 15, 2005, from http://www.commonwealtheducationfund.org/tanzania.html

CEF. (2005, June). *Global mid-term review.* Retrieved November 14, 2006 from http://www.commonwealtheducationfund.org/downloads/CEF%20Global%20Mid-Term%20Review.pdf

Cooksey, B., Court, D., & Makau, B. (1994). Education for Self-Reliance and Harambee, in Joel Barkan, ed., *Beyond Capitalism and Socialism in Kenya and Tanzania.* London: Lynne Rienner. p. 201-233.

Dachi, H. A., & Garrett, R. M. (2003). *Child labour and its impact on children's access to and participation in primary education: a case study from Tanzania [Electronic version].* London, UK: Department for International Development (DFID).

de Graaf, K. (2005, June 29 - July 2). *Public Expenditure Tracking (PET) in Tanzania at district-level: Effects on local accountability: Participatory research of and by Tanzanian NGO's [Electronic version].* Paper presented at the European Conference of African Studies, London.

Duhu, J. (2005). Strengthening Civil Society in the South: Challenges and Constraints - A Case Study of Tanzania. *International Journal of Not-for-Profit Law 8(1).* p. 42-53. Retrieved March 11, 2007 from http://www.icnl.org/knowledge/ijnl/vol8iss1/ijnl_vol8iss1.pdf

DfID. (2003). *Tanzania country assistance plan (June 2003 - December 2004) [Electronic version].* London, UK. http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/captanzania.pdf.

Dyer, K. (2005). *The cost of poverty: Transaction costs and the struggle to make aid work in the education sector in Tanzania.* [Electronic version]. Human Development Report Office. Occasional Paper 9.

EFA/FTI (Education for All – Fast Track Initiative). (n.d.).*Country Database.* Retrieved January 23, 2006, from http://www1.worldbank.org/education/efafti/countries.asp

Evans, A., & Ngalwea, E. (2001). Institutionalising the PRSP approach in Tanzania. In A. Evans (Ed.),

PRSP Institutionalisation Study: Final Report. London, UK: http://www.odi.org.uk/pppg/publications/papers_reports/spa/.

Fjeldstad, O., & Nygaard, K. (2004). Project brief: Low awareness amongst citizens of local government reforms. Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI), Norway. Retrieved June 15, 2005, from http://www.cmi.no/publications/2004/project_brief_no_6_march_2004.pdf

Frantz, B. (2004). General budget support in Tanzania: A snapshot of its effectiveness (unpublished). USAID. Retrieved June 20, 2005, from http://www.sarpn.org.za/documents/d0001036/P1149-PNADA029_Tanzania_April2004.pdf

Galabawa, J. (2001, October 7-11). *Developments and issues regarding Universal Primary Education (UPE) in Tanzania.* Paper presented at the ADEA Biennial Meeting 2001, Arusha, Tanzania. http://www.adeanet.org/biennial/papers/en_arusha_galabawa.pdf.

Galabawa, J. C. J., Agu, A. O., & Miyazawa, I. (2002). The impact of school mapping in the development of education in Tanzania [Electronic Version]. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 25*(1), 23-33.

Gibbon, P. (2001). Civil society, locality, and globalization in rural Tanzania: A forty-year perspective [Electronic version]. *Development and Change, 32*, 819-844.

Gould, J., & Ojanen, J. (2003). *Merging in the circle: The politics of Tanzania's poverty reduction strategy*: Institute of Development Studies, University of Helsinki.

HakiElimu, Sumra, S., & Tanzania Teachers' Union (2004). *The living and working conditions of teachers in Tanzania: A research report*, Dar es Salaam, Hakielimu. Retrieved June 15, 2006 from http://www.hakielimu.org/Living_work_cond.pdf

HakiElimu. (2005a). *Three years of PEDP Implementation: The government assesses its own progress.* Retrieved October 24, 2005 from http://www.hakielimu.org

HakiElimu. (2005, October 5). *HakiElimu Statement Regarding the Ministry of Education and Culture Circular Number 5 of 2005.* Retrieved October 24, 2005 from http://www.hakielimu.org

HakiElimu. (2007, January 30). *Statement: Government actions against HakiElimu: Citizens voices should not be muzzled in Tanzania.* Retrieved January 31, 2007 from http://www.hakielimu.org/e.pdf

Hakikazi, C. (2004). Participatory monitoring of PRS and pro-poor expenditure in selected districts and areas of Arusha region, Tanzania. Retrieved July 17, 2005, from http://www.hakikazi.org/local_monitoring.htm

Hyden, G. (1999). Top-down democratization in Tanzania [Electronic version]. *Journal of Democracy, 10*(4), 142-155.

Hyden, Goran. (2005). "Why do things happen the way they do? A power analysis of Tanzania." Embassy of Sweden in Dar es Salaam. http://www.hei.unige.ch/news/files/Goran_Hyden_Power_analysis.pdf

Hyden, Goran. (2006) "Beyond Governance: Bringing power into policy analysis". Paper presented to the Danida/GEPPA conference on "power, politics and change in weak states", March 1-2, 2006. Retrieved March 16, 2007 from http://geppa.dk/files/activities/Conference%202006/Goran%20Hyden.pdf

Igoe, J. (2004). Power and force in Tanzanian civil society: The story of Barabaig NGO in the Hanang Community Development Project. In J. Igoe & T. Kelsall (Eds.), *Between a Rock and a Hard Place* (pp. 123-157). Durham, N.C.: Carolina Academic Press.

Iheme, E. (2005). Strengthening Civil Society in the South: A Response. *International Journal of Not-for-Profit Law 8(1),* p. 54-62. Retrieved March 11, 2007 from http://www.icnl.org/knowledge/ijnl/vol8iss1/ijnl_vol8iss1.pdf

IRIN. (2006, May 9). *Tanzania: Education headed for crisis as AIDS strikes teachers.* Retrieved March 20, 2007 from http://hivaidsclearinghouse.unesco.org/ev_en.php?ID=6110_201&ID2=DO_TOPIC

IMF, & IDA. (2000). Tanzania: Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper - Joint Staff Assessment. Retrieved July 5, 2005, from http://www.imf.org/external/np/jsa/2000/tza/eng/110200.pdf

Independent Monitoring Group (IMG) (2005, March). *Enhancing Aid Relationships in Tanzania:.* Draft

Final Report. Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF).

Jennings, M. (2001). Development is very political in Tanzania. In O. Barrow & M. Jennings (Eds.), *The Charitable Impulse* (pp. 109-132). Oxford: James Currey.

Kassam, Y. & Mutakyahwa, R. (2006, May 20). *Institutional assessment of the Foundation for Civil Society: Final report.* Ottawa, Canada: E.T. Jackson and Associates.

Kelsall, T. (2001). Donors, NGOs & the State: Governance & 'civil society' in Tanzania. In O. Barrow & M. Jennings (Eds.), *The Charitable Impulse* (pp. 133-148). Oxford: James Currey.

Kelsall, T. (2002). Shop windows and smoke-filled rooms: Governance and the re-politicisation of Tanzania [Electronic version]. *Journal of Modern African Studies, 40*(4), 597-619.

Kenge, A. (2006, October 12). Dar's aid funds use impresses donors. *Daily News.* Retrieved October 12, 2006 from http://www.dailynews-tsn.com/page.php?id=3995

Khainga, D., Shitundu, J., Wasala, W., Nyoni, T., Onsomu, E., & Haji, S. et al. (2005). *United Republic of Tanzania: Education sector public expenditure review (PER) 2005. 2nd draft report.* Madrid, Spain: Altair Asesores, Neimacro Group.

Kigwangallah, N. (2005, September 4). Primary education programme has pluses. *IPP Media* Retrieved September 9, 2005, from http://www.ippmedia.com/ipp/observer/2005/09/04/48714.html

Kiondo, A. (1999). *Policy advocacy: The case of Tanzania Media Women Association (TAMWA).* Civil Society and Governance Programme, IDS. Accessed March 11, 2007 from http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/civsoc/final/tanzania/tan1.html

Komba, D. (1998). Capacity building for grassroots NGOs involved in basic education in Least Developed Countries of Africa and South Asia: A Tanzanian contextualized proposal. Dar es Salaam: UNESCO. Retrieved August 10, 2005, from http://www.tzonline.org/pdf/capacitybuildingforgrassrootsngos.pdf

Kruse, S. (2002). *Swaps and civil society: The roles of CSOs in sector programmes*: Centre for Health and Social Development. A report prepared for Norwegian Development Cooperation (NORAD).

Kuder, J. L. (2004). *The formulation of primary education policy in Tanzania within a global governance approach to aid and development [Electronic version].* Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Bristol.

Lange, S. (2005). Community participation in service delivery: Challenges for the Local Government Reform in Tanzania - DRAFT. Norway: Chr. Michelsen Institute. Retrieved July 15, 2005, from GMAIL

Lange, S., Wallevik, H., & Kiondo, A. (2000). Civil society in Tanzania. Norway: Chr. Michelsen Institute. Retrieved July 25, 2005, from www.cmi.no

Lavergne, R. and Alba, A. (2003). *CIDA primer on Programme-Based Approaches.*Canadian International Development Agency.

Lawson, A. and Rakner, L. (2005) *Understanding Patterns of Accountability in Tanzania: Final Synthesis Report*. Oxford: Oxford Policy Management and Bergen: Christian Michelsen Institute.

Luhwago, R. (2007, January 31). HakiElimu in trouble again. *The Nation.* Kenya.

Maarifa ni Ufunguo. (n.d.) *Maarifa ni Ufunguo.* Retrieved January 23, 2006 from http://www.ufunguo.org/index.htm

Maarifa ni Ufunguo. (2000). *Cost sharing: A case study of education in Kilimanjaro*. Arusha: Maarifa ni Ufunguo.

Maarifa ni Ufunguo. (2003). Financing education in Kilimanjaro: The story continues. Retrieved July 25, 2005, from www.campaignforeducation.org/resources/resource_search.php

Mercer, C. (2003). Performing partnership: Civil society and the illusions of good governance in Tanzania [Electronic version]. *Political Geography, 22*, 741-763.

Miguel, E. (2004). Tribe or Nation? Nation Building and Public Goods in Kenya versus Tanzania [Electronic version] *World Politics 56(3*), 327-362.

Mkombozi Centre for Street Children. (2005). *Inventory on current education policy and practices.* Retrieved January 28, 2007 from http://www.mkombozi.org/publications/research_report/2005_01_research_report_education_inv

entory.pdf

Mmari, D. Sundet G. & Selbervik, H. (2005) *Understanding Patterns of Accountability in Tanzania: Component 3: Analysis of Values, Incentives and Power Relations in the Budget Allocation Process.* Oxford: Oxford Policy Management and Bergen: Christian Michelsen Institute.

Mogalla, C. (1999). *The State and Civil Society in Tanzania: The Case of the National NGOs Policy.* Civil Society and Governance Programme, IDS. Accessed March 11, 2007 from http://www.eldis.org/static/DOC10842.htm

Mnjagila, S. (2004). Civil society engagement in EFA: What has been the added value? *Fifth meeting of the Working Group on EFA*. Tanzania EFA Coordinator. UNESCO, Paris. http://www.unesco.org/education/efa/global_co/working_group/csos.ppt.

Mushi, P. A. K., Malekela, G. A., & Bhalalusesa, E. P. (2002). Moving beyond the classroom: expanding learning opportunities for marginalized populations in Tanzania. Nairobi, Kenya: FAWE. Retrieved July 16, 2005, from www.fawe.org

Mushi, R., Penny, A., Sumra, S., Mhina, E., Barasa, F., Nyiruka, M., et al. (2004). *Joint review of the Primary Education Development Plan (PEDP) - Final report [Electronic Version]*: United Republic of Tanzania.

Mushi, S. (2001). *Development and democratisation in Tanzania: A study of rural grassroots politics [Electronic version]*. Kampala, Uganda: Fountain Publishers.

Nassor, S., & Mohammed, K. A. (1998). The quality of education: Some policy suggestions based on a survey of schools: Zanzibar [Electronic version]. *SACMEQ Policy Research Report, 4*.

Ndaki, W. (2007, January 31). More facilities, manpower needed to boost primary education. *The Guardian.*

Ngowi, P.S. (2003, October). CEF Tanzania Country Presentation. London: Commonwealth Education Fund. Retrieved October 30, 2005 from http://www.commonwealtheducationfund.org/tanzania.html

Ngowi, H. P. (2006). *Sustaining Funding for Civil Society Advocacy in Education in Tanzania: a report for CEF*. Commonwealth Education Fund. (unpublished).

Nshala, R. (1997). The freedom of association in Tanzania: Implications for civil society and sustainable development. Retrieved August 1, 2005, from www.leat.or.tz/publications/freedom.of.assoc/freedom.of.assoc.html

Nyangoro, J. E. (1999). Civil society, democratization, and state building in Kenya and Tanzania. In K. Mengisteab & C. Daddieh (Eds.), *State building and democratization in Africa: faith, hope, and realities*. London: Praeger.

Pfaffe, J.F., & Smith, I. (2005). *Final Report: Tanzania Education Sector Performance Assessment Framework (PAF). [Electronic version].*

PMO-RALG. (2005, October 5). Programme: Primary Education Development Plan (PEDP). Retrieved January 15, 2007 from http://www.pmoralg.go.tz/programmes/view_programmes.php?intItemID=3

Psacharopoulos, G. (1987). Public versus private schools in developing countries: evidence from Colombia and Tanzania. *International Journal of Educational Development, 17*(1), 59-67.

Rajani, R., Bangser, M., Lund-Sorensen, U., & Leach, V. (2001). *Situation analysis of children in Tanzania 2001*. UNICEF. Retrieved July 15, 2005, from http://www.tzonline.org/pdf/situationanalysisofchildren%201.pdf

Rawlence, B. (2004). NGOs and the new field of African politics: A case study from Zanzibar. In J. Igoe & T. Kelsall (Eds.), *Between a Rock and a Hard Place* (pp. 158-177). Durham, N.C.: Carolina Academic Press.

Rylander, B. (2003, June). *SWAp - Education Sector in Tanzania: Primary Education Development Plan 2002 -2006.* Paper Presented at IWGT Meeting. Helsinki. Retrieved January 16, 2006 from http://www.unesco.org/iiep/eng/networks/iwge/related_docs/swap_BR.doc

Samoff, J. (1979a). The bureaucracy and the bourgeoisie: Decentralization and class structure in Tanzania [Electronic version]. *Comparative Studies in Society and History, 21*.

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%2005.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%2005.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.

UNDP. (2005). *Human Development Report 2005*. Retrieved January 16, 2007 from http://hdr.undp.org/.

UNDP. (2006). *Human Development Report 2006*. Retrieved February 2, 2007 from http://hdr.undp.org/.

UNESCO. (2006). *EFA global monitoring report (EFA-GMR) 2007.* Retrieved November 11, 2006, from http://gmr.uis.unesco.org/

United Republic of Tanzania (URT). *Tanzania Assistance Strategy (TAS) Vol. 1 & 2. [Electronic version]*. Dar es Salaam: Government Printer.

URT. (1995). *Education and training policy (ETP) [Electronic Version]*: Ministry of Education and Culture.

URT. (2000). *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP).* Retrieved September 23, 2005 from www.imf.org/external/NP/prsp/2000/tza/02.

URT. (2001a). *Education sector development plan (ESDP). [Electronic Version]*. Basic Education Development Committee (BEDC), Ministry of Education and Culture.

URT. (2001b). *Education Sector Development Programme: Primary Education Development Plan (PEDP) (2002 – 2006)*, Basic Education Development Committee (BEDC), Ministry of Education and Culture

URT. (2002). *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper - 3rd Report.* Retrieved September 28, 2005 from http://www.imf.org/external/NP/prsp/.

URT. (2004). *Secondary education development plan (SEDP) (2005-2009): Education sector development programme [Electronic Version]*, Basic Education Development Committee (BEDC), Ministry of Education and Culture

URT. (2005). *National strategy for growth and reduction of poverty (MKUKUTA).* Retrieved November 5, 2005 from http://www.tanzania.go.tz/pdf/nsgrptext.pdf.

URT. (2006, February 23-25). Education Sector Review: Aide Memoire. *Education Sector Development Programme.* Inter-Ministerial Steering Committee. [Electronic Version]

Vavrus, F. (2000). Governmentality in an era of "empowerment": The case of Tanzania. In T. Popkewitz (Ed.), *Educational Knowledge: Changing Relationships between the State, Civil Society and the Educational Community* (pp. 221-242). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Vavrus, F. (2004). *Desire and decline: Schooling amid crisis in Tanzania*. New York: Peter Lang.

Wedgwood, R. (2005). Post-basic education and poverty in Tanzania. Working Paper No. 1. Centre of African Studies, University of Edinburgh. Retrieved September 5, 2005, from http://www.cas.ed.ac.uk/Wedgwood_Tanzania_PBET%20WP1.pdf

World Bank. (n.d.) *Fast Track Initiative – Country Database: Tanzania.* Retrieved October 23, 2005, from http://www1.worldbank.org/education/efafti/countries.asp

World Bank. (2001). Participation and Civic Engagement in Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRSP). Good Practice & Lessons Learned - The Case of Tanzania. Retrieved July 15, 2005, from http://www.worldbank.org/participation/goodless3.htm

World Bank. (2007). *EdStats.* Retrieved January 3, 2007 from http://devdata.worldbank.org/edstats/cd5.asp

Yamada, S. (2005). *Educational finance and poverty reduction: The cases of Kenya, Tanzania and Ethiopia.* GRIPS Development Forum. Discussion paper 8. Retrieved March 23, 2007 from http://www.grips.ac.jp/forum-e/pdf_e02/DP8.pdf