

FUNDED BY THE UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Independent Midterm Evaluation of  
**TEACH: Tanzania Education  
Alternatives for Children**

Winrock International  
Cooperative Agreement Number: E-9-K-6-0114

# Final Report



2009

**FUNDED BY THE UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

**Independent Midterm Evaluation of  
TEACH: Tanzania Education  
Alternatives for Children**

**Winrock International  
Cooperative Agreement Number: E-9-K-6-0114**

# Final Report

# 2009

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

List of Acronyms and Terms .....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	v
Executive Summary .....	vi
I. CONTEXT.....	1
II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	6
III. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES .....	9
IV. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY.....	11
V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	13
A. Project Design/Implementation.....	13
Conclusions .....	31
Recommendations .....	32
B. Partnership and Coordination.....	34
Conclusions .....	37
Recommendations .....	37
C. Management and Budget.....	37
Conclusions .....	40
Recommendations .....	41
D. Impact and Sustainability .....	41
Conclusions .....	45
Recommendations .....	46
VI. Emerging GOOD PRACTICES .....	47

### Annexes

- Annex A: List of Interviews and Visits
- Annex B: Documents Reviewed
- Annex C: Stakeholders' Meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> November 2008
- Annex D: Terms of Reference
- Annex E: Interview Guides

## LIST OF ACRONYMS AND TERMS

---

CA	Volunteer Community Activists
CLMS	Child Labor Monitoring System
COBET	Complementary Basic Education in Tanzania
DALDO	District Agriculture and Livestock Development Officer
DCLC	District Child Labor Coordinator
DED	District Executive Director
EFA	Education for All
EI	Child Labor Education Initiative
FDC	Folk Development Colleges
GOT	Government of Tanzania
GPRA	Government Performance and Results Act
ILAB	Bureau of International Labor Affairs
ILFS	Integrated Labor Force Survey
ILO	International Labor Organization
ILO-IPEC	ILO's International Program on the Elimination of Child Labor
MOAFSC	Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security, and Cooperatives
MOEVT	Ministry of Education and Vocational Training
MCDGC	Ministry of Community Development, Gender, and Children
MOLEYD	Ministry of Labor, Employment, and Youth Development
NICRA	Negotiated Indirect Cost Recovery Agreement
NISCC	National Inter-Sectoral Coordination Committee on Child Labor
NSGRP	National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (Mkukuta)
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OCFT	Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking
PAC	Project Advisory Committee
PEDP	Primary Education Development Program
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
SO	Sustainability Officer
TAWLAE	Tanzania Association of Women Leaders in Agriculture and the Environment
TBP	Time Bound Program
TOR	Terms of Reference
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
UTSP	Urambo Tobacco Sector Project
VETA	Vocational Education Training Authority
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labor

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

This report describes in detail the midterm evaluation, conducted during May 2008, of Tanzania Education Alternatives for Children (TEACH). The report was prepared by Macro International Inc., according to agreements specified in its contract with the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT). The evaluation of TEACH in Tanzania was conducted and documented by Sue Upton, an independent evaluator in collaboration with USDOL/OCFT staff, the TEACH project team, and stakeholders in Tanzania. Macro International Inc. would like to express sincere thanks to all parties involved in this evaluation: the independent evaluator, Winrock International and its partners, and U.S. Department of Labor.



*Funding for this evaluation was provided by the United States Department of Labor under Task Order number DOLB089K28215. Points of view or opinions in this evaluation report do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the United States Department of Labor, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.*

### THANKS

The evaluator would like to take the opportunity to express her appreciation and sincere thanks to the TEACH team, Ministry representatives, project partners, teachers, students, parents, and community volunteers who contributed to interviews, discussions, and logistical arrangements during the evaluation.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

### The Context

TEACH is one of the Child Labor Education Initiative projects that have been funded by the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) since 2001. Education Initiative (EI) projects are designed to ensure that children in areas with a high incidence of child labor are withdrawn and integrated into educational settings, and to avert at-risk children from leaving school and entering child labor. They are based on improving access to and the quality and relevance of education so that children withdrawn or prevented from child labor have viable alternatives.

Tanzania has a well-developed policy environment where education and child labor are concerned, though implementation remains challenging in such a large country with limited resources. Pre-primary classes increasingly cater to the needs of younger children, and in 2001 the Government of Tanzania (GOT) abolished school fees and made primary education compulsory from age 7-13, leading to a doubling of the numbers of children enrolled between 2000 and 2008. The Complementary Basic Education in Tanzania (COBET) program provides a second chance to access primary or secondary education for children who missed out on initial enrollment; likewise, a range of vocational training opportunities are being further developed for post-primary children.

Starting in 1994, Tanzania was one of the first countries in Africa to address child labor issues, which are now mainstreamed into the country's development policy through their inclusion in Mkukuta, the National Strategy for Growth and Poverty Reduction. Mkukuta identifies commercial agriculture, mining and quarrying, domestic service, and commercial sex as sectors where worst forms of child labor are prevalent, and links trafficking in persons to domestic labor and forced prostitution. The new 2006 labor law integrates ILO Conventions 182 and 138 with the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and there are plans to update the existing list of hazardous forms of child labor. Also in 2006, an Integrated Labor Force Survey provided up-to-date information on the current situation to inform policy implementation and development.

### The Project

In September 2006, Winrock International, Khulisa Management Services, and Tanzania Association of Women Leaders in Agriculture and the Environment (TAWLAE) signed a cooperative agreement with USDOL. As an association, they agreed to implement Tanzania Education Alternatives for Children (TEACH), a four-year project designed to contribute to Tanzania's Time Bound Program to eliminate child labor, and complement and support government policy and practice in five districts where child labor is particularly prevalent in smallholder farming. The project offers opportunities for education to 10,415 children withdrawn or at risk of entering child labor in Igunga, Ilemela, Iramba, Kwimba, and Urambo Districts. It provides pre-primary classes, school kits for primary school children, support for new or existing COBET classes, and vocational agricultural training. These activities are supported by the renovation and equipment of classrooms, learning materials for students, teacher training, curriculum development, school feeding programs and community awareness-raising activities. Winrock International coordinates the project, women from TAWLAE are responsible for

district- level implementation, and South Africa's Khulisa Management Services cover monitoring and evaluation activities. Community volunteers implement a number of project activities in their communities. TEACH also supports some national-level interventions, including activities of the National Inter-Sectoral Coordination Committee on child labor (NISCC), improvements to the National Child Labor Monitoring System, the development of a vocational education strategy in the agricultural sector, and the Ministry of Labor, Employment, and Youth Development (MOLEYD) in the organization of national events such as the World Day Against Child Labor.

## The Evaluation

The midterm evaluation looks at the project as a whole and its overall impact in relation to its stated objectives. Project design, implementation, management, and partnerships are reviewed and assessed with regard to their relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. The evaluation is designed to be a learning process that can facilitate any corrective action and encourage the development of successful aspects of the project. It aims to ensure that the needs of vulnerable children are being met and to highlight emerging good practices. Interviews in Dar es Salaam and field visits to three of the five project districts took place over 2 weeks in November 2008, culminating in a stakeholders meeting to discuss the initial findings and issues arising. This was complemented by a desk review of relevant documentation and telephone and e-mail input from stakeholders based outside Tanzania.

## Principal Findings and Observations

TEACH is a well-designed project that is integrated into and contributes to national child labor and education policy implementation. It is working exceptionally effectively with Government ministries and the ILO at national and district levels, and supports all five USDOL goals for EI projects. The project's education interventions are all operating well. Pre-primary classes and the provision of school kits are running smoothly and are universally appreciated. There are some excellent examples of highly successful vocational agricultural centers, the most complex of the TEACH interventions, though not all centers are yet operating to their maximum potential. COBET classes offer many children a second chance to access education, but it is proving challenging to achieve consistent attendance and gender balance in project interventions for older children. School feeding programs encourage children to come to school and are increasingly well managed by local communities, in spite of the small budget that the project is able to provide.

By September 2008, TEACH had reported 1,361 children withdrawn (475) or prevented (886); this represents only 30 percent of children actually enrolled in project initiatives (4,575 by November 2008) and 13 percent of the project target. This discrepancy is due to over-ambitious project definitions for retained, withdrawn, and prevented children, which need to be revised to ensure that project reporting accurately reflects the number of beneficiaries. A project revision has been requested and should make it feasible for the project to meet its target numbers. The project's monitoring strategy is time and energy intensive at the community level and the database is still experiencing some teething problems. While school attendance is being

measured, albeit with some delays, a system for consistent monitoring of children's work status has yet to be achieved.

The use of volunteers to implement the project at community level is problematic because of the level of work required, which leaves limited time for those concerned to meet their own survival needs. It is important to find a way to adequately validate the significant work carried out by these people, because without them TEACH could not operate at the village level.

The evaluation found widespread awareness of child labor issues among national and local government and project staff, but education was the stronger focus for all district and community-level actors, with limited evidence of consistent grassroots community knowledge of child labor and its consequences. This suggests that there may be room for some more-focused awareness raising to supplement the public campaigns that the project has already initiated. This might also work to empower parents of vulnerable children to identify strategies for becoming more actively involved in child protection and supporting their children's education.

The community asset appraisal process is facilitating the inclusion of TEACH activities in the local planning process. However, a more community-led approach, in addition to support for local government, could make provision for local advocacy and monitoring of the implementation of district plans. Project partnerships do not as yet include community organizations, and community activists currently have no institutional identity to support the recognition of their work and the sustainability of their role.

The three organizations that make up the project's implementing association draw on their complementary strengths and experience to create an effective working team. Project management at both national and district levels is characterized by its flexible response to arising issues, which are largely dealt with through a well-developed team approach focused on achieving project objectives. Some activities are somewhat under-budgeted, which puts staff under pressure to deliver results with limited resources. For example, vocational agriculture centers are only issued with protective clothing for one class of students, so graduates move on without the gumboots, overalls, facemasks, and gloves that they have been trained to use; likewise, the budget for school feeding is not large enough to provide consistently nutritious meals for all children.

The evaluation observed that TEACH educational interventions are having a positive impact on the lives of children, parents, teachers, and community activists, and the project is also playing an important role in supporting and developing child labor and education policy implementation at national and district levels. District authorities significantly contribute to the project through seconding staff, and providing offices and general operational support. TEACH is becoming increasingly integrated into local and national planning and reporting, which bodes well for the sustainability of interventions. Strategies for sustainability are quite advanced at the midway point, principally as a result of having been an integral part of project design and the existence of a sustainability officer, an innovation that will become increasingly important during the latter half of the project.



A number of emerging good practices noted during the evaluation include the following:

- The project design aligns with Government child labor and education policy and practice so that projects support and build on existing ideas and initiatives.
- The development of vocational agriculture training alongside business skills in areas where smallholder farming is widespread enables children and adults to build on what they already know and incorporate new methods to increase productivity and entrepreneurial initiatives.
- The project uses a national civil society organization to coordinate and implement activities on the ground, thus applying accumulated national and local knowledge and expertise, while building national capacity.
- The existence of a sustainability officer in place from the start of the project as a way of ensuring that sustainability is genuinely integrated into project strategy.

## Key Recommendations

### For USDOL:

USDOL might consider *extending the TEACH project* should the GOT make such a request. During the evaluation, a number of Government representatives expressed a desire for the project to continue for longer than 4 years; not only because of the resources it provides but because of the way it is building national capacity to implement child labor and education policy. Considering the time taken and the cost of project start-up activities: if a project is working in successful collaboration with a national government to tackle an ongoing problem, it makes sense to enable its work to be extended and replicated in other districts.

### For TEACH:

The project needs to instigate effective *work status tracking* of direct beneficiaries. Ideally, this will not only feed project reporting but also serve to establish a community-based system that enables local people to better protect their children. One suggestion is to establish a mentoring system where appropriate local adults (parents, community activists, or teachers) meet regularly with individual children to gather the appropriate information, using the opportunity to discuss any issues arising, and offer general support to the child concerned. This would require some training in how to talk to children to offer support and inspire trust.

**Budget permitting:** The project needs to find a way (i) for vocational agriculture students to be issued a set of personal protective clothing that they can take with them when they finish the course; (ii) to increase the daily allowance for school feeding from 250 TZS to the former level of 350 TZS; and (iii) to provide school uniforms for COBET students. The project should pursue its negotiations with potential private partners to support such initiatives.

Some research and analysis concerning the unequal *gender balance* among older project beneficiaries is required. If it is found that girls do not have adequate access to education and training opportunities that would benefit them, new recruitment and awareness-raising strategies are needed to tackle this.

Inter- and intra-district *exchange visits* between district teams, between community activists, and between vocational agricultural centers would enable good practices to be shared and problems to be resolved, as well as widening individual experience and rewarding initiative and success. Such visits are highly recommended as they are invariably cost-effective, bringing both expected and unexpected results. In a similar vein, vocational agriculture center *open days* would enable parents and communities to know more about what is happening there, provide opportunities for students to demonstrate their work, and encourage others to enroll.

**Regarding monitoring:** Khulisa is asked to use its extensive experience in database development and management as the basis for discussion with the rest of the TEACH team, to consider—

- How such management information systems might be better adapted to the realities of remote rural communities.
- How the information required might be reduced to its minimum to facilitate the collection of essential data by community members and field based staff.
- How to enable districts to produce and analyze reports from the database to inform their work.
- The feasibility of a monitoring strategy that serves both the national/project needs for accurate data and the community's need to protect its children through local monitoring of school attendance and work status. Such a strategy would need to take into account limited infrastructure and community literacy levels.

TEACH should facilitate and encourage *regular meetings at the village/ward level* that enable local stakeholders to sit together to discuss monitoring, awareness raising, and other child labor-related issues, including strategies for sustainability of project activities. This is one way to strengthen community-level support for project activities.

Measures planned to lighten *the workload of the project's district teams* should be monitored to ensure that they are adequate.

*Awareness raising* to help parents of vulnerable children, to support them in school, and to protect them from child labor should aim to involve such parents in analysis and discussion so that they can take responsibility for protecting their children. This might entail school-based seminars and parents' support groups and be linked to community child labor monitoring strategies. It needs to focus on empowerment, confidence building, the identification and development of parenting skills, and might also include strategies for advocacy.

Community activists could be offered some *training* on how to facilitate and develop the work with the parents of vulnerable children described above. A number of the TEACH district teams possess the skills to develop and implement such training.

The idea of *community activists becoming a recognized community group* in each community, to facilitate the continuation of their role after the end of the project, could be explored.

The project needs to develop a detailed picture of what interventions are assured in terms of *sustainability* and what remains to be done, thus providing a district-by-district focus for working towards sustainability.

## Conclusions

Overall, TEACH's comprehensive design is working well in practice. The project is being implemented in close collaboration with Government personnel, and is successfully enabling many vulnerable children to access education while demonstrating some new approaches to vocational training and pre-primary education. Although the project is somewhat behind schedule in terms of meeting its target numbers for children withdrawn and prevented from exploitive child labor, it is appropriately designed and situated to meet its primary project goal, and has the potential to meet its target numbers by the end of its 4-year duration. The project's flexible staff team is working hard to overcome the inevitable challenges that arise during implementation, and the project has every hope of meeting most of its targets by the time it comes to an end. This is an impressive and ambitious project that can become even better as it progresses.

## I. CONTEXT

The U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) funds international labor projects through its Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB). The Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) is the office within ILAB that administers grants and contracts to organizations engaged in efforts to eliminate child labor and raise awareness about child labor issues. Since 1995 Congress has appropriated over \$595 million to USDOL to combat exploitive child labor in over 75 countries. Such technical cooperation projects range from action programs targeting specific sectors of work to more comprehensive programs supporting national efforts to eliminate the worst forms of child labor as defined by the International Labor Organization (ILO) Convention 182. USDOL-funded projects seek to achieve five major goals:

### The Five Goals of USDOL-funded Projects

1. Withdrawing or preventing children from involvement in exploitive child labor through the provision of direct education services.
2. Strengthening policies on child labor and education, the capacity of national institutions to combat child labor, and formal and transitional education systems that encourage children engaged in or at-risk of engaging in exploitive labor to attend school.
3. Raising awareness of the importance of education for all children and mobilizing a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures.
4. Supporting research and the collection of reliable data on child labor.
5. Ensuring the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

Funds are directed towards two specific programs operating in geographic areas or economic sectors with a high incidence of exploitive child labor. Since 1995 Congress has supported the **International Labor Organization's International Program on the Elimination of Child Labor (ILO-IPEC)**. ILO/IPEC projects include national Time Bound Programs (TBP), sector-specific projects, data collection and research, and raising international awareness. In 2001 Congress started direct funding to the **Child Labor Education Initiative (EI)**, designed to ensure that children in areas with a high incidence of child labor are withdrawn and integrated into educational settings, and that they persist in their education once enrolled. The program also seeks to avert at-risk children from leaving school and entering child labor. EI projects are based on improving access to and the quality and relevance of education so that children withdrawn/prevented from child labor have viable alternatives. EI funds are competitively bid, and support cooperative agreements with international, nonprofit, for-profit, and faith-based entities. In addition to these two initiatives, in 2007 the USDOL awarded \$62.5 million for other child labor elimination projects, awareness-raising, and research activities.

### Education in Tanzania

In Tanzania, school-based education starts with **Pre-Primary**, a two-year formal school system for children 5 and 6 years old. From 2004 to 2008, pre-primary enrollment rose from 554,835 to

873,981 and now accounts for 36.6 percent of the total 5- to 6-year-old population, with gender parity among the children enrolled.<sup>1</sup> At age 7, children move automatically into a 7-year cycle of **Primary Education**, which has been compulsory since school fees were abolished in 2001. This has led to a steady increase in the number of children enrolled; from 4,370,500 in 2000 to 8,410,094 in 2008. Although around 1 percent (80,000) children dropped out in 2007 (mainly due to truancy), this is a considerable achievement. An inevitable result is increased pressure to provide quality education and learning environments, including trained teachers and adequate teaching and learning materials. The Government of Tanzania's (GOT's) second Primary Education Development Program (PEDP II) for 2007-2011 addresses this through its identified priorities, which include: expanding enrollment, improving quality, building capacity, addressing cross-cutting issues (such as HIV/AIDS and gender equality), and strengthening institutional arrangements (see text box).

#### GOT's Primary Education Development Program

PEDP II states that: *“Primary education will pay special attention to the aspect of equity to ensure that Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVC) such as street children, victims of child labor, girls, children with disabilities, children from poor families and from pastoralist and hunter-gatherer communities, and those living in difficult and hard to reach areas enroll, attend, and complete primary education.”* In addition, the Government will *“enroll all out-of-school children and youths in Non-Formal Education (NFE) centers linked to primary schools...”*

The PEDP II also emphasizes the responsibility at the District, Ward, and Village levels. Districts and Wards are responsible for supervising the implementation of education. Village governments are responsible for preparing and implementing Village Development Plans with provisions for supporting education and training interventions, enforcing compulsory enrollment and attendance regulations, and mobilizing community members and parents to participate in school governance. (*TEACH ProDoc p. 16.*)

In 2002 the Government introduced the Complementary Basic Education in Tanzania (COBET) program, which provides a second chance to access primary or secondary education services for children who miss out on primary school enrollment. COBET has achieved some success, but demand is high and the COBET centers have limited resources. COBET is split into two cohorts: COBET I from 11 to 13 years and COBET II from 14 to 17 years. In 2008 the total number enrolled is 111,413 children, 57 percent of whom are boys.

The GOT's Vocational Education Training Authority (VETA) offers several programs, including Post Primary Technical Training Colleges and Vocational Rehabilitation Training Centers. Folk Development Colleges (FDC), under the Ministry of Community Development Gender and Children, were developed to stem rural-urban migration and focus on literacy, numeracy, and vocational skills training. Although there are 58 FDCs, the introduction of fees and a lack of appropriate tools and technologies have led to under-utilization. FDCs are integrating VETA curricula and targeting primary school leavers and students with special needs. Although there are FDCs in three of the project districts, none offer agriculture skills training.

---

<sup>1</sup> All data in this section comes from the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training's (MOEVT's) Basic Education Statistics in Tanzania 2004-2008.

## Child Labor in Tanzania

The GOT can be described as a pioneer in the fight against child labor in Africa since ILO-IPEC initiated national capacity building to tackle the problem and provide education-based alternatives to child labor as early as 1994. Initial efforts sensitized, trained, and mobilized a range of stakeholders, and intensive media campaigns contributed to raising awareness of child labor. As one of the first three countries in the world to commit to a Time Bound Program, Tanzania is working to eliminate the Worst Forms of Child Labor (WFCL) in commercial agriculture, commercial sex, mining, and domestic labor by 2010. The country has previously participated in four USDOL-funded projects and collaborates with ILO-IPEC on several other child labor projects.

The GOT has also established a policy framework to address child labor which includes linking child labor issues to the National Strategy for Growth and Poverty Reduction (Mkukuta in Kiswahili), thus opening the door to the mainstreaming of child labor issues across all relevant ministries through its use of child labor as an indicator for monitoring poverty. The strategy identifies commercial agriculture, mining and quarrying, domestic service, and commercial sex as sectors where worst forms of child labor are prevalent, and links trafficking in persons to the issues of domestic labor and forced prostitution.

A new labor law signed in December 2004 integrates ILO Convention 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labor, Convention 138 on the Minimum Age, and the Convention on the Rights of the Child. While the Ministry of Labor, Employment, and Youth Development (MOLEYD) plans to update the country's list of hazardous child labor, the current list includes—

- Work that exposes children to physical, psychological, or sexual abuse.
- Children working with dangerous machinery, equipment, tools, or which involves the manual handling or transport of heavy loads.
- Work in unhealthy environments, exposing children to hazardous substances that may damage their health.
- Work under particularly difficult conditions such as working long hours, during the night, or when the child is being confined to the premises of the employer.

Child labor issues appear in the Child Development Policy, Children's Rights Statute, and the Orphans and Vulnerable Children Policy, among others.

In 2006, Tanzania’s fourth Integrated Labor Force Survey (ILFS) included a module on child labor which targeted all children age 5 to 17, living in the households covered by the survey. The report appeared in November 2008, providing data and analysis of various aspects of child labor, including its effects on school attendance (see following table<sup>2</sup>):

Integrated Labor Force Survey 2006	Boys	Girls	Total
Total number of children age 5-17 years	6,139,827	5,943,522	12,083,349
Children involved in economic work in last 12 months (% of all children age 5-17 unless stated otherwise)	69.8	70.9	70.4
Children involved in housekeeping in past 7 days	80.2	82.7	81.4
Children involved in economic or housekeeping work	84.0	85.5	84.8
Children not involved in work activity	15.9	14.5	15.2
Child laborers: ILFS approach <sup>3</sup>	22.8	18.5	20.7
Child laborers: All work full approach <sup>4</sup>	23.9	19.6	21.8
Child laborers: Economic work full approach <sup>5</sup>	20.7	16.0	18.4
Children 7-17 years attending school (as % of all children age 7-17)	81.5	82.1	81.1
<b>General findings:</b> The survey found that 70.4 percent of children age 5-17 are engaged in economic activities and 84.8 percent are engaged in work more broadly defined, including both economic and housekeeping activities. Boys are more likely than girls to be involved in child labor, and rural children are much more at risk than those living in urban areas (around 25% as opposed to around 7.75%).			
<b>School attendance:</b> The majority of children attending school are engaged in both economic and housekeeping activities (72.2% of 7-13 year olds and 81.3% of 14-17 year olds). This is more common for girls than for boys in both age groups. Of working children who attend school, 14.9 percent report that their work affects their school attendance, older children being more affected than younger ones.			
<b>Causes and preferences:</b> The major reasons offered by parents/guardians for letting children do economic work are: for good upbringing (37.6%), to assist in household enterprise (32.5%), or to supplement household income (20.8%). Of adults responsible for working children, 61.8 percent would prefer the children to go to school full time. Similarly, when working children were asked what they would like to do in the future, the most common priority was: going to school full time (76.4%).			

<sup>2</sup> Data from *Child Labour in Tanzania—An analysis of findings of the Integrated Labour Force Survey, 2006*, published July 2008

<sup>3</sup> ILFS considers excessive hours and hazardous labor and covers both economic work and housekeeping.

<sup>4</sup> ‘All work full’ approach includes the ILFS elements and also general hazards.

<sup>5</sup> ‘Economic work full’ approach covers only those children doing economic work and considers hours, hazardous occupations, and general hazards.

While the GOT is clearly committed to the elimination of child labor and has gone a long way in developing both education and child labor policy and practice, implementation remains challenging in a large country with underdeveloped infrastructure and limited resources. Thus, in September 2006 Winrock International, Khulisa Management Services, and the Tanzania Association of Women Leaders in Agriculture and the Environment (TAWLAE) signed a 48-month cooperative agreement with USDOL. As an association, they agreed to implement the EI project entitled TEACH with the aim of contributing to Tanzania's Time Bound Program to eliminate child labor; complementing and supporting government policy and practice in five districts where child labor is particularly prevalent.



## II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

---

Through a cooperative agreement worth \$5,090,000 over 4 years, TEACH aims to reduce the number of children participating in or at risk of entering worst forms of child labor; particularly in smallholder farming in the five districts of Igunga, Ilemela, Iramba, Kwimba, and Urambo. The project is designed to achieve its purpose of educating children who have been withdrawn or prevented from exploitive child labor in these districts through meeting the following five objectives/outputs:

1. Expanding existing child labor reduction efforts through enhancing educational alternatives and opportunities within the education system both geographically and demographically (targeting primarily smallholder farmers): *10,415 children age 5-17 withdrawn (5,145) or prevented (5,270) from exploitative child labor and supported to receive educational services.*
2. Improving educational infrastructure, environment, and quality for targeted children: *Improved educational infrastructure and quality for the targeted group of children.*
3. Raising awareness and designing awareness campaigns that foster community-driven solutions and innovations: *Increased awareness regarding the importance of education and the negative impact of child labor.*
4. Enhancing the policy environment and strengthening CLMS's data collection, data relevancy, and decision-making applications through capacity building efforts: *Enhanced capacity of national and district institutions to address exploitive child labor and education.*
5. Ensuring sustainability of efforts through community ownership, participation, resource and asset mobilization, and capacity building: *Ensured sustainability of project efforts.*

The project is designed to work closely with Government structures at national and district levels and to enhance implementation of existing education and child labor policy. This approach is a key strategy for sustainability and the project is fairly unique in having an officer—in place from the start—specifically responsible for ensuring a significant degree of sustainability of activities after the close of the project.

TEACH revolves around four key interventions, which offer opportunities for education to vulnerable children age 5 to 17:

- The establishment of 5 **pre-primary classes** in each district for children age 5-6 engaged in or at-risk of engaging in hazardous child labor.
- Provision of 1,125 **school kits and scholarships** to support the education of children age 7-10 withdrawn from exploitive labor. Kits include items such as uniforms, shoes, school bags, exercise and text books, and mosquito nets.

- Support for 50 new or existing non-formal **COBET Classes** (Complementary Basic Education in Tanzania) for children age 11-13 (Cohort 1) or age 14-17 (Cohort 2) <sup>6</sup> who are removed from child labor or at-risk of engaging in hazardous child labor.
- The establishment of 30 **Vocational-Agricultural Model Schools** for children age 14-17, withdrawn from hazardous child labor, and who have completed primary school and/or are not interested in joining COBET classes.

These activities are supported and supplemented by classroom renovation and equipment, teacher training, curriculum development, school feeding programs for preprimary, COBET and vocational agriculture classes, and community awareness-raising activities.

The project also contributes to a number of related initiatives that support the Government at a national level, including the following:

- The National Intersectoral Coordination Committee on child labor (NISCC) brings together representatives from the different Ministries concerned with child labor issues, as well as other relevant organizations and initiatives, including the ILO and TEACH. The committee facilitates the coordination and mainstreaming of child labor issues and TEACH contributes to this by organizing regular monitoring visits that enable members to see and hear about what is happening on the ground.
- Working with the ILO and the MOLEYD to reactivate and develop a national child labor monitoring system (CLMS) based on data already being collected by various government departments, so as to enable the GOT to measure its progress towards the elimination of child labor.
- Collaborating with ILO-IPEC to offer technical support to the MOLEYD in developing the National Action Plan on Child Labor.
- Collaborating with the Vocational Education Training Authority to design its strategy for the development of vocational education and training in agriculture. This entails making an inventory of existing agriculture vocational training programs by zone, an assessment of their effectiveness/efficiency, and documentation of best practices. On this basis a draft strategy will be developed and discussed, leading to the development of a final strategy document to guide the ongoing process.

TEACH is implemented by three organizations: Winrock International is the lead grantee and, as such, is responsible for overall coordination and reporting to USDOL; Khulisa Management Services from South Africa is responsible for project monitoring/evaluation; and the Tanzania Association of Women Leaders in Agriculture and the Environment is responsible for district- and community-level implementation. Thirty community volunteers (known as community activists) have been recruited and trained in each district to coordinate, implement, and monitor the project in their communities.

---

<sup>6</sup>In the COBET system, the MOEVT calls “cohort 1” the class preparing children for reintegrating into formal primary school (age 11-13) and “cohort 2” the class preparing children for reintegrating into secondary school.

The project operates in selected villages in five districts. The districts were selected because of the prevalence of child labor. For example, Iramba is known to be a domestic labor source, and Urambo's traditional agriculture is linked to commercial tobacco production. TEACH carried out baseline research that confirmed the relevance of project interventions in these areas, all of which are areas where smallholder farming is prevalent.

### III. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

---

The midterm evaluation looks at the project as a whole and examines its overall impact in relation to its stated objectives. The activities carried out during the first half of the Cooperative Agreement are reviewed and assessed with regard to their relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. The evaluation aims to—

- Help individual organizations identify areas of good performance and areas where project implementation can be improved.
- Assist OCFT to learn more about what is or is not working in terms of the overall conceptualization and design of EI projects within the broad OCFT technical cooperation program framework.
- Assess the degree to which objectives relevant to the country-specific situation they address have been achieved.
- Assess progress in terms of children's working and educational status (i.e., withdrawal and prevention from the worst forms of child labor; enrollment, retention, and completion of educational programs).

More specifically, it aims to—

- Address the capacity-building elements and the stakeholder engagement for project sustainability and potential as a replicable model.
- Address key project achievements and successes, and how TEACH has met challenges through community participation, ownership, and stakeholder involvement.
- Make recommendations for scaling up or replication of potential or emerging best practices.
- Make observations and recommendations regarding the national and local government commitment and strategies for sustainability.
  - At National/District level: Contribution of the project on Government policy/ initiatives towards elimination of child labor and its worst forms.
  - At District Level: Contribution of the project on implementation of Government policies/initiatives towards elimination of child labor and its worst forms.
  - At Community and School level: Assessing what benefits and changes in the children's learning processes have resulted so far from the project.

While considering—

- Whether the project succeeded in attracting young people to education in agriculture and entrepreneurship through TEACH educational services.
- Whether the project has developed strategies to address improvements in community-based monitoring and data capture.

To achieve these objectives, the various aspects of the project are divided into the following categories:

- A. Project Design/Implementation** looks at how well project design fits into the GOT's overall education and child labor initiatives, to what degree it supports USDOL's five goals, and its understanding and implementation of definitions of withdrawn and prevented. The evaluation examines the project's monitoring strategy, assesses the quality and relevance of direct educational interventions, and measures progress towards meeting its stated purpose and outputs, while addressing any obstacles in evidence at the midway point.
- B. Partnership and Coordination** identifies any major issues and challenges of initiating and developing project partnerships, and any partnership opportunities that warrant greater attention. This section looks particularly at the quality of the partnership between the three implementing organizations, with the GOT, with the ILO and within participating communities.
- C. Management and Budget** assesses the effectiveness of management procedures, USDOL's technical assistance and communication, and the project's use of its funding; likewise assessing its degree of success in leveraging non-project resources to support and develop activities.
- D. Impact and Sustainability** examines the effectiveness of awareness-raising activities and other strategies for sustainability, and studies the impact of project activities on systems for education and child labor prevention, on project partners, and on individual beneficiaries. It also seeks to identify emerging good practices and lessons learned.

The evaluation is an objective inquiry which can facilitate any corrective action and encourage the development and further use of successful aspects of the project. Ultimately, the purpose is to ensure that the needs of vulnerable children are being met through project interventions and that the best possible use is made of emerging good practices. It is designed to be a learning process for all those concerned.

## IV. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

---

After initial analysis of the purpose and scope of the evaluation, the evaluator carried out a desk review of key project documents (listed in Annex B). Before visiting the field, a phone call with USDOL Project Managers ensured a common understanding of the terms of reference (TOR) and the priorities for the evaluation. A program of field visits and interviews was agreed with project staff, including key informants emerging from both the desk review and TEACH recommendations. This took into account the evaluator's request that visits include examples of the most successful activities, as well as any that were problematic. The evaluator traveled to Tanzania for 2 weeks, and evaluation activities took place from the 13th to 28th of November, 2008.

**Key informant interviews at the National level** included discussions with the TEACH national team (including officers employed by the three implementing organizations), representatives of key ministries (MOEVT and MOLEYD), and the International Labor Organization.

**Meetings at District level** enabled the evaluator to meet with the TEACH District Coordinators and Community Mobilizers in Kwimba, Iramba and Urambo, the three districts visited during the evaluation. Ilemela District was not selected due to its already being the most frequently visited project district, and Igunga District was also not selected simply due to time constraints. Meetings with a cross-section of local government staff included District Executive Directors, Agricultural and Livestock Development Officers, Community Development Officers, Education Officers, School Inspectors, and Child Labor coordinators across the three districts.

**At Village and Ward levels**, meetings took place with groups of local leaders, parents, teachers, TEACH community activists, and children. A number of projects developed by vocational agricultural students were visited, and pre-school, COBET, and vocational agricultural classes were observed in progress. In each district a local interpreter who was not part of the TEACH team travelled with the evaluator to facilitate discussions. TEACH project staff assisted with introductions and explanations but were not present during any individual or group interviews. Overall, the evaluator was able to meet with 53 parents (32 women and 21 men), 281 children (99 girls and 182 boys), 56 community activists (19 women and 37 men), 33 teachers (14 women and 19 men) and 34 local leaders (6 women and 28 men).

On November 27th 2008, a **stakeholders' meeting** in Dar es Salaam brought together national- and district-level stakeholders to discuss and give feedback on the initial findings of the evaluation. The meeting was opened by Mrs. Edine E. Mangesho, the Deputy Permanent Secretary for MOLEYD. The meeting provided an opportunity for the 33 participants to discuss various aspects of TEACH and develop some ideas in response to some of the evaluator's observations (See Annex C).

**The draft report** was circulated to stakeholders to enable any further information, corrections, or contributions to be incorporated into the final report.

A particular constraint for this evaluation was the time available for field visits. The project's unusually large number of different interventions, combined with the geographical spread of activities, meant that it was only possible to visit a few of each type of intervention and representatives of all local stakeholders could not be interviewed in each location. This made it difficult to judge which findings and observations were specific to the school or community being visited and which were more general across the project as a whole.

## **V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

This section examines how the project is contributing to the Tanzania education and child labor environment, the strategies it has developed, and the activities it is implementing. These findings, conclusions, and recommendations are grouped in the five categories identified under the following evaluation objectives:

- Project Design/Implementation
- Partnership and Coordination
- Budget and Management
- Impact and Sustainability

The findings of the evaluation are organized around the questions posed by USDOL in the TOR, taking the opportunity to not only respond to each question but to expand on the issues concerned, as appropriate. Conclusions and recommendations complete evaluation of the relevant issues.

### **A. Project Design/Implementation**

#### ***Fit with GOT Programs***

TEACH was designed to support and complement existing programs to combat child labor within Tanzania and is proving to be very successful in doing so. Child labor is integrated into the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP), known as *Mkukuta* in Kiswahili, which is the key strategy document that guides development across all ministries. TEACH directly contributes to a number of interventions identified in *Mkukuta* where the reduction of child labor is specifically mentioned:



<b>An adaptation drawn directly from Mkukuta's Annex I that presents the broad outcomes, goals, operational outcomes/targets, and priority strategic actions in matrix form for the NSGRP:</b>				
<b>Goal: Rural income increased; poverty of both men and women substantially reduced.</b>				
<b>Operational Outcomes</b>	<b>Sub-category</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Intervention Package</b>	<b>Sector</b>
Transformed subsistence sector into smallholder commercial farming	Child labor	Educate communities on basic rights of a child, including the fight against child labor; develop and implement programs targeting reduction of child labor.	Rehabilitation programs and centers	Children
<b>Goal: Improved equitable access for boys and girls to quality primary and secondary education; universal literacy among women and men; and expansion of higher, technical and vocational education.</b>				
Increase in the number of young children prepared for school and life	Pre-school	Expand primary education system to develop quality pre-primary programs that link with existing early childhood provisions—health, nutrition, parenting education, etc.	Early childhood development interventions Pre school infrastructure Pre school teachers training Pre school books and learning aids	Education
Increased proportion of orphans and most vulnerable children enrolled, attending, and completing primary education; from 2% in 2000 to 30% in 2010	Primary education	Ensure all children (boys and girls), including those with disabilities, pregnant school girls, orphans, and other most vulnerable children (e.g., child laborers, street children) are able to effectively access and complete high-quality, child-friendly, and gender-sensitive primary education.	School infrastructure Learning Materials Curriculum reforms Awareness creation	Education
<b>Goal: Adequate social protection with basic needs and services and delivery of rights to the most vulnerable and needy groups.</b>				
Reduce proportion of children in labor country- wide, from 25% to less than 10% by 2010 and avail to them alternatives including enrollment in primary education, COBET, and employable vocational education skills training	Child labor	Develop and implement sector-based awareness and training programs, reducing worst forms of child labor. Educate communities on basic rights of a child, including the fight against child labor; develop and implement programs targeting reduction of child labor and promoting rights of orphans and vulnerable children.	Awareness and training programs Child Labor Law Enforcement	Children's rights

Thus it is clear that TEACH interventions contribute to various aspects of a range of Government programs. In a large and under-resourced country such as Tanzania, the implementation of development policy is an enormous challenge. TEACH is not simply assisting the Government to meet that challenge in terms of much-needed financial resources but is also piloting and developing new approaches in the field of vocational training; supporting essential

improvements to the quality of basic education that will help to ensure that children remain once they are enrolled.

Since Tanzania's child labor policy environment is well-developed and there is a considerable degree of awareness on the issues at both national and district levels, Mkukuta focuses on sector-based and community awareness raising, training initiatives, and child-labor law enforcement. The project supports this through its design of raising child-labor awareness in communities where poverty and tradition make this a real challenge.

### ***Fit with ILO-IPEC TBP***

Representatives of both the ILO and the MOLEYD were quick to explain that Tanzania's Time Bound Program is a government-coordinated program made up of a number of initiatives implemented by the Government and a range of other partners, including TEACH and the ILO. Government coordination and ownership of this program is another demonstration of the seriousness with which child labor is taken in Tanzania.

Project collaboration with the ILO is extremely good at the national level, where both organizations sit on a number of committees and work together to support the GOT in policy development and implementation. There used to be an ILO/IPEC project in Iramba, which resulted in the post of District Child Labor Coordinator (DCLC) being established. Although the project has now finished, the post remains and the DCLC is a strong supporter of TEACH interventions in the District, helping to ensure that TEACH and World Vision work in different communities to implement similar initiatives.

Both TEACH and the ILO are currently working in Urambo District where a Project Advisory Committee (PAC) brings together the different organizations working to combat child labor, so as to monitor and advise on child labor projects in the district. Currently these include TEACH, the ILO/IPEC's Urambo Tobacco Sector Project (UTSP), and the TBP. The UTSP supports children withdrawn from tobacco farming and re-integrates them into the primary education system, while supporting older children with training in vocations of their choice. The latter, upon completion of their vocational training, are provided with start-up capital in the form of working tools. The project has facilitated the formation and training of Village Child Labor Committees who act as watchdogs against child labor. TBP interventions include COBET, classroom renovation/ construction and equipment, school kits, and income generation, implemented by national or international non-governmental organization (NGO) partners.

A PAC Technical Committee makes field visits before meetings and reports back to members so that any issues can be discussed and resolved with input from everyone concerned. While District officials and the TEACH team in Urambo felt that the district was lucky to have so many child labor initiatives, they said that it is sometimes difficult for different approaches to operate side by side, and that some interventions are more successful than others. The TBP is apparently currently experiencing some difficulties, which have been attributed by the District Executive Director to the fact that they have no district-based office and must operate from Dar es Salaam. The fact that some partners ask for a local contribution and others do not is sometimes a problem, and it is difficult to start working in a community where a previous project has failed.

However these are fairly common local development issues and overall there are no major problems, as everyone works well together.

### ***Filling Gaps***

TEACH was designed to meet the needs of children working in informal agriculture on small scale family farms, based on the hypothesis that *“agriculture-based child labor contributes to low agricultural productivity, and poverty associated with low agricultural productivity motivates the rural use of child labor as well as the migration and trafficking of children to urban and peri-urban regions for work in fishing, mining, commercial sexual exploitation, and domestic labor.”*<sup>7</sup> Previous child labor prevention initiatives succeeded in reducing child labor on plantations but did not address the link between low productivity on smallholder farms and the lack of educational services in the most marginalized rural areas of Tanzania.

The project is demonstrating intervention strategies to tackle these issues and providing expertise to assist national and district authorities in exploiting the lessons learned. The sentiment that *“We still have a lot to learn from TEACH”* was expressed on more than one occasion during the evaluation, at both national and district levels. Successful vocational agriculture training is seen as very important in developing appropriate skills and changing young people’s perceptions and experience of agriculture. Preschool classes and school feeding programs are both official policy but implementation takes time in poor, rural communities. TEACH is helping to demonstrate the importance of both at the village level, so that communities are increasingly prepared to contribute and participate.

Although Tanzania demonstrates a strong commitment to eradicating child labor, it does not currently have an operational Child Labor Monitoring System to measure progress towards this goal. TEACH and the ILO are working together with the MOLEYD to develop and implement such a system that will be sustainable after the end of any project. This is an ambitious undertaking that plans to use proxy-indicators and existing data collection systems.

### ***USDOL Goals***

A2.1 The TEACH design supports all five of the USDOL goals through—

- Withdrawing and preventing children from involvement in exploitative child labor through the provision of direct educational services.
- Strengthening the capacity of national institutions (Government and TAWLAE) to combat child labor, and in formal and transitional education systems that encourage children engaged in or at risk of engaging in exploitive labor to attend school.
- Raising awareness of the importance of education for all children and mobilizing actors to improve and expand education infrastructures.

---

<sup>7</sup>TEACH Pro-Doc, p. 21.

- Supporting the collection of reliable data on child labor.
- Working for the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

The baseline survey largely confirmed the relevance of project interventions in the districts where the project works. It highlighted children's interest in education and the obstacles they face in accessing it, including poverty, parent's attitudes, and shortage of education provision and supplies. The study confirmed that exploitative child labor is present in TEACH project districts and that children out of school are most at risk. Children were found to be working in both economic and housekeeping activities; some were being forced to work, while others were working to purchase food or cover school-related expenses. Activities most likely to keep children out of school were herding livestock, farming, domestic chores, and taking care of younger children. The baseline study also revealed that many young people did not wish to pursue agriculture as a career, perceiving it as linked to poverty and hardship. There are signs that the project is succeeding in changing this attitude since a number of vocational agriculture students expressed the view that modern agriculture had much greater potential for economic gain than traditional approaches.

A potential weakness in this very comprehensive project design is the lack of any specific income-generating activities to tackle household poverty in the short term. The root cause of child labor is usually identified as poverty, and the TEACH strategy is to work towards poverty alleviation through education and by training to increase agricultural productivity over time. This risks leaving a gap in family resources when a child laborer starts to attend school instead of working. Some of the attendance problems experienced with COBET and vocational agriculture students may be linked to this factor. The inclusion of parents as students in vocational agriculture is one approach that could be expanded; this would be particularly effective where income generation is actively pursued during the training period so that graduation implies a natural progression to independent production using more effective approaches. It would also need to be open to parents of all project beneficiaries for maximum effect.

### ***Project Purpose and Outputs***

Overall, the project purpose and most of the outputs are realistic. However, the target of withdrawing/preventing 10,415 children age 5-17 years from exploitive child labor while supporting them to receive educational services is high. Especially in a project with such a broad range of interventions, and particularly since half the project's direct beneficiaries will come through vocational agricultural training—the most complex of the different interventions to implement successfully.

Placing emphasis on a high number of direct beneficiaries risks compromising quality and sustainability. A number of respondents during the evaluation said that they considered 6 months to be too short for adequate vocational training. It is also proving difficult to fit in all six vocational agriculture cohorts before the end of the project since recruitment requires considerable time and effort from the community activists. In addition, drop-outs were not taken into account in the calculation of target numbers, the target for enrollment being the same as the target for withdrawn/prevented direct beneficiaries. This means that the project, in fact, needs to serve more children than anticipated in order to reach the desired number of direct beneficiaries.

The project is extremely ambitious in what it hopes to achieve with the budget available. It was probably also somewhat unrealistic in some of its expectations, including the limits to voluntary work, staffing levels for the project's district offices, and provision of personal protective clothing for vocational agriculture students. These issues are all discussed further under appropriate sections of this report.

### ***Understanding and Implementation of 'Withdrawn' and 'Prevented'***

TEACH bases its project monitoring on USDOL definitions of retained, withdrawn, and prevented. The project has operationalized these by defining the level and period of attendance necessary before a child can be counted as withdrawn or prevented, as required by USDOL. These definitions are well understood by Project staff (see text box on the following page).

The project is measuring the attendance of potentially withdrawn and prevented children reasonably accurately using the methodology described in the field manual, which has been available throughout the project in both English and Kiswahili. In fact, teachers are generally responsible for reporting on attendance, as opposed to community activists, who are more involved in monitoring and following-up on absent children. Attendance monitoring has been improved by involving head teachers and explaining the purpose of monitoring (to provide better services); this keeps teachers from inflating attendance figures to evade dropouts in their class, and possible sanctions or disapproval.

More problematic is the tracking of children's work status; although community activists are aware of what is happening in their communities and work hard to keep children in school, tracking is currently not functioning effectively in terms of formal monitoring and reporting. This is further discussed in the following section, which looks in detail at the project's monitoring strategy. Difficulties with work status tracking mean that data for withdrawn children are currently based on attendance figures and do not guarantee that children are no longer working at all, although any child fulfilling the project's criteria for withdrawn has a sufficiently high level of attendance to suggest that s/he, if working at all, will be doing so for a limited number of hours.

**From the TEACH Monitoring and Evaluation Field Manual**

**Retained:** Once enrolled, a child age 5-13 will be considered retained if s/he attends class more than 70 percent of the time and has not been reported working at all in the previous month. Enrolled children age 14-17 are considered retained if they attend classes more than 70 percent of the time and are not working at all, or are working under improved conditions not considered WFCL in the previous two months. Community Activists will regularly collect school data on beneficiaries' attendance to verify that the children are attending class, and will do spot checks on former child workplaces and beneficiary families (at least once every 2 months) to monitor the work status of the child.

**Prevented:** Refers to children who were at risk of engaging in child labor and who benefit (or have benefited) from the project's provision of direct services that support their enrollment in an educational service or training opportunity, and who are retained for at least 6 months in the Pre-Primary Classes, COBET Classes, Scholarship program, or 3 months in the Voc-Ag Model School.

**Withdrawn:** Refers to children who were found to be working in exploitive child labor, no longer working under such conditions as a result of a direct education service, and retained in the TEACH Project educational program for at least 6 months (Pre-Primary Classes, COBET Classes, or Scholarship program, or at least 3 months in the Voc-Ag Model School). This includes children who have been completely withdrawn from work (children 5 to 13 years old) and children who were involved in hazardous work but who no longer are because of improved working conditions (children between 14 and 17 years old who were working with pesticides/chemicals, carrying heavy loads, working long hours without food, working with dangerous machinery, but no longer do as a result of the TEACH intervention) and who are benefiting from one of the TEACH Project education services.

TEACH is facing a problem with respect to its definitions of withdrawn and prevented, which are proving unrealistic and risk the project failing to reach its targets for withdrawn/prevented children. The September 2008 TPR reports that only 33.1 percent of children enrolled in TEACH education programs have qualified for withdrawn and prevented (W/P) status. Other children, although retained in TEACH programs, did not qualify because their attendance was lower than the 70 percent required to meet the criteria. This has led to a request for a revision of project definitions so that 70 percent attendance becomes 50 percent, and 6 months retention becomes a uniform 3 months across all interventions for children to be classed as retained. This seems a reasonable and sensible request: although the baseline study did not research actual levels of school attendance, some limited local research has shown that non-TEACH sponsored children in the same schools do not often achieve 70 percent attendance, so this is a high expectation for particularly vulnerable children. If the revision request is accepted it will enable the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) data to more accurately reflect the children who are benefitting from the project, but will make it that much more important to initiate improved work status tracking.

## ***Project Monitoring Strategy***

The project is in the process of developing a strategy that ensures that children are adequately monitored and that reported data is reliable and verifiable. The system revolves around a database that is fed by information collected on eight separate forms, completed at community level:

**Form A—Child General Assessment** (20 items of information)

**Form B—Child In-depth Assessment** (10 items of information)

**Form C—Child Enrollment/Registration Form** (26 items of information)

**Form D—School and Work Status Re-Assessment** (21 items of information)

**Form E—Transitioned or Dropped-Out Child** (6 items of information)

**Form F—Work Status of Children in the Community** (14 items of information)

**Form G—Attendance to Tech Training Programs/Services** (13 items of information)

**Form H—Child Completion of TEACH Program** (21 items of information)

Some early problems with the database have required its return to the Khulisa office in South Africa for modifications so that it includes attendance (which has so far been managed in a separate excel spreadsheet), and allocation of a unique registration number for each child, so as to avoid confusion regarding names.

There are some very practical difficulties with operating the system:

- It is very time and energy intensive, so community activists and TEACH district staff spend a lot of time filling in the forms and feeding data into the computer.
- It doesn't seem to be very well adapted to the realities of working in remote rural communities. Forms that needed to be shipped to South Africa for scanning had to be recopied onto clean sheets so that they could be machine read. Collection and distribution of forms and return visits to communities to collect missing information means that district staff spend a disproportionate amount of time on this, as opposed to other project business.
- A range of difficulties linked to poor infrastructure and limited local capacity to work with information technology have been challenging for the TEACH Monitoring & Evaluation Officer, who has visited all project districts to train staff and troubleshoot.

## ***Work Status Monitoring***

Form D, for tracking work status, is designed to be filled in by the child concerned on a quarterly basis and counter-signed by the teacher and community activist. It seems unlikely that all children would be able to understand the questions and complete the form unaided. There is also a possibility that children will not be motivated to enter accurate information about any work activities since they are aware that TEACH is fighting child labor, and may be worried about the consequences of admitting to working. However, these concerns are hypothetical since the forms are not currently being consistently completed and returned.

Form F requires community activists to visit “places where children are known to work” and assess the work status of any children they find, including those assisted by TEACH. The form seems poorly adapted to the realities of most project communities where children are most likely to be dispersed and working on family *shambas*, as opposed to gathered in one place. This form is also not currently in use.

### ***Project Management and Planning***

A further difficulty with current monitoring is that although data is used to inform project management, it is rarely available in time to support effective planning. Project personnel in the districts are not able to use the database to generate reports, so no immediate analysis takes place to inform implementation at the community level.

### ***Monitoring Responsibilities of Community Volunteers***

The project was designed to rely on community volunteers to monitor and report on children’s school attendance and child-labor status. As described above, this process starts with the identification, assessment, and enrollment of vulnerable children, which has proved to be very demanding. Forms A, B, and C are relatively well understood, but ongoing problems with incomplete forms require district staff to go back to the village for supplementary information, thus allowing entry into the database. Teachers are responsible for reporting on attendance, which seems to be working; however, it is proving difficult to have information available in time to assist project planning, and data for reports is often behind schedule. While community activists monitor attendance through classroom visits and follow up on absent children, they are not reporting on children’s work status and it is difficult to see how they could find time to do this using the approach outlined in the TEACH Monitoring and Evaluation Field Manual.

The project’s district staff find themselves in the position of persuading and encouraging community activists to fulfill reporting requirements, while knowing that they are already working long hours to support the project. The evaluator could see no benefit to the local people from the current approach to data collection, and finds the ethics of using local volunteers to meet U.S. government reporting requirements somewhat questionable. The possibility of establishing a more community-focused monitoring system that would help local people to protect their children in addition to providing the data that the project needs is discussed later in this section, since it goes beyond the project’s existing monitoring strategy that concerns us here.

### ***Educational Interventions***

The project’s direct educational interventions are widely appreciated by children, parents, teachers, local leaders, and district authorities. The four types of intervention are discussed in turn below, to highlight their particular strengths and some areas for improvement.



### ***Pre-Primary***

By November 25<sup>th</sup> 2008, the project had enrolled 635<sup>8</sup> of a targeted 1,050<sup>9</sup> children into five pre-primary classes established in each district. The teachers are a mix of professionals and para-professionals who have received training through the project (using national teacher training resources), including help to develop teaching aids from local materials. The project supported the renovation of a number of classrooms in primary schools to enable pre-primary classes to be established. Children receive a meal every day; usually porridge and sometimes fruit.

The evaluator visited a pre-primary class in each of three districts. Attendance was universally good—often as high as 90-95 percent. Children were observed in pleasantly renovated, painted and furnished classrooms, for the most part using creative teaching aids in environments conducive to learning. Teachers were universally dynamic and enthusiastic, and were employing a range of teaching methods. There is frequently more demand for places than the project can meet and some schools are responding to this by enrolling a second class, served by the same teacher. In other cases the demand is for pre-primary classes closer to where the children live, which at least one community (Manayi village in Kwimba) resolved for itself by building a pre-primary class and teacher's office. When children reach 7 years of age they automatically move into standard one. One head master pointed out that they then no longer receive a TEACH meal, which has led to some reluctance to move on. The project will continue to support and monitor these children for a period of 2 years, although the precise nature of this support has yet to be finalized.

Some variations in the working conditions and the quality of education offered were noted:

- One classroom with no door or windows, which meant that teaching aids risk disappearing unless they are dismantled and put away every evening to ensure their safety. The same classroom lacked sufficient chairs for all children.
- Some less experienced teachers were less confident than their colleagues.
- Some classrooms furnished with small tables and chairs adapted to the size of the children who were seated in small groups, and others had less-flexible desks with benches attached, all facing the front of the class.

Overall, the project's pre-primary interventions are very successful and effective in introducing vulnerable children to school life so that they are ready to move into primary school when the time comes. It is Government policy to offer this opportunity to all children and the project is playing a valuable role in helping to put this into practice. While the vast majority of these children are probably not immediately at risk of exposure to exploitive child labor, this type of pre-primary intervention is an effective way of preventing child labor at a later date. UNESCO's Early Childhood Development mission statement states—

---

<sup>8</sup> 282 girls and 353 boys (enrolled)

<sup>9</sup> 472 girls and 578 boys (target)

*The foundations of human development are laid during the child's early years, and early childhood requires an integrated approach to the child's care, development, and learning. Early childhood care and education is more than a preparatory stage assisting the child's transition to formal schooling. Today, early childhood policies are placed within a broader context of social development, gender equity, and poverty reduction. UNESCO leads the international policy drive for an integrated early childhood care and education system that encompasses both the well-being and holistic development of the child.*

The importance of early childhood care, development, and learning for all children means that particularly vulnerable children, such as those at risk of child labor, need to be targeted for such services in order to reduce their vulnerability. The project's pre-primary interventions also provide an opportunity for parents to develop new behavior patterns in terms of their children's upbringing; once their children are enrolled in pre-primary classes they are much more likely to move into primary education, immediately reducing the risk of exploitive child labor. DOL might very well consider this type of intervention as a good practice for future projects.

### **Scholarships and School Kits**

By November 25<sup>th</sup> 2008 the project had provided school kits to all of the 1,125 targeted children,<sup>10</sup> who will continue to receive such kits on an annual basis over 3 years to support their attendance in primary school. Kits are worth 50,000 TZS (about USD \$40) and include items such as school uniform, school bag, mosquito nets, soap, exercise books, text books, and shoes. The importance of having a school uniform to enhance confidence and self esteem was expressed by parents, teachers, and children and was summed up by one TEACH scholarship recipient when asked what she liked about school. She replied: "*When I get up and put on my uniform I feel very nice,*" which is exactly how every child would ideally feel when setting out for school. TEACH scholarships are in demand and attendance is generally good among recipients. This is an important intervention that can make the difference between a child staying in school or dropping out. The fact that most scholarship children are prevented rather than withdrawn was unanticipated by the project, which had expected to principally target children for withdrawal through this approach.<sup>11</sup>

### **COBET**

By November 25<sup>th</sup> 2008 the project had enrolled 1,253 of a targeted 3,000 children in COBET classes,<sup>12</sup> with 712 children in COBET I and 541 in COBET II. The evaluator saw a mix of committed professional and para-professional teachers using a variety of teaching methods, including group work and the use of locally produced teaching aids. Many classes take place in TEACH renovated classrooms. Discussions with COBET children revealed that this intervention is providing a second chance for children who thought that education was not for them. Some children have already transferred to the formal system, moving into primary or secondary school

---

<sup>10</sup> Of the 1,125, there were 609 girls and 516 boys (with 506 girls and 619 boys targeted).

<sup>11</sup> It can be noted that the overall ration of children prevented/withdrawn through project interventions remains as planned since the Vocational Agriculture Training program has served to withdraw more children than anticipated.

<sup>12</sup> Of these, there were 436 girls and 817 boys (with 1,350 girls and 1,650 boys targeted).

as appropriate. A larger number of children have reached a level enabling them to sit for exams, which will allow them to make the transfer in the coming school year. As with pre-primary children who move into another education program, TEACH will support and monitor COBET children for a period of 2 years in whatever type of education they are attending.

Attendance fluctuates for many COBET children. In Urambo this seems, to a large extent, to be due to seasonal farming requirements; classes are competing with family farms, other farms, and the children's own farm plots, all of which need attention. This may well also be the case in other districts.

The message that came loud and clear from all the COBET classes visited is a strong request from project staff, teachers, parents, and students for TEACH to provide school uniforms to assist integration into school and enhance self confidence. In the COBET class visited in Kwimba, most students were actually wearing a uniform provided by their parents, making those not wearing one stand out even more. In Urambo a COBET student explained, *"We need other children to see us wearing uniform so that they will know we are at school and they will want to enroll too."* In Iramba a teacher pointed out that COBET girls are often starting their sexual development and, as he put it, *"bigger girls feel uncomfortable in clothes that don't fit,"* thus drawing attention to the particular need for girls to have suitable clothing to enable them to feel comfortable in school. The other very clear message is the importance of school feeding programs in encouraging COBET students to attend school.

### **Vocational Agriculture Centers**

Also by November 25<sup>th</sup> 2008, TEACH had enrolled 1,562 of a targeted 5,240 children in vocational agriculture classes;<sup>13</sup> 745 in the first cohort (which has now graduated) and 817 in the second. This is the major initiative and innovation of the TEACH project, accounting for half of all planned beneficiaries. It was the intervention that showed the most variation between the five groups visited, and it would have been very useful to talk to more groups if time had permitted. Some very impressive results served to show what is possible, and the vocational agriculture centers started by the project clearly have enormous potential to change the lives of both children and their parents. Classes run for 3 days a week over 6 months and are taught by district agricultural extension workers. They are attended both by children age 14-17 years old and by some parents. The curriculum has been developed in collaboration with VETA and is still a pilot that can be refined, based on the experience of the project. The objective is to introduce students to modern agricultural and livestock rearing techniques and enable them to make a living, so they also receive training in entrepreneurial and small business skills.

In Urambo vocational agriculture is a new initiative in the district and is proving very successful. Teachers are committed, the project provides important inputs and equipment, and there is good cooperation with the District Agriculture Office. Classes are very relevant to student's lives and they recognize the potential of improved farming techniques. In the center, which was visited during the evaluation, each cohort registers as a group recognized by the district and opens a bank account. Groups work both together and individually, and the fact that the first group to graduate is doing well is encouraging others. The group currently has 120,000 TZS (around USD

---

<sup>13</sup> Of these, there were 413 girls and 1,209 boys (with 2,354 girls and 2,886 boys targeted).

\$92) in their account and is hoping to attract complementary Government funding for future projects. They have already attended district-level training on sunflower seed production and will get the necessary inputs to develop this through the District Agriculture Office. The group also has a small poultry project among its other initiatives. In addition to its operating effectively, this group was impressive due to the energy, initiative, and enthusiasm of its members. Both groups at the center concerned had prepared a report for the evaluator that they read and presented during the visit, and this sort of initiative for taking advantage of an opportunity to market themselves will stand them in good stead for the future. If such a group can emerge in Urambo, it is possible to replicate the success more widely, as is happening—to some extent—according to reports concerning other groups and other districts.

Students from a vocational agriculture center in Iramba expressed their need for start-up capital and requested access to other skills in addition to agriculture, such as carpentry and masonry. Practicing agriculture is a problem for students in the dry season due to shortage of water, so they tend to focus on livestock rearing. The evaluator was able to visit several pig-rearing projects, initiated with the help of a generous donation of pigs from the teacher at the center. Some of the piglets bred from the initial stock will be returned to the center and used to help other students to start operations—an example that could be used more widely.

Two very different vocational agricultural centers were experienced in Kwimba. In the first, the entire group—made up of both parents and children—was fairly unhappy with their experience. This was principally due to the absence of their teacher from the classroom for prolonged periods, which left them feeling unprepared to apply what they were learning after the end of the course. The group as a whole requested that they be allowed to repeat the entire course. Other issues also emerged during the discussion; linked to dissatisfaction were the feeding arrangements and the restricted access to some of the tools provided for use on the group plot of land. It wasn't possible to resolve the situation during the evaluation visit but there is clearly a need for some investigation and support from project staff to understand the problems that have arisen. The evaluator also met some students from another center who seemed happier and more energized. One group of graduates had received a loan of 200,000 TZS from the district over a 9-month period at 15 percent interest, which they had invested in poultry production and carpentry equipment and materials. This was originally a group with seven members, but three had married and moved away, leaving the other four to continue. While this group was functioning and had attracted some financial support from the district, they would benefit from ongoing advice and support.

Apart from the experiences of individual training centers, there were some common issues that arose. Currently the project provides each center with a set of protective clothing (overalls, gum boots, face mask, gloves) for each student in the class. At the end of the course this must be left behind for students in the following intake. This arrangement has a number of shortcomings:

- Students have different size feet so some students do not have gum boots that fit them.
- It is perceived as unhygienic to pass on gumboots in this way, and as socks are not commonly worn, this is a valid concern since fungal infections are thus passed from one student to another.

- It seems illogical to send students out at the end of the course without the protective clothing they have learned to use—if it is necessary during the training it is certainly necessary afterwards, and students are unlikely to have the resources to purchase their own or see it as a priority.

**As a result:** *All the students visited, their teachers, and the district TEACH staff requested that the project find a way to enable each student to be issued with a set of personal protective clothing that they can take with them at the end of the course.*

A related issue that needs to be continually reinforced concerns *safety*, particularly when using chemical products. Teachers need to not only explain the importance of wearing overalls, face masks, gloves and gum boots, but need also to demonstrate this appropriately in class and ensure that all students respect the rules and protect themselves adequately. This means that all students within range of a spray need to use a face mask—not just the young person operating the spray pump. If this does not happen during training it is extremely unlikely to happen afterwards. The dangers of agricultural chemicals are not well understood, and the results of inhaling or coming into contact with potentially toxic substances can be long-term and debilitating. The demonstration of spraying to control ticks that the evaluator witnessed did not respect the required procedures, although these were written on the board and explained by the teacher. The introduction of modern agricultural techniques needs to go hand in hand with effective practical training to promote safety at work.

The third issue common to vocational agriculture centers in all districts is the demand on *teachers' time*. Since the teachers are district authority agricultural extension workers they have other duties in addition to teaching at the centers, and these sometimes require them to be absent over an extended period—sometimes as long as a month during vaccination campaigns. Even when a campaign is not in progress, teachers are finding it demanding and stressful to fulfill all their commitments. As one teacher explained, *“These children are fragile—if I miss just one day in the classroom, I risk losing someone, so I’m running from one place to another to get everything done so that I can be at the center on time; I’m very tired.”* District Agricultural and Livestock Development Officers (DALDOs) explained that due to the shortage of trained staff, they are obliged to use their officers who are teaching at the centers for other duties. Some DALDO’s did not see the centers as the priority but as an additional extra that the district was supporting in addition to the normal work of the department. The project has tried to tackle this issue on a piecemeal basis across all districts, looking for solutions to the problem as it arises in different centers, and this is probably the most realistic approach. Too much pressure may serve to alienate district staff, but some creative thinking may be able ease the situation and help teachers to fulfill the demands on their time. For example, in Urambo the district can provide a motorbike and the project can cover the cost of a fuel allowance so improved transport will enable the teacher to move faster from one task to the next. Similar solutions enhancing cooperation between TEACH and district authorities may well be possible in other districts, and the project travel allowance for vocational agriculture teachers is expected to be introduced across the board in the near future.

Many students and graduates said that it was difficult to start activities after the end of the course without any start-up funding to buy equipment, seeds, and other inputs. TEACH policy is to help groups to access support from their district authorities and the project also has a small budget

that can be used to support activities (used to provide chicken wire for a poultry enclosure built by graduates in Urambo). The most effective way to tackle this issue is to ensure that the group starts to operate income-generating enterprises during the training course itself, so that they are practicing agriculture/livestock rearing as a small business enterprises from the start; thus, they are learning through doing and ensuring some income before graduation that can support ongoing activities. There is a group that is apparently doing this particularly successfully in Igunga District (not visited during the evaluation), demonstrating that it is a real possibility. *The idea of giving start-up funding automatically to a group or individual when they graduate, apart from the budgetary implications, does not seem the most productive way forward. Better to invest in ensuring that teachers can practice and pass on the necessary entrepreneurial skills to their students during the six months of the training.*

### **School Feeding Programs**

The school feeding program is an important aspect of the TEACH project in that it enables children who may not always be getting enough to eat at home to eat at school, thus encouraging them to attend and ensuring that they are not hungry when they are there. It is now GOT policy that school meals should be available to all students, but implementation is far from universal. TEACH is helping to show communities the benefits of school feeding and how to establish and manage such a program. At the start of the project, school feeding committees were able to budget for 350 TZS per child per day,<sup>14</sup> but due to budgetary constraints linked to fluctuations in the dollar exchange rate, this was later reduced to 250 TZS. Everyone that the evaluator spoke to at the community and district level strongly requested that this amount be increased. They explained that 250 TZS is not enough to consistently provide adequate meals throughout the year since prices fluctuate according to season. Some feeding programs have stopped providing fruit because the amount is too small to support the cost. Another factor that might be considered is that the needs of a pre-primary child age 5 or 6 are different from those of an adolescent in a vocational agriculture class who is often performing quite demanding physical work.

It is also worth mentioning that the TEACH district teams and community activists seem to be doing a generally good job of assisting schools and communities to develop effective and transparent management systems for school feeding programs. This is something that is known to be difficult in poor communities where food is a valuable commodity. TEACH feeding programs are trying to be sustainable by involving parents, inspiring some parents and communities to form new feeding groups with their own resources. The feeding program is managed by a committee of community representatives, including beneficiaries' parents. The community contributes time (to manage the logistics, the accounts, etc.), provides firewood and water for preparing the meals, and contributes to food preparation, either by paying a cook or rotating volunteers.

---

<sup>14</sup> In comparison, \$1USD is around 1,300 TZS.

## **Volunteer Community Activists (CAs)**

The community activists are the backbone of the TEACH project at the community level, and the project could not function effectively without them. The project was designed to run using volunteers at community level to promote sustainability, but no one fully realized the amount of work it would actually entail or how long it would take. It is difficult to make an accurate assessment of how much time CAs use on project business since this varies according to the time of year, the project cycle, and the distances they have to travel to follow up on children who are not in school. However, estimates range from 2-3 full days a week and sometimes even more.

### **The Principal Tasks Carried Out by Community Activists**

- Identify eligible vulnerable children and register/enroll them
- Oversee TEACH teaching interventions, feeding programs, and renovations in their village
- Initiate and implement awareness-raising campaigns and other meetings and activities
- Report on TEACH progress and issues in their village
- Track attendance and work status of TEACH children
- Visit parents/students/dropouts
- Attend meetings at District Level.

Community Activists are very pleased to be playing their role in the project and many of them recognized that their lives have changed considerably since they started to do so: *“We’re completely different people now. Before it was nothing to us if we saw children at work or out of school but now—even if it’s our neighbor’s child, we feel the need to take action.”* And when asked if this had led to them losing any friends: *“No! We have more friends than ever. All the children we have enrolled and their parents become our friends in the end.”*

However, in every meeting with community activists, at some point during the evaluation, they discussed their status as volunteers; either early on in the discussion or tentatively introduced when asked if there were any further issues to discuss. It seemed to the evaluator that CAs are overwhelmed with the level of work, and they themselves feel that they deserve and need to be paid some kind of allowance to make it possible for them to continue to do a good job. This is particularly evident during the current period when everyone is working in their fields to grow the food that will enable them to survive for the rest of the year. CAs can hardly be blamed for needing to do this as well, but they are also required to carry out their project tasks and are currently registering new students for the next preschool, vocational agriculture, and COBET classes. An allowance might enable them to pay someone else to cultivate their land.

*It seems somewhat incongruous that everyone in the project hierarchy is paid for the work that they do to implement the project until one arrives at the community level—where the poorest project workers are found—and they are working on a voluntary basis. TEACH is by no means*

the only development project using this strategy, but it is really time to change this approach so that work is valued and rewarded throughout the project, and so community-level workers and village governments are involved in developing locally appropriate strategies for sustainability. The development of community leaders and activists is a very effective approach to project implementation and has the potential to contribute to the sustainability of activities initiated by the project. However, such people need to be paid and to have some recognized status within their communities. The project's justification for using volunteers is that this is more sustainable than creating dependence on remuneration that will come to an end with the project. *The evaluator suggests that project funds be administered in collaboration with village governments; enabling them to pay community activists would ensure that CAs are responsible to local authorities and not directly to the project, thus beginning to establish local responsibility for child protection.* Sustainability comes through working with communities to develop child protection strategies that could include ongoing payment to CAs after the project ends.

A number of solutions to the problem were suggested by both CAs and TEACH District Teams, including the provision of a monthly allowance of between 10,000 and 30,000 TZS (USD \$8-\$25) per month—though this has significant budgetary implications. A different solution was to increase the number of seminars for CAs, for which allowances are paid for attendance. This has the advantage of keeping CAs in touch with district teams and motivated to work hard. One TEACH district team noted that the attendance of TEACH-sponsored children improves immediately after a CA seminar because they feel more motivated to make an extra effort. The same team also sounded a note of warning, reminding us that CAs are identified because of their capacity to persuade and influence members of their communities, with a potentially negative effect if they become increasingly frustrated because they feel that their work is not validated. This is a risk that seems fairly self-evident—you can identify good communicators in a community but that doesn't mean you can control what they communicate. All the CAs that the evaluator spoke with felt pressured by the level of work and felt they deserved better rewards and more recognition. At the same time, they said they were happy to be contributing to local development and that they are gaining a lot of valuable experience. While it is too strong to say the evaluation found that CAs do not feel valued or that their work is validated, the project needs to take steps to ensure that this does not happen. *The problem is primarily practical—CAs don't know how to generate the means of survival (food or income) and simultaneously fulfill the demands on their time made by the project.* Nobody is working in their fields while they are following up children who are not in school.

Winrock asked that the report should make clear that the CAs are highly valued by the TEACH project, and said that access to training and seminars in monitoring and how to work with community groups is increasing so that the CA contribution will be reasonable and sustainable.



## Gender

No. and % girls enrolled <sup>15</sup>	Igunga	Ilemela	Iramba	Kwimba	Urambo	By intervention	Project target
<b>Pre-primary</b>	71 44.2%	53 46.0%	66 50.9%	65 42.6%	49 39.6%	<b>304</b> <b>44.4%</b>	<b>45%</b>
<b>Scholarship</b>	116 51.6%	121 53.8%	110 48.9%	125 55.6%	137 60.1%	<b>609</b> <b>54.0%</b>	<b>45%</b>
<b>COBET I</b>	72 41.1%	82 45.3%	81 37.0%	80 47.7%	56 29.8%	<b>371</b> <b>41.0%</b>	<b>45%</b>
<b>COBET II</b>	47 29.3%	48 30.7%	41 27.3%	71 23.2%	27 18.8%	<b>234</b> <b>26.6%</b>	<b>45%</b>
<b>Voc-Ag A</b>	54 12.9%	45 24.0%	84 32.0%	52 37.7%	58 31.9%	<b>293</b> <b>27.2%</b>	<b>45%</b>
<b>Voc-Ag B</b>	27 15.2%	33 19.9%	65 37.1%	66 36.5%	19 25.7%	<b>210</b> <b>25.7%</b>	<b>45%</b>
<b>By District</b>	<b>387</b> <b>34.2%</b>	<b>382</b> <b>37.3%</b>	<b>447</b> <b>38.7%</b>	<b>459</b> <b>43.0%</b>	<b>346</b> <b>37.5%</b>	<b>2,021 *</b>	

\* 123 additional girls are enrolled in Kwimba but data collected did not include which intervention, so in total 2,144 girls are enrolled in all interventions across all districts.

A glance at a gender analysis of children enrolled in education initiatives by TEACH shows that the project is working with more boys than girls, a fact that project staff are well aware of. This was anticipated to some degree due to the areas of work being targeted. For younger children the difference is less marked, pre-primary being around the predicted 45 percent, girls actually accounting for over half (54%) of all scholarships, and COBET I girls (age 11-13) coming in at 41 percent.

For the 14- to 17-year-olds the percentage of girls enrolled is significantly smaller across all districts, accounting for little more than a quarter of all children enrolled in TEACH interventions for this age group. The recently published *Child Labor in Tanzania*<sup>16</sup> shows that for children between age 14 and 17 who do economic work, 89.5 percent of boys and 78.6 percent of girls are engaged in agriculture, forestry, and fishing activities, which suggests that the sector targeted by TEACH might lead to a difference of around 11 percent between the numbers of boys and girls the project could expect to work with. So the questions to be asked are: where are the girls, and what are they doing? There are a number of possible answers and the evaluation was not able to draw any conclusions in this regard. Do parents or girls themselves place less value on education and training for older girls? Is there a cultural or religious bias at work? Is the difference due to the educational interventions offered and are girls doing something else? Such questions deserve some consideration because the answers may suggest that future awareness raising needs to target the beliefs and practices preventing older girls from accessing education and training. The big difference between numbers of girls in vocational agriculture in Igunga and in Kwimba may provide a partial clue to what this is about, if other differences between these districts are related, or perhaps recruitment techniques are somehow different.

<sup>15</sup> Data provided by project M&E officer for situation as of November 25<sup>th</sup> 2008.

<sup>16</sup> Analysis of the findings of the Integrated Labour Force Survey 2006, p. 23.

## **Meeting Targets**

At the midway point, the project is behind in meeting some of its targets related to withdrawn/prevented children and some activities have been delayed. These include the community awareness survey, which is now scheduled for early in 2009 with a revised methodology. Although no budget is currently available to offer daycare for the children of vocational agriculture students, the project has every intention of at least piloting this initiative in some centers before the end of the project.

As previously discussed, delays in meeting withdrawn/prevented targets are related to over-ambitious project definitions, making it impossible to include many of the project's beneficiaries in GPRA reporting data unless these definitions are revised. The time taken to collect and process data from the field also contributes to an impression that the project is behind schedule because it takes some time for children who are registered and enrolled to appear in the system. It also has to be recognized that TEACH is a very ambitious project with multiple types of interventions at the community level, in addition to national curriculum development and other work in collaboration with various Government departments. Some of this is progressing more slowly than expected (for example the work with VETA to develop vocational agriculture training), and this is largely beyond the control of the projects since consultants and government offices work at their own pace.

## **Conclusions**

Overall, TEACH is a well-designed project that fits very well within national child labor and education policy. It works effectively both with Government ministries and the ILO, and is contributing to filling some remaining gaps in the country's child labor strategy. It supports all five of the USDOL goals and is responding to many of the needs identified in the baseline survey. While the project purpose and most outputs can be described as realistic, target numbers of withdrawn/prevented children are ambitious, as is the number of initiatives to be supported with the budget available. The project definitions for retained, withdrawn, and prevented are proving to be too stringent to attain target numbers and will ideally be revised to ensure that beneficiaries can appear in project reporting data. The project's monitoring strategy is time and energy intensive at the community level, and the database is experiencing some teething problems. While school attendance is being measured and reported, a system for consistent monitoring of children's work status has yet to be achieved.

The four educational interventions around which the project revolves are all operating well. Pre-primary and scholarship initiatives pose few problems and are widely appreciated. Attendance and gender balance are more challenging for COBET and vocational agriculture classes, particularly for the age 14-17 group. The establishment and operation of vocational agriculture centers is the most complex of the TEACH interventions, and while there are some excellent examples of highly successful centers, not all are yet operating to their maximum potential. School feeding is extremely important and is encouraging some communities to extend it to other children.

The strategy of using community volunteers to implement the project in their villages is not a complete success because the level of work required to coordinate, monitor, and report on project

activities and raise local awareness is more than can reasonably be expected of a volunteer. These community activists are finding it difficult to attend to their own needs as well as carry out their role as TEACH workers.

Overall, TEACH's exceptionally comprehensive design is working well in practice. The project is implemented in close collaboration with Government personnel and is successfully enabling many vulnerable children to access education, while demonstrating some new approaches to vocational training and pre-primary education. The project's flexible staff team is working hard to overcome the inevitable challenges that arise during implementation, and the project has every hope of meeting most of its targets by the time it comes to an end.

## Recommendations

These recommendations are for the consideration of all stakeholders. The evaluator has suggested an order of priority, subject to input from the project team based on their in-depth knowledge of implementing the project in the field.

The project needs to find a way for vocational agriculture students to be issued with a set of personal protective clothing that they can take with them when they finish the course.

The project needs to agree on an acceptable strategy for remunerating community activists for the work they are doing. Sustainability strategies should include working with district and village authorities to develop mechanisms to enable CAs to continue to support child protection in their communities after the end of the project.

The project needs to instigate effective work status tracking of direct beneficiaries. Ideally, this will not only feed project reporting but also serve to establish a community-based system that demonstrates how local people can protect their children. One suggestion is to establish a mentoring system, where appropriate local adults (parents, community activists, or teachers) meet regularly with a number of children individually to fill in Form D, using the opportunity to discuss any issues arising, and offering general support to the child concerned. This would require some training in how to talk to children to offer support and inspire trust.

Khulisa is asked to use its extensive experience in database development and management as the basis for discussion with the rest of the TEACH team, to consider the following:

- How such management information systems might be more adapted to the realities of remote rural communities.
- How the information required might be reduced to the minimum to facilitate the collection of essential data by community members and field-based staff.
- How to enable districts to produce and analyze reports from the database to inform their work.
- The feasibility of a monitoring strategy that serves both the national/project need for accurate data and the community's need to protect its children through local monitoring of school

attendance and work status. Such a strategy would need to take into account limited infrastructure and community literacy levels.

The evaluation supports the revision of project definitions of withdrawn/prevented so that beneficiaries can be included in project GPRA reporting.

Some research and analysis concerning the unequal gender balance among older project beneficiaries needs to inform any necessary action to redress this. This is to say that if girls are being otherwise catered for, there is probably no cause for concern. If, however, they do not have access to education and training opportunities that would benefit them, new recruitment and awareness-raising strategies are needed to tackle this.

It is highly desirable to increase the daily allowance for school feeding from 250 TZS to the former level of 350 TZS.

Budget permitting, it is suggested that ongoing support for children moving from pre-primary to standard might include the continued provision of a meal at school, if this is not otherwise available. The same might also apply to COBET children moving into formal education.

TEACH and District authorities are encouraged to ensure that renovated classrooms have a full set of classroom furniture (chairs for all children), and doors and window grills so that they can be secured when the school is closed.

The evaluator came across requests for different types of exchange visit during the evaluation, including between district teams, between community activists in different districts, and between vocational agricultural centers in the same district and in different districts. All of these are highly recommended, as such visits are invariably cost effective and bring both expected and unexpected results. They enable good practice to be shared and problems to be resolved, as well as widening individual experience and rewarding initiative and success. In a similar vein, vocational agriculture center 'open house days' would enable parents and communities to know more about what is happening there, provide opportunities for students to demonstrate their work, and encourage others to enroll.

Last but not least, with a more long-term perspective, USDOL might consider extending the TEACH project—should the GOT make such a request. During the evaluation a number of Government representatives expressed a desire for the project to continue for longer than 4 years, not only because of the resources it provides but because of the way it is building national capacity to implement child labor and education policy. Considering the time taken and cost of project start-up activities, if a project is working in successful collaboration with a national Government to tackle an ongoing problem, it makes sense to enable its work to be extended and replicated in other districts.

## **B. Partnership and Coordination**

### ***Coordination with GOT***

Project implementation is exceptionally well coordinated with key ministries, particularly the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (MOEVT) and the Ministry of Labor, Employment, and Youth Development (MOLEYD). Collaboration is facilitated due to the alignment of the project design with education initiatives that are already part of Government policy. TEACH is integrated into the annual work plans of both ministries so that they report on project activities. At district level, ministry staff are closely involved in TEACH implementation as seconded project staff, vocational agriculture trainers, school inspectors, and supervisors of project initiatives, and it is here where there is greatest collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security, and Cooperatives (MOAFSC). The project also works with the Ministry of Community Development, Gender, and Children (MCDGC), most of the project's district community mobilizer's being seconded from this ministry.

District Executive Directors are all aware and supportive of TEACH initiatives, seeing the partnership with the project as an effective contribution to implementing child labor and education policy on the ground. There are inevitably some issues linked to the joint implementation of the project, including conflicting demands on the time of district officers and limited availability of project funds to pay counterpart allowances for supervision and monitoring of project activities. However, this issue arises whenever government and civil society organizations work together and it does not seem to be seriously affecting implementation in this case.

The project contributes to the development of education and child labor strategies and encourages and supports inter-ministerial communication and planning through the National Inter Sectoral Coordination Committee on child labor. The MOEVT representative mentioned information sharing as a particular strength of the partnership with TEACH, which generally has an open and transparent relationship with district and central Government departments. The different stakeholders work collaboratively to resolve problems and meet challenges with open feedback and discussion so as to develop and improve interventions through good communication and mutual trust. The fact that the Deputy Permanent Secretary of the MOLEYD came to open the evaluation stakeholder's meeting in person says something about the importance that the GOT places on the partnership. A National Action Plan is being developed as the next step in encouraging coordinated policy implementation and effective partnerships between the GOT and TEACH-type projects.

### ***Coordination with ILO/IPEC***

As described in the previous section, TEACH works effectively with the ILO to assist the GOT with regard to child labor issues, and the project is one of a number that contribute to the national TBP. Due to good communication and effective partnership between the organizations concerned, implementing an Education Initiative project within this framework has not presented any apparent challenges beyond the day-to-day implementation issues that are resolved as they arise.

The TEACH project supports the goals of the TBP as a whole, contributing to both the upstream policy and the downstream elements of the TBP strategy framework.

#### **Tanzania's Time Bound Program**

Since 1994, Tanzania has been participating in the International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour. Tanzania was among the first countries to adopt a timebound approach to eliminate the worst forms of child labor within national and international frameworks. The program aims at substantial reduction of child labor in commercial agriculture, commercial sex, domestic work, and the mining sectors. Phase I intervened in 11 districts from 2002-2005. Phase II (2005-2008) currently operates in 16 districts. The strategic framework is twofold:

- Upstream elements relating to labor, social policies, and legislation; education and vocational training; macro-economic environment; employment and poverty reduction; awareness raising and social mobilization; and capacity building and work aimed at strengthening the knowledge base on child labor.
- Downstream work relating to the identification, withdrawal, and rehabilitation of children from the WFCL and the provision of educational and economic alternatives to child labor.

#### ***Coordination among TEACH Grantee Organizations***

TEACH operates very much as a project team, with members of each of the implementing organizations working out of the same office in Dar es Salaam. Responsibilities are clearly defined. Broadly speaking, Khulisa covers monitoring and related issues, TAWLAE is responsible for district-level implementation, and Winrock works at the policy and systems levels, coordinates and oversees activities, and reports to USDOL. Any tensions that arise are swiftly resolved, and the common objective of successful project implementation encourages effective cooperation to overcome differences linked to the particular responsibilities of each organization.

The partnership draws on and benefits from the local knowledge and accumulated experience of TAWLAE as a national civil society organization. TAWLAE, in turn, is building its capacity to work with international partners and extending its work in the field of agriculture. Khulisa and Winrock both contribute prior experience in USDOL-funded child labor projects, and Winrock was instrumental in the creation of the Association of Women Leaders in Agriculture and Environment which gave birth to TAWLAE in 1995. Such common experience and interests contribute to effective working relationships among the partner organizations.

Perhaps the only minor drawback is the location of the Khulisa office in South Africa, which makes it difficult for other project staff to be involved in the development of monitoring systems and strategy. If Khulisa were more accessible, the system might have been more readily adapted and tested in the field so that shortcomings could be identified sooner and appropriate strategies developed by the staff group as a whole.

## ***Community Partnerships***

The major challenge in maintaining community partnerships lies in addressing the issue of allowances for the 150 volunteer community activists who are using significant amounts of time to implement the project, as discussed in detail in the design/implementation section.

Local schools and parents have welcomed the opportunities brought by the project. One challenge is to persuade parents to send their older children to school consistently, even during periods when labor is in demand in the fields.

Although village and ward authorities were oriented and informed about TEACH objectives and activities at the beginning of the project and had to endorse them and commit cooperation and support for TEACH implementation, at one stage it became clear that village and ward authorities needed to be more informed about project activities so as to enable them to adequately support the work of community activists. In some instances, community activists had difficulty in explaining their activities to village/ward authorities who were unaware of their role. The project took steps to remedy this situation by inviting local leaders to seminars where the project, its objectives, and its activities were fully explained and the assistance of such leaders solicited. It is important to pursue the input of these people since they are at the heart of local planning and can play an important role in ensuring that project-initiated activities find their way into local development plans. They are crucial for the community asset appraisals that the project is in the process of implementing.

Possibly due to this project's close relationship with district authorities, it has placed less emphasis on partnership with community-based organizations than many other EI projects. That is to say, TEACH has chosen to build capacity and promote sustainability principally through aligning activities with Government policy and ensuring that district staff are closely involved in implementation, as opposed to building community capacity through work with existing or newly created groups. Relationships within the community are instigated and managed principally by community activists, and this seems to work well as long as they have the support of local leaders. The instigation of partnerships with community organizations is an area that TEACH might consider during the rest of the project.

Some examples of community organizations that TEACH might work directly with include School Management Committees, local women's groups, Child Labor/Protection Committees, Village Orphans and Vulnerable Children Committees, and parental support groups. These could be groups that already existed or were put in place or revitalized by communities due to TEACH initiatives. The advantage of working with an institution rather than individuals is strength in numbers and acknowledgement of common responsibility. If such groups had been asked to select representatives to work as CAs, it might have encouraged a stronger sense of community ownership of and responsibility for their work.

## Conclusions

TEACH has established highly effective partnerships with Government ministries at both central and district levels. The project also collaborates well with the ILO and contributes to IPEC through activities that support the goals of Tanzania's TBP. The three organizations that make up the project's implementing Association have drawn on their complementary strengths and experience to develop an effective working team. While the project's principal partnerships are with Government bodies, TEACH has worked to inform village and ward leaders of project activities to enable them to support community activists as they carry out their work within their communities. The greatest challenge is how to recognize and reward the significant and important work that these people carry out in every village where the project operates.

## Recommendations

TEACH should facilitate and encourage regular meetings at the village/ward level that enable local stakeholders to sit together to discuss monitoring, awareness raising, and other child labor related issues, including strategies for sustainability of project activities. This is one way to strengthen community-level support for project activities.

The project might consider the relevance of developing partnerships with community organizations—possibly through assisting community activists to become registered as recognized community groups or associations.

## C. Management and Budget

### ***Management Strengths***

District project staff highlighted a number of strengths of project management, including—

- Good communication between the Dar es Salaam and district project offices.
- The Dar-based staff are very available when they are needed, *even on weekends*.
- Central office staff make regular visits to the districts and all the staff from the Dar office have visited all the districts, and so are familiar with the environments where the project works.
- Three staff-team meetings have brought the whole staff team together for orientation, planning, and training purposes (two in Dar and one in Tabora). These were described as very useful.

The Dar office has a relaxed atmosphere that enables staff to focus on project implementation with the knowledge that their flexible management style provides space for creativity and change in response to identified issues. There is a clear expectation that all members of the team deliver results in their areas of responsibility.



The fact that a number of staff in some districts are seconded by the district authorities to work on the project assists project management to fit within local government systems and enhances collaboration with local government departments. District staff, drawn from the NGO sector, bring complementary skills that enhance participatory working and pragmatic management solutions.

While the evaluator was aware of which staff worked for which of the three implementing organizations, this was not evident from discussion or observation. Project staff referred to 'TEACH' as opposed to 'Winrock,' 'Khulisa,' or 'TAWLAE,' and the creation of this project identity is probably one of the greatest management strengths of the project.

### ***Technical and Financial Areas of Management that Could be Improved***

District staff sometimes find it difficult to meet demands from the Dar office because “*everyone wants information at the same time.*” This contributes to a perception that central office staff doesn't always understand the constraints of working in the field, and that providing information is more important than the project activities themselves. Financial reporting is also challenging for the project's district staff because they are not professional accountants and are expected to cover project administration in addition to implementation in the field. Currently, each district office has only one computer, which limits effectiveness since district staff have difficulty finding time to do all the tasks they are responsible for. All of these issues are related to an underestimation of the resources needed to operate the project at the district level. In response, TEACH has given each district the opportunity to take on an additional person to assist with data entry for 5 days a month, and will be providing an additional computer for each district office. While this is certainly appreciated, some teams are not sure that 5 days is enough and feel they need help with accounting as well as with data entry.

Because of the way the project is structured, the districts receive some of their funds from TAWLAE and some from Winrock. Sometimes, short delays in the arrival of funds can affect activities such as school feeding and the payment of salaries. This seems to be linked to delays in financial reporting from the field to TAWLAE and from TAWLAE to Winrock, and is to some degree due to field staff having more to do than they can comfortably manage, and also to a two-tier reporting system. However, no one presented this as a major problem and the two organizations work together in an attempt to avoid such difficulties.

As previously mentioned, TEACH is ambitious in the activities it is designed to carry out with the budget available. Monitoring takes up 14 percent of the budget, not including data collection and data entry at district level. Budgetary constraints have limited a number of project activities, including school feeding, provision of school uniforms and protective clothing, and the regularity of community activist meetings. One project District Coordinator explained the importance of investing in the early stages of the project to effectively raise awareness at community and district levels and reducing input as time goes on, but budget constraints have made this difficult to do. The tendency has been the reverse—too little was initially budgeted for a number of project inputs and this is now being remedied to some extent during the second half of the project. The fluctuation in the dollar exchange rate has also contributed to budget constraints, though current trends suggest this may be less of a problem in the immediate future.

Project staff at district level expressed a view that they are poorly paid in relation to their work load and to central project staff. They are unhappy with project field allowances, which they can only claim for 15 days a month, and no account is taken of weekend work. The lack of any overnight payments means that it isn't feasible to stay overnight in villages, so time and fuel are used going backwards and forwards. They drew attention to the dangerous nature of their work, which involves riding motorcycles over long distances on unsurfaced roads, often in remote areas. The fact that two members of the project's district teams have sustained serious motorcycle accidents and most of the rest have more minor cuts and bruises shows evidence of this. While it is beyond the scope of the project to provide cars at district level, pay is one way to compensate for dangerous working conditions.

TEACH district teams are enthusiastic about the project and committed to their work, so the preceding observations should not give the impression that they are focused on complaints. They are asking for the conditions that will enable them to best do their work, and that they perceive as fair. The evaluator is not in a position to judge to what degree their requests are justified, having little knowledge of the conditions of other similar workers in Tanzania. However, these points emerged independently in all three districts visited and reflect requests made by district staff at project staff meetings. A general tendency of the TEACH budget to underestimate the requirements of a number of budget lines suggests that this may also be the case where pay and conditions for district staff are concerned. The perspective from the project is that staff salaries and stipends are in line with what other local NGOs offer. Medical coverage is addressed in the budget revision, and workload will be reduced to some extent through hiring data entry specialists.

### ***Leveraging Non-project Resources***

The project has leveraged non-project resources in a number of areas.

#### **At Community Level:**

- 150 community activists volunteer their services
- Community leaders have provided some office space for community activists to use
- Provision of supervision, labor, and materials (sand, water, and stones) for classroom renovation
- Contributions to school feeding, including water, firewood, and cooks
- Plots of land for vocational agriculture training.

#### **At District Level:**

- Seconded project staff
- Provision of office space, payment of utilities, and security guards

- District personnel provide vocational agriculture training, monitoring, and supervision
- Districts make their vehicles available to assist with project activities
- District financial and technical support for TEACH vocational agriculture graduates
- COBET textbooks in addition to those provided by TEACH, in order to increase the books/student ratio
- Progressive district takeover of payment of COBET teachers. In Iramba, this has already started and is planned in other districts for future financial years.

At the national level, the project is investigating partnerships with private companies who may be prepared to contribute to costs of items such as school uniforms and gum boots. Negotiations have been initiated but await follow up and concrete results.

### **Has DOL technical assistance to date been adequate?**

TEACH appreciates the consistently open and helpful relationship that the project has with both current and previous project managers. Their technical advice, support, and feedback are described as “highly useful and very valuable.” USDOL’s Contracts office provided “excellent” support in establishing Negotiated Indirect Cost Recovery Agreements (NICRA) for Winrock’s partners. Feedback from USDOL helps to ensure that the project is on track and in line with the relevant management procedures and guidelines. USDOL was described as “maintaining an excellent balance of support for continual improvement and confidence in our ability to implement and meet project objectives.” Such flexible and useful support has been provided through feedback on Technical Progress Reports, discussions by phone and e-mail, and during project visits.

## **Conclusions**

The project is effectively managed at national and district levels. Project management is characterized by flexible responsiveness to issues arising, which are largely dealt with through a well-developed team approach focused on effective implementation. A desire to do as much as possible to fulfill the project’s purpose has led to under-budgeting of some activities, with the effect of putting pressure on project personnel to deliver results with limited resources. The project team is working well under these pressures, while seeking to draw attention to the shortcomings. Some staff are quite tired, particularly those working with injuries incurred in the service of the project. The fact that two project staff have had serious motorcycle accidents draws attention to the dangers faced by fieldworkers who drive many miles a week on dirt roads, often in remote areas.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> The community mobilizer in Igunga had a motorcycle accident resulting in a fairly serious injury to his leg, which is healing successfully. The district coordinator in Urambo also had a motorcycle accident in the course of his TEACH work. He injured his arm/shoulder, but treatment at the time of the evaluation was not proving successful. He was in some pain and had to wear a sling most of the time. The situation was very worrying for him, not only

The project has effectively leveraged community and district resources to support its activities and, with good follow up, should be successful in attracting some additional financial support from private partners at a national level. Such an addition to project resources would not only be very welcome but could enable the project to better serve a number of direct beneficiaries.

USDOL has supported the achievement of project objectives through consistently effective technical assistance.

## Recommendations

The project should continue negotiations with potential private partners as a means of providing COBET students with school uniforms, and vocational agriculture students with a full set of personal protective clothing that they can take with them when they graduate.

Measures planned to lighten the workload of the project's district teams should be monitored to ensure that they are adequate.

### D. Impact and Sustainability

#### *Awareness Raising Activities*

The project has concentrated its awareness-raising activities at the community level because the mainstreaming of child labor issues across the development policies of relevant ministries both demonstrates and contributes to levels of awareness at national and district levels. The project's mass awareness-raising campaigns have involved schools and others in the preparation of various performances to accompany sporting events, and addresses from local leaders in support of the anti child-labor/importance of education message. Radio has also been used to report on project activities and further spread the word.

The evaluator's admittedly limited discussion with the parents found more awareness of the importance of education than of the concept and associated risks of child labor. Child labor was generally equated with forced labor, meaning that one shouldn't make children work against their will, but parents were unable to identify criteria for deciding the types of work that were part of a child's education and socialization, and those that would be classified as child labor, or age-appropriate work for children.

Community Activists, with their more comprehensive point of view, said that they thought their work was making a difference in their communities and that parents are getting to understand more about education and child labor. They said that while TEACH has increased awareness, it is difficult to change tradition and to counter the effects of poverty and HIV/AIDS.

Community activists asked for more training on techniques and strategies for working in communities and raising awareness. One head teacher said he would like to be able to organize seminars for the parents of TEACH-sponsored children within his school, to focus on raising the

---

because of the immediate physical restrictions he was experiencing, but because he didn't know if his arm would recover or not. The project was covering all medical costs and assisting in accessing medical advice and treatment.

awareness of this particular group, see how they might be able to offer each other mutual support, and develop strategies to keep their children in school. The project's public campaigns could well be supplemented by work with such specific groups, as well as by house-to-house visits. It might be possible to involve a group of parents in tracking the work status of their children, and if such an approach was widened to include others in the community it could help to establish a local habit, in addition to feeding project monitoring data.

TEACH is quite unusual in that sustainability has been established as an integral part of project implementation from the very beginning, as demonstrated by the design of interventions that support Government policy and the strategy of working in close collaboration with District Councils. Two further strategies for sustainability that were also built into project design are the existence of a sustainability officer to ensure that activities are sustainable, and the community asset appraisal process.

### ***The Community Asset-Appraisal***

Since pre-primary, COBET classes, and vocational training opportunities are part of GOT policy, it is relatively straightforward for the District Councils to integrate these activities into local planning if the appropriate procedures are followed and the resources can be found. Tanzania's decentralized planning procedure starts at the village level, and local plans move progressively to ward and district levels, where they are consolidated and sent on to the appropriate central Government departments. In line with this approach, TEACH is initiating community asset appraisals in the communities where it works. This process involves TEACH personnel facilitating local leaders to work with communities to identify specific objectives and locally available assets to combat child labor. A 3-day exercise led to the production of a local action plan, proposing activities and identifying the required inputs, and a budget divided between locally available funding and that required from external sources. Currently, this process has been implemented in a limited number of villages, but over the coming months it will be extended to cover all communities where TEACH is active.

One advantage of this approach is that it fits into and supports existing planning procedures. It is enabling communities to be involved, to some extent, in identifying strategies to improve education provision for their children. However, participation is limited by the short length of time available, which doesn't permit the use of participatory tools and techniques that would help non-literate members of the community to be more fully involved. One of the project's district staff said that a minimum of a week was really needed to do the process well, but budgetary constraints make this impossible.

The two examples of community action plans that were available during the evaluation both focus on providing alternative education to more children and meeting the challenge of low standards of education. Apart from the title, "*A plan of action to combat child labor with community involvement 2008/2009*," child labor is not mentioned anywhere in the plans, inadvertently demonstrating the predominant concern of those involved. The community asset appraisal process offers an opportunity to look at child labor as an issue in its own right, and further raise awareness of the dangers it presents, in addition to how to tackle it through increasing education provision.

The action plans also reveal quite limited strategies for community education and behavior change. This suggests a need for more in-depth community-level analysis and identification of the issues so that strategies and activities are defined by the people concerned (the ones who need to be 'educated'). A further observation is that the actors identified as responsible for overseeing activities are uniformly school/village/ward authorities or TEACH personnel. Community-based organizations are notable by their absence.

These observations are not designed to be overly critical—the action plans are a good initiative to promote the integration of project initiatives into local planning. To progress from being simply good to being excellent, a more community-led approach needs to complement local authority planning procedures, as opposed to the current process which seems to support local authorities in doing their job, without significantly enhancing community participation and empowerment. When asked what added value the TEACH-initiated community asset appraisal had brought to his planning work, a Ward Planning Officer thought about it and replied “... *nothing really, this is the process we normally use for local planning.*”

### ***The Sustainability Officer***

The project's employment of a Sustainability Officer (SO) dedicated to working on sustainability issues is an interesting and effective initiative that ensures that such issues are crosscutting and consistently at the forefront of project concerns. The SO also works on leveraging non-project funds and is currently responsible for ongoing negotiations with private companies to fund items such as school uniforms and gum boots.

During evaluation interviews and the stakeholders meeting it was clear that the sustainability of TEACH interventions is a real concern of both local and central Government. The stakeholders' meeting did not have time to do any detailed mapping of achievements by district, but mentioned a number of elements that are recorded in Annex C. Some districts have already started to take over some costs and others are planning to do so. At this stage in the project it would be useful to develop a clear picture of what interventions are assured and what remains to be done to provide a district-by-district focus for working towards sustainability

### ***Individual Beneficiaries***

Impact on individual beneficiaries ranges from a complete change in life style and direction due to the unexpected arrival of an opportunity to access education or training, to the assurance of being able to remain in primary school due to the support of a TEACH scholarship providing uniform, supplies, and equipment over 3 years. Parents have also benefitted from vocational agricultural training, giving them an opportunity to increase their productivity through the use of improved agricultural methods. Pre-primary and COBET children have benefitted from improved teaching methods and locally made learning materials, and teachers have been able to improve their skills through TEACH-initiated training opportunities. Even for children with varying attendance, the project has provided a degree of choice that they and their parents did not have before.

Community activists have benefitted through the experience of being part of the project and working for change in their communities. One outstanding question concerns the role of these

community activists after the end of the project. Will they continue to operate as a group once they can no longer identify with the project as the umbrella that brings them together, or do they need to consolidate their role by becoming an officially recognized association with a specific role to play within the village?

### ***Partner Organizations***

A number of schools now have improved infrastructure, furniture, and equipment and can better meet the needs of the children in their communities. They have been alerted to the affects of child labor and the difficulties faced by many vulnerable families, which has the potential to open up a wider role in coordinating child support and protection at the heart of the community.

### ***Government and Policy in terms of System-wide Change on Education and Child Labor Issues***

A sustainability matrix assists the project in tracking its progress in this direction. At the national level, they work to support the NISCC with the identification of its new TOR, through attending meetings, input/monitoring of the development of the National Plan of Action to combat child labor, and organizational and financial support for NISCC monitoring visits, which all contribute to the overall sustainability of child labor initiatives. Work to develop a national CLMS promises to have considerable impact if it succeeds, since it will enable tracking of progress towards the elimination of child labor in the country and highlight areas of particular concern.

The project's encouragement for district-level implementation of child labor and education initiatives complements central Government policy and contributes to the effectiveness and impact of the national TBP.

#### **Progress towards Sustainability in Urambo District**

- The vocational agriculture center plot is used as a demonstration plot by the district Agriculture Office.
- Communities and local government will take over pre-primary classes.
- The District Education Office will take over COBET costs 1 year before the end of the project.

## **Lessons Learned**

One lesson is the importance of working closely with both district/village authorities and with community groups to achieve a synergy of approaches—combining empowerment and participation with official doorways that are open to local advocacy. If vulnerable families are to take advantage of new opportunities, they need to be actively involved in the associated decisionmaking at the community level. If they are viewed and hence treated as passive, delinquent, or in need of education, they are likely to fulfill this expectation. The greatest challenge for this exciting and innovative project is to make parents of vulnerable children partners and active participants in sustainable change in their communities. This entails challenging the view that poor parents who may be involved in alcohol abuse and domestic violence need ‘educating’ as opposed to support to take control of their lives and believe in themselves and the futures of their children.

Parents are largely absent from project interventions (except as participants in vocational agriculture training), as demonstrated by the fact that only one out three districts arranged any meetings with parents during the evaluation in spite of being asked to arrange such opportunities. Within the district where such discussions were organized, one school assumed that parents of all pupils were concerned, rather than the parents of TEACH beneficiaries. This suggests that parents of vulnerable children are marginalized within their communities (contributing to their children’s vulnerability), and the project is well placed to work with them to change this. If this can be achieved it will be an enormous contribution to sustained change with regard to child labor and education in the communities concerned.

## **Conclusions**

The evaluation found widespread awareness of child labor issues within national and local government and among project staff, but less evidence of consistent grassroots community knowledge of child labor and its consequences. Education was a stronger focus than child labor for all district- and community-level actors. The community asset appraisal process is facilitating the inclusion of TEACH-initiated activities in the local planning process. However, there seems to be little provision for the local advocacy and monitoring of the implementation of these action plans that a more community-led approach might offer. While the project has created community activists to ensure project implementation, these individuals currently have no institutional identity to support the recognition their work nor the sustainability of their role.

The project’s educational interventions are having a positive impact on the lives of children, their parents, teachers, and community activists. TEACH is also playing an important role in supporting and developing child labor and education policy implementation at national and district levels. However, if there is a gap in the project’s strategy it is at the level of community partnerships, which do not include community organizations and instead focus on work with local authorities and individual community activists.



Overall, TEACH is quite advanced at its midway point with regard to strategies for sustainability. The project can use the time remaining to consolidate what has been done and identify key areas as the focus for ongoing work. The existence of a sustainability officer is an innovation that will become increasingly important during the latter half of the project. While the effectiveness of this post will be better judged during the final evaluation, what is clear at this stage is that the project and its partners are planning for sustainability.

## **Recommendations**

There is room for some more focused awareness raising concerning the recognition of child labor and strategies for its prevention. This would serve to help parents of vulnerable children to support them in school and protect them from exploitive child labor. This might entail school-based seminars, parental support groups, and be linked to community child labor monitoring strategies. Such work should aim to involve parents in analysis and discussion so that they can take responsibility for protecting their children. It needs to focus on empowerment, confidence building, and the identification and development of parenting skills; it might also include strategies for advocacy.

Community activists could be offered some training on how to facilitate and develop the work with the parents of vulnerable children described above. A number of the TEACH district teams possess the skills to develop and implement such training, and Tanzania also has a practitioner.

The idea of community activists becoming a recognized community group in each community to facilitate the continuation of their role after the end of the project could be discussed.

Develop a picture of what interventions are assured and what remains to be done to provide a district-by-district focus for working towards sustainability.

## VI. EMERGING GOOD PRACTICES

---

Alignment of project design with Government child labor and education policy and practice, so that projects support and build on existing ideas and initiatives. This facilitates collaboration and partnership with government ministries at national and local levels, and enhances the chances of sustainability. It means that innovative and pilot interventions have more chance of being integrated and scaled up into general practice.

Development of vocational agriculture training alongside business skills in areas where smallholder farming is widespread; this enables children and adults to build on what they already know and incorporate new methods to increase productivity and entrepreneurial initiatives. Since much of sub-Saharan Africa relies on subsistence farming, this is an intervention with enormous potential for wider use.

TEACH uses a national civil society organization to coordinate and implement activities on the ground; thus applying accumulated national and local knowledge and expertise, while building national capacity. TAWLAE is treated as one of three equal partners in the TEACH team and expected to perform as such; thus helping to narrow the gap between national and international NGOs.

The idea of having a sustainability officer in place from the start of the project is an interesting innovation that might be more widely applied. It is a way of ensuring that sustainability is genuinely integrated into project strategy and not just a token part of the project document that is only really considered as the project draws to a close.

Pre-primary education interventions in areas where traditional practices, such as children working in family and commercial agriculture, are now recognized as child labor. Such interventions not only reduce the risk that the children involved will be exposed to exploitive child labor since they are more likely to be enrolled in primary school, but they also provide an opportunity for parents to develop new habits concerning the upbringing of their children.

## **Annex B**

### **Documents Reviewed**

Solicitation for Cooperative Agreement  
TEACH Cooperative Agreement  
TEACH Final Project Document  
TEACH Baseline study  
Personnel policy draft  
Project budget and budget notes 2006  
Project revision request 2008  
TAWLAE initiatives in alleviating poverty and ensuring food security in Tanzania 1995-2005

#### **Technical Progress Reports and USDOL comments for**

March 2007  
September 2007  
March 2008  
September 2008

#### **Training and monitoring documents:**

M&E field manual  
Asset appraisal training program and training guides and modules  
Facilitation skills  
Project goals, objectives and organization  
Community activists' roles and responsibilities  
Leadership for Change  
Advocacy  
Child labor – myths and realities  
Child labor situation  
Setting up and sustaining a network  
Child labor monitoring and data collection  
Project interventions  
Action Plan development

#### **GOT Documents**

Mkukuta - National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty 2005  
Child Labor in Tanzania – An analysis of the findings of the Integrated Labor Force Survey 2006  
Basic Education Statistics 2004-2008

## Summary of Ideas from Stakeholder Meeting Discussions

### Group One – Supporting Vocational Agriculture

Please discuss and suggest strategies and ideas for

- Enabling teachers to offer consistent services
  - Improve transport facilities for trainers
  - Introduce para-professional vocational agriculture facilitators
  - Offer refresher courses for teachers
- Ensuring safety and adequate personal protective clothing
  - Provide safety gear for trainers
  - Each child be provided with safety gear (no sharing – it's dangerous for their health)
- Facilitating / supporting graduate groups to develop their activities
  - Provide start up kits
  - Link vocational agriculture groups to relevant institutions to access support (Agriculture Department, Microfinance etc.)
  - Lobby and advocate for community support
- The possibility of exchange visits?
  - Encourage intra and inter district exchange visits
  - Community / parents visits to vocational agriculture centers – open days

### Group Two – Tracking work status

Please discuss and suggest strategies and ideas for

- Involving communities in tracking the work status of their children
  - Community awareness raising concerning of importance of education
  - Training for Child Labor Committees
  - Involve leaders at all levels (village/ward/division/district) in elimination of child labor via agendas of their meetings
  - Involve school committees
- Empowering parents to support their children in education
  - Parents must apply the available resources to support education
  - Entrepreneurship skills / education
  - Sensitize parents on the importance of education to their child
- Ensuring that the project can report on children's work status
  - Raise awareness of leaders at all levels (village/ward/division/district)
- (Linking into a National Child Labor Monitoring System?)
  - Apply the existing government report system and mechanism
- Any other ideas
  - Enact by-laws

### Group Three – Awareness raising and Empowerment

Please discuss and suggest strategies and ideas for:

- Supporting and empowering the parents of project beneficiaries
  - Awareness creation and sensitization through community meetings, parents meetings and household visits

Formation of parents' groups  
Training in entrepreneurship skills  
Provision of seed money for income generating activities  
(revolving fund)

- Enabling parents to better support their children's education
  - Provide assistance for income generation
  - Clubs to discuss education
  - Provide inputs like seeds
- Enabling parents to analyze / understand educational opportunities / dangers of child labor
  - Sensitization through seminars and home visits and radio
  - Training on child labor issues and importance of education
  - Study tours within and out of the district

#### **Group Four - Sustainability**

What has been achieved and what remains to be done in regard to the sustainability of:

- Pre-primary initiatives
  - Construction of classrooms for pre-primary classes by some communities
  - Some community contributions to paying teachers
  - Almost all primary schools now have pre-primary classes, eg.: Iramba 157 out of 167 primary schools and Urambo 131 out of 139 primary schools
  - What remains to be done?
  - District capacity building for para professional and professional teachers
  - Encouraging communities to contribute to school feeding programs
  - Recognition of District Child Labor Committees as permanent bodies to oversee child labor related issues
  - Community mobilized to contribute to procurement of school furniture and materials
  - District councils should budget for school materials
- Scholarship kits for vulnerable children
  - Local government authorities (LGAs) to allocate a reasonable budget for vulnerable children TEACH to submit list of vulnerable children they support to LGAs
  - Village governments to arrange for a system to contribute to scholarships, including mapping across relatives of vulnerable children
- COBET classes
  - LGAs to take responsibility for paying allowances to COBET teachers
  - LGAs and communities to ensure the availability of classrooms
  - Communities to follow up school attendance
- Vocational Agriculture centers
  - Vocational agriculture to be integrated into existing projects and programs Eg DADPS
- School feeding
  - Community to contribute foodstuffs
  - Vulnerable children/ Child Labor committees to be recognized as permanent bodies to oversee child labor related issues

## Annex D – Terms of Reference

---

*TERMS OF REFERENCE*  
**for**  
**Independent Midterm Evaluation of**  
**Tanzania Education Alternatives for Children**  
**(TEACH)**

---

<b>Cooperative Agreement Number:</b>	<b>E-9-K-6-0114</b>
<b>Financing Agency:</b>	U.S. Department of Labor
<b>Type of Evaluation:</b>	Independent Midterm Evaluation
<b>Field Work Dates:</b>	November 13-28, 2008
<b>Preparation Date of TOR:</b>	November 2008
<b>Total Project Funds from USDOL Based on Cooperative Agreement:</b>	US \$5,090,000
<b>Vendor for Evaluation Contract:</b>	<b>MACRO INTERNATIONAL, INC.</b> Headquarters, 11785 Beltsville Drive Calverton, MD 20705 Tel: (301) 572-0200 Fax: (301) 572-0999

## I. BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

The Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) is an office within the Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB), an agency of the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL). OCFT activities include research on international child labor; supporting U.S. government policy on international child labor; administering and overseeing grant and contracts to organizations engaged in efforts to eliminate child labor; and raising awareness about child labor issues.

Since 1995, the U.S. Congress has appropriated over \$595 million to USDOL for efforts to combat exploitive child labor internationally. This funding has been used to support technical cooperation projects to combat exploitive child labor in more than 75 countries around the world. Technical cooperation projects funded by USDOL range from targeted action programs in specific sectors of work to more comprehensive programs that support national efforts to eliminate the worst forms of child labor as defined by ILO Convention 182. USDOL-funded projects seek to achieve five major goals:

1. Withdrawing or preventing children from involvement in exploitive child labor through the provision of direct educational services;
2. Strengthening policies on child labor and education, the capacity of national institutions to combat child labor, and formal and transitional education systems that encourage children engaged in or at-risk of engaging in exploitive labor to attend school;
3. Raising awareness of the importance of education for all children and mobilizing a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures;
4. Supporting research and the collection of reliable data on child labor; and
5. Ensuring the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

USDOL is mandated to report to Congress the number of children withdrawn and prevented by the EI projects. As the EI program has developed, an increasing emphasis has been placed on this goal and ensuring that the data collected by EI grantees are accurate and reported according to USDOL definitions of “withdrawn” and “prevented”. Future EI projects will have an increasing focus on research and data collected on the issue of child labor, with particular emphasis on the quality of baseline data collected by grantees.

The approach used in the USDOL EI projects, to increase access to basic education, is intended to nurture the development, health, safety, and enhanced future employability of children engaged in or at-risk of entering exploitive labor in geographic areas or economic sectors with a high incidence of exploitive child labor. In the appropriations to USDOL for international child labor technical cooperation, Congress directed some of the funds towards two specific programs:

*International Labor Organization’s International Program on the Elimination of Child Labor (ILO-IPEC)*

Since 1995, Congress has earmarked some \$330 million to support the International Labor Organization’s International Program on the Elimination of Child Labor (ILO/IPEC),

making the U.S. Government the leading donor to the program. USDOL-funded ILO/IPEC projects to combat child labor generally fall into one of several categories: comprehensive, national Timebound Programs (TBP) to eliminate the worst forms of child labor in a set time frame; Country Programs; sector-specific projects; data collection and research projects; and international awareness raising projects. In general, most projects include “direct action” components that are interventions to remove or prevent children from involvement in exploitative and hazardous work. One of the major strategies used by IPEC projects is to increase children’s access to and participation in formal and non-formal education. Most IPEC projects also have a capacity-building component to assist in building a sustainable base for long-term elimination of exploitive child labor.

#### *Child Labor Education Initiative*

Since 2001, Congress directed international child labor technical cooperation funding to the Child Labor Education Initiative, which focused on the elimination of the worst forms of child labor through the provision of basic education. EI projects are designed to ensure that children in areas with a high incidence of child labor are withdrawn and integrated into educational settings, and that they persist in their education once enrolled. In parallel, the program seeks to avert at-risk children from leaving school and entering child labor. The EI is based on the notion that the elimination of exploitative child labor depends, to a large extent, on improving access to, quality of, and relevance of education. Without improving educational quality and relevance, children withdrawn/prevented from child labor may not have viable alternatives and could resort to other forms of hazardous work. EI projects may focus on providing educational services to children removed from specific sectors of work and/or a specific region(s) or support a national Timebound Program that aims to eliminate the worst forms of child labor in multiple sectors of work specific to a given country. Funds under the EI are competitively bid, and support cooperative agreements with international, nonprofit, for-profit and faith-based entities.

In addition to these two initiatives, in 2007, USDOL allocated \$60 million for child labor elimination projects not earmarked to ILO/IPEC or the EI program. As is the case with the EI, these funds were awarded through a competitive process. Finally, USDOL has supported \$2.5 million for awareness-raising and research activities not associated with the ILO/IPEC program or the EI.

#### **EI Project- Tanzania Education Alternatives for Children (TEACH)**

In September 2006, an Association of Winrock International, Tanzania Association of Women Leaders in Agriculture and the Environment (TAWLAE), and Khulisa Management Services received a 4-year Cooperative Agreement worth \$5.09 million from USDOL to implement an EI project in Tanzania aimed at withdrawing and preventing children from exploitive labor by expanding access to and improving the quality of basic education and supporting the four goals of the USDOL’s Child Labor EI as outlined above. The Association, with Winrock International designated as the lead grantee, was awarded the EI project through a competitive bid process.

As stipulated in the Cooperative Agreement, the overall goal of the TEACH project is to reduce the number of children engaged in the worst forms of child labor. Particularly targeting smallholder farming areas, the project will provide education alternatives to



withdrawn and at-risk children while delivering comprehensive community-driven awareness and prevention messages and facilitating community-based monitoring of child labor.

In five districts in Tanzania- Urambo, Igunga, Iramba, Kwimba, and Ilemela- the TEACH project plans to withdraw 5,145 children from, and prevent an additional 5,270 children from entering into, exploitive child labor through the provision of direct educational services. In the listed districts, the TEACH project targets children engaged in or at risk of engaging in exploitive child labor in the following areas: farming activities in smallholder farms and/or family farms; farming activities in commercial plants; herding livestock; domestic work for other families; prostitution; and selling goods in the market. The direct educational services employed by the project for targeted beneficiaries include 1) establishing pre-primary classes for children aged 5-6; 2) providing student kits and scholarships for children aged 7-10 in order to attend formal primary schools; 3) establishing new, or supporting exiting, Government of Tanzania (GoT) non-formal Complementary Basic Education in Tanzania (COBET) classes; and 4) Establishing Vocational Agricultural Model Schools (Voc-Ag Model Schools).

In addition to withdrawing and preventing children from exploitive child labor through the provision of direct educational services, the project seeks to:

- 1) Improve the educational infrastructure and quality for targeted children;
- 2) Increase awareness regarding the importance of education and the negative impact of child labor, particularly the worst forms of child labor (WFCL);
- 3) Strengthen the capacity of national and district institutions to address education and exploitive child labor, particularly the WFCL; and
- 4) Ensure the sustainability of efforts to combat exploitive child labor in Tanzania.

## **II. SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF EVALUATION**

The **scope** of the evaluation includes a review and assessment of all activities carried out under the USDOL Cooperative Agreement with Winrock International, TAWLAE and Khulisa Management Services. The evaluation should assess the achievements of the project toward reaching its targets and objectives as outlined in the cooperative agreement and project document. The evaluation should consider all activities that have been implemented over the life of the project to date- addressing issues of project design, implementation, lessons learned, replicability and recommendations for this and future projects. It will also evaluate the relevance, effectiveness, and elements of sustainability of the program activities carried out to date.

All USDOL-funded projects, which are funded through cooperative agreements, are subject to mid-term and final evaluations. The TEACH project in Tanzania started implementation in September 2006 and is scheduled for a mid-term evaluation in 2008. The **purpose** of the evaluation is to:

1. Help individual organizations identify areas of good performance and areas where project implementation can be improved;
2. Assist OCFT to learn more about what is or is not working in terms of the overall conceptualization and design of EI projects within the broad OCFT technical cooperation program framework;
3. Assess the degree to which objectives relevant to the country-specific situation they address have been achieved; and
4. Assess progress in terms of children's working and educational status (i.e. withdrawal and prevention from the worst forms of child labor; enrollment, retention, completion of educational programs).

The following issues and questions have also been identified by Winrock International, TAWLAE and Khulisa Management Services staff as of particular importance for the evaluation:

On issues:

- The mid-term evaluation should address the capacity building elements and stakeholder engagement for project sustainability and potential as a replicable model;
- Address key achievements, success of the project; how TEACH has met challenges through community participation, ownership and stakeholder involvement;
- Make recommendations for scaling up or replication of potential or emerging best practices;
- Make observations and recommendations on the national and local government engagement and sustainability strategies: At National /District level: Contribution of the project on Government policy/ initiatives towards elimination of child labor and its worst forms; At District Level: Contribution of the project on implementation (Complementarity) Government policies/initiatives towards elimination of child labor and its worst forms; At community and school level: What benefits and changes on the children's learning processes have so far been experienced as a result of the project.

On questions:

- Has the project succeeded in recruiting and engaging rural children (Withdrawn and Prevented) in attracting young people to education in agriculture and entrepreneurship through TEACH educational services?
- Has the project developed strategies to address improvements in community-based monitoring and data capture?

The evaluation is to be conducted with the purpose of drawing lessons from the experiences gained during the period of implementation. It will suggest how these lessons can be applied in programming future activities; existing or planned USDOL funded interventions, as well as the broader terms of action against child labor in the context of Tanzania. The results of

the evaluation will also be used as part of a results-based management framework and therefore inform future activities and direction of the project. The findings of the evaluation will assist USDOL and Winrock International, TAWLAE and Khulisa Management Services to improve project oversight and to take corrective measures where necessary.

For the purpose of conducting this evaluation, MACRO INTERNATIONAL, INC. will provide a highly skilled, independent evaluator to: a) determine if projects are achieving their stated objectives and explain why or why not; b) assess the impact of the projects in term of sustained improvements achieved; c) provide recommendations on how to improve project performance; and d) identify lessons learned to inform future USDOL projects. In addition, the contractor will provide recommendations to refine project-monitoring systems to ensure that project objectives and the measurement of results-based common indicators are being achieved across EI projects.

The contractor/evaluator will work with the staff of USDOL's OCFT and relevant Winrock International, TAWLAE and Khulisa Management Services staff to evaluate the project in question. The OCFT management and project staff will use the evaluation results to inform the relevance of the approach and strategy that are being followed. The evaluation results will also be used by Winrock International, TAWLAE and Khulisa Management Services to enhance effectiveness in the implementation. Therefore, the evaluation should provide credible and reliable information in order to suggest how the project could enhance its impact during the remaining time of implementation, ensuring the sustainability of the benefits that have been or will be generated.

Areas that the evaluation should seek to discuss are listed below, according to four categories of issue:

**Program Design/Implementation**

Assess the relevance and effectiveness of the project design to the country context and USDOL goals, as well as the project's progress toward meeting their goals.

**Partnership & Coordination**

Assess the strengths and challenges of the project's partnerships.

**Management and Budget Issues**

Assess the strengths and challenges in project management.

**Impact & Sustainability**

Assess the project's impact and prospects for sustainability.

### III. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND TIMEFRAME

#### **Desk Review**

After an analysis of the purpose and scope of the evaluation and the specific questions in the TOR the evaluator will review key project documents including

- Solicitation of Grant Applications
- The TEACH project document and Cooperative Agreement
- Documents related to project revisions
- Baseline research report
- Technical Progress Reports and DOL's responses 2006-2008
- Work plans and planning documents
- Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) and indicator data
- Management Procedures and Guidelines
- Other appropriate project documents

#### **USDOL Interview**

Before visits to the field the evaluator will talk to the USDOL Project Manager to ensure a common understanding of the TOR and priorities for the evaluation. This conversation will take place by phone as the evaluator is based outside the US. The evaluator will send the USDOL Project Manager and the US Winrock office a short list of questions by e-mail to enable them to have some written input into the process. Questions for the USDOL Project Manger will focus on DOL's impressions of the project design and implementation and any specific concerns about project management and monitoring. Questions for Winrock will also concern project implementation, management and monitoring, including the relationship with USDOL and the project team in the field.

#### **Identification of key informants and project sites to visit**

The evaluator will identify key informants emerging from the desk review and the TEACH team will provide a list of suggested interviewees. TEACH will also provide a list of partners, their locations and descriptions of their activities. They will suggest possible field visits based on the time available and the need to cover as broad a range of project stakeholders and activities as is feasible. On the basis of the above a program for the evaluator's 16 days in Tanzania will be agreed.

#### **Key informant interviews**

*1) Interviews with the TEACH project team* in Dar es Salaam will cover all aspects of project design, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, management and sustainability. Particular attention will be given to:

- Reflection on the project design and any challenges and surprises they have encountered in implementation.
- A detailed breakdown of project indicators and results to date
- Their experience of working with USDOL and the DOL common indicators
- The development of partnerships to implement the project

- Working with government at national and district levels
- The state of realization of the national Child Labor Monitoring System

The evaluator will cover similar points during meetings with TEACH staff at district level, with a focus on practical implementation. TEACH team members from the three organizations which make up the implementing association will be involved in key informant interviews: Winrock International, The Tanzania Association of Women Leaders in Agriculture and the Environment, and Khulisa Management Services.

**2) Other interviews at national and district level** will include representatives from the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (MOEVT) and the Ministry of Labor Employment and Youth Development (MOLEYD) in order to assess the degree to which TEACH activities are embedded in or encouraging the national approach to Education for All (EFA) and eliminating child labor. The evaluator will also meet representatives from the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, the Ministry of Community Development, the ILO and any other appropriate organizations to discuss to what degree TEACH is succeeding in networking and collaborating with others working for similar objectives.

Only three out of the five districts where the project operates will be visited by the evaluator due to the distances involved and the time available. One district from each of the three regions will be covered (Urambo in Tabora, Iramba in Singida and Kwimba in Mwanza), in the hope of gaining an overall impression of the varying environments where the project works.

**3) Meetings with the project's partners at community level** will take the form of semi structured interviews with teachers delivering the different types of TEACH educational interventions:

- Pre-Primary Schools – pre-primary classes
- Complementary Basic Education and Training (COBET)
- Vocational Agricultural Model Schools
- Primary schools – for those receiving student kits/scholarships

A list of questions to guide the process will cover project design, implementation, monitoring and sustainability, the partnership with TEACH and the local and national child labor and education context.

The evaluator will visit a range of educational interventions and communities. In each community the evaluator will meet with small groups of boys and girls who are part of project activities, in order to discuss their opinions and attitudes concerning child labor and education, the activities initiated by the project and how they see the future. In communities where a specific type of child labor is evident the evaluator will make every effort to talk to children concerned. The evaluator will ensure that interviews with children are relaxed and informal, with a limited number of questions and an accent on valuing their points of view and encouraging them to express themselves, so that they have a positive confidence building experience.

Similar focus group interviews will take place with parents, the project's community activists and other local leaders, grouped appropriately according to community norms and specific project activities. The evaluator will particularly be looking at the degree of community involvement and ownership of project activities, the degree of satisfaction concerning project achievements and approaches and attitudes concerning education and child labor.

Wherever possible, the evaluator will visit and observe project activities in order to assess the gender breakdown and general age of participants, the atmosphere and dynamics between staff and young people, the quality and content of the activity they are engaged in, the physical environment, materials and facilities available, in brief whether the activity seems likely to appropriately meet the objectives for which it was designed.

#### ***4) Stakeholders' meeting***

At the end of the field visits a stakeholders' meeting will bring together a broad range of actors involved with TEACH and/ or with education and/or child labor. This will enable the evaluator to verify her understanding of the project and to facilitate a discussion concerning ongoing project activities within the national education and child labor context.

#### **Logistics**

A member of the project's district team will ideally travel with the evaluator during the evaluation to provide introductions, but will not be present during individual or focus group interviews, with the possible exception of any larger meetings, where they may be observers. This will enable them to benefit from visiting communities, provide additional time to share information and discuss the project when traveling, enable the evaluator to see them interacting with project partners and help them to understand the basis for the evaluation's findings. The evaluator is aware of the potential for bias that could result from traveling with project staff and will be careful to remain objective and take precautions to ensure that the evaluation remains balanced. The evaluator has considerable experience and is accustomed to remaining objective while building a rapport with project staff. Translation will be provided by people specifically employed to provide that service in the districts concerned.

#### **Confidentiality**

The evaluation mission will observe utmost confidentiality related to information and feedback elicited during the individual and group interviews. In order to ensure freedom of expression and to mitigate any bias during the data collection process, implementing partner staff will not be present during stakeholder interviews.

### Timetable and Workplan:

The tentative timetable is as follows.

Tasks	Dates
Desk Review of Project Materials and Interviews with OCFT staff	October/November
International Travel	November 12
Field Work	November 13-26
Brief Initial Conclusions to Project Stakeholders	November 27
International Travel	November 28
Draft Report	Due to Macro December 12 Due to USDOL, December 17
Draft Released to Stakeholders Comments Due from USDOL and Stakeholders	December 19 January 2
Revised Report	Due to Macro January 9 Due to USDOL January 13

### Consultations and Meetings:

- Winrock International Headquarters and Project Office
- TAWLAE Project Staff
- Khulisa Project Staff
- ILAB/OCFT Staff
- Government Ministry Officials
- Other Project Stakeholders at national, district and community levels
- Beneficiaries

## IV. EXPECTED OUTPUTS/DELIVERABLES

The evaluator will submit to ILAB/OCFT **an evaluation report** that incorporates the results of the Tasks (outlined in Section III) in the format prescribed by ILAB/OCFT, which includes at minimum the following sections:

- a. Table of Contents
- b. Executive Summary, providing an overview of the evaluation and summary of main findings and recommendations
- c. List of Acronyms
- d. Evaluation Objectives
- e. Methodology of Evaluation
- f. Findings
- g. Lessons Learned and Good Practices
- h. Conclusions

- i. Recommendations
- j. Annexes, including list of interviews/meetings, site visits, documents reviewed, stakeholder workshop agenda and participants, summary TOR, etc.

The total length of the report should be a maximum of 40 pages, excluding annexes. The organizational format for the presentation of findings, lessons learned, conclusions, recommendations etc. is at the discretion of the evaluator.

The first draft of the report will be circulated to key stakeholders individually for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated and incorporated into the final reports as appropriate and the evaluator will provide a response to USDOL as to why any comments might not have been incorporated.

While the substantive content of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the report shall be determined by the evaluator, the report is subject to final approval by ILAB/OCFT in terms of whether or not the report meets the conditions of the TOR. **The first draft of each report is due to MACRO after return from an evaluation mission on December 12, 2008, as indicated in the above timetable, and a final draft is due on January 9, 2009, after receipt of comments from ILAB/OCFT. All reports including drafts will be written in English.**

## V. INPUTS

MACRO INTERNATIONAL, INC. will provide all logistical and administrative support for their staff and sub-contractors, including travel arrangements (e.g. plane and hotel reservations, purchasing plane tickets, providing *per diem*) and all materials needed to provide all deliverables. MACRO INTERNATIONAL, INC. will also be responsible for providing the management and technical oversight necessary to ensure consistency of methods and technical standards.

MACRO INTERNATIONAL, INC. or its subcontractors should contact Winrock International to initiate contact with field staff.

---



## **Annex E**

### **Interview Guides**

#### **GOVERNMENT – Central**

1. What are the main issues concerning child labor / education in Tanzania?
2. How is the GOT tackling child labor? and EFA? (policy/practice)
3. How does the TEACH project fit into this?
4. Can you describe the ministry's partnership with TEACH – how often and on what occasions do you meet with project staff?
5. What do you see as the strengths of the TEACH initiatives?
6. Do you have any specific concerns about TEACH activities?
7. What suggestions would you make for improvements?
8. How sustainable do you think TEACH initiatives will prove to be? Why?
9. What would you like the project to achieve in its final 2 years?
10. Is there anything else you'd like to add?

#### **GOVERNMENT – District**

1. What are the main issues concerning child labor / education in your district?
2. What government provision is in place to tackle these issues? (policy/practice)
3. How does the TEACH project fit into this?
4. Can you describe your partnership with TEACH – how often and on what occasions do you meet with project staff? What role does TEACH play in your work?
5. What do you see as the strengths of the TEACH initiatives?
6. Do you have any specific concerns about TEACH activities?
7. What suggestions would you make for improvements?
8. How sustainable do you think TEACH initiatives will prove to be? What factors are involved in sustainability? Obstacles/Opportunities?
9. What would you like the project to achieve in its final 2 years?
10. Is there anything else you'd like to add?

#### **ILO**

1. How would you describe the child labor situation in Tanzania?
2. How has ILO responded to this? What have been the main achievements and challenges?
3. How successful is the partnership between the GOT and the ILO?
4. How does TEACH relate to current ILO initiatives in Tanzania?
5. How would you describe collaboration between the ILO and TEACH?
6. What role does the TEACH team play at a national / district level?
7. What do you see as the strengths of the TEACH initiatives?
8. Do you have any specific concerns about TEACH activities?
9. What suggestions would you make for improvements?
10. How sustainable do you think TEACH initiatives will prove to be? What factors are involved in sustainability? Obstacles/Opportunities?
11. What would you like the project to achieve in its final 2 years?

## TEACH Team – Central

### Design/implementation

1. How does the TEACH project design fit into the overall GoT programs to combat child labor and increase education for all?
2. How does TEACH complement the ILO/IPEC TBP?
3. What are the gaps in government/ILO strategies to combat child labor and to what extent is TEACH able to respond to these?
4. Describe the strengths and challenges of implementing the base line survey – would you do anything differently if carrying out the survey a second time?
5. Can you explain how the project responds to the needs identified in the baseline survey and any such needs that the project is not meeting?
6. Do you think the project purpose and outputs are realistic?
7. Is the project on track to meet its outputs and targets – what factors are contributing to any delays?
8. To what extent is the project team able to understand and implement the DOL definitions of “withdrawn” and “prevented”?
9. Are the project definitions for “withdrawn” and “retained” and “prevented” proving realistic?
10. How well do you think each of the project’s educational interventions are working in practice? Please talk about the successes and challenges.
11. What are the principal tasks of the community activists?
12. Why are they volunteers and what effect is this having?
13. If you were designing the project now would you make any changes?

M&E officer: Describe the TEACH monitoring strategy; How well is it working? (Successes / challenges)

### Partnerships/Coordination

14. How does the partnership between the three implementing partners work – who is responsible for what? How successful is the overall collaboration? What are the challenges of working together?
15. How effective is the TEACH partnership with government ministries – please give some concrete examples of successes and challenges.
16. How effective has collaboration with ILO-IPEC been – successes /challenges
17. To what extent does TEACH support the goals of Tanzania’s overall TBP?
18. Describe the key district level partnerships that have been developed to implement and support the project and any issues and challenges that have arisen.
19. Describe the key community level partnerships that have been developed to implement and support the project and any issues and challenges that have arisen.

### Management/Budget

20. What are the technical and financial management strengths of the project?
21. Are there areas of management that could be improved? If so, how?
22. How successful has the project been in leveraging non-project resources?
23. How would you describe the project’s relationship with DOL?
24. Describe the usefulness or otherwise of
  - (i) technical assistance in understanding federal reporting requirements (GPRA)
  - (ii) feedback on TPR s
  - (iii) overall communications

### **Impact/Sustainability**

25. How effective has the project been at raising awareness at the national level?
  26. How would you describe the project's impact so far?
  27. Can any specific changes be seen in terms of policy and system wide change in education and child labor issues?
  28. What is the project strategy for sustainability?
  29. What is the role of the sustainability officer?
  30. Are there any signs that project activities will continue after the end of the project?
  31. What will the project be doing between now and 2010 to promote sustainability?
- Design question: When kids finish a programme sooner than expected should TEACH a) Offer ongoing support in whatever they are going on to or b) recruit replacement beneficiaries to fill the gap?
  - How often do staff from HQ visit field? (Why is HQ in Dar?)
  - Is data entry proving challenging? What solutions?

### **TEACH Team – District**

#### **Design/implementation**

1. How does the TEACH project design fit into the local government programs to combat child labor and increase education for all?
2. How does TEACH complement the ILO/IPEC TBP in your district?
3. What aspects of child labor are not covered by government or ILO initiatives? How is TEACH able to respond to these?
4. Describe the strengths and challenges of implementing the base line survey – would you do anything differently if carrying out the survey a second time?
5. Can you explain how the project responds to the needs identified in the baseline survey and any such needs that the project is not meeting?
6. Do you think the project purpose and outputs are realistic?
7. Is the project up to date with its work plan – what factors are contributing to any delays?
8. How are direct beneficiaries identified?
9. Can you explain the definitions of “withdrawn” and “prevented” that are used by DOL and the project?
10. How many children have been withdrawn/ prevented in this district – is the project meeting its targets?
11. How well is each type of project education intervention working in practice? Please talk about the successes and challenges.
12. What are the principal tasks of the community activists?
13. Does the fact that they are volunteers have any positive or negative effects?
14. If you were designing the project now would you make any changes to the way it operates?

M&E officer: How does TEACH monitoring the work and withdrawn/prevented status of direct beneficiaries? How well is it working? (Successes / challenges)

### **Partnerships/Coordination**

15. How does the partnership between the three implementing partners work – who is responsible for what? How successful is the overall collaboration? What are the challenges of working together?
16. How effective is the TEACH partnership with local government departments – please give some concrete examples of successes and challenges.
17. How effective has collaboration with ILO-IPEC been – successes /challenges
18. Describe any other district level partnerships that have been developed to implement and support the project and any issues and challenges that have arisen.
19. Describe the key community level partnerships that have been developed to implement and support the project and any issues and challenges that have arisen.

### **Management/Budget**

20. How efficient are the project's financial management and reporting procedures?
21. Are there areas of management that could be improved? If so, how?
22. How successful has the project been in leveraging non-project resources?
23. How does the central project team support the district team? Do you have any suggestions for improvements?
24. What training and orientation have you received concerning the project? How useful has it proved?
25. Are there any particular areas where you think you would benefit from training now?

### **Impact/Sustainability**

26. How effective has the project been at raising awareness at the district and community levels?
  27. How would you describe the project's impact so far?
  28. Can any specific changes be seen in terms of local policy and/or changes in education practice and child labor issues?
  29. What is the project strategy for sustainability?
  30. What is the role of the sustainability officer?
  31. Are there any signs that project activities will continue after the end of the project?
  32. What will the project be doing between now and 2010 to promote sustainability?
- Voc Ag Centers — mixture of children and parents/ other community members attending
    - i) What effect does this have (positive / negative)
    - ii) Some parents using protective clothing provided by the project for kids (boots) – check it out
    - iii) Do centers provide adequate working /learning environment (shelter, toilets...)
    - iv) Is 6 months long enough for sustainable skills learning?
    - v) Try to visit graduates – find out what they are doing – are they being monitored?
  - Community activist strategy – how does it work in practice – do they have enough time/ commitment to do the work required?
  - What is the child labor/ education balance of the project – how is it perceived in the field?
  - How effective are the different education interventions?

- Design question: When kids finish a programme sooner than expected should TEACH  
a) Offer ongoing support in whatever they are going on to or b) recruit replacement beneficiaries to fill the gap?
- How often do staff from HQ visit field? (Why is HQ in Dar?)
- Is data entry proving challenging? What solutions?

### **Teachers**

Pre primary, COBET, Voc-Ag and primary

1. How many TEACH children do you have in your class(es)?
2. What activities are they involved in?
3. How were they identified?
4. What difference do you think the project makes in their lives?
5. Can you give any concrete examples of changes in children's behaviour and achievement since you started working with them?
6. How are their parents involved in their education?
7. Describe any training that you participated in linked to work on the TEACH project.
8. How does the project team support you? What other support could they or anyone else offer you?
9. What are you most proud of linked to your work teaching this class?
10. What do you find the most challenging?
11. What do you see as the main objectives of the project?
12. How do you monitor children's attendance?
13. What do you do if a child is absent?
14. What do you understand by child labor?
15. Is there any sort of work that is acceptable for children?
16. What changes would you suggest to improve the project?
17. What will happen to these classes when the project finishes?

### **Parents/ Community Leaders**

1. What is it like to live here in this community? What assets do you have? What would you like to change?
2. What sort of work do different members of your family do to contribute to the wellbeing of the family?
3. What sort of work do your children do? Who decides what work they will do?
4. Are there any types of work that you think are not suitable for children? Which? Why?
5. Have you heard people talking about child labor? What does it mean to you? What do you think about it?
6. How are your children benefitting from being in this school/class/center?
7. How were they chosen to come here?
8. Do they come every day?
9. How are you involved in their education?
10. Do all your children go to school? Why not?
11. What do you like/not like about the education available for your children?
12. What changes would you like to see? (Ask about Community Asset Appraisal process in Iramba and Kwimba)
13. What will happen to this school/class/center when the project finishes? What would you like to see happen? Is there anything you can do?
14. Have you any suggestions about how to improve what the project is doing?

### **Children**

1. What are you doing here?
2. How long have you been coming here?
3. How were you chosen to be enrolled here?
4. Do you come every day?
5. What do you like about it? What don't you like?
6. What changes has it made in your life?
7. What do you hope to do when you finish the course here?
8. How has the project helped to make it possible for you enroll in education?
9. What do you understand by child labor? What do you think about it? Can you say what sort of work children might be good for/ harmful to children?
10. What can you suggest to improve the school/class/center here?
11. How could your teachers help you more?
12. What changes would you like to see in your community? (Ask about Community Asset Appraisal process in Iramba and Kwimba)

### **Community Activists**

1. How/ why did you become a community activist for the project?
2. Can you describe some of the successes and challenges of the work?
3. What are the issues around child labor in this district?
4. Is there adequate education provision to meet local demand?
5. How would you describe the quality of education provision in this community?
6. Are there any changes in education provision that you would like to see?
7. Can you describe the training that the project has provided?
8. How are you supported to carry out your work? Who offers support?
9. How has being a TEACH community activist influenced your ideas and your life in general?
10. Are you happy with your volunteer status within the project?
11. How do you see the future of TEACH initiatives after the end of the project?
12. Are you doing anything to prepare for this? (Ask about Community Asset Appraisal process in Urambo and Kwimba)
13. What advice or suggestions do you have for the TEACH team?