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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. This appraisal of the Mainland’s education sector plans by the Education Development Partners Group is produced in the belief that an objective review of those documents at this time will be a significant contribution to the education sector’s development.

II. It was instigated specifically to further Tanzania’s membership application to the Global Partnership for Education. The GPE has informed the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania (GoT) of an indicative allocation of some US$95 million to Mainland Tanzania for a Programme Implementation Grant to support the country’s efforts to provide quality education for all. Tanzania’s application for this Grant will be derived from the planning documents appraised herein and will also be aligned with the Global Partnership’s priorities as appropriate.

III. The provision of education in Tanzania Mainland, to which this appraisal refers, is guided by national and education sector policies together with various programmes. The plans listed in the box below are the foci of this appraisal.

- The Education Sector Development Programme (ESDP) of 1997, as revised in 2001 and 2008;
- The Primary Education Development Programme (PEDP III), 2012 – 2016;
- The Secondary Education Development Programme (SEDP II), 2010 – 2015;
- The Teacher Development and Management Strategy (TDMS), 2008 – 2013;
- The Folk Education Development Programme (FEDP), 2008 – 2013;
- The Adult and Non Formal Education Development Plan (ANFEDP), 2012 – 2017;
- The Technical and Vocational Education Development Programme (TVETDP), 2013/14 – 2017/18;

IV. This document uses the GPE’s 2006 appraisal guidelines as its starting-point. These comprise three sections: (a) an appraisal of the planning process; (b) an assessment of plan design; and (c) a consideration of implementation readiness. In addition some of the concepts and approaches in the currently emerging revised GPE guidelines for appraisal have been incorporated. Essentially, this appraisal seeks to establish:

- Have the plan preparation processes been participatory, thorough and transparent?
- Are the plans themselves appropriate and credible?
- What is the likelihood of the targeted outcomes of these plans being achieved?

V. Clear criteria are set out in the Guidelines and these have been objectively applied. While reviews inevitably identify imperfections (and hopefully offer practical ways of overcoming them) it must be emphasised that there are many positive features in this set of educational plans, that many aspects of implementation have been successful, and that on the whole they may be regarded as offering a reasonably sound basis for focussed additional investment.

VI. Given GPE’s emphasis on quality basic education for all, particular attention is accorded to the pre-primary/primary sub-sector. Along with the consideration of the education sector plan itself, that on Primary Education is the longest and most detailed chapter.

VII. The Education Sector Development Programme was launched in 1997, revised in 2001, and further revised in 2007/08 to cover the period from then through 2017: it is this second
revision that is currently in force. Several of the recommendations in ESDP have come to pass including the creation of an effective ESMIS, the establishment of participative dialogue and review structures, the incorporation of the Higher and Technical Education Divisions into MoEVT and the focussing of examinations away from memorisation in favour of knowledge application. Other ESDP objectives – for instance heightened teacher morale, regular school inspection, increased enrolment and higher achievement (including that of girls) at all post-primary levels and qualitative performance generally – have been less amenable to rectification especially in relation to the emphasis upon outcomes, although some gains have been recorded.

VIII. In terms of specific measures and particular targets, ESDP should undergo a mid-term review, as planned for 2013, to assess the status of its implementation and consider the incorporation of ongoing reforms across the sector in recent years, for some of which it has been responsible. Several underlying issues that have not been examined in depth in the sub-sectoral plans (such as learning outcomes, teacher commitment and quality assurance, and new strategic interventions and initiatives) should be dealt with thoroughly in a revised ESDP.

IX. The third Primary Education Development Programme has recently been finalised. It has many strengths, responding well to the recommendations made in an evaluation of its predecessor and addressing most, if not all, of the comments made by stakeholders during its development. It should, with continuing donor support and good management, achieve most of its objectives to a reasonable degree, and this should be of significant practical benefit.

X. However, in several crucial areas, including children’s learning, teachers’ effectiveness, inspectors’ roles, pre-primary expansion, secondary English-language readiness, the TRCs, and practical ICT applications, while analyses are presented and strategies offered, more could be done to seriously address the underlying problems. Moreover, there is no risk analysis. Thus, despite the substantial improvement that a full implementation of PEDP III will bestow, in parts the plan reads as being more about improving the situation than addressing the underlying problems.

XI. The inclusion in PEDP III of a Logical Framework and a set of Key Performance Indicators are welcome developments. All of the plans within the education sector should contain such items, their quality should be increased through in-house capacity development and shared approaches, and the Log Frames and KPIs in the sub-sector action plans should dovetail with one another and, vitally, should take forward the sectoral Log Frame and KPIs to be included in a revised ESDP. A sector-wide M&E framework is currently under development and will provide necessary coherence to guide the sector.

XII. Further attention should be given to the Key Performance Indicators and, with the intended monitoring mechanisms in operation, responding creatively to feedback. With that as guide, each year’s primary sub-sector action plan may deal more directly and increasing effectiveness with those fundamental issues that are not yet addressed. By such means, PEDP III will gather momentum and gain credibility as its implementation proceeds, to the increasing benefit of Tanzania’s children.

XIII. The second Secondary Education Development Programme covers the period 2010-2015. It is, in very many respects, a creditable plan, concentrating upon the identified problems and providing realistic and costed ways of overcoming them. However, at this half-way point in its implementation, there are many signs of its not being fully executed on schedule: the lack of the right resources at critical points has been a seriously limiting factor.
XIV. Given that the precise situation, together with the causes of those suspected deficiencies, are unclear, the immediate priority is for a thorough mid-term evaluation of progress to date against planned SEDP II performance, so that well-informed remedial action may be taken.

XV. The Teacher Development and Management Strategy which was approved in May 2008, contains clear and non-contestable objectives and has been of practical value: efforts made by GoT to operationalise some of TDMS’s strategic objectives, including school-based INSET, are commendable. However, several issues that would seem to be necessary elements of any practically valuable teacher development strategy – such as the anticipated demand for and planned supply of teachers, by subjects and geographical locations, over the coming decade – are not sufficiently addressed. A strategic re-think is opportune, addressing the central challenges of providing and maintaining sufficient, effectively deployed, competent, highly-motivated teachers.

XVI. This far-reaching ‘teacher strategy’ should pave the way towards the continuous professional development of teachers, accompanied by the preferred strategies, possibly focussing on in-school capacity building and school self-assessment with quality assurance, in which some progress has already been made. Unless this central challenge is met, Tanzanian education cannot significantly move forward.

XVII. A Folk Education Development Programme document was published in February 2008: its programme period has been extended to 2012/13. The central objectives and key indicators of FEDP will not be achieved over the originally intended plan periods (a) it did not start on schedule, (b) the policy decision by GoT that FDCs should provide both Folk and Vocational Education by 2013 caused further delays; and (c) insufficient funding has been available from the outset.

XVIII. Folk Education seems – from on-the-ground evidence, to be delivering more of value than the FEDP and quantitative details of its implementation to date reveal, including components related to Early Childhood Development. However, FEDP is out of date and producing an explicit, costed action plan covering the present and the next two years is a priority, consistent with an FEDP II – to be developed based upon an evaluation and through widespread participation – that brings together the amended objectives with the intended strategies and a realistic budgetary scenario.

XIX. The Adult and Non-Formal Education Development Plan was approved and published in February 2012 and is currently in operation. While some aspects of the financial analyses and estimates are imperfect, the plan’s treatment of monitoring and evaluation is reasonably thorough. However, no indications of planned tracer studies or of other assessment of outcomes are offered, nor is the issue of synergies and overlap between ANFE and other sub-sectors – including Folk Education – addressed.

XX. Given the limited success of earlier strategies in relation to out of school children, youth and adults, some aspects of this plan raise doubts regarding the likelihood of its complete and timely implementation. Creative approaches – such as the possible relevance of national/community service to a nationwide literacy campaign – might well be considered.

XXI. The Technical and Vocational Education Development Programme 2013/14-2017/18 is a high-quality plan, professionally prepared, and in many respects a model of what a comprehensive sub-sector plan (as opposed to an action plan) should be.

XXII. TVETDP is highly ambitious regarding additional infrastructure, staffing and graduates; its assumptions regarding sub-sector support (covering for instance tax revenue, GDP, inflation and the contribution of SDL to TVET) may not eventuate. The ‘minimum funding proposal under resources constraints’ may conceivably, in times of acute economic scarcity, come to
pass and, if that transpires, Tanzania’s movement towards middle income status will be impeded. Whether and to what extent TVETDP may be implemented is dependent upon a whole host of factors, the majority of which are clearly identified and thoughtfully addressed in this impressive document.

XXIII. The Higher Education Development Programme covers the years 2010-2015 and was approved in March 2010 after three years in preparation. Its effective use of graphics to illustrate key concepts is especially commended and the collaborative exercise of its evolution has been of clear benefit to directly involved academics and hence, it may be assumed, to their institutions and to Tanzania. Higher educational and secondary institutions are inextricably intertwined: the former provide the teachers for the latter; schools produce the students who will enter the universities. In that this appraisal necessarily looks at the quantity and quality of secondary teachers – and notes particularly the paucity of mathematicians and scientists in Tanzania’s classrooms – HEDP’s lack of focus on this key issue is regarded as an imperfection and shows inadequate level of consultation between the secondary and higher educational levels in the development of their plans.

XXIV. ESDP stated that “each of the sub-sectors will develop its costed rolling 3-year plans and associated performance management arrangements. However, as depicted in this present appraisal, more than four sub-sector plans (typically labelled ‘programmes’) have been produced and rather than ESDP’s proposed ‘rolling 3-year’ action plans, the sector developed 3-years Medium Term Strategic Plans (MSTP) that provide framework for planning, implementation, performance review and sets out the basis for resource allocation, mechanisms for engaging with other education stakeholders, and outlines the key milestones in the ESDP. The MTSP are translated into Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks and Annual budgets for each sub sector programme.

XXV. Some of the plans appraised were constructed on unrealistic assumptions regarding funding and, when those riches were not forthcoming, many of the objectives were unfulfilled. However, the most recent plans include more than one scenario, ranging from the ‘likely’ through to the ‘optimistic’ but indicating the ‘priorities amongst the priorities’, thereby making the financial aspects of those plans more realistic. [Rolling action plans are better-gearied to fluctuating financial fortunes than is the fixed 5-year sub-sector plan that is presently the norm.].

XXVI. Some major issues should be better addressed. For instance, the plans should more seriously assess (a) the likely supply and demand for teachers over the coming years; (b) fresh approaches to school inspection related to school-based self-assessment; (c) school-based teacher capacity development, as opposed to external courses [which welcome development is occurring in practice but not highlighted in the plan], and (d) the burgeoning private schools, colleges and universities segment, not to mention the prevalence of private tuition.

XXVII. As already emphasised (VII above), ESDP should be reviewed in early 2013 as a priority. This review should recommend ways to bring greater coherence among the sub-sectoral plans, the proposed interventions including the GPE programme, major strategic agreements such as the recently signed Education Reform Compact, the emerging Capacity Development Plan for M&E and a sector-wide M&E framework, Education Rapid Budget Assessment– and, indeed, all multilateral and bilateral forms of support to education.

XXVIII. Tanzania’s educational plans have identified priority areas where additional support is urgently needed and where such support – if well-directed and effectively applied – could make a significant and sustainable impact upon quality basic education for all – the Global Partnership for Education’s focus. Based upon the principles underlying the existing plans,
for the basic education sub-sectors and for the ESDP itself, the paramount challenge is that not all of Tanzania’s children are learning and this appraisal of those documents suggests that the emphasis should be on that reality.

XXIX. It is certainly possible for GoT (with support and through widespread consultation) to develop a feasible intervention based upon the principles and priorities explicit or, in some instances, implicit in these plans.

XXX. After substantial discussion, the Education Development Partners Group came to the conclusion that the Government of Tanzania should proceed at once with its Application for GPE membership.

XXXI. While ESDP and the relevant sub-sector plans are of an acceptable quality to justify proceeding in this manner, the Education Development Partners Group considers that the limitations identified in this Appraisal should be attended to and that the recommendations presented, notably the urgent need for a thorough review of ESDP, and the subsequent synchronising and dovetailing of all sub-sector (rolling action) plans with a revised ESDP, be considered very carefully by GoT and related stakeholders.

XXXII. Given the Millennium Development goal deadline of 2015 and the emerging post-MDG planning scenario from then onwards, it makes good sense for the alignment of planning approaches and cycles to be synchronised from that year onwards.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Purpose of this Appraisal

It is trusted that this appraisal of the Mainland’s educational plans by the Education Development Partners Group (ED DPG) will be of interest and value to decision-makers and planners across the sector. It was instigated in order to further Tanzania’s early membership of the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) but, more generally, it is hoped that an objective review of those documents at this time will be a significant contribution to the education sector’s development.

The GPE has informed the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania (GoT) of an indicative allocation of US$100 million, to be divided between Mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar, for a Programme Implementation Grant to support the country’s efforts to provide quality basic education1 for all. In turn, the responsible authorities have communicated to the GPE their intention of joining the Partnership and it is hoped to submit a funding application in early 2013 by which time the endorsement process would need to have been concluded.

This appraisal of the education plans is intended not only to identify their strengths and provide recommendations for further improvements but it also constitutes a basis for the continued commitment of the Development Partners (DPs) who, through the Joint Assistance Strategy for Tanzania (JAST), have already signified their readiness to aligning their support to the objectives, strategies and priorities in those plans. Tanzania’s subsequent application for a Programme Implementation Grant will be derived from the planning documents appraised herein and will also be aligned with the Global Partnership priorities as appropriate.

This appraisal relates to the Tanzanian Mainland – a separate appraisal of Zanzibar’s educational plans has been conducted2. It has been produced by the Education Development Partners’ Group, with technical support from Mike Douse, Team Leader (PROMAN) under the HIFAB Framework Contract for SIDA, and will be shared with education sector stakeholders before submission to the Global Partnership for Education.

1.2 The Educational Planning Landscape

The provision of education in Tanzania Mainland is guided by national policies, sector education strategies and programmes3. These documents are the foci of this appraisal:

---

1 This phrase – or the alternative ‘universal quality basic education’ – is highlighted in many GPE documents: in 2011, the Partnership “identified a funding gap of approximately $8 billion to achieve universal quality basic education in the countries it works in”, for example. Tanzania’s operational definition of ‘basic education’ embraces pre-primary, primary, secondary, adult and non-formal education, together with teacher development in relation to those sub-sectors; Education for All (EFA) is often regarded as relating particularly to the primary cycle although a wider interpretation is sometimes used.

2 The especial situation regarding higher education, planned for and guided on a Tanzania-wide basis, is addressed in the Higher Education chapter, below.

3 The distinction between a ‘plan’ and a ‘programme’ will not be dwelled upon unduly in this document – that which Tanzania labels as a Programme fully suffices as a Plan for present purposes.
- The Education Sector Development Programme (ESDP) of 1997, as revised in 2001 and 2008;
- The Primary Education Development Programme (PEDP III) 2012 – 2016;
- The Secondary Education Development Programme (SEDP II) 2010 – 2015;
- The Teacher Development and Management Strategy (TDMS) 2008 – 2013;
- The Folk Education Development Programme (FEDP) 2008 – 2013;
- The Adult and Non Formal Education Development Plan 2012 – 2017;
- The Technical and Vocational Education Development Programme (TVETDP) 2013/14 – 2017 (Draft); and
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It will be noted that these eight plans cover overlapping rather than identical time periods – this diversity will be addressed in this appraisal as will be the inter-relationship between the several plans and also the correspondence between the one sectoral architectural model and the seven sub-sectoral blueprints.

Other relevant official publications have been studied (such as the Human Rights Strategy, the Inclusive Education Strategy, the Information and Communication Technology Policy for Basic
Education, the Education Sector Strategic Plan on HIV/AIDS, the Strategic Plan for Gender Mainstreaming and the National Strategy for Care and Support Services in Primary Schools in Tanzania, Environmental Education Strategy (2010-2014) and reference is made to them only to the extent that they significantly impact upon planning across the sector. However, it is upon the eight plans listed above that this appraisal focuses.

1.3 The Structure of this Appraisal Document

In accordance with advice received from the GPE Secretariat, this document uses their 2006 appraisal guidelines as its starting-point. These comprise three sections: (a) an appraisal of the planning process; (b) an assessment of plan design; and (c) a consideration of implementation readiness. In addition, as currently emerging revised GPE guidelines for appraisal have been studied in their draft form, some of the concepts and approaches contained therein have been incorporated on a common sense basis.

Essentially, this appraisal seeks to establish:

- Have the plan preparation processes been participatory, thorough and transparent?
- Are the plans themselves appropriate and credible?
- What is the likelihood of the targeted outcomes of these plans being achieved?

The 2006 appraisal guidelines suggest a series of steps and each of these has been taken consecutively in the development of this document. This document addresses planning across the education sector, applies the GPE guidelines (both old and emerging new) and is packaged in a manner familiar to most of those stakeholders who will encounter it. Chapter 2 deals with the education sector, while in each of chapters 3 through 9 there are three sections, headed:

- Plan Preparation;
- Relevance and Credibility; and
- Achievement Probability.

Given GPE’s emphasis on ‘quality basic education for all’, particular attention is accorded to the pre-primary and primary education sub-sector and to PEDP III. Basic education in Tanzania is interpreted as also embracing secondary, adult, non-formal education, and teacher education. However, the delivery of basic education cannot be done without well-educated teachers and managers, thus planning within other sub-sectors is a necessary element in this appraisal. Therefore, although the focus is on primary education, the technical appraisal takes a sector-wide approach where appropriate (e.g. on the financing aspects), so that the issues relating to this level of education are put in their proper context.

Moreover, should good quality EFA be wholly achieved for the full primary cycle, any insufficient provision of secondary and TVET places might well result in economic and possibly social disruption. The education sector should therefore advance on all fronts from pre-primary through to postgraduate and the ESDP should offer overall guidance for that coherent and coordinated development.
Following major chapters on the education sector and on primary education, more succinct sections follow on each of secondary education, teacher development, folk education, adult and non-formal education, higher education and TVET. The final chapter brings together the overall conclusions and sets out recommendations covering – and proceeding beyond – those called for in the GPE Guidelines.

1.4 Methodology and Analytical Approach

The appraisal process involved a substantial desk review of the ESDP and relevant sub-sector programmes and plans, together with interviews and field visits. Discussions were held with senior MoEVT officers, key players in other government agencies, development partners, universities, civil society representatives and a range of others involved in the education sector or interested in its development. From field visits to two Regions, many insights into the actualities of Tanzanian Mainland education were gained together with, let it be admitted, a sense of the disconnect that sometimes arises between national plans and classroom realities.

In order to appraise the planning process, key players involved in the development of each of the eight plans were interviewed, as were representatives of DPs, private and NGO sectors and academia who might reasonably have been involved in or consulted regarding those processes. As GPE’s latest draft Guidelines suggest, the development of education plans should be participatory and well-organised and should also develop the capacity of those involved [s summary of DP and of CSO representatives’ responses to a question regarding their agency’s participation in particular plans is annexed].

In appraising the plans themselves, GPE’s draft guidelines suggest that the characteristics of a credible ESDP should be:

- Guided by an overall vision;
- Strategic, setting out the human, technical and financial capacities required;
- Holistic, covering for example formal and non-formal provision, with the learner as the central beneficiary, with recognised rights and needs;
- Feasible, including realistic ways of overcoming financial, technical and political restraints; ‘ownership by key stakeholders has an impact on feasibility’; and
- Sensitive to the constraints, addressing preparedness, prevention and risk mitigation in relation to potential vulnerabilities such as conflicts, natural disasters and economic crises.

These criteria were applied to each of the eight plans under scrutiny.

In order to assess the level of likelihood of the targeted outcomes of the plans being achieved, actual progress to date against intended achievement was examined in the case of those plans, such as the ESDP, already occurring. Difference between planned and actual progress was explored – made easiest in those few instances where Objectively Verifiable (SMART) indicators exist. In all cases, including those where sub-sectoral plans have yet to come into effect, such issues as the following were probed:

- Are there are risks and, if so, how will they be mitigated?
Will the Monitoring and Evaluation system provide robust indicators and valid and reliable data to monitor progress toward the achievement of inputs, outputs and results framework outcomes?

Are the reporting/feedback/consultation mechanisms transparent and adequate to maintain broad ownership during implementation?

Are the plans accompanied by detailed action plans?

Are those who will deliver that which is planned – classroom teachers, head teachers, inspectors, administrators, managers and others – aware of the plan and what it implies for them in terms of roles and responsibilities?

Are they committed to and capable of playing their parts in the plan’s successful implementation?

Based upon the answers to these and other questions, and upon sensitive probing, intelligent listening and insightful observation at meetings and in the field, clear indications of the practical consequences of each plan have evolved. And, from these analyses of plan preparation processes, of the plans themselves and of the likelihood of their objectives being achieved, consolidated conclusions have been drawn and practicable recommendations presented.

As called for in the GPE guidelines, this is a straightforward document that minimizes demands on officials and local donors, while attempting to ensure consistency in the rigour of the appraisal. It is certainly not intended to replicate the process of preparing the education sector plan itself or to create a parallel appraisal process. It is trusted that it both (a) provides evidence that a positive policy environment may – with coordinated effort – be enabled to exist for productive investments in the education sector, and that capacity constraints may be addressed to facilitate policy implementation; and (b) may guide the DPs in coordinating their support and, at an appropriate stage, providing their endorsement that the country’s sector plan is credible and sustainable. Beyond that, it is hoped that this appraisal will prove of value to all of those involved in planning, managing and delivering education across Tanzania.
2. THE EDUCATION SECTOR

The Education Sector Development Programme (ESDP) was launched in 1997, revised in 2001, and further revised in 2008 to cover the period from then through 2017. It is this second revision that is currently in force and which is the subject of this appraisal.

2.1 Plan Preparation

Draft versions of the revised ESDP were developed with technical support, largely involving two senior Tanzanian educational academics and a foreign consultant. Consultations were held with PMO and MoEVT officers and representatives of all donors active in the sector at that time, together with civil society and private sector agents. Discussions at district and regional levels occurred, visits were made to schools and colleges, an analysis of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) was conducted, and the draft plan was reviewed at a well-attended 1-day workshop, all comments received being incorporated into the final version. Implementation of some proposed actions began soon after the document had been finalised in late-2007 and it was officially approved in EDSC consultative forum and published in August 2008.

Based on the Education and Training Policy of 1995, the Tanzania Development Vision 2025, and in keeping with the MDG/EFA goals, Tanzania developed the original ESDP in 1997 to provide a sector-wide strategic framework for the implementation of the education sector reforms. Given the vastness of the sector, and as it was impossible to address all challenges simultaneously, the GoT resolved to develop a series of comprehensive and complementary sub sector plans that would be rolled out under the ESDP umbrella in a step-wise approach. The first sub-sector plan to be launched was the PEDP I (2002-2006) followed by SEDP I in 2004-2009.

It may be noted that the Development Partners who were involved in the 2007 consultations during the preparation of ESDP and who are currently involved in the ED DPG comprised SIDA, CIDA, UNICEF, DFID, UNESCO and WB. Key education sector actors at that earlier stage also included the EC, JICA and the Netherlands; USAID and WFP are involved now but did not participate then. It may also be noted that the Tanzania Teachers Union and representatives of commerce and industry were involved in discussions as the education sector plan evolved. Up to end of PEDP I, the key DP players in the sector also included Norway, Finland, Belgium and Ireland who were part of the Pooled fund partners for PEDP I, along with the EC, Canada, Sweden, the Netherlands and DFID.

2.2 Relevance and Credibility

The revised ESDP describes itself as “...a comprehensive programme aimed at a total transformation of the education sector into an efficient, effective, outcome/output based

---

4 The variant ‘Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Challenges’ is sometimes used. While the differences in practice are negligible, and while ‘Challenges’ is a more positive term than ‘Threats’, it is felt that ‘SWOT’ is more memorable (not to mention more academic in connotation) than is the acronym ‘SWOC’.

5 Throughout this appraisal document the term ‘ESDP’ refers to the revised version of 2007/08 save when an alternative interpretation is made clear.
system... an evolving national plan for achieving the educational goals expressed in Tanzania’s Development Vision 2025”

The thorough revision of ESDP in 2007/08 was ‘necessitated’ as a consequence of several factors including the 2006 and 2007 Education Sector Reviews, the adoption of MKUKUTA (the National Strategy for Growth and Poverty Reduction) and the formulation of PEDP I 2002-06, SEDP I 2004-09 and FEDP 2007-11. The Joint Assistance Strategy for Tanzania (JAST) and the Education Sector Review of 2006 had both indicated a need to take into account elements from the changing environment within which ESDP continued to be implemented.

These developments were occurring within a context of enhanced regional integration (for example, the SADC Protocol and the Sub-Saharan harmonising of Qualification Frameworks) and new sector dialogue structures. There was, accordingly, a need not only to revise ESDP’s targets and action plans but also to re-focus the education vision, strategic priorities, costing and communication networks of the plan in line with changing macro and micro socio-economic contexts and policy terrains.

The revised ESDP reports the achievements highlighted in the MKUKUTA status report, including improvements in school infrastructure, enrolment, teacher supply, and the provision of teaching and learning materials. It noted “…a positive trend in achieving some educational outcomes, mentioning increased enrolment rates at all levels of education, improving Teacher/Pupil Ratios, increased percentages of pupils passing the Primary School Leavers’ Examination, and increases in the transition of Standard VII pupils into secondary schools”.

It also identified the major challenges “still facing the education sector”, including the need to “...increase enrolments at Pre-Primary, Secondary, Folk, Vocational, Technical and Higher Education levels; improve pass rates and reduce the high unit costs per graduate; increase physical facilities and expand infrastructure at all levels; recruit and retain qualified teaching staff at all levels; increase teaching and learning materials and equipment; review and develop a curriculum that is demand driven; build adequate capacity in governance, management, monitoring and evaluation; ...address cross-cutting issues; ensure effective linkages and synergies within the education sector; ensure adequate funding of education programmes; and boost morale and ability to demonstrate initiatives across the sector”. These challenges necessitated the revision of ESDP.

In line with the Tanzania Development Vision 2025 and MKUKUTA, the ESDP vision was stated as having “an upgraded and coherently planned, managed and monitored educational sector that will develop human capital in order to boost economic growth and eliminate poverty”. The intention, therefore, was to invest in:

- Developing an integrated and outcomes-oriented education system;
- Changing education sector stakeholders’ mind-sets;
- Building a culture of cherishing human development through hard work, professionalism; entrepreneurship, creativity, innovativeness and ingenuity;

---

6 Throughout this document, phrases within quotation marks have been taken directly from the plan being appraised, save when clear indications of other origins are provided.
Fostering among learners a sense of self confidence and high respect for all people irrespective of race, gender, geographical location and disabilities; and

Seeking to facilitate the acquisition of the critical national attributes translating into measured capabilities possessed by graduates at different levels.

It should also be noted that ESDP was aimed at promoting the effective and cost efficient provision of educational infrastructure and ICT.

However, all of the proposed changes, reforms and interventions were to be focused on improving learning outputs and outcomes, on teacher capability improvements, and on promoting a better teaching and learning environment resulting in increased achievement and competences by learners and teachers. It was emphasised that this could be achieved only if governance and accountability were improved through output/outcome performance monitoring; this stress upon outputs and outcomes is a recurring theme.

It was recognised that to achieve these effective educational consequences would require sector-wide coordination, a coherent approach to investment and performance management, and an integrated process from entry (pre-school) onwards. A recognised challenge was that the educational sector in Tanzania was dispersed across a number of Ministries including the Office of the Prime Minister (PMO) with its regional and local government responsibilities. The education sector elements were situated within MOEVT and, to a lesser extent, the Ministry of Community Development, Gender and Children (MCDGC). ESDP entrusted the coordination function to MoEVT and proposed that it be managed through four sub-sectors, namely Basic Education, Technical and Vocational Education, Higher Education and Folk Education.

ESDP’s four outcome clusters to be addressed by the sub-sectors were:

- Capabilities and Values;
- Conducive Teaching and Learning Environment;
- Micro-Macro Efficient Management; and
- Education Provision in order to increase enrolment at all levels.

The key result areas of ESDP were:

- Education Leadership;
- Students/Learners and Teachers’ Capabilities/Skills Values;
- Institutional/School Incentives Processes;
- Cost Effectiveness and Cost Efficiency of Outcomes’ Achievement; and
- Consultative Dialogue Machinery and Performance.

Each of the four sub-sectors was considered important “as none should be marginalized”. The proposed arrangements were seen as significantly upgrading both sector-wide and sub-sectoral planning and performance management. ESDP made clear that each of these four sub-sectors should develop its action plan and associated performance management arrangements. Their plans should be related to the four outcome clusters and the five key results areas for which agreed indicators would be objectively verifiable and outcome-based.
Measures were to be instituted to facilitate the clinical supervision and mentoring of teachers. Such supervision “will result in reducing teachers’ absenteeism and increasing the pupils’ time on tasks”. Actions to be prioritised included the implementation of the Teachers’ Development Strategy (TDMS); planned quality in-service training of the teaching force at all levels; the enhancement of Teachers’ Resource Centres (TRCs), strengthening ICT in education institutions for open learning and taking measures to ensure the full realisation of the teacher management function. The use of management instruments such as the Open Performance Review and Appraisal System (OPRAS) at school level would be instituted in this regard. Furthermore, head teachers “will be assisted to develop instructional leadership capacity” (a point which is referred to below).

ESDP’s M&E and the need (which has to some degree been met) for an effective ESMIS7 are discussed in the following section. Related to information-driven planning, ESDP emphasised – as already noted – the ‘outcome-based approach’ observing that the plan’s “implementation will demand changes in (each of) mind-set; orientation of skills; work processes, instruments and procedures; and staffing and institutional set-up”.

At the Primary level, key action priorities would include implementing measures to reduce the relevant internal system inefficiencies; introducing school feeding schemes, albeit at local community’s expense; and the promotion of pre-primary education as a means to achieve community-based early childhood care. ESDP also addressed the primary school access needs of vulnerable groups and the girl child, catering for children who may have missed enrolment or who dropped out before completing primary education cycle. Access to primary education by such children also offered opportunities for instituting a parallel primary school system such as Complimentary Basic Education in Tanzania (COBET).

The official Language of Instruction (LOI) is Kiswahili at the primary level8 and English thereafter – and there is a wealth of research and policy papers on these matters. In practice, many students fail to grasp a working knowledge of English during their primary years and, indeed, many teachers of English at that level have little command of that language or of how it may best be taught. As noted in PEDP III, “the common language is Kiswahili which is the national language, and the lingua franca of Central and Eastern African countries. There are also over 120 tribal languages spoken in Tanzania”. There are limited learning materials and the situation is particularly difficult in remote and disadvantaged areas and where the mother tongue is other than Swahili (on meeting Standard 7 students in Maasai schools, the Appraiser could locate none who could communicate at all in English).

ESDP had reported that: “Expert opinion suggests that in cost benefit analysis terms the choice of Language of Instruction needs to be determined on the basis of five variables criteria, namely its effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, sustainability and equity. The role of English in relation to

7 The term ‘Education Sector Management Information System’, with the acronym ‘ESMIS’, is used throughout this document, distinguishing it from ‘FEMIS’ (the ‘Folk Education Management Information System’) and ‘LL-MIS’ (the ‘Lifelong Learning Management Information System’). The issue of why there should not just be the one comprehensive EMIS – minimising duplication, encouraging cooperation, embodying the sector-wide approach and eliminating redundant acronyms – cannot be avoided.

8 The 1995 Education and Training Policy (pp. 34-35) states that the “medium of instruction in pre-primary schools and primary school shall be Kiswahili, and English shall be a compulsory subject” It is understood that this issue will be addressed in the forthcoming Education and Training Policy revision.
regional integration is a relevant factor. In any case, both Kiswahili and English will be taught more effectively as subjects than is the case at the moment. Furthermore, the modalities of the possible adoption of Kiswahili as a language of teaching and learning will be explored more vigorously than was done in the past...”. The significance of these issues is widely recognised and the possibilities of, for example, mother tongue-based instruction in the early years are discussed by many at different levels within the sector. These issues need to be deeply addressed in the PEDP III and SEDP II plans, particularly the disconnection between ‘Kiswahili primary’ and ‘English secondary’.

Non-formal, adult and folk education were also emphasised by ESDP: “These provisions would not only provide opportunities of knowledge and skills development to immediate producers but should also deliver literacy and functional skills necessary for national development”. An implication here is that these also fall within the purview of ‘basic education’; an apparent weakness was the ignoring of potential synergies between NFE and Folk Education.

ESDP recognised the major challenge facing the education sector in terms of upgrading the physical facilities and infrastructure at post-primary, folk and vocational training levels to facilitate expansion of enrolment. It also observed that both the numbers of university graduates being produced and the proportion of youngsters acquiring work-related skills were low. ESDP addressed these challenges by aiming at ensuring adequate provision of human and fixed assets, focussing on utilizing the existing human resources and facilities to accommodate multiple intakes and enrolment. By these means, and without lowering standards, production of skilled personnel including graduates would be increased.

It was emphasised in the plan that the National Examinations Council of Tanzania (NECTA) and the School Inspectorate should focus on performance-oriented outcomes and that, as a long-term aim, all primary and secondary schools should be inspected at least twice annually as stipulated in sub-sector plans and guidelines.

The Government of Tanzania (GoT) holds the mandate in terms of education sector governance and implementation. However, successful implementation of ESDP would, it stressed, be achieved most effectively, justly and equitably by means of effective dialogue structures involving GoT, civil society, educational professionals, Development Partners and the wider community. An important element would be the committee structure and the following arrangements were proposed:

- Inter-Ministerial Steering Committee (IMSC);
- Joint Education Sector and Thematic Area Working Group (JESTWG);
- Government Education Sector and Thematic Area Working Group(GESTWG);
- Ministerial Development Committees:
  - Education Sector Development Committee (ESDC); and
  - Folk Education Development Committee (FEDC).
- Sub-Sector Task Forces; and
- Sub-Sector Technical Working Groups.
The sector plan recognised that resources required for its full implementation would be far more than the Government of Tanzania could afford and called for “careful and participative planning, effective performance management, cost-sharing and community participation at all levels and above all a significant transformation in mind-set and effective monitoring and evaluation...” It concluded that ESDP could be implemented on that financial basis assuming that:

- Cost-savings and increased efficiencies will be applied throughout the 10-year period covered by this edition of ESDP; and
- Contributions from communities, students, parents, civil society, the private sector and Development Partners will be necessary and applied to best effect.

Data on enrolment and successful graduating students indicated very low internal efficiency across the sector: an outcome that ESDP believed must be altered over the coming decade (i.e. to 2017). It specified that each of the sub-sectors would be required to:

- Calculate current unit (full) costs per graduate taking all related public investment into account; and
- Set ambitious yet achievable indicators for the reduction of those unit costs per graduate, ensuring that there is no associated depletion of standards or of quality.

At an institutional level, this should– the plan proposed – be done on the basis of variable unit costs per graduate. In addition, educational institutions should, as a matter of course, conduct tracer studies of their leavers.

ESDP noted that Development Partners had contributed significantly towards Tanzanian education, mostly through budget support, and that it was necessary that this should continue and, if possible, increase over the coming 10 years. During that decade, the Government would endeavour significantly to increase the Education Sector share of the national budget [a target of 22 per cent of total government expenditure was specified]. ESDP’s financial framework is based both in the form of budget support as well as Technical Assistance (TA) as stipulated in the JAST and upon contributions from Non-State Actors including international organisations, all in order to facilitate the sectoral plan’s successful and timely implementation.

A close reading of ESDP suggests that it meets the criteria set out in the introductory chapter in respect its being visionary, strategic, holistic, reasonably feasible and owned – as far as may be ascertained through interviews and field visits – by key stakeholders. In terms of its being sensitive to potential constraints, the approach to the likely funding situation is realistic and an awareness of organisational realities is displayed. However, five years have elapsed since ESDP was formulated and, inevitably, some situations have evolved and several new factors emerged that make the ESDP mid-term review necessary.

2.3 Achievement Probability

Many ESDP activities have been implemented, fully or partially; others have been, embedded to some degree, in approaches alternative to those detailed in the plan. One undoubted achievement has been the establishment and maintenance of an effective and widely-used Education Sector Management Information System, symbolised by the annual publication of an
attractive and fairly comprehensive compendium of Basic Education Statistics in Tanzania (BEST).

At the quantitative level, BEST enables the implementation of ESDP and the sub-sector plans to be accurately monitored and reported upon: as the sector plan stipulated, “ESMIS will be a key element in planning, monitoring and evaluating ESDP... (it) will assist education planners and policy makers to achieve information-driven decision-making and provide a clear picture of the performance and reform process in the education sector”.

The sector now has this coherent and reliable monitoring tool and, as ESDP prescribed, there are some indications that “education sector planning will become information-based”. However, the deeper monitoring and performance evaluation processes, geared at ensuring that ESDP implementation is not only on track but also is providing value for money, are not yet fully operational.

ESDP stated that “each of the sub-sectors will develop its costed rolling 3-year plans and associated performance management arrangements... there will be four plans covering all of Basic, Higher, Technical and Vocational and Folk education, taking advantage of the linkages between them, and relating also to market and social requirements and to relevant activities within companies and civil society... emerging through dialogue...”. As depicted in this present appraisal, more than four sub-sector plans (typically labelled ‘programmes’) have been produced and rather than ESDP’s proposed ‘rolling 3-year’ action plans, the sector developed 3-years Medium Term Strategic Plans (MSTP) that provide framework for planning, implementation, performance review and sets out the basis for resource allocation, mechanisms for engaging with other education stakeholders, and outlines the key milestones in the ESDP. The MTSP are translated into Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks and Annual budgets for each sub sector programme.

More positively, it is reported that the widely participative dialogue and the elaborate review structure stipulated in the ESDP have to some extent been realised [PEDP III provides a useful overview of the dialogue structure as presently operating]. IMSC, JESTWG, GESTWG and the two Ministerial Development Committees are functioning as are the sub-sector task forces and technical working groups, along with other bodies and high level meetings. While the representativeness and effectiveness of these groups in practice may be questioned, by most accounts the structure as advocated exists.

However, the sector plan’s requirement that “agreed indicators will be objectively verifiable and outcome-based” has not been fully applied, as will be addressed sub-sector by sub-sector below. Nor did ESDP’s proposal that the sub-sector plans be related to the four outcome clusters or that they address the five key result areas come to pass. As will be seen, some of these crucial themes have been explicitly addressed in some of the sub-sector plans, others dealt with in passing, if at all. Although the specific strategies set out in the ESDP have been taken forward in the plans developed over recent years, the conceptual framework established at the sectoral level has dissipated in the documents developed for particular sub-sectors.

The existence of a Rating Framework for the Joint Assessment of the Education Sector together with Prioritised Milestones is noted and a close examination of these documents offers some indications of the likely level of implementation of ESDP and the sub-sector plans and of the
evolving perceptions of priorities. For instance, one Milestone was to “Develop a 3-year, education sector-wide, costed, operational plan, including priorities from: ESDP; Medium-Term Strategic Plans for Education MDGs; and, sub-sector development programs”\(^9\). However, in that their indicators are not synonymous with those of the plans themselves, the Framework and the Milestones may have tended to focus attention away from those official GoT planning documents and thus distract from the monitoring of their implementation in favour of a different – albeit overlapping – set of targets.

ESDP observed that “...having approached 100% Net Enrolment Ratio (and exceeded 100% GER) for the primary phase, education sector investment over 2008-17 has no simple correlation with enrolments”. Looking back, this seems to have dealt with primary participation too optimistically. The most recent BEST data indicate a GER of 98.4% and an NER of 92% for 2012. It is suggested that the temptation to claim that the earlier and higher percentages were accurate and that the rates have actually been falling should be resisted. As the primary school age population is projected from the 2002 census (which is before the majority of present primary pupils were born), the denominators are suspect. Similarly, the decline in GER over recent years may well be a statistical anomaly based upon the bulge in over-age children – consequent upon the abolition of fees – passing through the system.

Moreover, the reported NER of 100% in 2006 – reflecting an assertion that 7.061 million of the projected 7.063 million children aged 7-13 were in school – is difficult to take seriously\(^10\). BEST reports that only some 28,000 of those in primary schools have disabilities (including Albinism\(^11\)) which represent 0.34 per cent of total enrolment –WHO norms suggest that about five percent of children worldwide have a moderate disability, while 0.7 percent has a severe disability. During recent visits to schools, of the children in attendance – as opposed to those registered – the proportion with moderate let alone severe disabilities was negligible. This adds to the uncertainty regarding the level of participation of school-age children in primary education: until the 2012 census results become available, some scepticism seems healthy.

It may be added that GPE advocates the annual calculation and presentation of the Primary Completion Rate (PCR), in many respects a more useful measure than the NER. This indicator has only been covered by ESMIS since 2010.\(^12\) But from information provided in BEST, and

---

\(^9\) It is understood that this milestone was made when the DPs were trying to assist the GoT to become a member of the Fast Track Initiative (now GPE) for which a costed operational plan was a prerequisite. Progress was slow, no 5-year Medium Term Strategic Plans (which would have been the main input for developing the 3-year, education sector-wide, costed, operational plan) have been sighted and progress towards this milestone has been abandoned.

\(^10\) The maximum recorded NERs – of those claims which may be considered reliable – are in the area of 98.6 to 99.2 per cent (in New Zealand, Finland and Singapore).

\(^11\) There is uncertainty worldwide on whether to identify albinism, which is associated with weak eyesight and skin sensitivity, as a disability. An accepted definition of ‘legal blindness’ is when a person’s “vision cannot be corrected with glasses or contacts to better than 20/200 in his or her better eye”: by this standard, some with albinism fit the legal category of visual impairment but most of those do not. Few countries include albinos, as such, in their statistics of children ‘with disabilities’ or ‘with special needs’, although some of them would be included in the ‘partially blind’ category. There have been deplorable incidents of discrimination and serious violence against some Tanzanians with this condition. More positively, one school visited by the Appraiser is carrying out highly commendable inclusive educational activities with albino children.

\(^12\) PEDP III includes Primary Completion Rate Indicators, citing the 2012 ‘net completion rate’ as 54.8% (males: 52.2%, females: 57.4%). UNESCO and Pole de Dakar (2011) claim that it is ‘close to 90 per cent’, which is clearly erroneous.
having applied some caution, it may be estimated at something of the order of 45-50% of the cohort, considerably improved over the last decade. [The Survival Rate from Standard I to VII is around 72% – about 76% for girls and 68% for boys.] In 2011, some 970,000 sat the Standard VII examination, some 570,000 passed and, of those, around 510,000 were selected for Form 1: and those so selected probably represent some 35-38% of the cohort.

Particular quantitative targets are tabulated along with the achievement to date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESDP Indicator</th>
<th>Achievement to 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 50% of all children receive two years of Pre-Primary education by 2012</td>
<td>Around 41% of boys and 39% of girls aged 5 and 6 years are attending pre-primary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Net Enrolment Rate in primary schools from 97.3% in 2007 to at least 99% by 2012</td>
<td>NER has declined slightly over the last five years but this may well be a statistical anomaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 50% of children aged 14-17 years are enrolled in ordinary level secondary schools by 2012</td>
<td>About 35.5% of both boys and girls aged 14-17 are enrolled: by Form 4 the proportion of boys significantly exceed that of girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 30% of the cohort are enrolled in advanced level secondary by 2012</td>
<td>Far below expectations: the reported GER is 5.1% and the NER 2.7% for Forms 5 and 6 (for girls, the rates are 3.2% and 2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased undergraduate enrolment in higher and tertiary education to at least 100,000 full time students, 50,000 part-time, and 25,000 distance learners by 2017</td>
<td>These targets for 2017 may well be achieved. In 2012 there are, in total, 114,500 students enrolled in government universities and colleges and 51,900 in non-government institutions at various levels. Some 36% of these are female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased post graduate enrolment in higher and tertiary education to at least 10,000 full-time students and 5,000 part-time students by 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased enrolment to at least 150,000 participants in Folk Education Institutions by 2015</td>
<td>Only around 9,000 participated in FDCs in 2011. Data for Folk and Vocational Education and Training are often combined: the total for FDCs and VTCs was 121,000 in 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A table portraying ESDP’s enrolment projections by sub-sector to 2012 along with the best available current data – all fully consistent with that set out above – is annexed. However, ESDP’s emphasis upon the qualitative – better teaching and learning, improved environments – and its stress on outputs (graduates) and outcomes (graduates in employment) rather than inputs (access) remains and will be returned to in subsequent chapters of this appraisal.

ESDP recognised the need to increase the teaching force remuneration to the level that the economy can afford: this remains a major problem. The field visits reinforced the recognition of a prevailing condition of **acute shortages** in almost all schools (lack of water, food, classrooms, latrines, chalks, inadequate and obsolete physical facilities and infrastructure The widely-
reported shortages of classrooms, laboratories, textbooks, learning equipment, chemicals, libraries, teacher housing, dormitories). As well as abject education poverty in a country vying for middle-income status, there are significant disparities in the provision of staffing, facilities and materials between (a) private schools and government schools serving relatively prosperous areas; and (b) the vast majority of government schools. Moreover, the expansion of private schools and colleges is likely to intensify these disparities. It is essential that these massive challenges be responded to in the educational plans.

In this context it should be noted that the World Bank’s Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) for Tanzania observes that the challenge is “to address so-called ‘quiet corruption’, such as teacher absenteeism, which is less visible than big-time corruption but occurs across a much wider set of transactions directly affecting a large number of beneficiaries”. Concerning Governance, and considering the complexity of such issues in the sector, the CAS sets out “to identify the issues in school management and teacher incentive systems and will recommend institutional development and governance interventions”. Having in mind that private education is ‘building two societies in one country’, the CAS also points to the support interventions which “include scholarships for girls and other marginalized groups or scholarships to private secondary schools”. In the Application for GPE Membership, the CAS deserves to be taken into consideration in relation to programme coherence and the complementary of interventions.

ESDP contained five economic-financial assumptions for the 2008-2017 ten-year period; these, together with the actual experiences to date are tabulated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESDP Assumption</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An annual inflation rate averaging 3.5–4.5%</td>
<td>Actual rate far in excess of assumptions: currently around 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real GDP growth rate of between 6–8% per annum</td>
<td>Achieved – now around 7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government allocating an average of 22% of its total expenditure to the education sector</td>
<td>Below target – moving up to around 19% from 15-16% in recent years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government revenue as a share of GDP averaging 16–17%</td>
<td>This reached 16.1% in 2010/11 and is likely to have been even higher since then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Partners contributing &gt;20% more to budget support than in 2006/07, in real terms</td>
<td>In 2008, the DPs contributed US$190 million to budget support and indications are that more recent contributions have been within range of the assumption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational expenditure as a share of total GoT expenditure has risen from 17.9 per cent in 2009/10 (actual) to 20.2 per cent in 2012/13 (budgeted). Similarly, the education budget as a share of GDP has increased from 4.4% in 2011/12 to 5.3% in this current FY (see Annex D, below). Education is the largest spending sector with a budget double that of the health sector and the share of education spending that is channelled through the decentralised levels of government has risen to two-thirds of the total from just under a half in 2008/09. As the recent Education Rapid Budget Assessment points out, factoring in the high rate of inflation, the real
increase in the education budget is projected to be at least 3 per cent in the current financial year.

As depicted in Annex E, the **budget shares** to the main three sub-sectors (primary, secondary and tertiary education) are, again in the words of the Education Rapid Budget Assessment, “broadly in line with international benchmarks of 50% for primary, 20% for secondary and 20% for higher education”. [It is noted that ‘primary’ includes pre-primary for this purpose.] That Assessment observes that “government plans to expand pre-primary education... given the focus on post-primary there may be reallocation of finance from higher to secondary”.

Noting the **low internal efficiency** across the sector\(^\text{13}\), ESDP called upon each of the sub-sectors to (a) calculate current unit costs per graduate taking all related public investment into account; and (b) set agreed achievable indicators for the reduction of those unit costs per graduate, ensuring that there is no associated depletion of standards or of quality by end-2008. Other than in some higher educational and a minority of secondary institutions, these measures do not appear to have been taken and the inefficiencies persist. However, the numbers of university graduates have increased (which might well be reducing unit costs at that level, as should the expansion of the Open University) and some of the longest-established higher educational institutions are conducting tracer studies of their leavers which should enlighten analyses of the private and social returns to investments in university education.

ESDP also stated that (a) cost-savings and increased efficiencies will be applied throughout the 10-year period from 2008 through 2017; and (b) contributions from communities, students, parents, the private sector and Development Partners will be necessary and must be applied to best effect. There has been an emphasis upon cost savings while fees have been introduced at the secondary level. Loan arrangements for tertiary students have also been clarified although it is understood that repayment levels remain low.

The recently-signed\(^\text{14}\) **Education Reform Compact** (ERC) contains several features that are remarkably similar to the central thrust of this present appraisal document. Emphasising learning outcomes at the basic education level, ERC’s priorities for the next 3 years comprise (a) improving teacher incentives, support systems, and professionalization, (b) enhancing student assessment, and (c) accountability. The core principles guiding the choice of initiatives are described as including:

- a systems approach;
- cost-effectiveness and value for money;
- evaluation embedded in programme design;
- wide stakeholder engagement;
- strong and ongoing communication; and
- financing linked to realistic results.

These principles may readily be supported.

---

\(^{13}\) The significant wastage in the education system, undermining the value-for-money, is (according to the Education Rapid Budget Assessment of November 2012) attributable to three issues: (i) high repetition rates in the early grades of primary education, (ii) general problems of repetition and dropout throughout all cycles, and (iii) low examination pass rates at the end of the primary and lower secondary cycles.

\(^{14}\) By the Minister for Education and high-level international DP and CSO representatives on 16\(^{th}\) November 2012.
This is a significant and positive development, endorsed at the highest level and dovetailing entirely with the proposed GPE-supported programme.

To summarise, several of the recommendations in the revised ESDP of 2008 have come to pass including the creation of an effective ESMIS, the establishment of participative dialogue and review structures, the incorporation of the Higher and Technical and Vocational Education Divisions into MoEVT and the focussing of examinations away from memorisation in favour of knowledge application. Other objectives – for instance improved teacher morale, regular school inspection, expanded enrolment and upgraded achievement at all post-primary levels and qualitative performance generally – have been less amenable to rectification, although some gains have been recorded.

Perhaps it is in relation to the emphasis upon outcomes that the aspirations embodied in ESDP have been least realised. As that document stated, to concentrate on learning rather than enrolment, on graduates rather than buildings, on competencies rather than training courses, and on the achievement of practical objectives rather than the approval of programmes necessitates a major shift in mind-set. Nevertheless, a central theme of ESDP was that returns upon investment in education should ultimately be reflected in the level and quality of each child’s learning – and this focus has yet to be achieved.

There is much in the 2008 revision that still needs to be done and, given that it is a perspective plan to 2017, it still offers useful guidelines and principles. For present purposes, it contains some indications of potential GPE programme priorities, reinforcing the focus upon Quality Basic Education for All and the need for committed teachers operating in convivial learning environments with the emphasis on inclusive education in child-friendly schools and classes. These general emphases remain unchanged and, as constantly underlined; their success should be measured in terms of each child’s learning.

Yet the plan’s specific prescriptions are increasingly out of date: for instance, the Education Minister’s announcements at each of the last two contributions to the budget debate relate to innovations which, while fully in accord with the sector plan’s goals and strategies, are not specifically proposed in that 2008 document. Similarly, recent developments regarding:

- Education costs, school fees and parental contributions (a Directive is to be issued in 2013);
- The recent Presidential Directive regarding the construction of science laboratories in secondary schools in all wards; and
- Form 2 examinations (pupils will now be allowed just the one re-sit: the pass mark remains at just 30 per cent)

did not arise from – nor are they specifically mentioned in – the ESDP. Moreover, a draft Education and Training Policy is being prepared and may be in force in the coming FY: that too will contribute to the aging of the 2008 revision of the ESDP.

Inevitably, in terms of its specific measures and its particular targets, the 2008 version of ESDP is due for a mid-term review, considering the substantial changes that have occurred across the sector in recent years, for some of which it has been responsible.
3. PRE-PRIMARY AND PRIMARY EDUCATION

As with each of chapters 3 through 9, the intention here is objectively to appraise a sub-sectoral plan – in this case the recently-produced third Primary Education Development Programme (PEDP III). As already made clear, the intention is to establish:

- If the plan preparation process been participatory, thorough and transparent;
- If the plan itself is appropriate and credible; and
- The likelihood of the targeted outcomes of this plan being achieved.

As this is an especially lengthy chapter, it may be helpful to state at the outset that:

- PEDP III has many positive features and its implementation should, of course, proceed, to the significant benefit of Tanzania’s children.

But, without in any way delaying that implementation,

- Participatory reviewed of the Key Performance Indicators should be done so that they provide challenging yet achievable targets for all key programme objectives.

In addition, and again without holding up PEDP III’s implementation,

- Some of the underlying challenges (such as universal participation, teacher effectiveness, quality assurance and each child’s learning), which it is felt are touched upon but not dealt with thoroughly in this plan, may be addressed in depth – and from a sector-wide perspective – in a revised ESDP. These and many other matters are addressed in the paragraphs that follow.

As this Appraisal was being conducted, the third Primary Education Development Programme (PEDP III), covering the 2012-16 period, was being finalised – as with its predecessors, it embraces also the pre-primary sub-sub-sector. The first PEDP, which ran from 2002 through 2006, evolved through substantial nationwide consultations and had four strategic priorities (expansion of enrolment, improving the quality of teaching and learning processes, capacity building and strengthening the institutional arrangements): it was by most accounts an outstanding success. Building on its achievements, the second phase, PEDP II 2007–11 pursued seven priority areas – enrolment expansion (access and equity), quality improvement, strengthening capacity in governance and management, cross-cutting issues, strengthening institutional arrangements, strengthening educational research and enhancing educational monitoring and evaluation.

PEDP III will, the plan itself makes clear, “re-address the challenges experienced in PEDP II and use a participatory approach to implementation. The main areas that need attention in PEDP III include: financing, capacity building, teaching and learning environment, emerging issues in pre-primary and primary education. Others are the “revamping of the 3Rs in lower primary”, curriculum reviews, assessments and examination, improving school inspection, the Education Sector Management Information System, educational research, enrolment expansion and cross cutting issues”.

3.1 Plan Preparation

From the outset, the drafting of PEDP III was carried out by government officials; in the latter stages, including a week in Morogoro in early-October, they were directly supported by educational specialists representing the DPs.

The process started in June 2012 and a first draft was available by end-July and sent to DPs and CSOs in early-August for their inputs. In late-September the Development Partners responded to the MoEVT Permanent Secretary and the Director of Primary, recommending “that significant changes need to be made to the document to ensure that it becomes a credible plan – attractive for both internal and external financing and an implementable plan that will deliver the human capital needed to put Tanzania on the right track to development”. Some of the DP’s specific comments were that:

- The contribution of PEDP III to the nation’s broader economic and social goals is not clearly explained;
- The structure of the document does not allow the reader to see the bigger picture;
- PEDP III needs to be an implementable strategic plan that delivers a quality primary education system;
- The sector analysis within PEDP III should be strengthened to ensure that strategies to address current challenges will deliver the step-change needed at this level; and
- The draft PEDP III misses some of the vital evidence and recommendations from the PEDP II evaluation.

In addition, the DPs noted that the M&E section was missing and the costing scenarios were unconvincing.

The Development Partners added that they could underwrite PEDP III’s further development and reconfirmed their commitment “to support the Government in developing the necessary skills and competencies needed to meet Tanzania’s ambitious development goals”. They noted that “…strengthening PEDP III offers a unique opportunity for the Government and its DPs to put their heads together and see how to make a step change in terms of access, quality and equity in basic education”. Some comments from CSOs were also submitted, based particularly on the evaluation of PEDP II implementation and focussing more on what should be the PEDP III priorities than on the draft PEDP III document itself.

The revised document was circulated to DPs in mid-October for their further inputs. The Extra Ordinary ESDC Task Force met later that month and noted that, while acknowledging that it responded to some of the earlier concerns and represented an improvement on the previous draft, the DPs felt that it could not be endorsed “at its current state, however would do so once the new inputs were incorporated”. At the ESDC Task Force’s Meeting in late-October, substantial comments were provided on M&E, Financing and Risk Analysis (for example, “Fiscal realities need to be spelt out more clearly and to include indicators to track funds” and “An analysis of how much resources have been availed to PEDP in the past and the anticipation of resources to be availed is necessary in order to prioritize where availed funds should be allocated”).

Other comments related to links to the TDMS, TRCs, teacher housing, continuous assessment, the delivery of Capitation Grants to schools, the training of para-professionals and pre-primary
teachers, out of school children, and researches on access, equity and quality. The general comment was made that “While it is important to appreciate the fact that the document needs to be finalized, it is important to ensure it is credible and will be attractive to financing stakeholders”. Members also raised concerns that PMO RALG and other government agency participation was limited, particularly because they were not represented at the meeting (and, it is reported, had not been involved in some earlier meetings). Members called for involvement of key stakeholders in the finalization of the document. The minutes of that meeting illustrate the degree and nature of the support being given (and influence being exercised) by the DPs in the development of this Tanzanian plan.

To take the process forward, at that Task Force meeting:

- A small team was formulated incorporating members from the Government, DPs and CSOs;
- The team was directed to meet on 30th October 2012 to discuss how they will carry the exercise forward and ensure that it is finalized and circulate by 5th November for comments from stakeholders by 8th November;
- The main activity for the team would be to work on the M&E, Finance and Risk Analysis sections;
- Further comments were invited from members to be directly forwarded to the small team; and
- It was agreed that the document not be endorsed until the task team had finalized incorporating the inputs. Thereafter, members would confirm whether they approved the document endorsement by email. Once endorsed the document would be forwarded to the ESDC for approval.

On 15th November a copy of the final draft of the PEDP III document was received by the Appraiser, with the information that it had been “circulated to all key parties and has come back to us with zero comments”. It is this version that is now appraised.

The importance accorded to PEDP III is reflected in its drawn-out genesis – and, at times, it may seem to an outside observer as if the discussion moved away from being concerned with how the limited resources may best be mobilised to meet the many challenges over the coming five years and towards the structure and content of a ‘document’. However, provided GoT participants have perceived their continued plan ownership as unthreatened, and provided they have not sensed the process as a one-sided matter of their being forced unwillingly to conform to external standards, significant capacity development in educational planning may well have occurred over recent months.

Notwithstanding the roles of some individual DP nominees in the plan’s evolution, this present Appraisal document, published by the Education Development Partners Group, applies the criteria objectively and reports accordingly – no other course of action is possible.

3.2 Relevance and Credibility

This version is a clear improvement upon its predecessors and represents a painstaking piece of work: some, if not all, of the DP’s many concerns have been responded to. The programme includes a ‘costing and budgeting framework’, based upon three scenarios, together with ‘pre-
primary and primary projections’. There is also a LogFrame and a valuable annex covering ‘the roles and responsibilities of education actors’, from School Committees through various government officers and groups, to CSOs.

When PEDP I commenced in July 2001, total primary school enrolment stood at 4.875 million with GER and NER reported at 84.9% and 66.0% respectively; by 2012, enrolment had reached 8.247 million with GER reported at 98.4% and NER at 92.0%. [As already noted, pupil cohort population estimates are projected from 2002 census data —as the 2012 demographic statistics are not yet available). Technical observations based on cross referencing between DHS, ESMIS, and household-based sources, indicate that the routine data system over-estimates net enrolment. According to that source, real NER is thus more likely to be around 80 per cent. Nevertheless, this undeniable increase represents a substantial achievement and a testament to effective planning.

However, a serious side effect of the increase in primary education enrolment is that many pupils enrol too late and stay in school for too long, often without successfully completing the cycle, thus contributing to low internal efficiency. The trend is particularly noticeable for pupils from poorer families. Moreover, based upon the Primary School Leaving Examination (PSLE) results, on the subsequent performance of primary graduate in the Form 2 examinations, and on views widely expressed by managers, inspectors and secondary teachers, and supported by the Appraiser’s own observations in their visits to schools and colleges, the quality of teaching is typically uninspired and, associated with that, the level of learning is frequently inadequate. It is vital that a primary education plan should fully recognise and respond appositely to this situation.

As with its predecessors, PEDP III is “aimed at achieving Universal Primary Education” and “an effort to translate Tanzania Development Vision 2025; the Education and Training Policy (1995); the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP); the Education Sector Development Programme (ESDP), together with the Education for All (EFA 2000) Goals and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) into feasible strategies and actions for the development of pre-primary and primary education”. PEDP III seeks to raise competencies, increase participation and completion, and prepare children for life in a multicultural society.

The plan addresses the impact of primary education on broader economic and social goals and its alignment with other international and national policies. Reference is made to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and to the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty popularly known as MKUKUTA and the Tanzania Development Vision 2025. It reports that the Education and Training Policy of 1995 is currently under review. Reference is made also to the Public Service Reform Programme, the Public Financial Management Reform Programme, the Local Government Reform Programme and the Public Service Pay and Incentive Policy. This particular policy is of particular interest as the remuneration, retention, morale and service delivery of teachers “across the country especially in difficult and hard-to-reach areas” is a crucial factor if EFA and the MDG of universal primary completion are to be achieved.

Specifically the main objectives of PEDP III are to:

- Increase equitable access to pre-primary and primary education;
- Raise the **quality of education** to ensure better learning outcomes for children including improved literacy\(^{15}\);
- Strengthen the capacity for **governance and management** for effective delivery of pre-primary and primary education services;
- Ensure that **cross-cutting issues** are addressed so that children receive a well-rounded education;
- Strengthen **research and monitoring and evaluation** to support evidence based decision-making and
- Streamline **institutional arrangements** and co-ordination mechanisms.

These ‘main objectives’ are then addressed in turn in the document, with objectives and strategies identified for each. A **Logical Framework Matrix**\(^{16}\) is included, comprising the six objectives together with related indicators, each having a baseline for 2012 and targets for the duration of the Programme.

It is noted that “**Pre-primary enrolment** in 2011 was 1,069,208 pupils, which is only 52% of the PEDP II target of 2,043,983 pupils”. Strategies include ensuring “that every primary school has a pre-primary class with adequate facilities, including classrooms and latrines” and providing “Capitation Grants of Tshs 10,000 per pre-primary pupil per year” as well as mobilising “communities to support quality improvement initiatives” and ensuring that “all pre-primary teachers are enabled to support skills for early literacy and numeracy development for pre-primary pupils”. The total costs set aside for all aspects of raising pre-primary participation from just over 1 million in 2011/12 to 1.8 million by the end of the PEDP III period are massive and it is far from clear that all of the underlying factors have been addressed or that alternative strategies have been assessed. Innovation approaches could have been better considered along with low-cost options. The importance of identifying children with special needs at this early stage has not been made explicit.

With regard to primary education, the PEDP II target of enrolling “all 7 year old children into Standard I by 2011” was not achieved and available data show that “that there are still school-age children who are not in school... current high Classroom Pupil Ratio of 1:70 which is below the national standard of 1:40...”. Strategies related to **increasing access** (i.e. participation) include “constructing, rehabilitating and furnishing primary education infrastructures... mobilising the private sector to continue to support provision of primary education through public-private partnership... (and) scaling up school feeding programmes to cover all primary schools”. Noting that “some forms of violence against children especially to girls have been cited in some schools... this may act as a barrier to participation and learning”, PEDP III sets out to “ensure that schools are protective and safe environments for children and... all teachers are sensitised on the National Code of Conduct and Professional Ethics”. While all of this is positive, the plan contains no convincing strategy for reaching the still high proportion of primary-age children still out of school, nor any indication as to why their non-participation persists.

---

\(^{15}\) The devaluation of ‘numeracy’ is referred to below.

\(^{16}\) Some purists might claim that it lack some key features of a true Log Frame, questioning whether, for example, the ‘Results’ are together necessary and sufficient to achieve the ‘Purpose’, just as many of the items labeled ‘Strategies’ are really re-statements of the items labeled ‘Objectives’, and raising other such issues.
Another crucial challenge is implied in a comment contained within the section on the competency based curriculum. Noting that “teacher attendance, regular exercises, marking pupils’ work and assessment of students have high bearing on ensuring delivery of the competency-based curriculum and on improving performance”, the clear implication is that these are often lacking, as is denoted by the related strategy of “reinforcing teacher attendance in class to promote effective curriculum implementation.

Under PEDP III, the Government “will continue to provide school-based INSET and scale it up to reach all primary school teachers” and also to “scale up school-based INSET to all primary school teachers especially in the priority subjects of science, mathematics and languages”. This is a welcome development but in none of the scenarios are these two intentions, each related to the precise number of ‘216,691 primary school teachers’, costed. In fact, the significance of bringing the capacity-building to the school – rather than taking teachers away on disruptive, per diem-oriented and frequently ineffective external courses – is no more than hinted at (although it is now widely discussed amongst Tanzanian educators) and not made fully explicit in the plan.

The plan gives much attention to teacher recruitment and retention, noting that “during implementation of PEDP II there was a declining Teacher/Pupil Ratio (TPR) as a result of deployment of teachers throughout the country. However, it has been observed that some of the teachers deployed to difficult and hard-to-reach areas either do not report or they do not stay long”. GoT” aims to provide incentive packages to teachers teaching in difficult and hard to reach areas and continue to address established the rights of all teachers. Moreover, it will continue to sensitize communities to improve school-community relationships”. Sensible strategies are identified in support of the objectives to ‘Increase the number of primary school teachers’ and ‘Recruit and deploy quality teachers especially in difficult and hard-to-reach schools’. However, the related projections are difficult to follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>8247172</td>
<td>8259546</td>
<td>8420256</td>
<td>8667638</td>
<td>8825326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>206179</td>
<td>206489</td>
<td>210506</td>
<td>216691</td>
<td>220633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Teachers</td>
<td>180987</td>
<td>206179</td>
<td>206489</td>
<td>210506</td>
<td>216691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortage 1.5%</td>
<td>25192</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>4018</td>
<td>6185</td>
<td>3942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attrition</td>
<td>2715</td>
<td>3093</td>
<td>3097</td>
<td>3158</td>
<td>3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Shortage</td>
<td>27907</td>
<td>3402</td>
<td>7115</td>
<td>9342</td>
<td>7193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Recruitment</td>
<td>7004</td>
<td>12344</td>
<td>12344</td>
<td>12344</td>
<td>12344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data raise several questions. In particular, how does the number of ‘existing teachers’ shoot up from 180,000 to 206,000 during this present year (it is now late-2012) and then, with a constant annual recruitment of around 12,500, increase steadily but not hugely thereafter (the INSET number of ‘216,691 primary school teachers’ being reached in 2015/16)? [It is stated that
this table is based upon the “Assumption: PTR 1:40 and Teacher Attrition Rate of 1.5%.”: Teacher Attrition by Qualifications and Reason (Table 2.19 in the latest BEST) lists the reasons why 2,500 primary teachers ceased teaching in 2011.]

Similarly unexplained current year ‘jumps’ relate to other facilities, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing classrooms</td>
<td>117907</td>
<td>206179</td>
<td>206489</td>
<td>210506</td>
<td>216691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Toilet Pits</td>
<td>148501</td>
<td>358573</td>
<td>359111</td>
<td>366098</td>
<td>376854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Desks</td>
<td>2013532</td>
<td>4123586</td>
<td>4129773</td>
<td>4210128</td>
<td>4333819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Teachers Houses</td>
<td>30,376</td>
<td>108,592</td>
<td>111,166</td>
<td>123,893</td>
<td>126,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing pre-primary classrooms</td>
<td>17197</td>
<td>41389</td>
<td>48876</td>
<td>56696</td>
<td>64810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No doubt these lurches arise from a statistician’s application of PEDP III standards and assumptions from 2012/13 onwards, discontinuity notwithstanding. These are not peripheral data and assumptions regarding, say, the numbers of teachers or the numbers of classrooms, need to be clearly explained if trust is to be placed in the entire 80 pages of statistical data.

Certainly the determination to improve conditions runs through the document. Promoting the retention of teachers especially in difficult and hard-to-reach areas’ is a vital objective, with teachers’ houses – and the mobilisation of communities and public private partnerships to participate in their construction – a relevant strategy. As PEDP III reports, “During PEDP II the government increased the available number of houses for teachers from one house to fifteen teachers in 2006 to one house to twelve teachers in 2011. However, this is far from the target of one house to one teacher”, just as the notion of some 80,000 being constructed in this current year (see above table) is entirely fanciful.

PEDP III contains positive intentions regarding the Teachers Resource Centres (TRCs), including ‘revamping and improving their utilisation’, together with the ‘construction of new TRCs and rehabilitating existing ones, providing facilities including IT and capacity building for all TRC Coordinators’. While these developments are likely to be beneficial, they are not based upon any thorough analyses of why so many of the TRCs have been underused and, in many cases, allowed to decay: is it just a lack of funds or are there other relevant factors?

PEDP III gives some attention to Information and Communication Technology, citing the ICT Policy of 2003. The education sector review of 2006 reiterated the need to expand the use of ICT to improve ‘quality in education’ and in 2007, the MoEVT developed an ICT ‘sub-policy’ for Basic Education intended to guide the integration of ICT at that level. “PEDP III will also be guided by the ICT policy to improve teaching and learning in pre-primary and primary schools. The programme will also take advantage of the policy to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the management and administration of education and broaden the basis of education financing, while optimizing the use of education resources, through partnerships and stakeholders participation... will develop a programme for enhancing ICT teaching capacity in primary schools that will integrate ICT in teaching and learning processes”. This is fine as far as it goes and strategies such as “provide appropriate ICT infrastructure including solar power support in
primary schools” and “train adequate number of teachers and curriculum developers on e-content development for primary schools” are welcome.

While making incontestable statements on the need to “prepare our children so that they can benefit from and contribute to our country’s development in the information age... build the foundation for a well-educated and learning knowledge society”, the 2007 Policy has not yet led to noticeable developments in government primary schools nationwide, although there are some indications that PEDP III will start to make that happen. Much of relevance to Tanzania’s primary schools has happened in ICT over the last five years, including a realisation of technology’s potential to solve many basic problems in a stimulating and cost-effective manner. For example, the Book Pupil Ratio (BPR) declined from 1:3 in 2008/9 to 1:5 in 2010/11 [the official figure, which many would dispute] and thus is still far from the national standard BPR of 1:1. While adequate and universally delivered Capitation Grants would help meet that challenge, other ways of addressing it are emerging: a computer-based solution to the dearth of textbooks grows ever-nearer. In a similar manner, solar-powered communication may enable all our children to access libraries and all our teachers to prepare compelling lessons and upgrade their qualifications from afar. That these possibilities are not grappled with in PEDP III is one of several indications of that plan’s approach as one of ameliorating the problems rather than resolving them.

PEDP III correctly identifies the 3Rs as Reading, Writing and Arithmetic but subsequently refers several times to just the ‘basic literacy skills’ to the exclusion of numeracy: “The Government will utilize the existing school-based INSET for primary school teachers to put emphasis on literacy development in primary schools... develop a literacy development programme in schools and TRCs that will employ current literacy development techniques such as Diagnostic Teaching Techniques... promote class libraries to enhance reading culture of pupils and teachers”. These are worthy developments but number skills are necessary also (although some would contend that numeracy is a subset of literacy). Moreover, teaching fundamental proficiencies to young children is an integral element in teaching young children generally and, while it might justify especial emphasis, it may make best sense to address the 3Rs within a wider framework and to utilise INSET to improve teaching as a whole – and consequently each child’s learning generally. By such means, school improvements, continuous professional development, curriculum reform, school self-assessment and effective inspection would be elements of an integrated campaign aimed at enhancing quality, so that learning outcomes in terms of literacy and numeracy would be a central component.

In a similar manner, the section on examination setting and administrative processes of examinations is valuable, but so also is the need for teachers continually to assess each of their children and to adjust their teaching accordingly. PEDP III gives no explicit attention to school- and classroom-based assessment and, certainly in comparison with the recently-signed Education Reform Compact (see Chapter 10, below), learning outcomes are scarcely mentioned.

The PEDP II evaluation and other studies have indicated that the school inspection objective was not achieved satisfactorily, apparently “due to inadequate working facilities; number of school inspectors and; training for school inspectors... science and mathematics subjects suffered the most... the current set up of the School Inspectorate Department does not provide requisite autonomy to deliver independently. This calls for a need to establish an independent inspectorate”. The PEDP III objective is to “Strengthen school inspection for quality assurance”
[the first strategy is that of “Providing school inspectors with adequate tools for effective classroom teaching quality assurance”, which is in effect a restatement of the objective]. Only one Logical Framework indicator relates to school inspection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of inspected</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Inspectorate Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pre-primary teachers who are competent</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Inspectorate Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of inspected</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Inspectorate Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primary teachers who are competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is worrying on several levels and this kind of oversimplification not only ignores the fact that many children are just not learning but helps evade a serious and necessary discussion of what quality assurance should really be about. How best may teachers be guided towards better teaching? How best may schools ensure that all of the children are learning? Perhaps an ‘independent inspectorate’ is the answer: it would have its champions. But there are other models, including that of school-based self-assessment with a streamlined inspectorate providing quality assurance. This would give the Head Teacher a key role in educational leadership, including guiding and monitoring the teachers in all aspects of their teaching (and ensuring that no class is ever unattended). PEDP III’s descriptions of the roles of education actors does not extend to that of the Head Teacher (or, indeed, of the Teacher, or even the Inspector).

However, an indication of how the Head’s role is perceived by the plan’s designers may be gathered from the skills areas within which PEDP III states that capacity development should be provided in governance, management, finance, procurement and action-oriented research. Perhaps ensuring that all of the teachers are teaching and that all of the children are learning should have been more explicit under those headings – it would seem to be the Head Teacher’s main responsibility. Perhaps thinking more deeply about how a small cadre of highly-skilled inspectors (or advisors) could facilitate this crucial school-level function should have occurred. Perhaps expecting inspectors to certify all teachers as competent in conditions of low-quality learning should have been questioned more scrupulously. It is felt that PEDP III’s consideration of inspectors and their quality assurance function is inadequate.

Strengthening capacity in governance and management includes the functions of Ward Education and TRCs Coordinators, Education Sector Management Information Systems at councils, regional and national levels, e-Governance at councils, regional level as well as MoEVT and PMO-RALG headquarters. These are dealt with sensibly as are Information, Education and Communication (IEC) for primary education, although more attention might have been given to
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17 GoT has been piloting a programme to address this approach through the capacity building of school heads and several senior officers in the education sector, including some who have witnessed it working elsewhere, advocate this approach.
the potential of school committees and boards and to the value of effective School Development Plans.

The important cross-cutting issue of reducing gender disparities in the schools is addressed and, as the plan states, in terms of participation, gender parity has been achieved in all regions at the primary level, although the claim that “there is no gender parity in terms of completion and examination performance at the end of primary schools” is slightly misleading. The focus of PEDP III will be on addressing gender imbalances particularly in terms of achievement through such strategies as enhancing teachers’ capacities to equip boys and girls equally with the skills, knowledge and attitudes needed for life. It may be added that the World Economic Forum’s Gender Gap Analysis provides, in its own words, "a detailed framework for capturing the magnitude and scope of gender-based disparities around the world” and its benchmarks are extremely valuable for delineating national gender gaps on educational and other criteria.

Although guidance and counselling services have been institutionalized in schools, “incidences of indiscipline, drug abuse and drop-out are still rampant” [no data are provided on this worrying development]. Under PEDP III, the capacity of the pre-primary and primary schools to provide quality guidance and counselling services to learners will be increased. The National Guidance Strategic Plan on care, support, guidance and counselling will be implemented and, according to the plan, teachers will be trained in these areas, which is to be welcomed.

As PEDP III makes clear, “sports and games are among the important components of culture of any society. They provide entertainment, improve health and the healthy mind of a person, instil good discipline, and popularise ability and talent of an individual. However, during PEDP II there has been inadequate number of teachers and play-grounds for games and sports in schools. PEDP III will strengthen sports and games in pre-primary and primary schools”. However, the strategies (“Train teachers to deliver quality sports and games activities... provide equipment and materials for sports and games”) do not really convey any sense of excitement or determination that significant progress will be made: here is an area where challenging indicators may be set and imaginative approaches conceived.

The 12 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) represent a serious attempt to focus upon consequences rather than contribution and this is commendable: all plans should have KPIs and, indeed, Log Frames and their quality should be raised through in-house capacity building. Comments upon the individual items should not be taken as criticism of the overall approach, which is applauded. Of the dozen, 3 are labelled ‘Impact KPIs’, 3 as ‘Outcome KPIs’ and the remaining 6 as ‘Output KPIs’. This categorisation may be contested: if it is accepted that ‘children’s learning’ is what the system should be producing, probably only 2 would qualify as genuine ‘outcome indicators’. Which is not to deny that most of the 12 are well worth measuring, as indeed are most if not all of the Log Frame indicators. The KPIs are tabulated, along with some comments on each:
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18 BEST reports that 289,000 males and 278,000 females passed PSLE (A, B or C) in 2011. It is at the secondary level and beyond where the disparity becomes particularly pronounced: females make up 49% of all Form 1 students but only 32% of those in Form 6, for example.
## PEDP III Key Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PSLE exam pass rate: (a) National average for the PSLE pass rate, disaggregated by gender; (b) Number of councils with PSLE pass rate &lt; 40%</td>
<td>A reasonable KPI provided PSLE standards remain constant (e.g. the 30% pass mark, which may be regarded as permitting low standards to prevail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Net enrolment rate for primary education by gender</td>
<td>Describing this as an ‘impact’ indicator may be contested. Completion rate is a better indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>% of cohort completing Standard VII (net completion rate)</td>
<td>A good indicator which should be disaggregated by gender; is 72.8% a suitably ambitious 2016 target?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Primary qualified teacher/pupil ratio: (a) National average; (b) # of LGAs &gt; 50</td>
<td>Describing this as an ‘outcome’ indicator might be questioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Amount of Capitation Grant received per pupil: (a) National average of Capitation Grant received; (b) # of LGAs with Capitation Grant &lt;Tshs 10,000 received</td>
<td>This seems to be an internal input indicator. Getting the full grant is important but it is not measuring the consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Transition rate from Standard VII to Form I by gender</td>
<td>This is a good outcome KPI: the targets are yet to be shown by gender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pupil Classroom Ratio (PCR): (a) Pre-primary pupil/classroom ratio; (b) Primary pupil/ classroom ratio</td>
<td>Optimistic – getting from 1:70 to 1:45 for (b) would be really impressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Proportion of pupils who, by Standard IV, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade-level text especially Kiswahili</td>
<td>Another good KPI; the phrase ‘especially Kiswahili’ weakens an otherwise clear and useful Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>% of Ward Education Committees conducting regular M&amp;E school visits</td>
<td>Not a convincing KPI; ‘regular’ is ambiguous (once every two years?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>% of schools with at least 1 trained teacher on care, support, guidance and counselling</td>
<td>Not a convincing KPI: better to think of ways of measuring the trained teachers’ consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Number of Annual Reviews</td>
<td>Not a convincing KPI: producing one Review each year tells us nothing about their quality, their readership or their effects, if any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>% of education functionaries provided training on their roles and responsibilities: School Committees, WECS, LGAs, Regional Secretariats, MoEVT, and PMO-RALG officials</td>
<td>Not a convincing KPI: better to think of ways of assessing improved performance based upon that training (100% is seldom a useful target)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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19 Comparisons may be made with the earlier pledge to achieve the second MDG of universal primary education by 2015.
While PEDP III has been approved and assuredly its implementation should proceed, it is suggested that this list of KPIs should be reviewed. Getting a good and widely-agreed set of Indicators, including a clear idea of how the data will be obtained and how the results will be acted upon is a valuable exercise. Some of the above may well be abandoned in favour of challenging yet achievable targets covering all of the dimensions considered important (for example, numeracy, utilised school development plans, sports and games, school self-assessments, SACMEQ scores by gender and by rural/urban, and children with special learning needs). Devising such a set of KPIs should in itself be a valuable capacity-building experience: essentially, it involves examining what pre-primary and primary education is really about. The temptation to measure only what is easy to measure should be resisted.

The consideration of the financing structure of the education sector is clear and well-documented. As with PEDP II, the PEDP III cost projections are based on the calculated unit costs and the enrolment projections between 2012 and 2016. Those used in PEDP III are based on the identified gaps following the implementation of PEDP II as well as the actual data reported in Basic Education Statistic of Tanzania (BEST). They have been derived by taking into consideration basic assumptions related to Capitation Grants, the average inflation rate, the domestic revenue collection as a per cent of GDP, the real GDP growth rate, up to 20 per cent of overall recurrent expenditure allocated to the Education Sector and out of this total, up to 60 per cent allocated to Basic Education, the National Population Growth rate of 2.9 per cent constant over the plan period; the real exchange rate following the purchasing power parity in the medium and long terms, and construction costs as assumed in the three scenarios. Along with the indicators, these assumptions will be monitored [it may be noted that no substantial and explicit Risk Analysis is included in the Plan].

As was the case of PEDP II implementation, a large share of the resources for PEDP III (2012-2016) will be used for “teacher salaries and Capitation Grants under recurrent expenditure. In regard to development expenditure, the PEDP III resources allocation and implementation will focus on the selected national priority areas, namely the construction of teachers’ houses in difficult and hard to reach areas, the construction of classrooms and improving water supply and sanitation”.

Another crucial PEDP III strategy is to “implement the Medium-Term Pay Policy Strategy which addresses the provision of incentives to teachers”. Under PEDP I and PEDP II the number of qualified teachers increased from around 53,000 in 2001 to 169,000 in 2011. The projections of primary teachers’ salaries is based on new recruitment as well as the 15% annual increase to meet inflation and rises from Tshs. 1,239 billion in the current year to Tshs. 1,885 billion in 2015/16 [the specified total in the document, also of Tshs. 1,885 billion, is an error]. However, as already noted, whether these measures will result in sufficient and suitable teachers going to, remaining in and effectively teaching in all of Tanzania’s disadvantage areas, remains questionable.

In the course of implementing PEDP III, the Government in collaboration with Development Partners and other education stake holders will strive to ensure that the proposed capitation amount of Tshs 10,000 per students and Tshs 20,000 per student with special needs is achieved: these sums do not vary between the three scenarios.
In relation to **infrastructure**, there is currently a shortage of almost 2 million desks – approximately half of the requirements – and “in 2011 there was a shortage of 155,351 Teachers’ houses, 91,854 Boys pit latrines and 118,338 Girls pit latrines”. Although the Government will mobilize and sensitize the community to contribute in cash and in kind so to address the shortage of infrastructures especially in difficult and hard to reach areas, the funds available do differ significantly between scenarios.

**Three costing scenarios** have been developed to support PEDP III implementation:

- Scenario I is the actual resource requirement and the Government’s preferred scenario. It estimates the costs given 100% implementation of activities to meet the goals and strategies that feature in previous chapters. Scenario I will cost Tshs. 4,807 billion within the programme duration and the annual funding gap would be of the order of Tshs. 570 Billion;
- Scenario II is the medium-cost scenario and assumes that 50% of the key constructions i.e. classrooms and required teachers’ houses are completed. It will require a total of Tshs. 3,431 Billion over the duration of PEDP III with an annual funding gap of some Tshs. 410 billion;
- Scenario III is the lowest cost scenario and assumes that 25% of the same constructions will be completed and that 20% of construction costs will come from other sources including community support in cash or in kind over the five year period. It will require a total of Tshs. 2,796 billion with an annual funding gap of some Tshs. 200 billion.

While the three scenarios – covering 100%, 50% and 25% – differ significantly in volume, interpolations may readily be made: it is the indication of priorities in times of scarcity that is most important.

The consideration of **strategies for addressing the funding gap** is reasonable, the starting-point being that “efforts will be made to ensure that at least 20% of Government resources will be allocated to the education sector with at least 60% of the education sector budget allocated to the pre-primary and primary education levels... (and) will also explore opportunities for further funding from both internal sources such as private companies, and external sources such as its current Education Development Partners, potential new Development Partners and other bilateral partners”. Improving internal efficiency of the system and “ensuring that all resources are used most effectively” will also assist as will the forthcoming Financial Management Information System

### 3.3 Achievement Probability

PEDP II having concluded at end-2011, an evaluation of the impact of PEDP II was conducted by the EcomResearch Group in mid-2012. Their report presented a “comprehensive evaluation of PEDP II in order to establish its quantitative and qualitative impacts and draw lessons to inform the design of PEDP III and other plans for the sector”. Its overview of ‘Findings and Achievements of PEDP II Objectives’ noted that:

“...PEDP II had some desirable impacts in areas of financing, capacity building, organization, management and governance, learning environment, technical support services, enrolment, school outcomes and cross cutting issues but to a very large extent these were rather limited
due to resources availability, the rather unrealistic targets set for each component and other factors...”.

The overall performance of PEDP II was rated as unsatisfactory: understandably, this verdict is not reported explicitly in PEDP III. Component-wise, the assessment was as follows:

- **Satisfactory performance** achieved in teacher training and arresting pupil repetition rate;
- **Moderately satisfactory performance** in the financing the programme, addressing teacher incentives and implementing measures to tackle cross-cutting issues;
- **Moderately unsatisfactory performance** realised in capacity building; organisational, management and governance; teacher recruitment; conduct of school inspections, ESMIS and promoting pupil enrolment expansion;
- **Unsatisfactory performance** achieved in the case of construction of classrooms, procurement of desks, monitoring and evaluation, arresting dropout rate and generally enhancing learning outcomes (pupil completion rate, pass rate and transition rates); and
- **Highly unsatisfactory performance** in the case of provision of books and construction of toilets.

The evaluation made 12 key recommendations:

- Strengthen much further the level, certainty and cost-effectiveness of PEDP funding;
- Invest further but more strategically in the capacity building of key frontline actors (including Ward Education Coordinators, Village Governments, School Committees, Head Teachers and other teachers) on how to more accountably transform the ‘school’ into a more dynamic and effective vehicle for achieving critical learning outcomes;
- Strengthen the existing Organisation, Management and Governance structures of primary education in order to enhance efficient and effective management... by devolving more powers to the local education officers such as DEOs/MEOs and Ward Education Coordinators;
- Strengthen teacher recruitment and deployment;
- Enhance teacher morale by... strengthening administrative measures so that the statutory rights of teachers ... are catered for in a timely and correct manner... introducing a policy of providing housing allowance to teachers;
- Continue to enhance the school learning environment by... local arrangements to provide pupils with food... classrooms and toilets... pupils’ desks, books, teachers tables and chairs to needy schools... pre-primary classrooms... rehabilitation and maintenance of school facilities... providing councils, school committees and schools with skills and ideas in effective mobilization of the community and other partners in construction and rehabilitation of classrooms... facilities which are appropriate for disabled students... friendly school environment and ensuring adequate facilities for
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20 "The achievements recorded during the implementation of PEDP I and II are impressive.... despite these achievements, there were challenges that constrained the attainment of objectives and targets planned... the financial gaps were high such that they negatively affected the achievement of targets set...".
inclusive education... implementation of the ‘competence-based-curriculum.’... enhancing ICT teaching capacity in schools... reviewing the Standard VII examination;

- Strengthen the coverage and cost–effectiveness of school inspections... transform the inspectorate into an executive agency which becomes “independent and effective” eye for monitoring the sub-sector... encouraging civil society organisations and other institutions to provide strategic monitoring and evaluation feedback on the sub-sector;

- Strengthen the information management, monitoring and evaluation system of the sub-sector... designing PEDP phases as programmes with watertight Result-based logical frameworks with clear results to be achieved, respective indicators, SMART targets;

- Provide a suitable Monitoring and Evaluation framework so as to ensure regular monitoring and follow-up of the stakeholders – implementation of the programme and provide timely response to problems... an effective communication strategy;

- Enhance educational research focussed on the needs of primary education;

- Continue to mobilise school enrolment;

- Further enhance achievement of learning outcomes by according greater emphasis on effective management and accountability of all actors... actor performance monitoring and accountability... routinely monitoring and rewarding and/sanctioning performance at all levels (Ministry/Council/School Committee/Head teachers/Teachers/etc.); and

- Step up progress in taking advantage of the opportunity to radically address the cross-cutting issues of HIV/AIDS, environmental education and human rights through the school system.

Each of those recommendations was accompanied by specific measures to “help with its operationalization”.

In considering the likely achievement of PEDP III’s objectives, one key consideration is the extent to which the shortcomings of PEDP II have been attended to and the very sensible recommendations of that evaluation incorporated. On the whole, it may be stated that most of these recommendations have been responded to and, in some instances, convincingly: perhaps the plan’s authors even took EcomResearch counsel as a starting-point. This justifies some confidence in PEDP III achieving more of its objectives, and to a higher level of success – in terms of children’s learning – than did its immediate predecessor.

Effective Monitoring and Evaluation is crucial to PEDP III’s successful implementation and this has been afforded substantial attention, as recommended in the evaluation and in the earlier comments of several DPs. The Log Frame indicators, particularly the KPIs, have already been addressed and further attention may be given to these over the coming weeks. Responsibilities for monitoring the Ministries’ annual action plans have been clearly assigned and the “dissemination of information output will be carried out using different media such as newsletters, brochures; M&E reports, websites, internet and dissemination meetings/forums... the results of PEDP III Reviews will be shared through ESDC dialogue structure.”. It is clear also that this feedback will not merely be reported but that remedial action is likely to be taken. These processes are budgeted for and there is a sense that, just as classroom teachers are being called upon to ensure that their children learn, so also across the sub-sector those responsible at the several levels will be involved in monitoring as an integral element of effective management.
PEDP III has much strength, including those important features highlighted in the three previous paragraphs. However, as already mentioned, in several crucial areas it seems to avoid addressing the underlying issues. In relation to, for instance, children’s learning, teachers’ morale, inspectors, pre-primary expansion, TRCs and ICT applications there is a reluctance seriously to address the basic problem, while the word ‘risk’ appears only once in the entire document (and then in relation to ‘fiduciary risk’). Thus, despite the substantial improvement that a full implementation of PEDP III would bestow, in parts the plan reads as being more about improving the situation rather than providing the solution, of being aimed at amelioration rather than problem resolution. For all its commendable elements, and despite the many valuable contributions to its evolution from a variety of sources, PEDP III embodies no determination to guarantee that all of Tanzania’s children should learn. Moreover, few of the LogFrame indicators apply the outcomes emphasis advocated in the ESDP and those that come the closest underline the gradualist approach. There is little in this plan to suggest that its Goal of “all children acquiring the basic skills, knowledge and attitudes needed for further education and life” is regarded as an attainable target rather than an idealistic slogan. It is a road map for a journey rather than for reaching a destination.

Nevertheless, PEDP III should now be implemented and, with continuing donor support and good management, may achieve most of its objectives to a reasonable degree, and this should be appreciated. Attention may still be given to tidying up the 12 Key Performance Indicators and, with the intended monitoring mechanisms in operation, responding creatively to feedback. Similarly, those underlying questions that appear to have been avoided may still be explored in depth and answered more thoughtfully as PEDP III unfolds. Indeed, some of the core issues may best be addressed within a revised ESDP. With that as guide, each year’s primary sub-sector action plan may address more directly and with increasing effectiveness those fundamental issues of universal participation, teacher effectiveness, quality assurance and each child’s learning that are not yet directly answered. By such means, PEDP III will gather momentum and gain credibility as its implementation proceeds, to the increasing benefit of Tanzania’s children.
4. SECONDARY EDUCATION

The first Secondary Education Development Programme covered the years 2004-09 during which time both the number of secondary schools and the number of students enrolled more than tripled. The second such plan (SEDPII) was finalised, approved by GoT and published in mid-2010: it covers the period 2010-2015.

4.1 Plan Preparation

The preparation of SEDP II was managed by MoEVT’s Secondary Education Unit supported by two university-based national consultants. With the decentralization of the management and administration of secondary schools, those involved in implementing SEDP II, in addition to MoEVT and PMO–RALG, includes Regional Secretariats, Local Government Authorities, Ward Level officers, village-level School Boards, School Management Teams, Non-State Actors and Development Partners – of these, only some DPs and a small number of NSAs appear to have been involved in its development. Similarly, while stressing that the linkages between secondary education development and the programmes for primary and higher education are vital, limited planning liaison seems to have occurred between these sub-sectors.

4.2 Relevance and Credibility

It is stated that SEDP II builds on national and international reforms regarding the education sector which have taken place in the last 15 years, such as the Tanzania Development Vision 2025, the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (commonly referred to by its Kiswahili acronym: MKUKUTA), the Education and Training Policy of 1995, the Education Sector Development Programme (ESDP, 2001) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). In addition, “…SEDP II aims to accommodate the ESDP (2008–2017), which is the base of all sub-sector programmes, including PEDP II (2007-2011) and HEDP (2010-2014)”.

The programme’s vision – drawn from the revised ESDP of 2008 is, as SEDP II puts it, “to continue to have upgraded and coherently planned, managed and monitored education sector, secondary education sub-sector inclusive, that will develop human capital in order to boost economic growth and eliminate poverty”. The Tanzania Development Vision 2025 noted particularly that “...the education system should be restructured and transformed qualitatively with a focus on promoting creativity and problems solving...” and this is quoted in SEDP II and, indeed, aimed at within its objectives and strategies. The values, therefore, are clear and set in a convincing context.

Review of SEDP I revealed a number of challenges, including:

- Poor performance in secondary education examinations;
- Acute shortages of teachers, especially in the sciences and mathematics;
- Distorted deployment of teachers;
- Inequalities in learning environments among different schools;
- Insufficient infrastructure, including many uncompleted construction projects;
- Lack of, or non-use of, laboratories in most schools;
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- Poor teaching approaches in the classroom, predominantly teacher-centred;
- Low transition rates from Ordinary to Advanced Level “due to few Form 5 places”;
- Limited school management skills of some Heads of Schools;
- Increasing number of students from poor households in relation to scholarship provision;
- Limited access for nomads, marginalized groups and disabled learners.

In response to those challenges, SEDP II focuses “more on the following five areas:

- Improvement of quality and relevance... independent learning, critical thinking and analytical skills... wide reading... improving science teaching at all levels... ICT as a tool for teaching and learning;
- Enhancement of access and equity... increasing A-Level participation rates, especially in the sciences... improving girls’ participation and performance... nomads, marginalized groups and disabled learners... expansion of Form 5 and Open and Distance Learning... completing construction, including sanitation facilities... new structures where required;
- Improvement of the teaching force and teaching process... incentive systems and rationalisation of ratios between natural science and social sciences/arts subjects, diploma and degree holders... improving pupil/teacher interaction in classrooms... continuous assessment so that the learning is not solely based on one final examination result... student-centred methodologies;
- Improving management efficiency and good governance... the Open Performance Review and Appraisal System at all levels... institutionalization and use of EMIS; and
- Institutionalization of cross-cutting issues... gender, improved sanitation and greening of the environment, patriotism and human rights in mainstream curriculum and school management... sensitization and awareness campaigns on HIV/AIDS, child abuse and gender-based violence will be intensified... guidance and counselling.

These foci respond directly to the stated challenges and are spelled out in reasonable detail in the plan document, in which the related activities are also costed at a tolerably convincing level. However, achieving transformations of this nature necessitates a substantial change in the mind-sets of local managers and those actually delivering the schooling, calling in turn for thorough and sensitive monitoring – the likely effectiveness of this is addressed in the following section.

The plan includes GoT’s reaffirmation of its commitment to continue focusing resource allocation to the secondary education sub-sector and “…as would be expected, quality improvement and relevance takes the lion’s share of the budget, followed by access and equity, and then the improvement of the teaching force and teaching processes”. Its cost estimates are largely based on (a) secondary school enrolment projections, (b) the anticipated unit costs of intended activities including tuition fees and personal emoluments, and (c) other operating costs and development expenditure.

The ‘basic assumptions’ upon which the financial estimates are founded resemble those discussed in Chapter 2, above with the addition of:
The enrolment in secondary education is expected to increase up to 70% out of those passing PSLE by 2015; and

- For the sake of computing Teacher Needs for Secondary Schools, the pupil/teacher subject ratio has been used taking into consideration that a secondary school teacher teaches two specialized subjects.

In relation to the former, it may be noted that the PSLE pass rate has risen to 58.3% in 2011, compared with 52.7% in 2008 and 49.4% in 2009 – the base years for SEDP II – while just over half of Standard VII leavers are enrolled in Form 1. While the latter assumption appears reasonable, earlier concerns regarding mathematics and the sciences cannot be ignored and assessing the competence of the teachers in relation to what they are required to teach, by subjects and levels, requires more than quantitative data.

Two sets of budget scenarios (revenue and expenditure) are presented, the first showing that full SEDP II implementation would cost some Tshs.3.02million over five years, including Tshs. 1.59million (52.5% of the total) for teachers’ salaries. The second scenario provided instances of the ways in which implementation costs could be strategically reduced if the full resource requirements could not be met. From an examination of the detailed bases of the estimates, their justifications appear reasonable. As well as funding from the Central Government, the LGAs, and DPs, “local communities will also contribute financially and through physical involvement in the implementation of the Programme”.

### 4.3 Achievement Probability

The document states that “SEDP II will be closely monitored and regularly reviewed to make sure it is on track”. A clear work plan and a results-based monitoring framework are included in its annexure and it is further stated that “...follow up and supervision activities will continue within the Government structure to unblock any bottlenecks that may arise in the course of the implementation of the Programme”. As already underlined, a programme that involves:

- Improved quality and relevance;
- Enhanced access and equity;
- Committed teachers and better teaching;
- Efficient management and good governance; and
- The institutionalisation of cross-cutting issues, necessarily requires high-quality monitoring of the kind described.

The document makes clear that “…regular monitoring and evaluation strengthens dialogue between all concerned parties and enhances the quality of outcomes and speed of completing each activity…” and the annexed work plan “will be a key tool for monitoring progress... follow up and supervision activities will continue within the Government structure to unblock any bottlenecks that may arise in the course of the implementation... the results framework and monitoring framework will be used to measure progress toward desired outcomes, using the baseline data as a starting point”. M&E activities specified in the document as contributing to the process include:

- Tailor-made evaluation instruments will be designed for self-evaluation and reports availed on semi-annual basis and shared in the ESDC fora;
Each year a formative evaluation of the Programme activities will be performed and results will be shared in the ESDC fora; and

At the end of the Programme period, a summative evaluation will be conducted to take stock of achievements, missed opportunities, failures, and lessons learnt. This evaluation will be shared in the ESDC fora and also presented in national workshops for all stakeholders.

At this mid-term stage of SEDP II implementation, very limited progress in these areas appears to have occurred.

In discussions within MoEVT, problems reported regarding SEDP II implementation to date include:

- Few – and sometimes ineffective – inspections, due to the limited numbers and their lack of funds for fuel;
- The persistence of poor academic standards and consequent low pass rates: ‘5,000 pupils leaving Standard VII unable to read and write... cheating in examinations... no science and mathematics teachers... no books...’;
- This being reflected in the Form 2 pass mark of 30% as “if it were any higher there would be mass failures”\(^\text{21}\); and
- Teachers remain unwilling to go to secondary schools in remote and ‘hard to reach’ locations;
- Secondary education quality has also been affected by quality issues at the primary level. In addition, the rise in primary enrolment benefited poor households in particular, but did not translate into similar high transition rates to secondary education. Contrasting with an earlier statement (italicised above), it is reported that unfilled Form V places exist but that insufficient Form IV leavers of sufficient merit can be located to fill them. Observations such as these, while appearing plausible, are unsubstantiated by firm evidence in the absence of thorough monitoring of the kind foreshadowed in the plan.

During visits to secondary schools in late-October 2012, and in discussions with students, teachers, community members and managers, the predominant comment was related to the severely limited funding and the lack of necessary facilities. Even where significant progress is evident in terms of access, this often results in there being 60 to 110 pupils in a classroom and in deterioration in the qualified teacher/pupil ratio. An awareness of their responsibilities in SEDP II implementation, and the general commitment and reasonable capability of those at district, ward and school levels was fairly evident in those encountered during the field visits although, with a few exceptions, there seemed a general feeling that ‘I cannot make much of a difference’. There are certainly some good secondary schools, some good educational leaders, and some teachers who would like to do a decent job. But the conditions in which they find themselves makes that difficult.

SEDP II is, in very many respects, a creditable plan, concentrating upon the identified problems and providing realistic and costed ways of overcoming them. However, at this half-way point in

\(^{21}\) As raised in several recent articles, such as Setting low education standards: implications and complications by Henry Muhanika in The Guardian of 18th November 2012, and letters to editors.
its implementation, there are many signs of its not being fully executed on schedule. Perhaps the necessary changes in mind-set were underestimated, possibly the implicit assumptions regarding the capacity and dedication of those called upon to deliver it were overoptimistic, probably the lack of the right resources at critical points has been a seriously limiting factor. However, given that the precise situation, together with the causes of those suspected deficiencies, are unclear, the immediate priority is for a thorough mid-term evaluation of progress to date against planned performance, so that well-informed remedial action may be taken.
5. TEACHER DEVELOPMENT

The Teacher Development and Management Strategy (TDMS) describes itself as a “five year GoT strategic plan designed to realise the goal of having and sustaining adequate number of competent teachers and tutors effectively to support the pre-primary, primary, secondary, adult and non-formal education, as well as properly staffing the Teachers’ Colleges”. Although the term ‘teacher education’ is used in many GoT and other documents, and although the responsible MoEVT unit is the ‘Teachers Education Division’, given that ‘continuous professional development’ is a shared goal, this chapter is headed accordingly.

5.1 Plan Preparation

TDMS was produced by the Basic Education Development Committee and approved in May 2008. It was developed by MoEVT officials supported by two highly-qualified national consultants, utilising the findings of a sample survey, and it evolved through substantial dialogue and the customary review structure in which representatives of DPs, other GoT agencies, academia and civil society participated. Those involved in its implementation emphasise that (alone in this set of planning documents, the other seven being termed ‘programmes’) it is a ‘strategy’.

In February 2006, MoEVT had embarked on a comprehensive study of the Teacher Education system. That study came up with a descriptive report of teacher education in Tanzania and its major findings and recommendations, which were considered in the formulation of TDMS, comprise:

- Limited professionalism;
- Insufficient teachers to meet the demand;
- Unsatisfactory teaching quality; and
- Poor teaching force management and motivation.

The Government’s decision to put in place the TDMS was a necessary complement to the substantial increases in basic education consequent upon PEDP and SEDP, each of which had exacerbated challenges in terms of teacher demand, supply and distribution. There was a critical shortage of teachers at all levels and particularly in certain geographic locations. There were also challenges in terms of motivation, willingness to work in hard to reach locations, quality assurance and quality control for teachers, and in terms of the need to provide continued professional development programmes for teachers. Those involved in preparing the strategic plan had these issues in mind.

5.2 Relevance and Credibility

TDMS sought to embody the National Development Vision of education as “a strategic tool for the transformation of the mind-set of the people of Tanzania, thereby equipping them with the requisite knowledge and skills, which will enable them competently and competitively to cope with both national and international challenges” and the Education Sector Development
Programme perspective. To realise the TDMS intention would have required huge investments in terms of finance, human resource and commitment. As TDMS makes clear, “...implementation shall be within the frameworks of the revised ESDP and the existing MoEVT structures”.

The document specified strategic objectives “each embedded with a number of clear strategies and targets to guide implementation” [and it would be difficult for anyone to disagree with any of them]:

- Attract and retain adequate number of quality teachers;
- Develop adequate quality pre-primary, primary, secondary school, adult and non-formal education teachers as well as special needs teachers;
- Develop adequate quality A-level secondary school teachers and school managers;
- Recruit adequate quality teacher educators, education managers and technical staff;
- Supply adequate quality vocational and technical education teachers;
- Recruit adequate number of quality faculty staff and leaders for faculties of education and university colleges of education;
- Improve reform processes and linkages in teacher education programmes;
- Ensure continued in-service teacher education and professional development;
- Improve the assessment and evaluation in teacher education programmes;
- Strengthen collaboration between Teacher Education, Local Government Authorities and other stakeholders on matters related to teacher development and management;
- Strengthen the monitoring and support systems for effective teacher education;
- Establish and sustain standards of excellence for teacher education; and
- Improve teachers colleges infrastructure and facilities for conducive teaching and learning environment.

Strategies are set out in respect of each objective and, in general, these make reasonable sense, just as the efforts being made to deliver on these objectives are recognised. However, in the light of available support, together with what might be termed the ‘bureaucratic distance’ from strategist to deliverer, it is difficult to see how an objective such as ‘Attract and retain adequate number of quality teachers’ could possibly be achieved over a 5-year period. The stated strategies under that objective could well be highly desirable (“conducive environment for teachers created and supported through community sensitisation and mobilisation by 2009... fee exemption for candidates studying science and mathematics instituted by July 2009... attractive incentive package for teachers at all levels with special consideration to those in difficult environments, instituted by 2009”). However, even were these three wishes to have been granted (within 18 months’ of TDMS’s publication date), they would not of themselves have brought about the appointing and retaining of an ‘adequate number of quality teachers’, nor is there a clear exposition of what – in a dynamic teacher supply and demand situation, taking full account of the growing private school segment – that ‘adequate number’ would be.

Similar observations may be made regarding the credibility of all thirteen objectives and their associated strategies although, as emphasised, the principles behind them are entirely laudable. It is also worth noting that, of the several relevant developments, some are occurring outside
this specific set of stratagems, albeit sharing a similar spirit to them. For instance, the movements towards

- **School self-assessment**, with quality assurance and advisory support rather than traditional ‘inspection’; and
- **School-based in-service upgrading**, rather than the traditional ad hoc, disruptive, per diem fixed external courses,

Could well be of much significance to the continuous professional development of those who teach. Indeed, these particular innovations were referred to positively in discussions within MoEVT with senior educational managers during the field visits. Many of those with whom these possible developments were discussed were positive about them but they are yet to appear as national policies in any planning document sighted.

### 5.3 Achievement Probability

There is general agreement amongst those presently involved in planning and managing teacher education that the Teacher Education Master Plan for 2000-05 (with the misleading acronym TEMP) was unsuccessful. Published in January 2001 and described as the ‘medium term strategic and programme framework’, it is now criticised by some for bearing the designation ‘plan’, it being contended that “as teacher education is an integral supporting element within a wider sector, such as primary or secondary, it should be a ‘strategy’ supporting the plans in those areas”. This contention would carry particular weight were PEDP and SEDP to incorporate teacher education plans for their respective sub-sectors, based upon an overall education sector strategy: neither PEDP III nor SEDP II contains any such explicit scheme.

One factor of likely relevance is the organisational location of MoEVT’s Teacher Education Division, which is directly responsible to the Permanent Secretary, along with Higher Education, TVET, and the Inspectorate. Both the Pre-Primary & Primary Unit and the Secondary Unit are, however, responsible to the Commissioner for Education and, of course, the delivery of basic education has been decentralised and is coordinated through PMO RALG. This, together with TDMS having no budget line, may have negatively influenced the Strategy’s impact.

At least of equal seriousness has been the funding situation. TDMS set out cost projections based largely on unit costs and estimated numbers of units in relation to three scenarios. These ranged from “100% coverage of the 13 stated objectives over five years” through “eight priority objectives over five years” to a “three-year MTEF being adopted to guide the TDMS financing”. In the event, funding of that level has not been forthcoming.

TDMS states that “a comprehensive system of monitoring and evaluation shall be developed with an objective to guide assessment and evaluation of the level of achievement of targets set on each strategic objective, and provide feedback to stakeholders and review the implementation practices”. It is further specified that “...the strategy is to strengthen the monitoring and evaluation of teacher education. The targets are: monitoring and evaluation framework reviewed and harmonised by 2010; capacity for monitoring and evaluation of teacher education programmes strengthened by 2012 and Teacher Education Management Information System linked to ESMIS and operationalized by 2010”.

None of this has been achieved and, given the previously-mentioned bureaucratic distance of Teacher Education from basic educational delivery, which is not surprising. As the Strategy makes clear, “... the central Ministries shall continue to focus on policy and legislation formulation, coordination, quality assurance, setting standards... implementation roles shall be devolved to schools, colleges, local government authorities and non-state actors for ownership, increased participation, accountability and efficient service delivery”. However, TDMS does not explicitly address the underlying challenges associated with achieving sufficient, effectively deployed, competent, highly-motivated teachers in the devolved situation.

It is understood that an evaluation is scheduled to take place during 2012/13 and ongoing measures such as the inspectors’ reports on particular visits through to the Ministry’s Annual Performance Reports offer, at their differing levels, some forms of feedback. However, there was no ongoing monitoring of the implementation of TDMS as such nor has any focussed evaluation of progress towards its thirteen objectives as yet been conducted.

The Strategy made a number of assumptions, four of which applied especially to teachers:

- The average teacher salary (from Grade A to Graduate) was assumed to be Tshs. 320,000;
- The number of teachers was assumed to increase by 10% while their salaries is assumed to increase by 5% yearly;
- Science and mathematics teachers were assumed to be ¼ of the total number of teachers at all levels (primary, secondary and teacher colleges); and
- It was assumed that 1/3 of teachers in both levels are teaching in remote and ‘hard to reach’ areas.

The remuneration of a newly-qualified teacher currently ranges from Tshs. 260,000 upwards depending upon qualifications but salaries have barely kept pace with inflation over recent years and are a major source of discontent.

The total number of qualified (Grade A and above) primary teachers in the schools has risen from 155,000 in 2008 to 180,000 in 2012. Over the last five years, some 21,500 have graduated from Teachers’ Colleges with Diplomas and around 40,000 with Grade A qualifications: a total of 61,500. This is equivalent to a third of the existing teaching force (about 2,500 teachers leave the profession annually) and it seems likely that a fair proportion of those qualifying do not proceed to teach. During the field visits it was reported that, in respect of one zone “we need 700 teachers for each secondary subject, we have about 300-400 for most subjects... 100-150 for each science... about 50 for mathematics”. In structured discussions with a sample of trainee teachers, it was made clear that, while all intended “to report for duty, unless posted somewhere far away”, but – in the case of more than two-thirds of those interviewed – “we will not to be in teaching in ten years’ time”.

Further observations from the field visits include:

- The widespread incidence of unattended classes, referred to earlier: one of the main “early and major development” set out in the revised ESDP was to “ensure that all teachers devote all of the required time to actual teaching”, so that whenever the pupils are in the classroom their teacher must be with them – this still does not universally occur; and
The pervasive dependence on ‘chalk and talk’: also referred to earlier. Characterising all of this is the persisting situation of poor teaching and learning, as asserted in a recent article on pre-Form 1 orientation classes:

“Currently, teachers are demotivated and most of them are incompetent due to their ill preparation and therefore, unless something is done to boost primary school teachers’ morale and competency, (orientation classes) will still be needed. It is just the whole vicious cycle”.

These issues would seem to be a necessary element of any practically valuable teacher development strategy, extending to the anticipated demand for and planned supply of teachers, by subjects and geographical locations, over the coming decade. Alongside these data and their analyses, such a document should pave the way towards the continuous professional development of teachers, accompanied by the preferred strategies (possibly focussing on in-school capacity building and self-assessment with quality assurance).

TDMS has been of some value but a strategic re-think is opportune, addressing the central challenges of providing and maintaining ‘sufficient, effectively deployed, competent, highly-motivated teachers’. This could well be based upon the intended 2012/13 evaluation and, rather that resulting in a stand-alone strategy document or ending up just as key sections of PEDP and SEDP, it should be an integral element of a revised ESDP: where all educational strategies should reside.

It is vital that decision-makers and planners have clear guidance on how the fundamental goal of achieving ‘good’ (well-prepared and happily-housed) teachers, first-rate teaching and, hence, high-level learning is to be realised. These are crucial challenges – as Mwalimu Nyerere made clear, “the truth is that it is teachers, more than any other single group of people, who shape the ideas and inspiration of the nation” – and Quality Basic Education for All cannot be achieved unless and until they are met.

---

6. FOLK EDUCATION

A 19-page Folk Education Development Programme document covering the period 2007/08-2011/12 was published in February 2008. It has subsequently been decided within MCDGC to extend its programme period to 2012/13.

6.1 Plan Preparation

It is reported that FEDP was prepared jointly by Ministry of Community Development, Gender and Children (MCDGC) officers in collaboration with “MoEVT officers and some development partners”. The document itself contains no Ministerial or other foreword and there is no evidence of significant Development Partner, private sector, civil society or other groups’ participation, although – as with other plans – its preparation was guided by ESDC members and “processed by that committee at every stage”. Consequently it remains unclear as to whether and to what extent this plan is ‘owned’ by the stakeholders although – and this should be stated – the commitment to its objectives of the involved managers and planners is evident.

6.2 Relevance and Credibility

FEDP deals with:

- The expansion of enrolment in Folk Development Colleges;
- The improvement of the quality of education;
- Improving leadership and evaluation;
- Cross cutting issues;
- Implementation; and
- Budget and financing of the programme.

In fact the document moves straight in to these practical issues, dealing chapter by chapter with the specifics of Enrolment Expansion, Quality Improvement, the Folk Education Management Information System, Financial Management Training and an Action Plan and Budget [as the anticipated funding was not forthcoming, the financial basis of FEDP was unrealistic]. Accordingly, there is no overall vision, no explicit consideration of strategies, no substantive analysis of risks and no consideration of how technical, financial or other restraints might best be recognised and overcome. The relationship between Folk Education and other educational provision, both at national and local levels, is not addressed and – in conditions of scarce resources – that might be considered a serious omission.

Prior to FEDP being prepared, there had been concern on the quality of Folk Education with respect to needs assessment, curricula, facilitators, teaching learning infrastructure, and the facilitation of learning processes in Folk Education institutions. Based on the on-going public service reforms, FEDP recognised that Folk Education had to modernise in order to meet on-going community needs by the provision of good quality and relevant skills training. The document states that “essentially this is the second priority because the outcomes of the sector should produce quality services so as to promote self-employment and poverty reduction” and, although this statement is not entirely clear, the general sentiment rings true.
An important and, in terms of FEDP, unplanned development is that Folk Education is currently beginning a programme to provide both folk and vocational education to leavers from primary and secondary schools. From January 2013, 1,250 Vocational Education and Training students will be enrolled in 25 FDCs and these numbers will increase year by year to all 55 FDCs and expanding the enrolment to more than 50 students from each college. As this major decision was taken after FEDP had been produced and approved, no reference could be made to it in that plan.

6.3 Achievement Probability

In 2009/2010 the Ministry conducted an impact assessment study covering all 55 FDCs. The main objective of the study was to assess the impact of folk education on FDCs trainees. The findings indicated that “above 79% of the graduates had managed to acquire self-employment” and “their life standards have improved significantly so much so that they have managed to build their decent houses, paid for their health services, education to their children and some are having big contracts with district councils to construct schools dispensaries etcetera”. Also in 2009/2010, the Department of Community Development conducted a needs assessment of a sample of 20 FDCs with the view to reviewing the curriculum. It was revealed that apart from the 38 trades provided by FDCs there were new 45 skills required by the target groups and “the curriculum is being reviewed to incorporate these new skills”. These are encouraging developments.

The importance of effective Needs Assessment was recognised in FEDP which sets out their objectives— in relation to demand-based provision — together with targets: from 2007/08 through 2011/12 it was planned to conduct 491 such assessments; to date only 275 have taken place, although “each FDC conducts at least one needs assessment per annum so as to prepare a training programme”. FEDP recognised that Folk Education curricula have shortcomings and “do not adequately address needs of participants and communities that have diverse needs due to geographical location and focused socio-economic needs”. It aimed at reviewing the curricula in order to meet community demands but, as tabulated, progress against targets has been slow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>177 curricula developers trained by 2011.</td>
<td>Only 20 trained by 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish monitoring and evaluation tools and indicators by 2009 – 2010.</td>
<td>The instrument to capture data for long course for FDCs and VET now exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the curricula to include indigenous knowledge and skills by 2009/2010.</td>
<td>Curriculum is being reviewed after needs assessment conducted in 2010 – 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide adequate gender responsive learning and equipment facilities to meet specific needs of learners in all FDCs by 2008 – 2009;</td>
<td>Gender and Development course compulsory for all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590 facilitators trained in gender responsive facilitation and learning skills by 2008 – 2009;</td>
<td>Training on gender provided to 70 FDCs staff in 2009 – 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate assistive devices for people with disabilities procured as required up to 2008 – 2009.</td>
<td>No substantial number of assistive devices have been procured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To date, 32,000 have participated in long courses, 80,000 in short courses and 36,000 in outreach courses – substantial numbers but significantly (around 50% overall) fewer than the targeted 84,000, 105,000 and 110,000 respectively. Of the planned 55 FDCs to be expanded and rehabilitated, the infrastructure of 34 has been upgraded to date. Progress related to the proposed Day Care Centres has been negligible.

The Folk Education Management Information System, in collaboration with the Education Sector Management Information System and the Lifelong Learning Management Information System, will – as set out in FEDP – provide planners and implementers with “accurate and timely information to manage Folk Education reforms in the context of ESDP and MKUKUTA. FEMIS will not only enable managers and implementers to organize, process and store Folk Education data, but will also assist in decision making, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation”. It was planned to “train and retrain 279 FEIs staff on the use of FEMIS (encompassing both ESMIS and LL-MIS) to ensure effective flow of accurate and timely educational information by 2011 and to establish FEMIS by 2009/10”. 124 staff were trained, 5 IT specialists were recruited at the Ministry by 2009, and FEMIS is – despite some teething problems – operational. The issue – first raised in a footnote within Chapter 2, above – of whether having three separate educational MIsSs is compatible with a genuine sector-wide approach cannot be avoided, although it is reported that the “FEMIS is in harmony with ESMIS”.

Financial management training, including the preparation of guidelines (in financial management itself, institutional arrangements, procurement procedures, cost sharing, and the rehabilitation programme) has been reasonably on track, with 440 of the intended 470 ‘managers and others’ having attended courses. [The ESDP emphasis upon ‘outcomes’ would call for an assessment of improved productivity consequent upon that training.]

To sum up, the central objectives and key indicators of FEDP will not be achieved over the originally intended plan period, concluding this academic year, for three main reasons:

- **It did not start on schedule** – an officer reported that “more than twelve initial months were virtually lost”;
- **The policy decision by GoT that FDCs should provide both Folk and Vocational Education by 2013 caused further delays; and**
- **Insufficient funding** has been available from the outset.

As tabulated, the financial gap has increased year by year as what was planned could not be achieved in the absence of anticipated funding (in Tshs. million: source MCDGC).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrent Cost</td>
<td>23,327.63</td>
<td>27,710.79</td>
<td>29,757.11</td>
<td>31,636.9</td>
<td>34,994.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Cost</td>
<td>20,580.71</td>
<td>23,373.81</td>
<td>25,462.48</td>
<td>28,058.08</td>
<td>32,330.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Financing Gap (in million USD)</td>
<td>3,743</td>
<td>5,442</td>
<td>5,510</td>
<td>4,916</td>
<td>4,135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrent Cost</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>22.89</td>
<td>24.34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[It should also be noted that a substantial financing gap was incorporated in the second scenario of the original FEDP.]

In fact, Folk Education seems to be delivering more of value than FEDP and its implementation to date reveals. Whether the plan, incorporating the original targets together with the inclusion of vocational education may be achieved even by 2012/13 is problematical. In any case, FEDP is out of date and producing an explicit, costed action plan covering the present and the next two years is a priority, consistent with an FEDP II – to be developed through widespread participation, consequent upon the planned comprehensive evaluation – that brings together the amended objectives with the intended strategies and a realistic budgetary scenario.
7. ADULT AND NON-FORMAL EDUCATION

The Adult and Non-Formal Education Development Plan (ANFEDP) for the period 2012/13–2016/17 was approved and published in February 2012 and is currently in operation.

7.1 Plan Preparation

Recognising that its 2003/4–2007/8 Medium Term Strategy “to ensure equitable and quality provision of education for out of school children, youth and adults” had failed to reach some target groups, the MoEVT has recently prepared its Adult and Non-Formal Education Development Plan 2012/13–2016/17. That document states that “the plan was developed through an intensive work and consultation process, in order to respond to the SWOT23 analysis and recommendations of the Evaluation Report on Adult and Non-Formal Education strategy of 2003/04-2007/08 and it contributes to the implementation of the Education Sector Development Programme”. The document was circulated to DPS for inputs. Inputs were received and incorporated. When representatives of 11 Development Partners were recently asked to “Please indicate your organisation’s level of participation in each of the following plans”, 5 of the DPs stated that they had had ‘some involvement’ while none reported that they had been ‘closely involved’. Relevance and Credibility

ANFEDP was developed to meet government commitments to address challenges affecting the adult, non-formal and continuing education and achieve Education for All (EFA) goals, Millennium Development Goals, the strategy for economic growth and poverty reduction and the Tanzania Development Vision 2025. It is aimed at ensuring that “out-of-school children, illiterate youth and adults will get quality education and create a lifelong learning society and improve people’s livelihood, as well as increased awareness to prevent HIV and AIDS and address other cross cutting issues”. It focuses on the critical issues of

- Advocacy and sensitisation;
- Access and equity;
- Quality enhancement;
- Capacity enhancement and development;
- Monitoring and evaluation;
- Administration and coordination; and
- Financing and sustainability of the adult, non-formal and continuing education.

And the intentions in each of these areas are set out clearly and succinctly.

In addition, ANFEDP indicates and clarifies the institutional roles and responsibilities of various levels of Government as well as Civil Society Organisations in relation to management and delivery. It includes administrative arrangements, and the need to strengthen linkages with main support institutions such as the Institute of Adult Education, the Tanzania Institute of Education, the National Examinations Council of Tanzania, the Vocational Education and

---

23 See earlier footnote regarding SWOT and SWOC.
Training Authority and the National Council for Technical Education. ANFEDP states that it “intends to enhance and strengthen the linkage of adult and non-formal education and formal education for better coordination and thus improve the quality of education and enhance access and equity”. It is based upon the realisation that basic and post literacy for young people and adults along with continuing education should be viewed as a lifelong process which builds a complete literate society and intends to realize the EFA goals and contribute to the improvement of people’s livelihood.

The plan states that “At the turn of the new millennium in 2000, it was estimated that adult illiteracy had increased from 9.6 per cent in mid 1980s to 31 per cent” in 2004 and this figure becomes a target: “The main issue which this plan addresses is that of the remaining illiteracy rate of 31 per cent among the adult population who cannot contribute effectively to poverty reduction initiatives and sustain socio-economic development of the country”. However, more recent estimates are lower: UNICEF gives an adult literacy rate of 73 per cent over 2005-10, for example and the World Bank’s Development Indicators state that the “Tanzania Adult Literacy Rate is at 72.90%,”, both organisations thus giving an illiteracy rate of around 27 per cent. This is not an exact science, definitions are imprecise and the sampling methodologies are often contested. However, 31 per cent seems high, which understates the progress that has been made in recent years, just as <10 per cent for three decades ago appears implausibly low.

The number of out-of-school children and youths (up to 18 years) “estimated to be 1.5 million and who have no access to formal schooling or have dropped out of school” may also be contested but the seriousness of the challenge is unambiguous. However, the plan’s targets possess a synthetic exactitude: “6,523,100 illiterate adults aged 19+ years and 3,528,876 neo-literate youth and adults who will enrol in basic and post literacy programmes... 318,240 youth and adults who will be enrolled in Integrated Post Primary Education and Open and Distance Learning secondary education centres... 469,630 disadvantaged children aged 11-18 years old, especially those from nomadic communities, children with disabilities and children living in the streets”. Round numbers (such as 6.5 million, 3.5 million, 320,000 and 470,000) should suffice as indicators and for cost estimating purposes.

The least convincing section of this plan (as with some but not all of those appraised in other chapters) is that related to its financing. Moreover, some of the key estimates appear inaccurate and inconsistent, as an inspection of these three consecutive statements in the final paragraphs of the Executive Summary readily demonstrates:

- The total cost for implementing ANFEDP over a period of five years will be Tshs. 314.5 billion (US$ 196.5 million);
- The average amount of money allocated for the past five years for Adult and Non-formal Education from government, CSOs, United Nations agencies and other Partners is Tshs 30,450 billion per annum;
- The financing gap for implementing ANFEDP for 5 years is 284,455,184,044 billion;
- During the plan’s consultative development: it is worrying that this set of statements survived unchallenged and uncorrected through to approval and publication.

---

Some societies have utilised national/community service as a means of promoting universal adult literacy.
Ignoring the spurious precision and the misplaced decimals, this plan – in common with some of the others – accepts a **massive financing gap** as its starting point. The amount in question appears to be of the order of US$ 150 million (although other interpretations of the above statements are possible and neither main text nor annexed tables clarify this issue). A plan that is based on such a funding chasm – even were it to have depicted the financing situation clearly and consistently – fails to meet the credibility criterion in this important area.

### 7.2 Achievement Probability

The plan’s treatment of **monitoring and evaluation** is reasonably thorough, based upon an acceptance of the existing “…ineffective monitoring and evaluating system for adult, non formal and continuing education... (un) availability of reliable data for making rational plans and effective implementation...”. Goals for establishing a reliable M&E system along with an upgraded research capacity are outlined along with a set of related objectives covering for instance expanding LL-MIS countrywide, and supporting – and conducting training on – research methods to teachers of adult, non-formal, and continuing education. The substantial (and, yet again, precise) sum of Tshs. 3,663,561,844 is set aside for M&E and is split up by years and between Ward Education Coordinators District Adult Education Coordinators, District School Inspectors, Regional Adult Education Officers and MOEVT, NLC and IAE. Monitoring and evaluation are taken seriously in ANFEDP.

However, there is no explicit consideration of risks and their mitigation, nor are the understandings, capacities and commitment of those responsible for plan delivery addressed. There is no action plan, nor any indication of planned tracer studies or other assessment of outcomes, nor is the issue of synergies and overlap between AE/NFE and other sub-sectors – including Folk Education – addressed. Despite the several convincing features, given the limited success of the 2003/4-2007/8 Medium Term Strategy in relation to out of school children, youth and adults, some aspects of this plan raise doubts regarding the likelihood of its complete and timely implementation.
8. TECHNICAL AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Covering the period 2013/14–2017/18, this is the first ever Technical and Vocational Education and Training Development Programme (TVETDP). It is noted that, unlike some of the other plans, it is being prepared well in advance of the 5-year period which it is to cover.

8.1 Plan Preparation

The plan has been drafted by a national consultant who is a Vice Chancellor with a technological background. His TOR had been developed, shared and approved in the sector dialogue fora, which included DPs and CSOs. Preparation of the plan was preceded by a Situational Analysis (SITAN) which involved a critical analysis of the TVET system based on desk reviews of various existing reports and extensive consultations with 375 stakeholders (institutions and individuals having a stake with TVET) from 11 regions in Tanzania Mainland. The stakeholders included Government Ministries, Departments and Agencies; TVET Providers; Industry/Employers; Quality assurance and professional bodies; Development Partners; and other stakeholders, including lecturers/teachers, graduates, trainees, parents/sponsors of students, and promoters of TVET.

The SITAN report was then subjected to a SWOC Analysis25 and identification of the major issues for consideration in TVETDP, “including skills gap in the short, medium and long terms, and formulation of strategic direction for addressing these, thus consolidating/improving all major strengths and eliminating most, if not all, weaknesses of the TVET system observed, touching base with the market opportunities and challenges”. As reported by MoEVT’s TVET division, the draft TVETDP document “was shared with all stakeholders before finalization”. It was submitted to the Government Task Team and, in turn, to the Technical Working Group which includes Development Partners and private sector representatives as well as government officers.

A copy of TVETDP dated 19 November 2012, incorporating “inputs by the Technical Working Group”, was received on 23 November with the advice that “we are expecting to refine it further by incorporating inputs from TVET TWG members and a wider stakeholders meeting”. Given the schedule for the preparation of this present document, it is this version that is now appraised. [It is trusted that, before finalization, a thorough proofreading of TVETDP occurs as there are several distracting errors, from the cover page onwards.]

8.2 Relevance and Credibility

This is a high-quality plan, professionally prepared, and in many respects a model of what a comprehensive sub-sector plan (as opposed to an action plan) should be. In contrast to some of the other plans appraised in this document, TVETDP carries the conviction that those involved in its preparation believe in the necessity of a plan for their sub-sector and see it as a crucial weapon for TVET’s cost-effective development.

25 See earlier footnote regarding SWOTs and SWOCs.
A useful Glossary of TVET terms is provided, followed by some clear paragraphs on the Tanzania education sector generally and this sub-sector particularly, neither of which lapses into legalese: the annexed bibliography is another welcome inclusion. The plan’s rationale is then presented, covering the Tanzania Development Vision 2025 – which presents the underlying challenge of transforming the economy “from a predominantly agricultural one with low productivity to a diversified and semi-industrialized one buttressed by science and technology” – and the Education Sector Development Programme (ESDP), which “aims at enhancing the micro- and macro-management of educational institutions so as to improve the delivery of outputs and outcomes”: an emphasis not recognised in all sub-sector plans. It is noted that “there is no programme as yet for guiding TVET, notwithstanding its central position for achieving national economic growth and poverty reduction” and that “the success of TVET depends on the successes of other education subsystems”, once again explicitly recognizing the interconnectedness between programmes which other sub-sector plans understate.

TVETDP also accepts the need to “adjust itself to meet the expectations from the rapid technological changes and the ever dynamic socio-economic environment”, responding to labour market demands and promoting flexibility in order to improve access, equity, relevance and effectiveness. Noting that these “cannot be realized in an ad hoc manner”, the necessity of having and following a plan is further justified, the goal being that of providing “the nation with the human capital that is adequate and appropriate for solving the problems of the society and meeting the challenges of transforming Tanzania into a middle income country by 2025”.

Some specific adversities are noted unequivocally at the outset:

- Quality TVET is an expensive undertaking;
- The perception of TVET, particularly of VET, is that it is the preserve of those who are poorly performing;
- The roles and benefits of TVET graduates in workplaces are unclear compared to others with comparable other qualifications;
- Potential change of policies by development partners and/or donor fatigue may threaten support to TVET; and
- Skills Development Levy management may affect skills development for the informal sector and the least developed sectors.

Extensive lists of ‘main strengths’ and ‘weaknesses which need to be addressed’ are also presented, together setting the scene for the approach to plan development that follows.

A central point is that TVET enrolments “are still by far not adequately aligning with SEDP, PEDP and HEDP achievements. On average, over two million Standard VII leavers were not able to join Secondary Education over the last five years. Similarly, almost 800,000 Form IV leavers could not proceed to Form V, and over 40,000 Form VI leavers were ineligible to join higher education. And yet the total enrolment of learners in 2010/11 was only 85,000 in TET and just over 100,000 in VET. The gender imbalance in science and technology related programmes (“female learners in such programmes constituted 11-19% only”) is identified while “with respect to learners with disabilities, VET had capacity to accommodate only 20% and TET up to 3% of the eligible candidates” and the particular lack of TVET opportunities in rural areas are also underlined. All of this is “liable to create severe human capital imbalances in the labour market due to lack of technicians and associate professionals”.
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The plan then proceeds to identify significant skills gaps, based upon the results of the 2007 Integrated Labour Force Survey (ILFS) and a detailed study jointly executed by the Planning Commission and the London School of Economics in 2011. This study benchmarked 14 selected middle income countries (China, India, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Egypt, Malaysia, South Korea, Thailand, Philippines, Morocco, Jordan, Syria, Tunisia, and Cote d’Ivoire) “as well as Vietnam because it shares important characteristics with Tanzania” and “the average data from the benchmarked countries was used to represent what is referred to as the Model Medium Income Country”. This is a widely-accepted occupational planning procedure and, in this instance, highlights Tanzania’s particular shortages in the highly-skilled areas. Looking also at immediate and longer-term priorities, “the requirements for professionals dominate during planning and development, as well as for guiding the end of life activities; associate professionals or technicians are most critical during the preparation stage; while skilled workers have greatest roles during actual realisation and to significant extents during construction phase and in end of life activities which are often labour intensive”.

Continuing the analysis, specific Five Year Development Plan targets for 2015/16 for particular highly-skilled occupational groups are derived, as summarised by broad study categories:

- Scientists: 52,000
- Engineering, Manufacturing and Construction: 88,000
- Health and Welfare: 144,000
- Social Science, Business and Law: 328,000
- Teachers: 320,000

More specific targets are also provided (for example, there are now 8,549 associate professionals in Agriculture, by 2015/16 there should be 19,650; for associate professionals in TET facilitation, the figures are 719 and 12,351). It is made clear that “strategic efforts should therefore be directed to enhance access to TVET, with a view to filling such skills gaps, while also promoting the participation of the disadvantaged groups for equity and equality”. Targets for 2024/25 are also tabulated (although the acronym ‘TDV’ is not explained).

These demand estimates, after a consideration of quality issues, then lead to the ‘Alignment of Learners Enrolment and associated Resources Implication’, commencing with the ‘Projection of learners’ enrolment for addressing the skills gap’. Essentially, the number of TET students will need to double over the coming two or three years while the number of VET students will need almost to treble. The ‘Grand Total number of TVET Students’ will need to increase from an estimated 290,000 in 2012/13 to over 1.4 million in 2017/18 (vividly illustrating the level of this plan’s aspirations).

Implications for teaching and technical TVET staff are also presented, moving from 7,600 facilitators in 2011/12 to over 90,000 in 2017/18: an increase of some 84,000 or about 1,000 per cent over six years. As the plan observes “this is a major investment in terms of recruitment, staff development and retention... there is obvious need to widen the catchment for

---

26 TVETDP’s author would be well aware of long-standing criticisms of this methodology along the lines of ‘Tanzania is very different to India’ (for instance) and ‘The world of work will be very different 15 years from now’, both of which imply that the approach should be used with caution rather than not applied at all.
recruitment, improving the capacity of TVET teacher training institutions to be able to train an increased number of new recruits without pedagogical skills, enhancing cooperation with the private sector... and availing conducive working environment and incentive mechanisms to ensure retention of staff”. It notes also that “ICT mediated teaching and learning will also be key ingredient in reducing such magnitude of staff requirements whenever possible”. Even with the widespread and creative application of ICT, one cannot help wondering where these additional 84,000 teachers and other TVET staff will come from, who they are, and what they are doing now!

The implications for TVET physical requirements are also detailed: at present the cumulative space requirement in square metres is around 1.7 million, by 2017/18 it will be over 8 million. “Applying the average unit cost of USD 750 per square metre... it is apparent that about USD 4.77 million (approximately Tshs. 7.6 trillion) will be required over the first five years of TVETDP” which, as observed in the plan, “may not be realistic”. Accordingly, attention is given to, for example, “a few manageable strategic investments in new and/or upgrading civil works while putting more emphasis on strategic partnerships with industry to introduce complimenting apprenticeship and other non-residential/part-time modes of training and their combinations... under this scenario, 56 new DVTCs will be constructed, 10 new TET institutions and 4 new institutions for training of TVET facilitators will be constructed to collectively absorb 35,000 full time equivalent learners (at least 500 in each) in addition to 350,000 to be enrolled under other non-residential/part-time modes of training... selected existing institutions will also be upgraded to improve respective capacities to enrol a mix of more learners... to promote ICT mediated teaching and learning connectivity will be enhanced in at least 40 institutions”.

Those bases having been explored, the plan is set out coherently, with a Mission of instituting “a sustainable quality TVET system capable of providing, facilitating and promoting an integrated competitive workforce; preparing individuals for employment and entrepreneurship; as well as enhancing the individual capacity for lifelong learning”. Priority areas comprise:

- Access and equity in TVET;
- Quality of outputs;
- Capacity to provide quality TVET; and
- Monitoring and Evaluation of TVET.

Key result areas with specific goals, strategies and targets are then set out in relation to each of those priorities, the twenty listed goals being of the following nature: “To increase the competence of graduates so that are able to integrate in the work places and carry out all the required work tasks properly within 3 months and one year after graduation for at least 50% of fresh graduates from VET and TET respectively by 2015/16 and increased to at least 75% by 2017/18”. These goals illustrate the comprehensiveness of TVETDP and the logical thoroughness with which it has been constructed.

In its consideration of programme implementation, a clear depiction of the overall management structure is presented and institutional responsibilities are set out for each of the players:

---

• Stakeholders Annual Forum;
• Ministerial level;
• TVET Technical Working Group;
• TVET Quality Assurance Agencies (NACTE Council/VET Board, NACTE/VETA Management);
• Private Sector and other employers;
• TVET providing institutions;
• Other Agencies supporting TVET (TRA; HESLB; TCU; TEA28);
• Development Partners in TVET;
• Workers, graduates and learners; and
• Other stakeholders.

An issue arises as to the capacity – and perhaps the motivation – of some of these players effectively to perform their roles in TVETDP’s implementation: perhaps this should have been addressed more thoroughly in the plan, the ‘weakest link’ being likely to characterise the overall effort.

The major financial implications for implementing TVETDP are based clearly on the analyses and assumptions, together with unit costs which are also presented. The conclusion is that the “implementation of the Programme for the first 5 years shall require availability of about Tshs. 1.598 trillion” or about one billion dollars [as the plan observes, “this amount is quite significant”]. Over a third of this would be applied to improving access and equity and almost half to extending capacity. “in terms of specific activities, the largest cost implication (about 38% of the total) is in the provision of loans, grants and scholarships to learners in programmes that are critical for supporting the realization of FYDP and/or from under-represented and disadvantaged groups”. As with all sections of this document, the tables are clear, the graphics helpful and the justification logical [apart from one instance of a ‘trillion’ which should be a ‘billion’, no mathematical error has been detected in either text or tables, which level of accuracy is highly commendable].

TVETDP implementation is expected to be financed from various sources including:

• Government: recurrent funding, loans, grants and scholarships to learners as appropriate, and the rehabilitation and maintenance expenses;
• Owners of other TVET institutions to meet the recurrent, rehabilitation and maintenance expenses in respective institutions;
• Contribution from the Skills Development Levy: a “planned increase to 3-4 %”, and “the anticipated growth of the economy will stimulate more employment opportunities hence more SDL collections”;
• The significant expansion of enrolments will assist institutions to generate more revenues through tuition fees… clarify student unit costs for the various TVET programmes and levels of study;

28 None of these four shortenings is included in TVETDP’s list of Acronyms and Abbreviations.
Private Public Partnership arrangements will be employed in the development of expensive physical infrastructure and equipment for teaching and learning in institutions; and

Development partners supporting TVETDP through direct projects or institutional support in addition to General Budget Support.

The plan recognises that, in order to ensure effective participation by all stakeholders in financing TVETDP, emphasis will be put on the creation of prerequisite conditions, including “macroeconomic stability, environmental sustainability, a conducive business environment, good political and economic governance, aggressive investment promotion for more jobs creation, proper land use planning and property rights management”. Assumptions include tax revenue increasing as a percentage of GDP from around 15% in 2011/12 to at least 19% by 2015; the gross domestic saving as share of GDP will increase from the current 10.6% to 14% by 2015/16; single digit annual inflation rate will be maintained over the plan period; GDP will grow from 6.4% in 2011/12 up to about 10 per cent by 2015/16 onwards; GoT will allocate up to 20-25% of its overall national recurrent expenditure to education; GoT will increase TVET budget by 25% annually based on 2012/13 baseline in the first 3 years of the Programme; the SDL base will be expanded to include all employers, which will lead to an increase in collections by at least 50%; SDL’s share to TVET will increase to two third of the levy; and in addition to the contribution through General Budget Support; and Development Partners increasing their direct support to projects and/or institutions by 10 per cent during the plan period.

Based on these assumptions and fixing the existing 2012/13 data on TVET financing as baseline, the potential contributions by various sources to TVET are projected, totalling the following in billions of Tanzanian shillings over the 5-year plan period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>(current)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government: (Recurrent)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government: (Capital)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Development Levy</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Partners</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total funds available</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A ‘basic scenario’ and four alternative scenarios are presented: in each case the TVETDP costs are aggregated with the on-going requirements of financing the current TVET sub-sector’s activities. For the Basic Scenario, all costs implications of the proposed plan are included, implying a total budget in order to implement TVETDP and finance the regular and current activities of the TVET subsector of Tshs. 3.769 trillion, resulting in a deficit (or funding gap) of Tshs. 1.04 trillion. Alternatively:

- In Scenario 1, the number of new DVTCs to be constructed is reduced from 56 to 31: with this Scenario, the financing gap would be reduced by Tshs. 75 billion;
- In Scenario 2, establishment of the proposed 6 Centres of TVET Excellence are not included: with this Scenario, the financing gap will be reduced by Tshs. 81 billion;
- In Scenario 3, loans and grants to learners not included: with this Scenario, the financing gap will be reduced by Tshs. 525 billion;
- Scenario 4 is a combination of Scenarios 1, 2 and 3, together reducing the gap by Tshs. 681 billion; and
A ‘minimum funding proposal under resources constraints’ is also tabulated, setting out what would be achieved were GoT and DPs to contribute only Tshs. 550 billion over the plan period.

The Logical Framework is itself a reasonable example of the genre, although labelling it as a matrix for just “Monitoring and Evaluation” undervalues its utility as an overall planning and communication tool. The programme’s development objective is given as “Contribution to the realisation of the Education Sector Development Programme (ESDP) for more effective attainment of educational goals” which will contribute to the overall goal of “the realisation of Five Year Development Plans, MKUKUTA and hence Tanzania Development Vision 2025”. It should be noted that a result-level indicator such as “Access, equity and quality of TVET improved and instilling the necessary knowledge and skills for enhanced employability and mobility of learners” does not meet the SMART requirements in that it is not objectively verifiable. [Lower level indicators are more specific.] A goal-level indicator is “attaining middle income status by 2025” which is a cogent reminder of where the plan is leading. Moreover, the underlying logic is convincing and the listed major assumptions depict the range and seriousness of the factors that may impact upon TVETDP’s successful implementation.

8.3 Achievement Probability

While the section on monitoring and evaluation in the main plan document is limited to a few fairly general sentences (for instance: “essentially, M&E will be a consultative, shared responsibility of implementing institutions, TVETDP coordination team and other stakeholders … (there will be) annual review workshops which will harmonize the individual institutional reports”), more specific information is annexed. Fourteen major activities are specified (for instance “Piloting and improving the developed draft KPIs for eventual full operationalization”), each with specified Key Inputs/Minor Activities for costing (for instance, “Awareness creation, reporting mechanism, stakeholders endorsement”) along with indicative annual cost implications. M&E will be “guided by the Programme Log Frame Matrix” and “all beneficiaries will be required to develop respective more detailed log-frames as instruments for monitoring and evaluation of progress at respective level”, which requirement will itself be interesting to monitor.

The section on sustainability and risks is also brief, noting that “all targets have been set with a view to their harmonious up-scaling for achieving the middle income status by 2025 and hence realization of Tanzania development vision”. As noted, that “depends on the huge mobilisation of resources from various sources” and this may be negatively affected by adverse developments in the world economy, particular mention being made of the “on-going Euro crisis (which) may also have negative impact on aid”. Adverse natural conditions such as drought and floods “which may also affect the economy particularly in agriculture, transport, energy and therefore industry, hence Government contribution to TVETDP” are also noted, and the Log Frame29 lists several other factors including the “existence of will and commitment to invest in the TVET sub-sector”.

---

29 Consistency regarding the abbreviated form of ‘Logical Framework’ is also desirable.
The assumptions behind this plan are significant: who can be confident about the level of tax revenue or of GDP increases or of inflation appreciably falling or of the contribution of SDL to TVET rising substantially, for example? Vast also is the diversity between the several scenarios, ranging from a funding gap of over a trillion Tanzanian Shillings to one of about 0.37 trillion. Moreover the ‘minimum funding proposal under resources constraints’ may conceivably in times of acute economic scarcity be as likely an eventuality as any of the other scenarios – and if that transpires, Tanzania’s movement towards middle income status would not be achieved on schedule. But to be less than confident about TVETDP’s successful implementation reflects a healthy scepticism regarding the likelihood of overcoming all of the acknowledged challenges rather than any reservations regarding the programme itself. This is a worthy plan and, for the sake of Tanzania’s future, deserves to be implemented. Whether and to what extent it comes to pass is dependent upon a whole host of factors, the majority of which are clearly identified and thoughtfully addressed in this impressive document.
9. HIGHER EDUCATION

The Higher Education Development Programme (HEDP) covers the years 2010-2015 and was approved in March 2010.

9.1 Plan Preparation

The process of developing the interventions in this programme goes back to the year 2002 when the then Ministry of Science, Technology and Higher Education sponsored a research project on Post Primary Education and Training which focused on Costs and Financing, Labour Market, Vocational Education, expansion of Secondary Education in relation to Post-Secondary Education and Training. Some of the issues being addressed in the current plan have their genesis in those studies. In the interim, MSTHE developed two Sub Master Plans: the Higher and Technical Education Sub Master Plan (2003-2018) and another on Science and Technology (2003-2018). These were formally launched in October 2003 the development of HEDP was geared towards their operationalization.

HEDP involved three years of preparation and it is reported that “the key stakeholders and experts involved provided moral encouragement, intellectual stimulation and material support very generously”. The Minister of Higher Education, Science and Technology at that time set up the ‘task force of academics’ in 2007 and its members engaged in widespread consultation with ‘donors, business and civil society’ commencing with a ‘two day brainstorming workshop’. That Task Force visited eight countries in Africa, Asia and Europe and the lessons learnt from these visits were used in the development of the first draft version. [Amongst those lessons were measures being taken to increase students enrolment in higher education institutions and to deal with staff shortages, recruitment and retention, together with the use of ICT for teaching, research and communication, the construction and rehabilitation of infrastructure, alternative students loan schemes and the contribution of higher education to the economy.]

The Task Force submitted its first draft proposal in December 2007 at the Ministry’s Annual Meeting in Arusha and it is reported that most of the comments made at that meeting were incorporated. Following the re-structuring of Government Ministries in early February 2008, the HEDP draft document was presented to MoEVT Management and another Task Force was formed to improve the document [the Secretariat comprised the Higher Education Division, that unit having been established at MoEVT in line with an ESDP recommendation]. The Team solicited inputs from different stakeholders and incorporated comments given by MoEVT. The improved draft document was tabled at the Stakeholders meeting held in August 2009 and, after thorough discussions, the meeting agreed to form yet another small Team to incorporate comments and inputs given by the Stakeholders before holding a follow-up meeting with them for their further inputs. That took place in December 2009 and again the comments were incorporated. In addition to inputs and comments given by Stakeholders in various meetings and workshops, this document has also incorporated inputs submitted by the Task Force formed by the Government in November 2009 to address resource requirements of higher learning institutions for the coming decade.
Although protracted, HEDP’s evolution was undoubtedly thorough and widely participative. One criticism may be made in that area of consultative involvement, not so much with HE stakeholders as with the other educational levels. Higher educational and secondary institutions are inextricably intertwined: the former provide the teachers for the latter; schools produce the students who will enter the universities. In that this appraisal necessarily looks at the quantity and quality of secondary teachers – and notes particularly the paucity of mathematicians and scientists in Tanzania’s classrooms – HEDP’s lack of focus on this key issue is regarded as an imperfection and shows inadequate level of consultation between these two levels.

Relevant to this issue is HEDP’s avoidance of the possibly damaging time gap between (a) the end of Form 6 classes and the examinations and (b) the commencement of higher educational studies. Moreover, the imminent introduction of national/community service could further cloud the picture. There is evidence worldwide that an uninterrupted progress from school to university is particularly necessary for students of mathematics and the pure and applied sciences: disciplines in which Tanzania presently experiences serious shortages, including insufficient teachers qualified in these areas. HEDP’s overlooking this issue may be seen as a further blemish on an otherwise thorough analysis.

9.2 Relevance and Credibility

Two positive points may be made about the HEDP at this section’s outset. Firstly, its effective use of graphics to illustrate key concepts is especially commended: a ‘good’ plan may be one that could be presented on, say, thirty attractive PowerPoint slides. Secondly, irrespective of the merits and consequences of the plan itself, the collaborative exercise of its evolution has been of clear benefit to the body of involved academics and hence, it may be assumed, to their institutions and to Tanzania. Participatory preparation of a plan is, in part, a practical exercise in capacity building.

Tanzania is committed to all regional and international conventions and protocols on the development of education at all levels. Consistent with those, and with Vision 2025 and the MKUKUTA objectives, HEDP was seen as “…establishing a scientific and progressive society; a society which is innovative and forward looking– one that is not only a consumer of technology but also a contributor to the scientific and technological progress for our common future”.

Under HEDP, there are nine priority areas which “if properly and adequately implemented can help Tanzania attain her visions and aspirations”; they are grouped into the following main areas;

- Institutional Reforms – focusing on policy instruments, governance structures and management, and institutional linkages;
- Service Delivery – addressing challenges pertaining to relevance and diversification, access and equity, and quality improvement, and
- Sustainability Mechanisms – including financial, environmental and human resource sustainability.

The outcome of an effective implementation of this Programme is seen as including” the creation of a critical mass of human capital capable of:
Moving the economy up the value chain;
Raising knowledge capacity to nurture a first class education system;
Addressing sustainable socio-economic innovations;
Continuously improving Tanzanians’ quality of life; and
Strengthening institutional implementation capacities”.

In addition, those involved in developing HEDP saw it as “…designed to take a national character... to evolve a common vision and a strong consensus on how to link education to all sectors of the economy in this country... (calling for) enhanced political will that will make education the top priority in the allocation of resources, and in making effective use of the right incentives, legislation, policies and action oriented governance frameworks”.

Implementation of HEDP was viewed as a logical follow-up to the Education Sector Development Programme. However, while the quantitative achievements of both PEDP and SEDP in boosting enrolments are quite substantial, Tanzania’s participation rates in higher education have “remained abysmally low at about three percent and this seems to be among the lowest rates in the world”. Nevertheless, the plan seems not to identify any especially creative ways of remedying this major deficiency, although expansion generally is addressed and a ‘Development Objective’ level indicator is that the “Higher education participation rate (GER) increase to at least 10% by 2015”. It is not really clear how this laudable albeit relatively modest aspiration is to be achieved.

Moreover, the potential of the Open University of Tanzania receives very little focus, other than the passing comment that “open and distance learning programmes, offered by open universities, should also be included among other higher education institutions”, under the heading ‘access and equity issues to be addressed’.

The main goal of the HEDP was expected to be achieved through three developmental objectives:

- Establish a comprehensive and coordinated higher education system through undertaking institutional reforms;
- Improve delivery of higher education through enhancement of relevance and diversification of curriculum, increased access, equity and quality;
- Enhance capacity of the higher education system so as to maintain and sustain all its functions effectively and efficiently.

The Ministry of Education and Vocational Training was to provide a coordination mechanism and ensure that all stakeholders are fully involved. Four implementation stages have been defined:

- Programme initiation and strategic planning;
- Formulation of programme design and benefits;
- Formulation, evaluation and selection of activities to achieve targets; and
- Implementation, monitoring and improving.

The total budget requirement for the programme’s specific activities and coordination over a five year period from 2010 was estimated as Tshs. 485,905 million with some 96 percent
committed to the critical activities under service delivery, including the improvement of academic infrastructure, staff training, new programmes, increased enrolment and innovative ways of financing higher education. The overall budget requirement for the higher education sub-sector for the 5 years from HEDP’s commencement was estimated at Tshs. 3,603 billion. Out of that budget, the Government of Tanzania was committed to provide a total of Tshs. 3,178 billion to cover both recurrent and development expenditure in higher education. The then current Development Partners were expected to contribute Tshs. 296,810 million in the 5-year HEDP period and “the financing gap of Tshs. 130,000 million is expected to come from other new Development Partners, Financial and Social Security institutions in a form of grants and soft loans... Public–Private Partnerships and internally generated incomes will also be encouraged and intensified to fill the gap...The private sector – the main users of the graduates – will be sensitised to contribute more to higher education in order to reduce this gap. In terms of service delivery, the higher education financing mechanism has improved and ... the legal basis for loan repayments has been clarified under the 2005 Act”. According to the Education Rapid Budget Assessment of November 2012, “there is an absence of information on higher education loan spending and on whether this still needs to be contained, as raised in the 2011 Rapid Budget Assessment”: it is a concern that uncertainty still prevails in this area.

While this analysis is reasonably convincing, and while financial developments to date have not thrown the general approach off track, the greatest challenge to HEDP implementation is the financial resource flow, amidst the current global recession and the state of the national economy. In this expectation, the programme came up with an alternative option of funding ‘top’ priority areas within the ‘ordinary’ priority areas incase funds were not forthcoming. The document stressed that “MoEVT together with HEIs and other stakeholders in the country should work in unison to implement the Programme and carefully examine (a) additional sources of financing, including income generation and fundraising activities to supplement government allocations; and(b) cost reduction and avoidance measures at institutional, programme, and project levels”, noting that “with careful planning, allocation of resources and tracking of performance for improvement, it should be possible to realize the main goal of the Programme within the timeframe”. While there is likely to be some slippage, the confidence remains justified.

Key HEDP implementers include MoEVT, HEI’s, Government institutions, agencies and stakeholders in the higher education sub-sector and the various stages of implementation, responsibilities, accountability, monitoring, evaluation and control, and budgets are described in some detail in the document. Responsibilities are carefully set out with MoEVT playing the coordinating role and ensuring that all stakeholders are fully involved. A Higher Education Technical Working Group (HETWG) has been established under ESDP so that programme activities can be mainstreamed into the education sector wide programme. Programme activities related to research, innovation and ICT will be coordinated in collaboration with the Tanzanian Commission for Science and Technology (COSTECH) and the Ministry of Communication, Science and Technology. It may be added that COSTECH supports the National Research Agenda and is not limited strictly to narrowly-defined S&T projects.[According to its 2011 CAS report, the WB will support the Tanzanian goal of developing Arusha into a world centre of excellence in higher education in the region under the Science and Technology Higher Education Project, including the Arusha campus of the African Institute of Science and Technology and the Arusha campus of the Aga Khan University.]
COSTECH was intended to cover Universities and University Colleges accredited by the Tanzania Commission for Universities (TCU) and higher education service agencies.\footnote{In a situation of burgeoning private universities, the HEDP’s consideration of the crucial issue of standards and accreditation is limited to this statement that the responsibility is that of TCU. It seems that there is no coherent national strategy regarding private institutions at this level or, indeed, across the education sector.} For non-university higher education institutions accredited by the National Council for Technical Education (NACTE), there another plan is currently being developed, namely the Technical and Vocational Training Development Programme (see Chapter 9, below). For the purposes of HEDP, ‘higher education’ refers to the education offered by institutions registered by TCU and does not include education offered by institutions that are registered under NACTE.

In practice, this HEDP is predominantly about government universities. Although \textit{private universities} will not directly get subventions from the Government budget, to some extent they will benefit from the programme. For example, they will be able to train their staff in well-equipped and staffed public universities, recruit staff trained in public universities, continue to get student and infrastructure development loans and be connected to the National Education and Research Network. They will also indirectly benefit from other government interventions such as tax relief on education materials. Nevertheless the recent expansion of private universities was not foreshadowed in HEDP and would merit particular attention when the plan is reviewed – presumably in or about 2015.

The special situation of \textit{Zanzibar} in relation to higher education and the HEDP merits some mention. Two senior academics from the State University of Zanzibar (SUZA) participated in workshops and discussions related to HEDP’s development while SUZA, along with Zanzibar University and the University College of Education, Zanzibar are amongst the 31 institutions listed in the document. However the nation-wide organisation of higher education, in contrast to the Mainland and Zanzibar configuration of education at lower levels, is not remarked upon. Nor does the 2007 Zanzibar Education Development Programme (ZEDP) focus upon that distinction although it does note that “opportunities for higher education are provided through the Open University of Tanzania in Zanzibar”.\footnote{The ZEDP gives more attention to open learning at the higher educational level than does the HEDP.} Furthermore, a number of Zanzibar students are pursuing higher education in Tanzania Mainland and outside the country”. It is understood that, in recent discussions, senior SUZA managers and academics were unaware of the existence of ZEDP.\footnote{Based upon an extremely small and no doubt unrepresentative sample, Mainland university managers seem to display a fair understanding of HEDP and a vague awareness of ESDP and some sub-sector plans.} Balancing this is the reported perception in some Mainland academic circles that ‘higher education in Zanzibar is going its own way’ and that this trend is inevitable.

### 9.3 Achievement Probability

**Monitoring and evaluation** are addressed in some detail in the plan and the former will be a shared responsibility of the implementing institutions and the coordination unit at MoEVT. All activities undertaken under this Programme will be checked based on (reasonably SMART) indicators annexed to the plan in order to assess programme performance. “In principle, every major activity to be undertaken will develop LogFrames with gender-sensitive indicators and monitoring calendars with well-defined targets as instruments for M&E. The monitoring system will be guided by the following elements:

- Consistency with Programme goals;
Some higher learning institutions have now adopted the academic registration system ARIS developed by the University of Dar-es-Salaam’s Computing Centre. As well as improving efficiency and increasing transparency, ARIS has the potential to enhance HEDP monitoring. Another key development is the implementation of the PMO-RALG Planning and Reporting system, also developed at UDSM and in use by all district councils across the country.

HEDP further made clear that “M&E will be implemented through a consultative process… (its) oversight will be under the mandate of the recently constituted Higher Education Technical Working Group (HETWG) which will provide an advisory role and report regularly to the Education Sector Development Committee. The results of M&E will be used by all actors in decision making. Lessons learned will be integrated into Programme activities to achieve greater effectiveness. Frequency of submitting reports will normally be quarterly, but depending on the nature of activities, The Programme Management Team (which comprises MoEV and representatives of the implementing institutions) might issue specific requirements on reporting. In order to ensure consistency in reporting and share experiences on programme implementation, there will be annual review workshops which will harmonize the individual institutional reports”. Some but not all of this has come to pass – indicators have been developed covering some activities and these are, it is reported, being applied although evidence of the ‘annual review workshops’ has not been sighted. Nevertheless, there are some indications that genuine monitoring is occurring by the responsible MoEV division, especially in relation to the major public institutions.

This is a long-term Programme and has been designed to be implemented in two phases. Phase I between 2010 and 2015 and Phase II between 2015 and 2020, the latter to require review. There is no doubt that the implementation of HEDP, which focuses on quality higher education and the improvement of the teaching and learning environment, is going to continue to be expensive. HEDP states that an “incremental approach, from one year to another will be reviewed and plans developed such that each activity is closely followed and budgeted... institutions will have to ensure efficient and effective utilization of resources and will be encouraged to mobilize and be proactive enough in generating their resources internally to supplement the central sources”. Given the economic and financial situation, this will require a continuing commitment by GoT, DPs and other higher education stakeholders. It will also need careful monitoring by HETWG [it is reported by one senior academic that “this group never meets”!] and other responsible agencies. The budget and cost projections have been made taking into consideration the assumptions that (a) GoT would “increase the higher education budget by 20 per cent annually in the first three years and then 10 per cent in the last two years based on 2009/10 baseline budget”; and (b) the Development Partners will increase their contributions (projects support) by 10 per cent in the first two years and remain at that same level for the last three years”. It is too early to say with certainty whether that will eventuate: other than WB, SIDA and some support through EU international programmes, there is very limited DP participation.

It is intended that the programme will provide funds to institutions based on the priority areas that it earmarked and, to access these funds, institutions have been reviewing and/or preparing their strategic plans wherein the main objectives would have to match with the HEDP Strategic
objectives: this seems to have been occurring. Funds sought from other sources (outside the national budget) should, HEDP made clear, as far as possible focus or support activities identified as priority areas under the plan. The 5-year Science and Technology Higher Education Project (STHEP) under World Bank support was inaugurated in March 2008 and it was hoped that “Phase II of STHEP will fund some of the activities listed under HEDP”. Indeed, the projects engendered by the plan have now been finalised, and shows that the STHEP complements HEDP implementation”.

Tanzanian higher education does not move rapidly and in many respects this is a Higher Education Investment Plan rather than a blueprint for all aspects of the sub-sector’s development. Nevertheless – given the lucidity of and widespread involvement in the preparation of HEDP – those directly involved in the planning have a clear and shared idea of where they intend to go.
10. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This final chapter brings together the main implications of its predecessors and sets out some practicable recommendations both generally and in specific relation to the Global Partnership for Education application.

10.1 Positive Planning Aspects

While reviews inevitably identify imperfections (and hopefully offer practical ways of overcoming them) it must be emphasised that there are many positive features in this set of educational plans, that some aspects of their implementation have been successful, and that – with some updating and additional thought – they may be regarded as offering a reasonably sound basis for focussed additional investment in order to achieve quality basic education for all.

10.2 Coherence and Synchronicity

The eight plans appraised in this document are disharmonious in that they cover a range of time spans and fail to provide an entirely coherent educational planning framework. While ESDP is generally acknowledged as the foundation document, not all of the sub-sector plans coincide in every key respect with that sectoral plan. Indeed, as situations and aspirations have evolved since ESDP was last revised some five years ago, it would be surprising if the sub-sector plans now being formulated were to correspond with that master plan is all particulars.

ESDP called for 3-year rolling action plans for each of four specified sub-sectors. However, rather than ESDP’s proposed ‘rolling 3-year’ action plans, the sector developed 3-years Medium Term Strategic Plans (MSTP) that provide framework for planning, implementation, performance review and sets out the basis for resource allocation, mechanisms for engaging with other education stakeholders, and outlines the key milestones in the ESDP. The MTSP are translated into Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks and Annual budgets for each sub sector programme.

There are often gaps between one plan period ending and the plan for the succeeding period being produced. Some plans are not officially approved until well into the first year of their operational period. There are often significant (and unexplained) gaps between a plan’s final version being completed and the identical version being officially approved, published and circulated.

Alternative education sector planning arrangements are possible. In some cases elsewhere there is a sectoral policy cum strategy document supported by sub-sector plans (or programmes). In other instances there is – as ESDP suggested – one sector-wide plan and a synchronised set of rolling action plans. It is therefore recommended that:

A. The Government of Tanzania should assess its overall education sector planning arrangements, striving to achieve coherence and synchronicity, giving particular
consideration to the proposal in the 2008 revised ESDP for rolling action plans in each sub-sector.

Some may consider that the existence of separate sub-sector plans (as opposed to action plans aimed at implementing the one overall sectoral plan) is inconsistent with a genuine sector-wide approach. Moreover, there is no need for each sub-sector to present its own set of goals and values – these should be synonymous with those of Tanzania education generally, as set out in the sectoral plan. Accordingly, it is believed that it makes best sense for the ESDP (updated as necessary) – ideally based upon a revised Education and Training Policy and, of course, harmonising with the Five Year Development Plan – to constitute the fundamental strategic document and for sub-sector (rolling five-year action) plans, the emerging Global Partnership programme, the Education Reform Compact (see below), the education sector M&E plan, the ‘results-based’ approach and all other educational innovations and interventions to flow from and support that sectoral plan. Given that pre-eminence, it is opportune to update the sectoral plan and it is accordingly recommended that:

B. ESDP should be thoughtfully reviewed in early 2013.

This is seen as a priority. Without a current sectoral blueprint, the several sub-sectoral plans and interventions such as ERC and the GPE programme – and, indeed, all multilateral and bilateral forms of support to education – lack coherence. Moreover, some of the deeper issues that are not dealt with thoroughly in the sub-sector plans – teacher commitment, quality assurance, learning outcomes, for instance – may be addressed in depth on a sector-wide basis. All official strategies (for instance in relation to ICT, HIV/AIDS, gender mainstreaming and primary school care and support services) should be incorporated in a revised ESDP, together with all necessary educational strategies – for example, those related to teachers and to teaching – should be set out in ESDP rather than being the focus of separate documents.

Education sector plans should be produced by and for GoT in order that it may best mobilise available resources in pursuit of its educational goals and objectives. There should be genuine consultation with stakeholders and beneficiaries nationwide but, even when a document is required to meet the criteria of some funding opportunity, that plan should be produced predominantly for Tanzania. That having been said, it may also be noted that pp 6-18 of the draft Guidelines for Education Sector Plan Preparation and Appraisal, currently being finalised by the Global Partnership for Education, offer a very useful guide to education sector plan development commencing with the fundamental principle of ‘country ownership’ as mentioned above.

Given the Millennium Development goal deadline of 2015 and the emerging post-MDG planning scenario from then onwards, it makes sense for the alignment of planning approaches and cycles to be synchronised from that year onwards. This is regarded as fully consistent with a major revision of ESDP and the subsequent aligning with it of all sub-sectoral plans.

In some instances, perhaps due to MoEVT organisational structures, involvement across sub-sectors has been restricted: the SEDP and HEDP appear to have been developed in partly isolation from one another, for example. Moreover, some major issues seem to have fallen into the gaps between the several sub-sectoral plans. For instance, no plan seems to have adequately assessed:
The likely supply and demand for teachers over the coming years: the lack of clear information in this area is problematical for primary, secondary, teacher development and higher education planners alike;

Fresh approaches to school inspection [replacing the present dysfunctional arrangement with school self-assessment backed up by quality assurance];

School-based teacher capacity development, although these possibilities are being thoughtfully addressed across the sector; or

The burgeoning private schools, colleges and universities segment, not to mention the prevalence in urban areas of private tuition – officially outlawed but widely practiced – with its attendant tribulations.

A thoroughgoing ESDP revision would need to cover all of these and other such areas.

A revised ESDP should also take account inter alia of the successful outcomes to date in relation to strategies and objectives set out in the 2008 revision together with current challenges and should incorporate the principles set out in recent GoT strategies in the areas of ICT, HIV/AIDS, gender mainstreaming and primary school care and support services (see below). The expansion of private provision at the post-secondary level also merits attention as does the gap between Form 6 completion and university entrance – soon possibly to be affected by national/community service arrangements [which might itself possibly be relevant to a national literacy campaign]. Conceivably, the on-going preparation of a revised Education and Training Policy should be concluded in parallel with the realisation of the sector plan. If the first recommendation (above) is accepted, the ESDP will be the basis of each sub-sector’s rolling action plan, and it should be prepared and formatted with this in mind.

The issue of education financing has been close at hand throughout this appraisal. Some of the plans appraised were constructed on unrealistic assumptions regarding funding and, when those riches were not forthcoming, many of the objectives were unfulfilled. However, the most recent plans include more than one scenario, ranging from the ‘likely’ through to the ‘optimistic’ but indicating the ‘priorities amongst the priorities’, thereby making the financial aspects of those plans more realistic. [The ESDP recommendation regarding rolling action plans is better-g geared to fluctuating financial fortunes than is the fixed 5-year sub-sector plan that is presently the norm.] Government allocations to the overall education sector, and that amount as a share of the government budget, is tabulated (see Annex IV), along with the division among sub-sectors and the level of external financing. As the most recent sub-sector plans are financially credible – at least in respect of their least optimistic scenarios – there is every expectation that a revised ESDP would be similarly realistic.

The recently-signed Education Reform Compact (ERC) contains several features that are remarkably similar to the central thrust of this present appraisal document. Emphasising learning outcomes at the basic education level, ERC’s priorities for the next 3 years comprise (a) improving teacher incentives, support systems, and professionalization, (b) enhancing student

---

33 A survey conducted in Dar-es-Salaam by The Guardian newspaper, as reported in its edition of 14th November 2012, found that “tuition centres were mushrooming, some of them situated at school premises... at (one) school, standard five to seven pupils need to pay 3,000/- every Friday and 300/- every day...”.

34 Such as those listed on pp 8-12 of the Executive Summary of the UNESCO and Pole de Dakar Tanzania, Education Sector Analysis (see Bibliography, below).

35 By the Minister for Education and high-level international DP representatives on 16th November 2012.
assessment, and (c) accountability. The core principles guiding the choice of initiatives are described as including:

- A systems approach;
- Cost-effectiveness and value for money;
- Evaluation embedded in programme design;
- Wide stakeholder engagement;
- Strong and on-going communication; and
- Financing linked to realistic results.

These principles may readily be supported.

This is a significant and positive development, endorsed at the highest level and dovetailing entirely with the proposed GPE-supported programme. However, with interventions of this magnitude, the ownership of the ‘conceptualisation agenda’ emerges as an interesting issue. Probably the most sensible arrangement is for the ESDP (updated as necessary) to constitute the fundamental strategic document and for sub-sector (rolling three-year action) plans, the emerging Global Partnership programme, this ERC and all other educational interventions and statements of principles and priorities to flow from and support the Government of Tanzania’s sectoral plan.

10.3 Consultation, Participation and Ownership

In the case of the original PEDP and, to a lesser extent, the 2007/08 revised ESDP, the involvement of government agencies, development partners, academia, civil society and the private sector in plan formulation has been genuine and substantial. However, the participation in plan development at the Regional and District levels, let alone in local communities and schools, has been negligible [during the field visits, several of those interviewed recalled the nationwide PEDP consultations in the late-1990s and one officer had attended a ESDP workshop five years ago].

Similarly, the reported involvement of Development Partners (see Annex B, below) and Civil Society Organisations (Annex C) is also limited. While those directly involved in developing every plan may chant the mantra “this programme has been prepared by the Government in collaboration with Development Partners and Non-State Actors through stakeholders’ workshops, joint working sessions and ESDC consultative meetings”, this claim may contrast with some stakeholders’ perceptions. But let it also be admitted that at times the institutional memory across the group of Development Partners – and even within a particular DP – is sometimes less than perfect.

Finally, in terms of consultation, some of those experts contracted to draft particular plans met with the responsible Minister, producing added value in at least one instance – although some may question the appropriateness of this involvement. In terms of plan ownership, and also to enhance quality and the likelihood of effective implementation, wide and genuine involvement should occur as plans are developed and revised. In the case of the ESDP, this should extend to a media campaign aimed at a nationwide debate and information exchange: this should be Tanzania’s education sector plan. As the sub-sector or cluster (action) plans are prepared and
(annually) updated, all stakeholders should be effectively represented in the discussions and their views reflected in the documents. It is therefore **recommended** that:

C. The Government of Tanzania should ensure that all of its relevant agencies nationwide, together with the private sector, civil society and development partners are effectively involved in the development of educational plans, especially the ESDP, and that the media be used skilfully to encourage nationwide understanding and ownership.

### 10.4 Inputs, Outputs and Outcomes

ESDP called for an integrated and outcomes-oriented education system. Achieving this necessitated a fresh way of thinking about educational development, paying less attention to the particulars of investment and more to the **consequences**. This has proved difficult to achieve – several of the plans, including ESDP itself, were announced and covered by the media in terms of numbers of classrooms to be constructed, teachers to be trained and students enrolled. Targets are set and speeches couched in terms of money being spent\(^ {36} \), books being provided, computers being installed, inspectors attending courses and colleges being opened. These are long-standing worldwide practices and, as such, not easy to discard. But it is the outcomes that matter: how many children reach adulthood with the required capacities to thrive in contemporary Tanzania and with a love of learning? How many graduates are competent to meet the demands of industry, commerce and primary production? How many teachers – despite their inauspicious conditions – are devoted to their profession and motivated to inspire those in their charge? If government expenditure and international support have no bearing on the consequences of education – for individual learners and for society – they are difficult to justify in a world characterised by economic scarcity.

The change should commence in the classroom where it would become the **teacher’s responsibility** not just to be present and to cover the syllabus but **to ensure that all the children learn**. In recent years, this has become a major re-emphasis internationally and reports of developments, including some dramatically successful programmes, may readily be accessed\(^ {37} \). This would need to be backed up by the evolving school-level self-inspection system, with the quality assured by ‘inspectors’ whose task would become that of monitoring children’s learning and advising teachers on how best to stimulate it [where not every child is learning it is hard to accept that all teachers are competent]. While there would still be indicators to cover inputs and activities, the Key Performance Indicators would be couched in terms of outputs and outcomes, dealing with such crucial consequences as:

- The number/proportion of Standard II, III, IV and V pupils/cohort able to demonstrate literacy and numeracy;
- SACMEQ levels, particularly in reading (in Kiswahili) and mathematics;

---

\(^{36}\) ‘Government sets aside 202.6bn/- to boost education programmes’ is a typical headline: that particular one from the Daily News of 7\(^ {th} \) November 2012. A seminar for journalists might well help educate them on the need to emphasise outputs and outcomes, as well as briefing them on the overall approach to educational planning and nationwide participation.

37\(^ {37} \) GPE’s *All Children Learning Report of 2011* is an appropriate starting-point. Entering keywords such as ‘active learning’, ‘child-centred teaching’ and ‘participative learning’ will also engender examples of potential relevance. The specific move towards teachers being responsible for their children’s learning is addressed in various national programmes with such titles as ‘Every Child Learns’ and ‘Each Child Can Learn – Each Child Must Learn’ (and sometimes in the vernacular, such as ‘Shikhbe Protiti Shishu’).
The number/proportion of Standard VII pupils/cohort passing the PSLE;

The number/proportion of Form 4 pupils/cohort demonstrating sufficient ability and achievement to merit entry into higher secondary; and

Similar performance gauges for those pursuing basic education through non-formal and folk education routes.

Other indicators may measure the support provided to teachers in classrooms – infrastructure, learning materials, capacity building, quality assurance, community support, effective management – but it should be the children’s learning, facilitated by the competence and commitment of their teachers that it is all about. This emphasis is contained – but not always highlighted – in the plans and it is therefore recommended that:

D. The Government of Tanzania should ensure that the thrust of all educational plans and the focus of all key indicators relates predominantly to each child’s classroom learning.

It may be added that some of the plans appraised were constructed on unrealistic assumptions regarding the likely funding (much as a family might base its budget on the basis that it would win the lottery) and that, when those riches were not forthcoming, many of the objectives were unfulfilled. Other plans sensibly include more than one scenario, ranging from the ‘likely’ through to the ‘optimistic’ but always indicating the ‘priorities amongst the priorities’ and incorporating strategies for dealing with unexpectedly higher or lower resources that anticipated. The ESDP recommendation regarding three-year rolling action plans is better-geread to fluctuating financial fortunes than is the fixed 5-year sub-sector plan that is presently in fashion.

10.5 GPE’s Foundation Skills Emphasis

It is assumed that the Global Partnership for Education’s Strategic Plan for 2012–2015 will be studied alongside this Appraisal. That document’s observation that:

“...much greater consideration needs to be given to improving education quality, increasing equity, reaching marginalized populations, and building strong national education systems...”

is echoed herein. That Plan’s second strategic goal is similarly emphasised:

“All children master basic literacy and numeracy skills by the early grades.”

GPE’s efforts will support and complement the work that many of its partners are providing through strong leadership in areas such as the quality of the learning environment and the protection of child rights, as well as addressing broader learning outcomes such as adult literacy, technical and vocational training, and schools or learning spaces as centres of community. During the period of this GPE strategic plan (2012-16) the Partnership will focus specifically on the foundations of learning, including early acquisition of literacy, numeracy, and other foundational skills. The indicators that will be used to measure progress on this goal are as follows:
The proportion of students in the early grades who demonstrate against credible national systems that they can read and understand the meaning of grade-level text according to national curricula; and

- The proportion of students in the early grades who have numerical conceptual understanding and procedural fluency with basic operations.

As foreshadowed above, it is **recommended** that:

**E. The Government of Tanzania should, in its practices, plans and indicators, embody a concentration on the foundations of learning in the pre-school and early primary years, ensuring that teachers are able to apply effective ways of facilitating and testing literacy and numeracy, providing a firm foundation for a love of reading and an enjoyment of mathematical ideas.**

10.6 **Education and Contemporary Technology**

The 2007 ICT Policy for Basic Education has not yet led to noticeable developments in government primary schools nationwide and the sector’s plans generally do not take account of the potential benefits to children’s learning of the imaginative application of contemporary technology. The non-appearance of the ten-year e-Education Development Programme for Basic Education entitled ‘Tanzania Beyond Tomorrow’ begs the question of whether tomorrow will ever come. When the last draft was reviewed, two years ago, questions regarding how ICT should relate to traditional media and methods were raised, along with why the spotlight should be restricted to ‘basic education’. Similarly, MoEVT’s *ICT Strategy Framework for the Education Sector in Tanzania*, also sighted as a 2010 draft version, seems similarly gridlocked in the pipeline. [“Assisting Higher Learning Institutions to evolve into Centres of Excellence in teaching and research in ICT” and “Selecting and developing appropriate teaching and learning technologies for the secondary and teacher education sub-sectors” are undeniably good causes]. It is accordingly **recommended** that:

**F. The Government of Tanzania should incorporate far-sighted and authoritative strategies regarding the application of ICT across the education sector, aimed at achieving cost-effective and imaginative ways of enhancing children’s learning.**

For example, a digital solution to the dearth of textbooks grows ever-nearer: improving the ratio from 1 book per 20 children to 1 book per 4 (as has been set as a goal in some locations) may be regarded as a most welcome move in the right direction (as the forthcoming wave of books will assuredly improve the situation greatly) rather than a lasting solution. Similarly, solar-powered communication may soon enable all our children to access libraries and all our teachers to prepare compelling lessons and upgrade their qualifications38 from afar.

---

38 In at least one country, enabling newly-qualified teachers to upgrade their qualifications by open learning has successfully encouraged a high proportion of them to stay in remote areas (and in Papua New Guinea there are very many such locations): in three years a diploma may be raised to a degree and a B.Ed. may be raised to an M.Ed. and so forth. Solar-powered computing facilities are also supporting office administration in these hard-to-reach schools.
10.7 The Gender Perspective

In 2012, 48.7% of pre-primary pupils, 49.7% of primary pupils, 46.4% of secondary pupils, 43.7% of those in teacher education, 46.8% of those in vocational education and 36.4% of those in higher education are female. While calculable progress has undoubtedly been made, clear challenges remain and, of course, the issues go far beyond such quantitative summaries. MoEVT’s Strategic Plan for Gender Mainstreaming includes the objective of “…pre-primary, primary, secondary, teachers colleges, Vocational Education and Training and adult and Non-formal education curricula providing gender responsive pedagogy and andragogy39 by 2015”. The Vision is that of a “gender-sensitive education system whose stakeholders have knowledge, skills and attitudes to promote gender equality so that all women and men, girls and boys have equal access to resources, benefits and opportunities for development”. It is therefore recommended that:

G. The Government of Tanzania should ensure that a revised ESDP and subsequent sub-sector plans embody the Strategic Plan for Gender Mainstreaming principles, along with practicable activities and precise indicators; and that investments – such as the envisaged GPE support – should generate gender-sensitive education.

Such pupil-friendly and gender-sensitive education should embrace teaching, classroom and school organisation, facilities, curriculum, learning materials, examinations, counselling, teacher recruitment and promotion, inspection, management and educational systems.

10.8 HIV/AIDS

AIDS Surveillance reports depict an increase in HIV incidence over the last 10 years, seen as peaking with 225,000 new infections in 2010. The number of HIV-positive individuals is likely to have increased from 1.1 million in 2006 to about 1.5 million in 2012. This suggests that the number of new cases, the number of people living with HIV and AIDS, and the number of AIDS deaths will all increase. This follows a predetermined increase in the number of orphans, child headed households and children made vulnerable by AIDS, adversely affecting the demand for and supply of education. Of the eight plans being appraised, some give scant attention to the HIV/AIDS pandemic (typically listing it as one of several ‘cross-cutting issues’) while others (such as SEDP II) suggest that thoughtful responses are being made. MOEVT’s Strategic Plan for HIV/AIDS 2008-2012 is the overarching strategy for all HIV and AIDS interventions in the education sector aimed at providing strategic focus, accelerating the response of the education sector at all levels, protecting learners and education service providers, enhancing the effective implementation of programmes to reduce new HIV and AIDS cases, and mitigating its impact in the sector. It is recommended that:

H. The Government of Tanzania should ensure that a revised ESDP and subsequent sub-sector action plans embody the Strategic Plan for HIV/AIDS and that this plan’s objectives and approaches be taken into full account in relation to educational investments – such as the envisaged GPE support.

39 For present purposes, andragogy may be interpreted as “learning strategies for adults”. More complex and impressive definitions may readily be located in the literature should they be desired.
10.9 Caring and Supporting Children

The National Strategy for Care and Support Services in Tanzanian Primary Schools identified a set of comprehensive Care and Support areas which each school has to provide “if we are to attain the Global intention of quality Education to all children by 2015”. These include:

- Good and quality education whereby each school has adequate and relevant teaching and learning materials;
- Quality school administration/leaderships;
- Provision of nutritional food;
- Health services including first aid kits, de-worming and anti-malaria programmes;
- Quality psychosocial services;
- Clean and safe water for drinking and cooking and adequate sanitary and toilets for both boys and girls;
- Friendly infrastructure, taking consideration of children with disabilities; and
- Safety and security of all children and young people while in and out of school.

It is reasonable to extend these aspirations beyond ‘primary’ to encompass all of basic education as defined in Tanzania. Some of these are challenging in conditions of economic scarcity yet all are justifiable if the well-being of children is recognised as a necessary pre-condition to quality education. It is therefore 

**recommended** that:

1. **The Government of Tanzania should ensure that the standards set out in the National Strategy for Care and Support Services in Tanzanian Primary Schools be embodied in a revised ESDP and subsequent sub-sector plans; and that investments – such as the envisaged GPE support – should aim at achieving these care and support standards across basic education nationwide.**

10.10 Towards the Appropriate Programme

This appraisal of Tanzania’s educational plans has identified priority areas within them where additional support is urgently needed and where such support – if well-directed and effectively applied – could make a significant and sustainable impact upon quality basic education for all – the Global Partnership for Education’s focus. They are inter-related and paramount amongst them is the quantitatively and qualitatively limited learning outcomes across all basic educational stages – this comes through in every survey but is not directly addressed – in the sense of meeting the challenge and solving the situation, as opposed to ameliorating the difficulties and improving the situation – in any of the plans appraised.

That not ‘all of the children are learning’ is largely caused, it is suggested in the documents, by the insufficiency of competent and fully-committed basic education teachers, especially in some key subjects and in particular geographical areas. In turn, this is contributed to by such factors as:

- Inefficient and outdated systems of teacher development;
- Inefficient, outdated and often inoperative systems of and inspection;
- Insufficient learning materials and some imperfections regarding curricula;
- Poor infrastructure, limited facilities and unfavourable school environments; and
Some managerial and administrative inadequacies.

[That list is not necessarily in order of priority nor is it all-inclusive.]

These and other fundamental causes are generally related to limited – and sometimes poorly distributed – funding. However, based upon the principles underlying the existing plans, for basic education sub-sectors and the ESDP itself, the paramount challenge is that not all of Tanzania’s children are learning and those documents suggest that the emphasis of the proposed GPE-supported programme be on that reality. Nevertheless, as the responsibility for formulating and for ‘owning’ any such intervention is indisputably that of Tanzania, this Appraisal’s penultimate recommendation is that:

The Government of Tanzania should, working closely with other stakeholders, and taking full account of this Appraisal of its educational plans, identify the problems, set out the objectives, define the purpose, delineate the results necessary to achieve that purpose, and designate the activities required to bring about those results, in order to develop its fully costed and properly scheduled Programme aimed at contributing to the achievement of Quality Basic Education for All Tanzania’s Children.

A recent McKinsey report (see bibliography, below) points to improving the learning experience of students in their classrooms by means of upgrading system performance. Yet improving the system comes not only with enhancing the structure and increasing the resources but also by changing the process by modifying curriculum and improving the way that teachers instruct and principals lead. One obviously cannot argue with the report’s conclusion that cultivating improvement at any level shares six common interventions:

- Improving the skills of teachers and principals;
- Assessing students;
- Developing data systems;
- Creating supportive educational policy and law;
- Revising standards and curriculum; and
- Establishing a rewards system for teachers and principals.

The similarities between these emphases, the ERC’s prescriptions for ‘improving learning outcomes at the pre-primary, primary and secondary levels’, and this appraisal’s general conclusions is noteworthy.

10.11 Application for GPE Membership

Global Partnership membership is conditional upon the applicant country having (an) educational sector plan(s) that meet specified criteria regarding participation in their development, relevance and credibility, and likelihood of achievement. Each of the eight documents appraised herein contains much of value and represents considerable thought and commitment on the part of those involved.

The summarised observations contained in this appraisal, together with possible ways forward, are tabulated below:
## Plans, Reflections and Potential Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Ways Forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESDP</strong></td>
<td>While still offering useful guidance and while many major proposals have been acted upon, some key recommendations – notably those relating to each child’s learning and the emphasis upon outcomes, together with the call for three-year rolling sub-sector action plans – have yet to become the reality. The 2008 revision is becoming outdated and many recent developments and approved strategies, as well as the forthcoming Education and Training Policy, need to be encompassed in a revised version.</td>
<td>Review thoroughly at the earliest opportunity, consistent with GPE guidelines, incorporating recent strategies and attending to contemporary developments, and seizing upon synergies across the sector. ESDP should constitute the basis of all sub-sector action plans and every intervention – both major (such as GPE and ERC) and minor – within the sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEDP III</strong></td>
<td>A substantial plan with much strength, responding well to a thorough PEDP II evaluation and including an effective approach to M&amp;E. However, there are several weaknesses in key areas, including a lack of any risk assessment and an unwillingness to address some underlying problems in relation to, for example, universal participation, learning outcomes, teacher commitment and quality assurance.</td>
<td>Creatively review the KPIs, then implement through rolling three-year action plans within the context of revised ESDP targets [Some of the fundamental issues addressed less than thoroughly in PEDP III should be dealt with thoroughly in the revised ESDP].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEDP</strong></td>
<td>A creditable plan many of whose activities appear not to be being implemented, probably due to limited funding: a mid-term evaluation is needed so that the situation may become clear and well-informed remedial action taken.</td>
<td>Evaluate progress to date and then amend and update it as necessary. Then implement it through rolling three-year action plans within the context of a revised ESDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TDMS</strong></td>
<td>Some progress has been made but teacher morale seems low and, consequently, teaching is ineffective. Attention needs to be given not only to the future demand for and supply of teachers, by subject and location, but also to school-based INSET (continuous professional development), commitment, supervision by Head Teachers, teaching methods and the responsibility of teachers for their children’s learning.</td>
<td>Incorporate an up-to-date and wide ranging strategy for teachers and teaching within a revised ESDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDP</strong></td>
<td>Good things are happening but the plan started very late, had much less financial support than expected and was affected by the policy decision to incorporate VET. Its main objectives are unlikely to be achieved, even by 2013, and a reappraisal of priorities and actions is needed.</td>
<td>Review the situation, evaluate achievement to date, and proceed to develop and implement rolling three-year action plans within the context of a revised ESDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANFEDP</strong></td>
<td>This recently approved plan has strengths (e.g. values, M&amp;E, allocation of responsibilities) and weaknesses (lack of links with Folk and Vocational, no risk analyses, unclear and unconvincing budgetary scenarios).</td>
<td>Correct the financial arithmetic and implement through rolling three-year action plans within the context of a revised ESDP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FEBRUARY 2013

| TVETDP (2012) | This is a high-quality plan, professionally prepared, and in many respects a model of what a comprehensive sub-sector plan (as opposed to an action plan) should be, signifying that those involved in its preparation believe in the necessity of a plan for TVET. Highly ambitious regarding additional infrastructure, staffing and graduates, the resource requirements are massive and the assumptions are optimistic | Implement through rolling three-year action plans within the context of a revised ESDP |
| HEDP (2010) | A thorough plan, painstakingly developed and gradually being implemented, but weakened by the lack of articulation with SEDP, the side-lining of open learning, and the closing of its authors’ eyes to burgeoning private higher education: in some respects more of an ‘investment plan’ than a comprehensive higher education sector development plan | Attend to the imperfections, bridge the gaps and then continue to implement through rolling three-year action plans within the context of a revised ESDP |

Two basic modalities for the use of a Global Partnership Program Implementation Grant are (a) education sector support or budget support, and (b) discrete financing. The Programme Implementation Grant provides funding for the implementation of a programme that contributes to the implementation of the national Education Plan. The programme must be derived from the Education Plan and be aligned with the Global Partnership priorities as appropriate. Programme support is an un-earmarked financial contribution to a recipient government’s budget. The funds thus transferred are managed in accordance with the recipient’s budgetary procedures and the dialogue between donors and partner governments focuses on sector-specific concerns, rather than on overall policy and budget priorities.

Consequently, the issue is whether (a) GoT already meets the GPE criteria for discrete financing, or (b) the application should be delayed and attention focussed on upgrading the education sector plan(s) over the coming months. Having been addressed at some length by the Education Development Partners Group, it is agreed that it is viable for GoT (with support and through widespread consultation) to develop a feasible intervention based upon the principles and priorities implicit (rather than explicit) in these plans.

The Education Sector Development Committee, after a substantial discussion based upon a Concept Paper setting out alternative programme foci, determined that the preferred emphasis of a GPE-supported programme should be in the area of literacy and numeracy. It also agreed that equity issues should be applied within that intervention. This decision is supported by the Education Development Partners Group and it is, accordingly, recommended that:

K. The Government of Tanzania should proceed at once with its Application for GPE membership, developing an Implementation Programme focussed upon ‘Numeracy and Literacy for All Children’, as agreed at the ESDC meeting on 20th November, and as further identified in discussions with Stakeholders, for submission in late-December 2012.

While ESDP and the relevant sub-sector plans are of an acceptable quality to justify proceeding in this manner, the Education Development Partners Group considers that the limitations
identified in this Appraisal should be attended to and that the recommendations presented above – notably the urgent need for a **thorough review of ESDP, and the subsequent synchronising and dovetailing of all sub-sector (rolling action) plans** with a revised ESDP – be considered very carefully by GoT and other educational stakeholders.
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ANNEXES

Annex A: ESDP’s 2007 Projections and Present Actualities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB SECTOR</th>
<th>2012 – as projected in the ESDP</th>
<th>2012 – best available actual data</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Primary (Years 1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td>2,417,718</td>
<td>1,034,729</td>
<td>Lower than 50% of the projected total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (STD I - VII)</td>
<td>8,326,962</td>
<td>8,247,172</td>
<td>Roughly as projected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 1</td>
<td>847,210</td>
<td>522,379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 2</td>
<td>654,394</td>
<td>455,653</td>
<td>Significantly lower than projected indicating a serious set of problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 3</td>
<td>639,521</td>
<td>420,193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 4</td>
<td>605,748</td>
<td>404,585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 5</td>
<td>197,917</td>
<td>40,890</td>
<td>Very significantly lower than projected: extremely serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 6</td>
<td>138,054</td>
<td>40,572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Education</td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td>112,447</td>
<td>The definition now includes all ‘post-secondary, non-university and technical institutions’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>205,110</td>
<td>166,400</td>
<td>Approaching the target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk Education</td>
<td>93,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>These data are now combined in BEST: lower than projected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education and Training</td>
<td>76,600</td>
<td>121,348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex B: Reported DP Participation In Plan Development

Representatives of 11 Development Partners responded to an invitation to “Please indicate your organisation’s level of participation in each of the following plans” as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Closely involved – significant participation</th>
<th>A degree of involvement – some participation</th>
<th>Not involved – no participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEDP 2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDP 2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex C: Reported CSO Participation in Plan Development

Representatives of 14 Civil Society Organisations involved in education responded to an invitation to “Please indicate your organisation’s level of participation in each of the following plans” as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Closely involved – significant participation</th>
<th>A degree of involvement – some participation</th>
<th>Not involved – no participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEDP 2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDP 2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANFEDP – recent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDP III – current</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVETDP – current</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex D: Education sector financing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2008-09 Actual</th>
<th>2009-10 Actual</th>
<th>2010-11 Actual</th>
<th>2011-12 Actual</th>
<th>2012-13 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education expenditure as a share of GoT expenditure (%)</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>17.90</td>
<td>18.90</td>
<td>18.27</td>
<td>20.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education expenditure as a share of GDP (%)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development spending as a share of total education spending (%)</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of decentralized expenditure in education spending (%)</td>
<td>49.90</td>
<td>59.40</td>
<td>60.80</td>
<td>68.05</td>
<td>66.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education expenditure in US$ millions</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>1,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education expenditure per capita (US$)</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Education Rapid Budget Assessment for Tanzania, November 2012
### Annex E: Education Budget Shares to Sub-Sectors

[2012/13 Budget, Tshs. Billions]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Sector</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Recurrent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>1,183.6</td>
<td>1,210.2</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>468.9</td>
<td>480.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>600.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>600.8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Training Institutes</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>108.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult/Non-formal, Training/folk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>694.0</td>
<td>1,865.3</td>
<td>2,559.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Education Rapid Budget Assessment for Tanzania, November 2012