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1. Introduction

This report was written in the wake of one of the greatest catastrophes in the recent history of Tanzanian education. Half of all Form 4 students failed the 2010 national examination. Despite sitting through four years of secondary education, 174,193 of the 352,840 students who took the exam either failed in every subject or got a single “D” out of the seven subjects tested and failed the rest (NECTA, 2011). Formal education for these 174,193 members of the next generation leading Tanzania has, for the most part, come to an end. Parents are confused, and the nation is shocked. The country is left wondering, “What has caused this?” and, “What urgent action needs to be taken?”

While no one could predict such a sharp decline in our secondary school students’ performance, many of us in the education sector at the national level saw the symptoms. There has been a quick and steady decline in exam performance over the past few years. The implementation of the nationwide government initiative called the Secondary Education Development Plan (SEDP), has emphasized enrollment—building enough schools to provide enough classrooms for the nation’s youth to attend secondary school. This has been achieved—the number of government secondary schools has more than quadrupled from 828 in 2004 to the current 3,425, and the number of students enrolled in them has increased from 264,888 in 2004 to 1,515,671 today (URT, 2008b, 2011a). However, the government has not been able to match the pace of this enrollment with the required educational inputs. While the amount of students has increased more than five-fold, the number of teachers in government secondary schools has only managed to quadruple from 9,896 in 2004 to 39,934 now (URT,2008b, 2011a). To cope with the shortage of teachers, many secondary schools, particularly rural community secondary schools, hire or receive teachers without qualifications to teach in secondary schools. Currently, one out of every thirteen teachers in secondary schools, two are unqualified to teach there (URT, 2011a). On top of this, adequate textbooks, learning materials, and laboratories remain a problem. When children are in secondary school being taught by unqualified teachers with too few learning materials, how can it be a surprise when they fail the national exams?

This is the second volume of a three-part series entitled Restoring Teacher Dignity. Several of the most significant factors causing declines in student performance at the primary and secondary levels, and the means to mitigating them, were discussed in the first volume, Restoring Teacher Dignity: Learner Outcomes, TDMS, and the 2010/11 Budget (HakiElimu, 2010). Fundamental approaches to increasing the quantity and quality of teachers were outlined, namely:

1) Providing incentives for teachers posted in remote schools.
2) Upgrading licensed and paraprofessional secondary school teachers.
3) Ensuring opportunities for professional growth through in-service training.

There is a teacher crisis in Tanzania. Rural schools are sorely understaffed. Media reports of schools with one teacher for 100 students have recently been verified by the government’s own research (URT, 2010g). The government continues to rightfully allocate more new teachers to rural areas, but this has little impact as many of them don’t report to their posts or leave within the first year. In 2008, almost 40% of new teacher graduates didn’t even enter the teaching workforce. This, combined with transfers of rural teachers to urban schools, meant rural areas only received 35% of the new teachers the government planned to send them whereas urban areas ultimately received more than twice as many new teachers as planned (URT, 2010g). The shortage of teachers in rural areas cannot be overcome if these trends continue. Remote incentives are popularly used in neighboring countries to help address this issue. Typically in the
form of salary increases but also including flat hardship allowances or earlier promotion opportunities, remote incentives may prove vital to retaining teachers in rural areas.

To cope with this teacher shortage, schools, particularly community secondary schools, are taking in unqualified staff to teach. To be qualified to teach at a secondary school, one needs a diploma or degree, qualifications that can be found in almost all government secondary school teachers. On the other hand, however, almost 30% of teachers at community secondary schools are unqualified, having only a license or having a Form VI education (URT, 2010g). A teacher upgrading program is needed to further educate these unqualified teachers so that they may return to the classroom with the appropriate knowledge and skills to teach secondary school students.

Finally, providing teachers with opportunities for continued professional growth such as in-service training will also ensure the desired quality of education is met. Teachers need consistent and ongoing training not only to remain accurately updated on curriculum changes and to advance their own capacities but also because in-service training helps address another challenge in schools—teacher absenteeism. A large study surveyed schools in May 2008 and uncovered an average of 10% of primary school teachers and 13% of secondary school teachers as being absent for the entire month. In some secondary schools, as many as 70% of the teachers were absent. Many of these teachers were on study or sick leave, but in a number of cases, teachers were absent for reasons not even known by the head teacher/master (URT, 2010g). While in-service training, which temporarily removes teachers from schools, may seem counter-intuitive as a solution to teacher absenteeism, such professional growth opportunities ultimately help keep teachers in the classroom by increasing their competence in their careers and keeping them more personally invested in their profession. In-service training has positive influences on teachers and motivates them to continue fully contributing their strengths towards the betterment of the students they teach.

The Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (MoEVT) has recently taken positive steps toward the provision of in-service training. In February 2011, after years of policies and plans in place discussing the provision of large-scale in-service training, it may finally be becoming a reality as the Minister for Education and Vocational Training, Dr. Shukuru Kawambwa, announced that almost all primary school teachers, 156,000 of them, will undergo in-service training in the areas of science and mathematics (Mugarula, 2011). This comes after years of work between MoEVT and UNICEF and more recent advocacy efforts by HakiElimu.

All three of these strategies—remote incentives, upgrading, and in-service training—remain vital to improving the quality of education in Tanzania. These measures and more can be found in a government strategy called the Teacher Development and Management Strategy (TDMS) but for the most part remain largely unimplemented. Volume I of Restoring Teacher Dignity discusses TDMS and how it may be realized. In terms of the recent Form IV failures, these issues may have the most direct impact on learner outcomes and student performance.

This second volume of Restoring Teacher Dignity continues to look at factors affecting learner outcomes in terms of not only how improving them can recover the quality of education Tanzanian students receive but also how addressing them can revive the teaching profession as a whole. In reality, teacher welfare and learner outcomes are not strictly separate, and when a decline in one is seen, it is not surprising to see a decline in the other. The government needs to recognize that investments in teachers—whether through training, working conditions, or salaries—are not only investments in these individual civil servants but investments in Tanzanian children and the future of the nation.
Thus, this second volume continues the dialogue on how to improve the quality of education in Tanzania by concentrating on teachers themselves. How can such increased enrollment be matched by an equal increase in teaching staff? How can it be made certain that this teaching staff is not simply adequate numbers of adults standing in front of classrooms but competent, qualified individuals with the capacity to endow Tanzanian children with an effective education? And how, once these teachers are recruited, trained, and hired, can it be ensured that they have adequate living and working conditions that contribute to retaining them in their professions rather than acting as incentives to leave? It is this final question on which the following discussion focuses. This is done by looking more closely at two components that are currently plaguing the teaching profession and the education system in general in Tanzania: teaching materials and teacher housing.

2. Building a Teaching Environment

2.1 Teacher Retention

Teacher attrition, that is, teachers abandoning the teaching profession before retirement age, is a problem in many Sub-Saharan countries and elsewhere. While it incorporates the early loss of teachers for any reason, including involuntary reasons such as early death from illness, teacher attrition is driven mostly by teachers seeking out better work elsewhere. This may be for higher pay, but it also relates to other working conditions, as revealed by a study on secondary education in Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Madagascar, Uganda, and Tanzania:

Teachers indicate that, although higher salaries would encourage better performance, improvements in conditions of service are also very important in promoting job satisfaction, motivating teachers, and promoting retention.  
(Mulkeen, Chapman, DeJaeghere, Leu, & Bryner, 2005, p. v)

In part, teacher retention is affected by economic factors, as teachers make rational economic decisions about their careers and seek better paid work where they can. However, there is also considerable evidence that teachers feel their work is becoming increasingly stressful and that their status is falling (Macdonald 1999, 839). There is evidence, for example, that teaching conditions have deteriorated drastically in Senegal, Burkina Faso, and Mali, with an insufficient supply of student textbooks and teaching materials, inadequate equipment, poor teaching and living accommodation, and a high number of students per classroom (Caillods 2001, 143–44).

(Mulkeen et al., 2005, p. 11)

Insufficient teaching materials are a major disincentive to the profession. How can teachers do their jobs without the appropriate materials? How could doctors do their jobs without medical equipment? How could mechanics do their jobs without tools? Every profession requires its own equipment. Trying to perform that job without the appropriate materials is very frustrating, and for people in that situation, it isn’t very long before they start thinking about leaving and looking for another job.

Due to its implication on teacher retention, the provision of teaching materials is recommended by the above study as one of the strategies for keeping teachers in the profession. It claims, “Improvement of conditions of service for teachers is a promising way of increasing teacher morale, making the profession more attractive, enhancing retention of teachers, and improving
the quality of teaching and learning,” and succinctly states, “Provide teachers with better resources for good teaching” (Mulkeen et al., 2005, p. 11).

Likewise, the lack of housing causes teachers to rethink their profession and perhaps look for alternatives. When teachers are posted to various schools and communities, it’s natural for them to expect the government to uphold its part of the agreement, which is that they will be provided proper accommodation when they report to their posts. Instead, when some of them report, they find make-shift accommodation or houses that are below standard. At other times, they may be offered nothing and be forced to rent accommodation themselves. Across East Africa, housing is an important incentive for teachers, particularly for those teaching in rural areas, female teachers, and new teachers:

A second major incentive for teachers to locate in rural areas is the provision of teacher housing. Where teachers cannot live near the school, they are likely to spend a lot of time traveling, often to the detriment of their school work. Housing is particularly important for female teachers. In Malawi, official education data reveal a strong association between the availability of housing in an area and the presence of female teachers in the school. Similarly in Uganda, a recent study on teacher attrition considers the provision of housing to be a key factor in ensuring teacher retention, especially in rural areas.

(Mulkeen & Chen, 2008, p. 23)

The loss of teachers to the teaching profession is rarely distributed evenly across the teaching force. Attrition is highest in geographical locations where living conditions are extremely poor, harsh, or expensive, or where teachers do not feel comfortable with the local ethnicity, customs, or language (Macdonald 1999, 838). Attrition rates are also higher in the early years of a teaching career.

(Mulkeen et al., 2005, p. 11)

In this way, the lack of housing contributes not only to teacher attrition but also to the deficiency of teachers in rural areas and ultimately to the lower quality of education being provided in these areas. As evident, both teacher housing and teaching materials have deeper implications on some of the more complex issues currently hindering the education system in Tanzania.

2.2 Continuously Improved Teaching Conditions as a Right

Moreover, working conditions of teachers as being discussed here are not only important components to improving the quality of education but also constitute a rights-based issue. A number of human rights agreements, particularly those concerning the right to education, that the government of Tanzania have signed and ratified, refer explicitly to the obligation of governments to continually improve the working conditions of teachers. In 1976, Tanzania acceded to the United Nations International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, one of the most fundamental human rights agreements on the planet. Concerning the right to education, it states the following:
This concept appears again in the Draft Principles and Guidelines on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights, a document that is currently being drafted and that, if adopted by the African Union, will provide fuller meaning to the rights and government obligations as laid out by the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights. Originally adopted by the Organization of African Unity (since replaced by the African Union) in 1981 and ratified by Tanzania in 1984, the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights states, “Every individual shall have the right to education” (OAU, 1981, §17). The Draft Principles and Guidelines on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights flushes out exactly what this right to education in Article 17 means for the members of the African Union. Amongst other things, it also establishes obligations concerning teachers’ working conditions:

57. The rights in article 17 impose, amongst others, the following obligations on States parties: …

ii. To…continuously improving the conditions of service…of teaching staff.

(ACHPR Commission, 2009)

Teaching materials and housing, as parts of the material conditions of teaching staff, must be provided not only for the reasons already mentioned in sections above but also because they are obligations to the right to education which the Government of Tanzania has agreed to in various human rights covenants.

3. Teaching Materials—Commitment and Streamlined Transfers

The importance of teaching materials and housing is well known by those orchestrating the ongoing development of the Tanzanian education system. They are primary components of the plans central to this development: the Primary Education Development Programme (PEDP) and the Secondary Education Development Programme (SEDP), both of which are currently in their second phases. PEDP II is a five-year government program to develop the primary education sector from 2007 to 2011. SEDP I, a similar five-year government program but for the development of secondary education, ran from 2004 to 2009, while SEDP II was recently launched to be implemented from 2010 to 2015. These programs set very specific targets for improving the availability of teaching materials and teacher housing.

Despite such well developed plans and commitments concerning the improvement of teaching materials and construction of teacher housing, analyses reveal that the will to provide some of these most crucial of educational inputs has been shockingly low. Implementation reports, education statistics, budget speeches from the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training, and the national budget cumulatively paint a picture of what some may see as outright neglect of the education system. These matters need to be rectified immediately if the Tanzanian education...
system is to provide a sustainable teaching and learning environment that results in adequate, qualified teachers and quality learner outcomes.

3.1 Teaching Material Commitments

Concerning teaching and learning materials, PEDP II states:

The quality of education is enhanced by availability of relevant and quality teaching and learning materials that are also gender responsive. Appropriate textbooks are one of the crucial factors in successful learning.

(URT, 2006b, p. 22)

With this in mind, it sets up four objectives related to teaching and learning materials:

- To facilitate teachers and pupils to prepare and use teaching and learning aids;
- To provide sufficient and relevant instructional materials for all pupils in the school;
- To provide sufficient instructional materials to support curriculum requirements;
- To provide conducive environment for teaching and learning.

(URT, 2006b, p. 22)

Of everything potentially included in a teaching and learning environment, the provision of textbooks to classrooms is leaned on most heavily by PEDP II. It establishes a target for number of textbooks it aspires to reach, which is at least one textbook for each student by 2010 as opposed to the national average in 2005 which was only one textbook for every three students (URT, 2006b, p. 23).

In order to achieve these objectives, teacher materials are to be provided through a specific funding mechanism called the capitation grant. This grant consists of funds sent from the central government to primary and secondary schools. The amount for the grant is meant to be calculated on a per-student basis—schools, via district councils, report to the central government the total student enrollment, and the central government sends capitation grants to schools, via the district councils, based on the enrollment. For government primary schools, PEDP II stipulates that capitation grant is to equate to Tsh. 10,000 per student per year (URT, 2006b, p. 44). This Tsh. 10,000 is to be used according the following breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Capitation Grant Expenditure Breakdown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks, teaching guides, supplementary reading materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalk, exercise books, pens, pencils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination paper, purchase and printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capitation Grant</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from URT, 2006b, p. 48)
With enrollment in government primary schools in recent years being above 8.2 million students (URT, 2011a), at least Tsh. 82 billion per year should have been provided in the form of capitation grants.

Likewise, the national plan for secondary education emphasizes the need for teaching and learning materials and sets up a capitation grant to provide them. For government secondary schools, capitation grant is set at Tsh. 25,000 per student per year, according to both SEDP I and SEDP II (URT, 2004a, p. 46; 2010d, p. 19). While there is not a detailed guideline as to its uses as for primary schools, the secondary school capitation grant is nevertheless intended for teaching and learning materials. SEDP II has gone further in specifying that 50% of the capitation grant is to be used to purchase textbooks (URT, 2010d, pp. 20-21). With enrollment in government secondary schools averaging about 1 million students in recent years, an average of about Tsh. 25 billion in capitation grants should have been disbursed annually according to SEDP.

In sum, capitation grants over recent years as called for by government policies can be summarized as below. As the capitation grant for the upcoming fiscal year is budgeted in the middle of the calendar year and academic year, the enrollment figures of that year are used to calculate the capitation grant budget for the incoming year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary Education</th>
<th>Secondary Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government primary school enrollment (students)</td>
<td>Capitation grants to be provided as per PEDP II (Tsh. 10,000/student) (based on preceding year's enrollment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8,235,432</td>
<td>78,796,880,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>8,296,608</td>
<td>82,354,320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>8,313,080</td>
<td>82,966,080,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8,267,026</td>
<td>83,130,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>8,200,651</td>
<td>82,670,260,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(URT, 2006b, 2010d, 2011a)

### 3.2 Teaching Material Fulfillments

The little, late, and leaked disbursement of capitation grants is a widely discussed topic in the education sector, among the government, research institutions, civil society organizations, teachers, and citizens in general. The provision of funds by the central government is known to fall short of plan. Though they are fully intended for schools, the funds are passed through from the central government to district councils, at which point it appears “leakages” occur, causing schools to rarely receive the full amount. And, they arrive to schools late because of late release from the central government and delays at district councils (more on this discussed below).

The following of this money is often conducted through public expenditure tracking surveys (PETS). While they typically provide financial snapshots (one or two fiscal years) of the selected survey areas, they do not usually look at longer multi-year periods of those issues for the nation as a whole. While it is absolutely vital to track funds traveling from the central government to ensure that they are fully received by schools, this report seeks to provide information that is not typically been provided by PETS, that is, information on the total trend of central government fulfillments of its commitment to provide the capitation grant over recent years.
Below is a chart comparing the capitation grant commitments as seen above with the actual level of fulfillment:

![Chart 1: Total Capitation Grant Commitments Fulfilled, 2007-2011](chart.png)

This information is visually represented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary Education</th>
<th>Secondary Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitments</td>
<td>Actual Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>78,796,880,000</td>
<td>25,978,639,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>82,354,320,000</td>
<td>45,507,836,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>82,966,080,000</td>
<td>56,269,162,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>83,130,800,000</td>
<td>45,559,566,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>82,670,260,000</td>
<td>23,161,111,184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary Education</th>
<th>Secondary Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitments</td>
<td>Actual Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>12,262,300,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>20,727,350,000</td>
<td>9,153,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>25,896,825,000</td>
<td>130,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>32,342,275,000</td>
<td>10,127,988,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>35,033,250,000</td>
<td>41,101,901,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This information is visually represented below:
As above, capitation grants sent to primary schools from the central government have averaged only about half of what they should have been, with last year’s capitation grant funding being the lowest in recent history. For secondary education, both the information and the actual execution of capitation grants are a bit more irregular. What is clear is that for the entire period of SEDP I (2005-2009) only 30% of the planned capitation grants was disbursed to secondary schools. As stated in the introduction of the SEDP II policy document:

Capitation grant of Tshs 20,223,591,000 was sent to all Government schools for teaching and learning materials. This amount gave an average of Tshs 7,634 per student per year. However, this amount did not match with the Tsh. 25,000 planned in SEDP I.

(URT, 2010d, p. 11)

However, as demonstrated in the table and charts above, there appears to be renewed government commitment to the secondary school capitation grant with the launch of SEDP II which started in 2011. More funds in the form of capitation grants have been disbursed in the first year of SEDP II than in all five years of SEDP I put together. While capitation grants for secondary schools totaled Tsh. 20 billion from 2005 to 2009, Tsh. 41 billion was released in 2011 alone.

While this is a good start in rectifying matters, for the vast majority of the last five years the government has nonetheless only been partially fulfilling its commitments to provide capitation grants to primary and secondary schools. Students in classrooms with few if any books and teachers trying to do their jobs in unequipped working environments are direct results of this.

### 3.3 Government Commitment

How can this situation be remedied? The first issue to be addressed is that of capitation grant allocation in the national budget. As above, the amount actually provided in the form of capitation grants typically falls far short of what is planned. This problem sometimes starts at the formation of the budget itself. In years past, local government councils have been directed by the Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs to budget for less than Tsh. 10,000 per
primary school student in their districts. For example, in the preparation of the 2009/10 budget, local governments were instructed to budget Tsh. 8,000 per primary school student (URT, 2009c, p. 42). Naturally, if the central government is actively planning to fall short of national policy targets, these targets will not be met by the national budget. This situation has since been rectified—the Ministry of Finance has since been directing local governments to budget the appropriate Tsh. 10,000 per primary school student (URT, 2010e, 2011d).

Similarly for secondary education, for years the Ministry of Finance has been instructing local governments to budget Tsh. 20,000 per secondary school student as capitation grant (URT, 2010e, 2011d), an amount 20% less than the policy of Tsh. 25,000 per secondary school student. Even after all of the pomp and circumstance following the launch of SEDP II (Athumani, 2011; Kimboy, 2011) and renewed government commitment to provide a capitation grant of Tsh. 25,000 per secondary school student, local governments were still instructed to only budget Tsh. 20,000 per student for the 2011/12 fiscal year (URT, 2011d). Right from the beginning, the central government was planning to cut SEDP II capitation grants by 20%.

Figure 1: Public Launch, Quiet Cuts

As seen in the previous section, this budget fortunately did not become a reality as LGAs were provided with an average of Tsh. 29,331 per secondary school student in 2011. However, the opposite happens as well: even if a full capitation grant amount is budgeted, it may not be provided. The budget passed by Parliament at the beginning of the year is often very different from the funds actually spent by the end of the year. The Government of Tanzania operates on a year-to-year cash budget in which the expenditures of a given fiscal year depend on the revenue of that year. When there are revenue shortfalls throughout the year, the approved budget expenditures are affected. The Government of Tanzania does well in trying to isolate the education sector from these revenue instabilities by giving it a high priority and attempting to provide its planned budget with the appropriate funds as much as possible.

Nonetheless, key items of the education budget can get cut. This happened to the primary education capitation grant in 2010 and 2011. Despite a planned budget of Tsh. 80 billion for the 2009/10 fiscal year as announced to Parliament and the nation by the former Minister for Education and Vocational Training, Prof. Jumanne Maghembe, in July of 2009 (URT, 2009d), the actual amount provided as capitation grants was half that at Tsh. 40 billion (URT, 2010b).

This drastic cut became a point of contention with education stakeholders at the 2010 Joint Education Sector Review held in September of that year. Not only did it raise issues of government commitment but also government integrity: in July 2009 during the Parliament
budget session the Ministry announced a budget of Tsh. 80 billion for capitation grants for 2009/10 (URT, 2009d), a year later in July 2010 again during the Parliament budget session it announced that Tsh. 80 billion had indeed been released as capitation grants (URT, 2010f), and then a couple of months later in September 2010 at the Joint Education Sector Review, a forum far less public than Parliamentary sessions, it revealed that only Tsh. 40 billion had been provided as capitation grants (URT, 2010b).

Figure 2: Public Success, Private Failure

To monitor capitation grant expenditures of Tsh. 80 billion equal to Tsh. 10,000 per student per year for improving education. These funds are aimed to be used to purchase teaching and learning materials, textbooks, maintenance, administration, and examinations in Councils;

In July 2009, the former Minister for Education Prof. Jumanne Maghembe tells Parliament and the nation that Tsh. 80 billion has been budgeted for primary school capitation grants for fiscal year 2009/10 (URT, 2009d, author’s translation).

During the period under review, Capitation Grant (CG) amounting to Tsh. 80,029,920,000 was budgeted. However, only Tsh. 39,893,815,800 was disbursed from Treasury to the LGAs. The LGAs disbursed the same amount to schools for purchasing of textbooks, other teaching and learning materials, school rehabilitation, internal examination and administration.

Two months later, in September 2010, the Education Sector Performance Report 2009/2010 written in August is presented at the Joint Education Sector Review, revealing that the actual amount disbursed for primary school capitation grants was only Tsh. 40 billion, less than half of what had been publicly stated (URT, 2010b).

This again happened in 2011 as another Tsh. 80 billion was budgeted for primary school capitation grants, but only Tsh. 23 billion was provided (URT, 2011c), except rather than stating these realities in Parliament, the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training and PMO-RALG chose to stay silent on the exact primary school capitation grant figures.

Before anything else, the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training needs to commit itself, both in seriousness and honesty, to fully provide capitation grants according to plan. This is possible. While the number of primary and secondary school students continues to grow, and the education budget is larger than ever, capitation grants are nevertheless smaller than in the past.¹ There are relatively few specific government funding mechanisms that get noticed and analyzed by the public, and the capitation grant is one of them. From the very beginning of budget formulation to when funds are released by the central treasury, the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training simply needs to give the capitation grant the high priority it deserves.

¹ While attempts were made to compare the capitation grant performance of the five years of PEDP II to that of the preceding five years of PEDP I, data from various sources, including annual performance reports, joint reviews, and disbursement records as reported by a public expenditure tracking survey, proved too contradictory. The general picture however suggests that not only more total funds but also more funds per student were provided during PEDP I.
3.4 Streamlined Transfers

As mentioned above, capitation grants are plagued not only by the small budget provisions from the central government but also by leakages along the way as they travel to schools. Just as teaching materials can hardly be procured without capitation grants, they also cannot be acquired if these funds are left misused, unused, or sidelined, never allowing them to reach the schools. Streamlining the capitation grant funding mechanism by transferring capitation grants from the central treasury directly to school accounts rather than through district councils is one way to ensure the funds arrive in full and more quickly.

Years of research covering both PEDP I and II have tracked the government’s primary mechanism for improving the availability of teaching and learning materials. In 2003, a pilot research of fifteen schools in six districts reported 95% of capitation grants as reaching schools from the central government, with little variance in capitation amounts school to school (Björkman & Madestam, 2003). Despite these relatively positive results, the following year a much wider survey of 210 schools in 21 districts, examining fiscal years 2002 and 2003, showed only 62% of capitation funds as reaching schools with some schools receiving as much as Tsh. 8,700 per student per year while others received as little as Tsh. 1,600 (REPOA & Ministry of Finance, Government of Tanzania, 2004).

More recently, the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training conducted its own public expenditure tracking survey (PETS) on the 2008 fiscal year, covering 283 primary schools and 75 secondary schools in 27 districts. For primary schools, the MoEVT PETS revealed a leakage of 8.3% (or Tsh. 3.2 billion lost at district councils) and an average capitation grant of Tsh. 4,189 per student (as opposed to the Tsh. 10,000 outlined by PEDP II) with some schools receiving as much as Tsh. 19,236 per student and others as little as Tsh. 1,260 per student. On average, there were 35 days between when the councils received capitation grants from the central treasury to when they were received by schools. Secondary schools averaged a capitation grant of Tsh. 11,130 per student (as opposed to the Tsh. 25,000 established by SEDP), and neither leakages nor delays were problems as these funds were directly deposited from the central government into schools’ accounts (URT, 2010g).

HakiElimu recently conducted its own PETS, covering 24 primary schools in six districts and spanning three fiscal years from 2008 to 2010. It showed an average capitation grant leakage of 11.7% and an average of Tsh. 4,736 per student reaching schools (HakiElimu, 2011b).

If left ignored, the issues of capitation grant leakages and delays, particularly those of primary schools, will continue to diminish teaching environments even if allocations are rectified. Though it is an option to attempt to ensure that education funds are appropriately transferred to the respective schools by perhaps providing district officials with capacity building workshops, the experts of the 2010 MoEVT PETS lean toward a more immediate and reliable recommendation to guarantee that education development funds reach schools with their intended amounts and sooner: transfer capitation grants directly from the central government to primary schools as was being done with secondary schools.

2 This is what the 2010 MoEVT PETS report calls the “learning grant.” The report uses the term “capitation grant” differently from how it is used in SEDP I, SEDP II, and Education Sector Review Reports. The 2010 MoEVT PETS report uses “capitation grant” to mean the combination of a “learning grant” and school fee subsidies. There seems to be no “learning grant” under the SEDP system; rather, what the report calls the “learning grant” seems to correlate directly to what is typically referred to as the capitation grant. To term “capitation grant” to effectively mean the combination of the capitation grant and school fee subsidies gives misleading results.
Speaking of capitation grants, the 2010 MoEVT PETS states, “To ensure that grants actually reach schools with the intended amount, they could be granted directly to schools rather than councils transferring the[em] at their own discretion” (p. 64). The MoEVT PETS sees the opportunity “to raise the level of allocation of these grants to schools by reducing the amount of school contributions managed by councils” (p. 64). Furthermore,

To address the above issues related to uneven distribution of grants and delays in transfers it suggests a revisit to the approach in allocation and transfers of grants to schools. One option similar to many other countries could be to allocate ‘block grants’ for non-wage inputs directly to schools (p. 76).

Experiencing circumstances similar to those of Tanzania, the education minister of Uganda recently enacted this very change. As reported by Kampala’s Daily Monitor,

To stop the abuse of free education funds, the minister said the government took a decision to start piloting remitting the money directly to school bank accounts, effective this year, with the aim of rolling out to the rest of the schools in the country. Currently, the money is sent to the districts—fuelling corruption in a bureaucratic process of release to government-aided schools.

(Mugerwa, 2010)

This approach of removing the district councils from the flow of funds between the central government and schools depends on “a functioning oversight system for primary schools”—an effective decision making arrangement and oversight function by the beneficiaries,” namely, “the students represented by their parents” (p. 76). Fortunately, as the MoEVT PETS discovered, this already exists in Tanzania. In its research, the PETS found that school committees were functional in 100% of the 283 primary schools surveyed, meeting an average of six times per year, with 100% of them publishing accounts and receipts (p. 76).

It appears Tanzania is ready to streamline the non-wage grant allocation system by removing the redundant and obstructive bureaucracies created by district councils in the distribution of capitation grants from the central level to schools. Though the assistance of district councils may have been necessary when schools did not have their own bank accounts or their own functioning oversight systems, times have changed, progress has been made, and district councils may now be removed from this process to ensure schools get capitation grants more fully and more timely.

Despite recommendations from its own research, primary school accounts and committees being capable of this change, and neighboring countries such as Uganda streamlining their own transfer process, the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training has actually done the opposite: instead of adjusting the primary education capitation grant funding stream to be more similar to that of secondary education by transferring capitation grants directly from the central treasury to primary schools, it has changed the secondary education capitation grant funding stream to be more similar to that of primary education by transferring capitation grants first to district councils before they are forwarded to secondary schools.

No doubt the problems of leakages and delays that were plaguing primary school capitation grants are now plaguing those of secondary schools. The Ministry of Education and Vocational Training must heed the call made by education stakeholders at last year’s Joint Education Sector Review held in September 2010 who called for:
Funding to be disbursed on time so that schools can buy the resources they need for the academic year. To support this, the government should consider transferring capitation grants directly to schools rather than through councils. (URT, 2010c)

4. Teacher Housing—Good Governance and Full and Direct Transfers

Just as teaching materials and capitation grants are thoroughly developed by leading education programs such as PEDP and SEDP, so is the construction of teacher housing. And just as the provision of teaching materials is falling sorely short of expectations, so is the construction of teacher housing, only more so. In a centrally-administered system in which teachers are posted to schools by the ministry, the lack of appropriate housing, particularly in rural areas, will continue to tarnish the teaching profession as a whole and act as a substantial disincentive for those considering entering or staying in the profession.

4.1 Teacher Housing Commitments

PEDP and SEDP establish targets and funding mechanisms for the construction of teacher houses. Concerning teacher housing, “PEDP recognizes provision of teachers’ houses as an incentive for teachers in particular to those employed and deployed in the difficult and hard to reach and remote areas” and aims to provide 50% of newly-recruited teachers with housing (URT, 2006b, p. 16).

To meet these objectives, PEDP II sets annual construction targets for primary school teachers’ houses. Two-thousand houses are to have been built in 2007, and 21,936 built in each following year (URT, 2006b, p. 14). PEDP II estimates the cost of constructing a single teacher’s house to be Tsh. 8.75 million. As with all school infrastructure developments under PEDP II, 20% of the cost is meant to be met by communities, so for teacher housing construction, Tsh. 7 million per house is to be provided by the government while the remaining Tsh. 1.75 million is to be supplied by the local community (URT, 2006b, pp. 38, 48). Thus, the funds to be released by the government annually for the construction of teacher housing would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary school teachers' houses to be built</th>
<th>Funds to be provided by the government for teacher housing construction (Tsh.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>14,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>21,936</td>
<td>153,552,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>21,936</td>
<td>153,552,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>21,936</td>
<td>153,552,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>21,936</td>
<td>153,552,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(URT, 2006b, p. 14, 47)

As mentioned above, these houses are to be constructed for teachers who are working in remote areas, which PEDP II estimates to be 75% of the teaching workforce (URT, 2006b, p. 47). Thus, in accordance with the actual number of government primary school teachers in recent years, the total number of teachers’ houses required in the Tanzanian primary education system, as suggested by PEDP II, is as follows:
Table 5: Primary School Teacher Housing Total Targets, 2007-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of government primary school teachers</th>
<th>Total teacher housing requirements$^1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>151,231</td>
<td>113,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>149,433</td>
<td>112,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>151,476</td>
<td>113,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>159,081</td>
<td>119,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>167,111</td>
<td>125,333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(URT, 2006b, 2011a)

As for secondary education, SEDP I and II likewise stress the construction of teachers’ houses. SEDP I focused on the construction of teacher housing as part of expanding two-stream schools to four-stream schools and building new O-level schools in underserved areas (URT, 2004a, p. 7). SEDP II concentrates on providing adequate housing to these community secondary schools as well as schools in rural areas. It aims for community secondary schools to have “2,000 housing units built every year throughout the programme time” and “900 schools especially in the rural areas to have at least 2 staff houses by 2014” (URT, 2010d, p. 28, 37).

As for the cost of implementing this construction plan, SEDP I sets the unit cost of a single teacher’s house at Tsh. 12 million (URT, 2004a, p. 33). Again, communities are meant to contribute to this construction, but this time 25% according to SEDP I (URT, 2004a, p. 41). So, for each house built under SEDP I, the government was to provide Tsh. 9 million. SEDP II has a radically different unit cost of a teacher’s house, setting it at Tsh. 40.3 million (URT, 2010d, p. 68). It is not stated why the unit cost is now more than three times what it was during SEDP I. This may be due to a larger housing plan, a response to cost underestimations during SEDP I, or a reflection of current and projected inflation of the price of building materials. As in all three of these education policy documents, SEDP II includes a footnote (though not in as fine of print as the others) at the end of the document explaining that communities are presumed to contribute to school construction costs, only this time their assumed contribution has risen to 30% of the costs as opposed to the 20% in PEDP II and 25% in SEDP I (URT, 2010d, p. 92). So of the Tsh. 40.3 million estimated to be required by each new teacher’s house in SEDP II, the government is to provide Tsh. 28.21 million.

The total secondary school teacher housing construction targets and their respective government budgets are summarized below:

Table 6: Secondary School Teacher Housing Construction Policy Commitments, 2007-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Secondary school teachers’ houses to be built</th>
<th>Funds to be provided by the government for teacher housing construction (Tsh.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3,890</td>
<td>35,010,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6,337</td>
<td>57,033,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>11,566</td>
<td>104,094,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>21,240,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>56,420,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(URT, 2004a, 2010d)

$^3$ Although PEDP II directly states the total teacher housing requirements (p. 47) as based on the anticipated total number of teachers, the actual number of government primary school teachers is less than that anticipated by PEDP II. Thus the total teacher housing requirements in this chart are different than those listed on p. 47 of PEDP II.
Unlike PEDP II, which provides estimations of total houses required to accommodate the teaching labor force, SEDP I and II only dictate the number of houses to be built each year without stating how many are needed cumulatively.

4.2 Teacher Housing Fulfillments

Even more disturbing are the actual efforts to build teacher houses, which make a 30-50% provision of capitation grants look like a huge success. In recent years, there has been as low as just 1% of the teacher housing construction commitments fulfilled. The table below compares what was planned to be built according to government policy to what was actually built according to government implementation reports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary school teachers’ houses to be built</th>
<th>Primary school teachers’ houses actually built</th>
<th>Percentage of commitment fulfilled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,961</td>
<td>148%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>21,936</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>21,936</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>21,936</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>21,936</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(URT, 2006b, 2008c, 2009b, 2010b, 2011c)

While 21,936 teacher houses have been planned to be built annually over recent years, only 277 were built in 2008 and 293 in 2010, each only about 1% of the construction target. And while it would take over Tsh. 153 billion shillings per year to build these 21,936 houses annually, the funds allocated for this activity were only Tsh. 3.2 billion in 2008 and Tsh. 1.4 billion in 2010 (URT, 2008d, 2010b). These budget allocations are only 1-2% of what was planned for just a few years prior.

Of course when annual construction targets are missed by such extents, the primary education system will not progress in terms of total actual teacher houses required, and the shortage will continue. The table below demonstrates the percentage of the housing requirement for primary school teachers that has been in recent years. Due to the availability of information, only the years 2008 to 2010 are presented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total teacher housing requirements</th>
<th>Total teacher houses actually available</th>
<th>Teacher houses actually available as a percentage of requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>112,075</td>
<td>38,200</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>113,607</td>
<td>39,259</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>119,311</td>
<td>41,073</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(URT, 2006b, 2008b, 2009a, 2010a)

As in the table above, less than a third of the houses required has actually been available to teachers in recent years.

For secondary schools, data on teacher housing is not as thoroughly reported as with the primary education sector. From the period of 2007-2009, whereas 21,793 houses were to be built, it appears that about 2,179 were actually constructed (URT, 2008c, 2009b; Omari & Moshi, 2009). This represents an achievement of about 10% of the SEDP target. In budgetary terms, actual funds provided have fallen sorely below commitments. For example, in 2009, when the
national plan called for Tsh. 139 billion to be provided for the construction of secondary school teachers’ houses (as in Table 6 above), only Tsh. 8.8 billion, or 6%, was released (URT, 2009b, p. 26). The meager implementation of the teacher housing construction components of both PEDP II and SEDP has lead to identical dilemmas: severe housing shortages for teachers in both primary and secondary schools.

4.3 Good Governance

As with capitation grants, there seem to be two issues surrounding the problem of teacher housing construction: budget allocation and implementation. To address the problem of budget allocations, a similar solution exists for teacher housing construction as does for capitation grants. As capitation grants require government commitment to remedy their allocation problems, teacher housing construction needs good governance to ensure the appropriate budget is allocated.

The problem of the teacher housing construction budget relates to the overarching problem of the total development budgets in the education sector in recent years. In the primary education sector, when the implementation of PEDP I, from 2002 to 2006, is compared to the implementation of PEDP II, from 2007 to 2011, the realities of the two programs are as different as night and day. Whereas implementation of PEDP I often saw the meeting and sometimes even the surpassing of targets, PEDP II is regularly falling drastically short, with implementation rates often as low as single-digit percentages, as seen above. For example, in 2005 PEDP I constructed 3,528 (111%) of the 3,169 intended teacher houses, but in 2008 PEDP II only constructed 277 (1%) when the plan called for 21,936 (URT, 2006a as in HakiElimu, 2007; URT, 2006b, 2008d). The table below shows these huge differences between PEDP I and PEDP II. In total, while PEDP I surpassed its teacher housing construction target by fulfilling 113% of its commitments over its five years, PEDP II has fallen severely short, accomplishing only 5% of its total teacher housing construction target. In terms of real houses built, PEDP I built 17,094 houses in five years while PEDP II built only 4,742.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>PEDP I</th>
<th>PEDP II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3,262</td>
<td>21,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>21,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3,169</td>
<td>3,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>4,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>21,936</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>21,936</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>21,936</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>21,936</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One possible explanation of the huge difference between the two phases of PEDP is budgetary: PEDP I received far more development funds than PEDP II is receiving. On average, PEDP I received Tsh. 109 billion in development allocations per year, while PEDP II only received Tsh. 12 billion annually, just 11% of PEDP I’s development funds. The overall trend in PEDP development funds is as below. Due to the availability of budget information, some funds are expressed as their budget allocations, others as their actual expenditures.

This is not a simple reflection of dwindling funds; rather it is the result of budget allocation priorities. While PEDP and the primary education sector in whole continue to receive increasing overall funds year after year, PEDP’s development budget has nevertheless been shrinking. The chart below puts the development budget of PEDP within the overall budget for primary education:
The above chart literally visualizes the relative non-existence of PEDP development funds over recent years: While PEDP development funds indeed existed from 2008-2011, their small amounts can’t even be seen when compared with the funds for primary education as a whole. If it’s not for development, where is this other money going? The surplus portions of the primary education budget are comprised of such expenditures as teacher salaries and benefits, capitation grant, national examinations, other charges, and recurrent expenditures of the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training. On the surface, however, the increase in non-development primary education funds does not reflect the actual increase in these non-development inputs: teaching staff and enrollment have each increased by about 40% since 2002, capitation grant has actually been lower during some PEDP II years than during PEDP I, and teachers complain of low salaries and unpaid arrears. Nevertheless, the 2008 PEDP II non-development budget is four times that of the average of PEDP I. Further research is required to know exactly where this money is going, particularly that disbursed under the large, general category of ‘other charges.’

This is a major question of government priorities. While PEDP I was under a project funding scheme, meaning donors provided funds specifically earmarked to only go towards PEDP I, PEDP II is funded by General Budget Support (GBS), meaning the government receives donor funding and decides itself how it should be used. Do such drastic reductions in PEDP development expenditures in the context of an ever-increasing primary education budget suggest that the development of the primary education sector has been the priority of donors but not that of the government? Or are these the results of avoiding another large loan from the World Bank which made up the largest portion of foreign financing for PEDP I? Or, as others in the sector believe, were PEDP II development funds forgone to facilitate the government’s secondary school building initiative that began in 2005?
This becomes an issue of governance because it seems that money is available, both within the education budget as well as other parts of the national budget, for the construction of teachers’ houses, but it is not being allocated to this activity. At the central level, one only needs to look at how much money the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training alone is spending on travel (in and out of country) and fuel to get a picture of how much money is actually available. Chart 5 shows a five-year history of how much money the Ministry of Education has been budgeting for travel and fuel compared to how much the entire government has been budgeting for the development of primary education. As can be seen, during the last three years the amount allocated for travel and fuel of just this single ministry actually outweighed the funds the total government dedicated to the development of the country’s entire primary education system.

Similarly, when one looks into the government budget, one can see that while the government isn’t providing much money for the construction of teachers’ houses, it is providing ample sums for the construction of homes for Regional Commissioners (RCs) and District Commissioners (DCs). Regional development budgets are littered with line items such as “Construction of DC’s House,” “Rehabilitation of DC’s House,” “Rehabilitation of RC’s House.” Not only are there large sums of money put into these budget lines, but no matter how much money is dumped into them, such construction and rehabilitation continues year after year. For example in Mtwara Region, Tsh. 395 million was spent on rehabilitation of the RC’s house in 2008/09, another Tsh. 300 million was spent on this same rehabilitation in 2009/10, Tsh. 232.9 million was again approved by Parliament in the 2010/11 budget for this rehabilitation, and then the Mtwara Region again asked Parliament for Tsh. 468.45 million for again rehabilitating the RC’s house in the 2011/12 budget (URT, 2010i, 2011f). That’s almost Tsh. 1.4 billion spent on rehabilitating the Mtwara RC’s house just over the last four years! What kind of house is this?

During the same period, only Tsh. 143 million was budgeted by Mtwara Region for the Primary Education Development Programme, and that was in 2008/09—since then there have been no funds designated to PEDP in Mtwara Region’s budget.
Mtwarra Region is only an example of this budget trend. In sum, regional governments have either budgeted or spent over Tsh. 15 billion on RC and DC housing construction and rehabilitation since 2008. Considering there are currently 21 Regional Commissioners and 134 District Commissioners in Tanzania, it may be roughly estimated that about Tsh. 97 million in public funds has been invested into each RC’s and DC’s house since 2008.

While regions are not allocating funds for the development of primary education in their budgets, this does not mean they are not receiving PEDP development funds. These funds are still sent and received as development grants from the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training and the Prime Minister’s Office – Regional Administration and Local Government (PMO-RALG). The issue of PEDP development funds in regional budgets is raised not merely as a question of availability but moreover as a question of good governance. The funds for both RC/DC housing construction/rehabilitation and PEDP in regional budgets historically come from local revenue, that is, taxpayers’ money. While regional governments have the power to use taxpayers’ money for the development of primary education in their constituencies, they have been using it mostly for the development of their own houses: Since 2008, regions have budgeted a total of Tsh. 6 billion in local revenue for the development of primary education while allocating Tsh. 15 billion in taxpayers’ money to the construction or rehabilitation of RC’s and DC’s homes. This seems to be an exact opposite reflection of the needs of the citizens paying these taxes.

While 155 RCs and DCs nationwide are getting their homes continually re-constructed and rehabilitated (or at least that is what the money is meant to go towards), housing for 159,081 teachers, the current government primary school teacher workforce, seems to go neglected. For example, in 2010 Tsh. 3.2 billion was spent on RCs’ and DCs’ homes (URT, 2011f) while the same amount was made available for the construction of primary school teachers’ homes nationwide (URT, 2010b, p. 26), averaging about Tsh. 20 million per RC/DC house and Tsh. 20,000 per teacher house. RCs, DCs, and government school teachers are all civil servants—is it fair that one class should receive Tsh. 20 million and another Tsh. 20,000 for the same type of provision? Or does this trend only point further to questions and concerns about RCs and DCs serving as politicians rather than civil servants (Shivji, 2006; Lazaro, 2011)?

While the specific annual budget data for teacher housing construction may not be available every year, the trend in RC and DC housing construction and rehabilitation can nonetheless be compared to all available primary education development funds to help further visualize government priorities. As can be seen in the chart at the right, with its drastic decrease, the entire PEDP development budget has converged with the RC/DC housing construction/rehabilitation budget, meaning that in recent years the government of Tanzania has been budgeting about the same amount for the development of the nation’s entire primary education system as it has for the construction and rehabilitation of RCs’ and DCs’ houses!

Chart 8: Primary Education Development vs. RC & DC Housing Construction & Rehabilitation

(URT, 2006d, 2007c, 2008f, 2009f, 2010i, 2011f)
Clearly these trends raise concerns about governance. Is the government appropriately using public funds? Are the government’s priorities, in terms of where it puts public funds, the people’s priorities? With budget allocations such as these, can the government say it is working to improve the quality of education in Tanzania? With this type of commitment to educational development, is the government of Tanzania fulfilling the international agreements it has made that “the material conditions of teaching staff shall be continuously improved”? The first step to resolving any of this is for those within the government to ensure good governance—that public funds, both those already allocated to the education sector and some of those that are not, are appropriately used for the public wellbeing, particularly in terms of improving the quality of education.

4.4 Full and Direct Transfers

Other than the inappropriately small budget allocation for it, another large obstacle blocking the construction of teachers’ houses is the use of that allocation. Even the small amount of money that is released by the central treasury to district councils for teacher housing is often not fully utilized. For example, Tsh. 7.1 billion of the Tsh. 10.3 billion available for constructing teachers’ houses in 2007/08 was actually carried over from the 2006/07 fiscal year as it had not been used (URT, 2008c). In 2009/10, Tsh. 1.8 billion of the Tsh. 3.2 billion for teacher housing was carried over from the previous year, and even though Tsh. 3.2 billion was available in 2009/10, only Tsh. 1.7 billion was used (URT, 2010b).

The cause for this needs to be understood. It may be because the majority of these funds arrive in district councils’ bank accounts late in the year, making them difficult to be fully utilized before the close of the fiscal calendar (see chart on next page). Or, it may be part of the overall financial management problems in most district councils, resulting in the vast underspending of all types of development grants received by councils as evidenced by Controller and Auditor General reports in recent years (HakiElimu, 2011a). The inefficiencies in development grants can be clearly seen when communities uphold their part of the agreement by contributing to 20% of the construction in the form of sand, bricks, and lumber, but the incomplete buildings sit for years waiting for the district council to release development funds to complete the roofs and cement plastering. It is difficult to know what exactly is impairing this funding mechanism, but what is known is that schools need teachers’ houses, money exists for their construction, but they’re not being built.

The recent MoEVT PETS also revealed these inefficiencies. On top of its already meager funds transferred from the central government to district councils, on average an entire 25% of the funds never made it from the districts to the schools the MoEVT PETS surveyed (see chart below). If that average is similar nationwide, it means Tsh. 3 billion in school development funds were unused in 2008 (URT, 2010g, p. 61).
As with all averages, there are highs and lows that are hidden. In this case, the low was 0%: While councils reported having distributed development grants to 48% of the schools surveyed, only 18% of the schools reported ever receiving such grants (URT, 2010g, p. 61), meaning 82% of the schools had not received any development funds from the government. The public expenditure tracking survey conducted by HakiElimu last year revealed that of the 24 primary schools surveyed, 17 had not received a single shilling in development funds for the last three years (HakiElimu, 2011b, p. 15). The complaints across the country of dilapidated classrooms and schools entirely lacking latrines make sense when these findings are considered: development of the primary school system will remain utterly neglected when the majority of primary schools are not even receiving development grants.

(URT, 2008f, 2010g)

As the MoEVT PETS found, the under-spending of education funds results in not only under-development but inequitable development. Even if initial budget allocations are equitably based, in-year reallocations mean those councils which spend more money receive more money while those which have not spent their education funds do not receive any more, so the quality of education is left to spiral downward in some areas while advancing in others:

While some councils received less than 50% of the amount budgeted due to low level of execution, some received 30% more than the amount budgeted i.e. during the fiscal year a reallocation of the Education Block Grants took place between councils due to different capacities in executing the amounts allocated (URT, 2010g, p. 67-68, emphasis in original).

The issue of available but unused development grants is not a school-level but a district-level problem, with perhaps some districts utilizing such grants but the majority of schools not receiving them. It is not difficult to find examples of unfinished classrooms or teachers’ houses on primary school campuses with the community having done their part in laying foundations and building walls, waiting sometimes years for the government to supply the means of roofing and plastering them.

![Figure 3: Stunted Growth](image)

Classrooms at Kwaraa Primary School in Babati Urban District remained unfinished for 5 years until a local religious organization took it upon itself to appeal to international assistance to begin roofing them.
Everything recommended above for the direct transfer of capitation grants likewise applies to teacher housing. Alongside capitation grants, development funds are included by the MoEVT PETS as funding streams that would be more efficient if directly connected to school accounts (URT, 2010g, p. 64). The financial infrastructure exists (banks, transfer capacities, and schools with designated development fund bank accounts), and, according to the MoEVT PETS, the oversight structures exist (active school committees and school boards) (URT, 2010g, p. 76). Directly transferring development funds from the central treasury to school bank accounts, while notifying councils of the transaction, allows them to be fully and immediately available rather than being derailed and delayed at the council level. Development grants provided by the central government can be more fully utilized if directly issued to schools, allowing school administrations to more timely complete development projects.

5. Conclusion

Evidence of the decline of the quality of Tanzania’s education system surrounds us. Government budgets, government implementation reports, teacher attrition rates, and drastic drops in examination performance all testify to this fact. The work that lies ahead is to no longer preach the problem but to start working towards solutions.

Some of the solutions discussed in this report are easy and immediately implementable; others are not. Directly transferring capitation and development grants from the central treasury to schools is equally as easy as transferring them from the central treasury to district councils, which the government already does. They are both simply bank transfers, except routing them directly to school bank accounts ensures a fuller and more timely receipt of these much needed funds. The central government has all the resources and power required to do this; it can be accomplished immediately, and it will improve the availability of teaching materials, textbooks, and teacher housing in both the primary and secondary education sectors.

Other solutions will take more time. Strengthening government commitment and good governance requires not only the central government but its various institutions, domestic and international organizations, and the general public. The first step is getting the information out to these stakeholders and simply demonstrating that things don’t have to be like this, an endeavor that has very much been the focus of this report. Accountability rarely happens behind closed doors. It is only through the access, analysis, and dissemination of the relevant information—information that can be sometimes out of reach physically, technologically, or bureaucratically—that ministries, Parliament, the international community, and Tanzania’s citizens can begin to demand for changes to be made.

Failing to address the issues raised in this report is effectively a prison sentence for the Tanzanian people. Quietly allowing the lack of teaching materials and housing to deter educators from the teaching profession will continue to negatively impact the education of Tanzania’s children; without critical-thinking capacities, problem-solving capabilities, basic literacy and numeracy competencies, and employable skills, the future generation of Tanzania is certain to be trapped in a cycle of poverty, underdevelopment, dependency, and repression.

The key to escaping this cycle is education, and in Tanzania’s case, this education for liberation must begin with restoring the dignity of teachers and their profession so as to attract and retain the most qualified individuals to effectively impart knowledge to the next generation. This can be done in part by providing teachers with the materials and housing required for them to do their jobs, and in fact these are some of their rights as agreed to in international and regional covenants ratified by Tanzania. The work that lies ahead is for domestic and international organizations, teachers, students, and citizens to make certain that central and local governments are acting on the recommendations of this report to ensure the current cycle of poverty is broken.
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This report was written in the wake of one of the greatest catastrophes in the recent history of Tanzanian education. Half of all Form 4 students failed the 2010 national examination. Despite sitting through four years of secondary education, 174,193 of the 352,840 students who took the exam either failed in every subject or got a single “D” out of the seven subjects tested and failed the rest (NECTA, 2011). The educational progress of these 174,193 members of the future generation of Tanzania has, for the most part, come to an end. Parents are confused, and the nation is shocked. The country is left questioning, “What has caused this?” and, “What urgent action needs to be taken?”

As in the first volume, this second volume of Restoring Teacher Dignity continues to look at factors of learner outcomes in terms of not only how improving them can recover the quality of education Tanzanian students receive but also how addressing them can revive the teaching profession as a whole. In reality, teacher welfare and learner outcomes are not strictly separate, and when a decline in one is seen, it is not surprising to see a decline in the other. The government needs to recognize that investments in teachers—whether through training, working conditions, or salaries—are not only investments in these individual civil servants but investments in Tanzanian children and the future of the nation.

Thus, this second volume continues the dialogue on how to improve the quality of education in Tanzania by concentrating on teachers themselves. How can the recent increased enrollment by matched by an equal increase in teaching staff? How can it be made certain that this teaching staff is not simply numbers of adults standing in front of classrooms but competent, qualified individuals with the capacity to endow Tanzanian children with an effective education? And how, once these teachers are recruited, trained, and hired, can it be ensured that they have adequate living and working conditions that contribute to retaining them in their professions rather than acting as incentives to leave? It is this final question on which the enclosed discussion focuses. This is done by looking more closely at two components that are currently plaguing the teaching profession and the education system in general in Tanzania: teaching materials and teacher housing.