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1. Executive Summary:

1.1 Overview of the Children’s Agenda
The Children’s Agenda (CA) is a coalition of local, national and international non-governmental (NGO) and civil society (CSO) organisations, UNICEF, and the Ministry of Community Development Gender and Children (MCDGC), who are committed to advocating and improving child rights in Tanzania. The CA is currently chaired by the Children’s Development Department of the MCDGC with the deputy chair occupied by an elected member from civil society (currently Compassion International), with UNICEF serving as secretariat.

Through a series of consultations involving children in 2009, analyses of the situation of children, and discussions among key government and CSO partners, the CA defined a series of focus areas as the basis for its advocacy engagement, referred to as the ‘The Top Ten Investments’. These include the following:

1. Invest to Save the Lives of Children and Women
2. Invest in Good Nutrition
3. Invest in Better Hygiene and Sanitation in Schools and Health Facilities
4. Invest in Early Childhood Development
5. Invest in Quality Education for all Children
6. Invest to Make Schools Safe
7. Invest to Protect Infants and Adolescent Girls from HIV
8. Invest to Reduce Teenage Pregnancy
9. Invest to Protect Children from Violence, Abuse, and Exploitation
10. Invest in Children with Disabilities

Influencing positive change in laws and government policies, services, and budgets relating to the Top Ten Investments constitute the long term goals of the CA. The interim outcomes of the CA, on which this evaluation focuses, are as follows:

- **Electoral advocacy**: Increased visibility of children’s issues amongst elected officials and electoral candidates;
- **Strategic partnerships**: Established child rights partnerships with Parliamentarians, Councillors and other key influencers;
- **Media engagement**: Increased/strengthened partnerships with mass media for child rights advocacy;
- **Child participation**: Strengthened and expanded opportunities for sustainable, quality child participation;
- **Building advocacy capacity**: Strengthened capacity for policy influence and budget advocacy.

1.2 Evaluation objectives
The purpose of this evaluation was to apply the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria and assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, interim outcomes and sustainability of the Children’s Agenda in its pursuit of advancing an advocacy agenda for child rights at national and sub national levels in
Tanzania between the period of 2010 and 2013. The evaluation makes recommendations for addressing these challenges with the objective of ensuring that the Children’s Agenda is fit for purpose in delivering upon its mandate.

The main questions of this evaluation are as follows:

1. To what extent have agreed activities taken place and interim outcomes achieved during the period 2010 to 2013, noting the absence of written plans in the 2010-2011 period?
2. How efficient and effective is the Children’s Agenda, including its activities and structure, with respect to the membership capacity of the coalition?
3. How efficient and effective is the Children’s Agenda, including its activities and structure, with respect to the capacity of the coalition as an entity in and of itself?
4. How relevant have the activities and structure of the Children’s Agenda been to the needs and goals of its members and to its ability to advocate for children’s rights?
5. Is the Children’s Agenda as it is currently structured sustainable over the longer-term?
6. In what ways has the Children’s Agenda supported advocacy efforts on behalf of marginalized populations and gender equity?
7. What are the weaknesses, strengths, constraints, opportunities, and lessons learnt since the implementation of the Children’s Agenda?
8. What is the capacity and reliability of existing monitoring and evaluation systems, and how can these systems be improved?

The formative evaluation covers the period 2010 to 2013, which is an extension of the original period (2010-2012) outline in the evaluation Terms of Reference. This was agreed upon by the CfBT evaluation team and UNICEF Tanzania staff because the year 2013 had been completed by the time the evaluation formally began in early 2014. The evaluation examines the degree to which the interim outcomes have been achieved, or expected to be achieved (effectiveness); how well the coalition network engaged with each other in order to see how productive, adaptive and in-line with its objectives the CA network was (efficiency); how the work of the CA is aligned with children’s priorities, legislative and policy agendas and how it compared to advocacy models of ‘best practice’ (relevance); the contribution of the CA and its members toward advancing a child rights agenda in Tanzania and the presence of a government chair that may enhance or reduce the CA’s influence (capacity). The evaluation also sought to capture unintended consequences produced through the coalition’s existence, and the probability of continued long-term benefits (sustainability). The evaluation was undertaken across four locations in Mainland Tanzania: Dar es Salaam, Dodoma, Mwanza and Mbeya, purposively selected for the geographic variedness.

In order to ensure the evaluation was prepared, accessed and communicated in accordance with globally recognised evaluations standards, the CfBT evaluation team followed the UNICEF-adapted UNEG evaluation report standards and structure.

1.3 Evaluation methodology
The formative evaluation employed participatory, non-experimental, mixed-methods techniques,  

---

1 Sustainability is understood as the ability of the CA to remain functional and effective with a decreased administrative and financial role of UNICEF.
seeking to engage members and constituents of the Children’s Agenda actively in the evaluation process. The approach was agreed to be non-experimental with a focus on relational aspects in which a range of variables could be considered to establish correlation rather than causation. The evaluation did not utilise a control group or comparison project and did not measure project impact. The approach used mixed methods drawing upon a variety of archival, quantitative, and qualitative methods to respond to the evaluation questions, since these allowed for the data to be contextualised and triangulated. However, as explained in the limitations (section 3.4) there were many setbacks to undertaking collecting of the more quantitative data. The evaluation data collection included semi-structured interviews with member and non-member stakeholders, parliamentarians and political party leaders, a CSO/NGO Survey, Focus Groups with children’s councils and Young Reporters Network members, document and archival review, and media tracking of print, social and some digital media.

1.4 Most important findings and conclusions
The main conclusions of this evaluation are as follows:

The CA was marginally successful in raising awareness of child rights issues with political candidates and the public at large in 2010. However, it was not successful in subsequently influencing party platforms and candidate policy commitments in such a way that lead to increased power and influence of children’s rights advocates in parliament or that lead to positive changes in government policies, services, and budgets that affected children.

The self-perception of CA members is that advocacy capacity among themselves is moderate to high, but the CA as a collective was not credited with this capacity; it was claimed that leadership direction, coordination, and resources were the “capacities” in need. Indeed, it appears that the strength of the CA coalition has suffered since 2011 due to lack of focus and leadership direction. While members say their commitment to child rights advocacy remains very high, the extent to which members communicate, share resources and capacities, and coordinate with each other, is low. As a result there is little perception that concerted effort to build external or partner capacity member capacity has increased as a result of CA activities cooperation or support.

The CA made considerable progress in terms of awareness of children’s rights among some parliamentarians and the public in 2010, but this momentum has faded. The CA has since struggled to make influential and effective partnerships at the national, regional, local government levels, and with other government ministries, political parties, or cultural and religious leaders.

The CA has, however, taken some efforts to establish partnerships with the media. Though it appears that these activities have not yet led to substantial media coverage of child rights issues or coalition events. Overall, the media analysis found that reporting on child welfare did not increase over the period reviewed (2010-2013) and that specific mention of the CA was extremely limited. Since 2010 there has been a slight decline in print reporting on child welfare issues each subsequent year. Furthermore, specific press releases and events led by the CA seem not to have been picked up in the media. Closer relationships with journalists’ organisations and editors, rather than individual journalists, are needed.
The CA has been instrumental in expanding the number of children’s councils, who seem to be focusing on advocating for abused, neglected, and trafficked children by reporting cases to local authorities. However, many of the children’s councils do not appear to be following MCDGC guidelines for establishing and running the councils with any consistency. Mechanisms for holding MPs and other elected officials to account for commitments to children’s rights and support for children’s and CA member’s participation in local and regional policy setting and budgeting processes are also needed.

The coalition model or group structure (rather than working through a series of individual organisations) should be considered a relative strength for this advocacy work, as is the sub-structure of the taskforce model. Admittedly it was difficult to assess if the coalition structure of the CA had been best suited to the Tanzania context since there is no comparable structure against which it can be compared. But given the many positive developments and successes of the CA, in particular those achieved in 2010 as well as the expressed benefits of local organisations partnering with larger international ones (both realised and potential) one has to conclude that the coalition structure has supported these successes. That said it appears that at the next level down, the working structure of the CA would benefit from some restructuring to enhance its capacity and effectiveness.

The self-perception of CA members is that advocacy capacity among them is moderate to high, but the CA as a collective was not credited with this capacity. The CA as a coalition itself considers that it has not been provided with necessary capacity by the CA. In other words, the CA acknowledges that it, as a coalition, has not been leveraged to the full potential. Instead, members claimed to have many of their capacities as individual members before joining the CA. To summarise the findings; two thirds of survey respondents and member interviews reported that they or staff in their organisations possessed more than 75% of the 11 advocacy capacities contained in the Advocacy Capacity Index. However, the vast majority (80%) of these reported that all the capacities they possessed (except for working with members of parliament) were not obtained or improved by the CA. Indeed, it appears that the strength of the CA coalition has suffered since 2011 due to lack of focus and direction and a lack of a well-functioning members ‘network’. While members say their commitment to child rights advocacy remains very high, the extent to which members communicate, share resources and capacities, and coordinate with each other, is low. As a result there is little perception that member capacity has increased as a result of CA cooperation or support.

The effectiveness and efficiency of the CA as a coalition is mixed as it appears to have undertaken activities in many areas of advocacy but with varying results. Again, in part this is because of ineffective or partially ineffective strategies as in the case of the media and in part because of a weakening coalition network where there is a lack of good communication and collaboration.

There were many more findings and conclusions which are detailed in section 5. The above were selected as the most critical and important conclusions for the CA to consider. The recommendations outlined below are based on a combination of these conclusions and the outcomes of a workshop that was held in April 2014.
At present the CA cannot be considered sustainable over the long term due to a lack of engagement from the leadership and many members. The weak leadership and lack of direction frequently cited in interviews is concerning for the future of the CA. Furthermore, the CAs financial and administrative dependence on UNICEF is also problematic. Though less critical than the leadership and dependence on UNICEF, other factors affecting its sustainability are; a lack of an established theory of change to support its strategy and activities and the lack of an existing monitoring and evaluation system despite there being capacity within the CA and secretariat to embed such a system.

1.5 Main recommendations

As part of the UNICEF adapted UNEG evaluation report standards, this evaluation has made recommendations that are sustainable for the CA’s resources and relevant to the findings and opinions of the members. The process followed in making these recommendations was initially based on the evaluation team’s findings. Following this, a workshop involving the CA and its’ members (including the chair and secretariat) was held to discuss in detail the recommendations and findings, and ensure that the recommendations made were agreeable and actionable. The recommendations are given in detail in section 6 of this report, but they are also summarised here.

1. Review the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan
2. Consider a new leadership structure
3. Re-configure the taskforces and subtasks (along the lines below)

   Taskforces and Subtasks
   Taskforce 1: Leadership
   • Chair
   • Vice Chair
   • Secretariat
   • Taskforce Chairs
   • Advisory board made of other Gvt bodies, private sector, academia, etc.

   Taskforce 2: Visibility and Public Education
   • Identity & Branding
   • Research and Information Dissemination
   • Event planning and support
   • Media and Publicity

   Taskforce 3: Elections & Government Relations
   • National (MPs, Prime Minister, Ministries)
   • Regional (District/Municipal)
   • Local (Village and Ward)
   • Political Parties
   • Religious/Cultural Leaders

   Taskforce 4: Child Participation
• National
• Regional
• Local

Taskforce 5: Member Capacity
• Networking and sharing of expertise through an ‘Expert bureau’
• Member recruitment, induction, and support

4. Consider reducing or re-focusing the Top Ten Investments
5. Develop networking or sharing of expertise to build capacity
6. Establish an M&E system
7. Track and celebrate political commitments
8. Improve visibility of the CA and child welfare issues in the media
9. Seek high profile persons of influence to champion CA issues
10. Consider and agree the role of children’s councils for the CA
2. The Children’s Agenda and its Context

2.1 The 2010-2013 Children’s Agenda Results Framework

Since there is currently no single log frame or theory of change framework developed for the CA covering the period under review, the evaluation team constructed the theory of change below to support conceptualisation of the results being evaluated. These result areas were drawn from documents pertaining to the 2010-2011 set-up phase and the 2012-2015 strategic plan. The logic follows a sequence from interim outcomes, to advanced outcomes and finally to impact. It is based on assumptions that 1) events and consultations with politicians, elected officials, and political parties leads to increased visibility and knowledge of children’s rights issues, which in turn leads to the adoption of a children’s rights agenda among these individuals and institutions; 2) that the publication of guides and toolkits and workshops for CA members and stakeholders leads to increased advocacy capacity, which in turn leads to increased child rights advocacy activities; 3) that consultation, training and education of parliamentarians, LGA staff, and religious and cultural leaders leads to increased child rights partnerships between CA members and local and national levels of government, which in turn leads to the adoption of child right’s oriented budgets, policies, and services; 4) that training and workshops for media professionals on reporting on child rights issues leads to increased partnerships between the media and CA members, which in turn leads to increased media coverage of child rights issues and CA activities; and 5) publications, training, and education for CA members and other stakeholders who support Junior Councils leads to increased capacity to support Jr. Councils, which in turn leads to increased child participation in local, regional, and national decision making.

Fundamental to this approach is the principle of child centred development using the best interests of the child as a starting point for breaking inter-generational cycles of poverty toward ensuring sustainable human development. Damage and impairment due to malnutrition, poor health and inadequate care and safety impedes future learning ability and physical development. Child wellbeing is therefore considered as the being the cornerstone for the wellbeing of the country.
Figure 1: The 2010-2013 Children’s Agenda Results Framework

**Interim Outcomes**

- Increased/strongened partnerships with mass media for child rights advocacy
- Government policy change and increased budgetary support for children’s issues
- Increased amount and quality of media coverage of children’s issues
- Strengthened partnerships between the Children’s Agenda and key influencers
- Adoption of children’s rights policy agendas in Party manifestos and candidate platforms
- Increased visibility of children’s issues amongst elected officials and electoral candidates

**Advanced Outcomes**

- Positive indicators and trends in the TopTen Investments for Children
- Strengthened and systematised engagement with children in policy making processes
- Strengthened capacity for policy influence and budget advocacy
- Established child rights partnerships with Parliamentarians, Councillors and other key influencers
- Increased amount and quality of media coverage of children’s issues

**Impact**

- Interim Outcomes
- Advanced Outcomes
- Government policy change and increased budgetary support for children’s issues
- Increased amount and quality of media coverage of children’s issues
- Strengthened partnerships between the Children’s Agenda and key influencers
- Adoption of children’s rights policy agendas in Party manifestos and candidate platforms
- Increased visibility of children’s issues amongst elected officials and electoral candidates
2.2 The Country Context & Operating Environment

The demographic context
Tanzania has undertaken five Population and Housing Censuses since achieving independence in 1961. The first census, conducted in 1967, reported a total population of 12.3 million and the 2012 census showed the population had increased to just less than 45 million. Although the population of Tanzania has tripled in the past four decades, the population is unevenly distributed, with 80 percent of the population inhabiting rural areas with an increasing urban population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics (TDHS and the 2010 UNICEF Children and Women in Tanzania (Situation) report)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (thousands) 2011, total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (thousands) 2011, under 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (thousands) 2011, under 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population annual growth rate (%), 1990-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population annual growth rate (%), 2011-2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life expectancy, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual growth rate of urban population (%), 1990-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual growth rate of urban population (%), 2011-2030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The political context
The Government of Tanzania (GoT) ratified the UN convention of the Rights of the Child (CRC) in 1991, and the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child (ACRWC) in 2003. In 1996 Tanzania formulated a Child Development Policy, which was revised in 2008. The policy advocates for children’s rights to survival and development, protection and participation. The Law of the Child Act, passed by Tanzania’s parliament in November 2009, provides a national legal framework through which the rights of children can be protected and realized. Among the rights addressed in the law are children’s right to have an opinion and to participate in decision-making.

In 2002, the government of Tanzania created the Junior Council structure which aims to represent children’s views at national and regional levels. The MCDCG has further advocated for consultations with children as a key feature in national review processes and child rights monitoring. While there are now a number of policies and laws favouring child participation, children’s issues are still quite marginalised in Tanzania.

The status of children is outlined below according to various sectoral dimensions:

1. Status of Health
Over the last decade, Tanzania has made remarkable progress in reducing under-five mortality. Since 1999, the under-five mortality rate has declined by almost 40%, a decrease equivalent to saving the lives of nearly 100,000 Tanzanian children every year. These gains in child survival have

---

2 Information in the following section was drawn from the 2012 Population and Census, the 2010 Tanzania Demographic and Health Survey (DHS), and the 2010 UNICEF Children and Women in Tanzania (Situation) report. Data was not yet available from the most recent EFA global monitoring report when this report was prepared.

3 The information in this section was drawn from the 2012 census, the 2010 Tanzania Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) and the 2010 UNICEF Children and Women in Tanzania (Situation) report. Data was not yet available from the most recent EFA global monitoring report when this evaluation was written.
largely been achieved through investment in effective, mostly low cost interventions, in particular, increased use of insecticide-treated mosquito nets, improved treatment of malaria, immunization (which has reduced deaths from measles), and expanded coverage of Vitamin A supplementation (which boosts children’s immune systems).

Despite this progress, around 155,000 children under-five years are dying annually, the vast majority from readily preventable causes. Malnutrition, malaria and diarrhoea (largely caused by drinking unsafe water and poor sanitation and hygiene) are the biggest killers. Nearly 50,000 of these deaths are of children less than one month old; of which three-quarters survive for less than a week. Newborn deaths are inextricably linked to the health of the mother during pregnancy and to the adequacy of obstetric care at delivery; most can be averted if coverage of basic maternal and neonatal interventions is expanded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics (Taken from 2010 TDHS and the 2010 UNICEF Children and Women in Tanzania (Situation) report)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 in 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearly universal (97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over half (54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Status of Nutrition

Unlike child survival, very little progress has been made in reducing chronic malnutrition. About four out of ten children in Tanzania are stunted, denying these children the opportunity to develop to their full mental and physical potential. The most harm occurs during pregnancy and in the first two years of a child’s life. Malnutrition is also linked to one-third of all under-five deaths, making it the single largest cause of under-five deaths in Tanzania. Yet, simple, cost-effective, affordable interventions are available that can have lasting impact on a child’s prospect.

Exclusive breastfeeding initiated within one hour of birth and continuing for six months is the most effective life-saving intervention. In addition, to breastfeeding – which optimally should continue until two years of age – young children from six months of age need to be fed frequently and given a variety of foods to prevent malnutrition. To facilitate change in feeding practices, women and their families must be routinely counselled and supported during antenatal and postnatal care on the importance of breastfeeding and safe weaning. Only 13.5% of infants aged 4-5 months are exclusively breastfed in Tanzania.
Food fortification is another proven, low cost, effective way to reduce malnutrition. Most countries address micronutrient deficiencies by fortifying common foods such as salt with iodine, oils with vitamin A, and flour with iron. Every shilling invested in food fortification will yield an eight-fold return. Food fortification could reduce anaemia in children and women by 20% to 30%, reduce key birth defects by 30%, and vitamin A deficiency by 30%.

Demographics (Taken from 2010 TDHS and the 2010 UNICEF Children and Women in Tanzania (Situation) report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutrition</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 2.5 million</td>
<td>Number of children who are chronically malnourished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 in 7 (14%)</td>
<td>Babies aged 4-5 months who are exclusively breastfed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Status of Hygiene and Sanitation in Schools and Health Facilities

Hand-washing is at critical at certain times – after using a toilet, before preparing meals, before eating or feeding a child, and after attending a child who has defecated and is a simple, cost-effective way of saving children’s lives. Research indicates that it can reduce the risk of diarrheal disease – a major killer of children under-five – by up to 47%. The integration of basic hygiene education into maternal health services and the curriculum in schools are needed to facilitate behavioural change.

Demographics (Taken from 2010 TDHS and the 2010 UNICEF Children and Women in Tanzania (Situation) report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water, Sanitation and Hygiene</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 in 5</td>
<td>Schools without functioning hand-washing facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 in 5</td>
<td>Schools without an on-site water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 in 10</td>
<td>Children and caregivers who do not wash their hands with soap after using the latrine or cleaning a baby or before preparing and eating food</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Status of Early Childhood Development

The first two years of a child’s life are critical to the development of the brain – if a child is under-nourished and under-stimulated the negative impact on physical, emotional, cognitive and intellectual advances is considerable. In particular, providing young children with stimulating educational and social experience in pre-school strengthens their later school adjustment and achievement. Although services for health, nutrition, protection, parent education, and early learning exist in Tanzania, access and quality of these services vary considerably and there is little to no coordination to ensure that all children receive the support to early childhood development in these critical early years. Less than half (42 per cent) of five and six-year-olds were enrolled in pre-primary schools in 2011.

5. Status of Education for all Children

Progress has taken place in the education sector in Tanzania with major growth in enrolment in primary and secondary schools. The abolition of fees and other monetary contributions in primary schools in 2001, coupled with the compulsory requirement that parents/guardians send all children to school, meant that 94 per cent of children aged 7 to 13 years were enrolled in primary school in 2011, compared with only 59 per cent in 2000. Net secondary school enrolment has also expanded.
quickly: from 6 per cent in 2011 to over 30 per cent in 2011. Despite this expansion, the education system struggles to deliver quality education. According to the 2013/4 UNESCO GMR, there are still almost a million children out of school, with lack of equity between rural – urban and boys and girls. So while there is progress there are still problems with equity, quality and learning achievement.

Rapid expansion in enrolment has meant that classroom sizes have mushroomed – with an average of 73 pupils in each government primary school classroom in 2010. Mwanza region is hardest hit, with an average 93 pupils per classroom. There has been no corresponding increase in the number of trained teachers, particularly in rural areas. Most schools also face extreme shortages in textbooks, desks, chairs, toilets, water supply, and hand-washing facilities. On average there is one textbook for every 5 students.

Around half (53.5%) of pupils passed the primary school leavers’ examination in 2010; in Shinyanga and Kigoma regions around 70 per cent of girls failed the exam compared with around 50 per cent of boys. During 2010 alone, about 68,000 pupils dropped out of primary schools and 66,000 students left secondary school early. In the same year, over 7,000 girls dropped out of primary and secondary schools due to pregnancy. Nevertheless, girls with secondary or higher education are ten times less likely to become pregnant as adolescents than girls with no education.

6. Status of Child Safety in Schools
Ensuring children are safe in schools remains a key area of concern. The Violence Against Children survey in Tanzania reported high levels of violence in schools finding 50% of girls and boys surveyed had been punched, kicked and/or whipped by teachers. Furthermore, the survey finds that ‘78 per cent of girls and 67 per cent of boys who had been abused by teachers, reported that they have been punched, kicked, or whipped more than five times.’ Corporal punishment is sanctioned by the Government of Tanzania however this goes well beyond the accepted level of punishment stated within the Corporal Punishment Act of 1979. In addition, the VAC survey also found that ‘16.7% of females reported that at least one incident occurred on school grounds, while 25.5% of females reported an incident occurred going to or from school’.

7. Status of HIV amongst Infants and Adolescent Girls
The national prevalence among the general population (15–49 age groups) is estimated to have dropped from 7.1 per cent in 2004 to 5.7 per cent in 2008. Data from the 2010 Tanzania Demographic Health Survey suggests significant improvement in some key areas, which may reduce adolescent vulnerability to HIV and AIDS. Over 50 per cent of sexually active adolescent girls used a condom during their last sexual encounter – a 32 per cent increase since 2004. The data indicates that condom use by sexually active adolescent boys also rose by more than 17 per cent during the same period. The TDHS 2010 data suggests that high-risk sex practices have decreased
with the proportion of girls aged 15 to 19 years having sex with more than two partners falling from five per cent in 2004 to two per cent in 2010.

Nevertheless, although HIV prevalence has slightly decreased, many challenges still exist in Tanzania’s effort to achieve reduction in new HIV infections. It is estimated that about 100,000 Tanzanians between 15–49 years are infected with HIV each year. On the Tanzania Mainland, approximately 80 per cent of HIV infections arise from sexual contact between HIV-infected and uninfected individuals, with mother-to-child transmission accounting for 18 per cent and 2 per cent through others. About 1.4 million people are currently living with HIV, and approximately 11 per cent of them are children under 15.

Among young people aged 15 to 24 years, the average HIV prevalence is 3.6 per cent and is significantly higher among females than males. For example, the HIV prevalence among women aged 23 to 24 years is as high as 7 per cent compared with 2 per cent among males. While almost all young people aged 15 to 24 years have heard about HIV and AIDS, relatively few know enough to protect themselves against infection. According to 2010 data, among young people aged 15–24 years only 48 per cent of girls and 43 per cent of boys have comprehensive knowledge of HIV and AIDS. Comprehensive knowledge increases with education. Almost 60 per cent of young people aged 15 to 24 years with secondary or higher education possesses comprehensive knowledge of HIV and AIDS, compared to only 21 per cent of youth with no education.

<p>| Demographics (Taken from DHS and the 2010 UNICEF Children and Women in Tanzania (Situation) report) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIV and AIDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-third</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Status of Teenage Pregnancy

According to the 2010 DHS survey approximately 23 percent of women start childbearing between the ages of 15-19 and 6 percent are pregnant with their first child. Girls living in rural areas are almost twice as likely as girls in urban areas to start childbearing before they reach 19 years. More than half of girls with no education are mothers or pregnant before they reach 19 years, compared with about 25 per cent of those who completed primary school and less than five per cent of girls who attended secondary school. Fifty per cent of women and 43 per cent of men age 18-24 report having had sex before age of 18.

Infants born to young mothers face far greater survival risks than those born to older mothers. Among mothers less than 20 years old, for every 1,000 live births, 41 infants die during the first month of life. Adolescents who become pregnant also face stigma and discrimination in their communities. Discrimination against young mothers by fellow students, teachers, parents, religious and other leaders, and difficulties managing care for their newborns tend to discourage girls from attending and/or returning to school after giving birth.

9. Status of Violence, Abuse, and Exploitation against Children

The statistics in this section are taken from the 2009 Violence Against Children Survey.
Nearly 3 out of every 10 females aged 13 to 24 in Tanzania reported experiencing at least one incident of sexual violence before turning age 18. Among males in the same age group, 13.4% reported experiencing at least one incident of sexual violence prior to the age of 18. The most common form of sexual violence experienced by both females and males before the age of 18 was sexual touching, followed by attempted sexual intercourse. When asked about experiences in the year preceding the survey, 14.0% of females and 5.9% of males aged 13 to 17 years reported that they had experienced at least one form of sexual violence. Of those who had their first sexual experience prior to age 18, nearly one-third (29.1%) of females and 17.5% of males reported that their first sexual intercourse was unwilling, meaning that they were forced or coerced to engage in sexual intercourse. Approximately one-quarter of females and nearly 3 out of every 10 males aged 13 to 24 years reported experiences of emotional violence by an adult prior to turning 18. Between 4% and 5% of females and males aged 13 to 24 years reported that they were threatened with abandonment by an adult prior to turning 18 years of age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics (Taken from DHS and the 2010 UNICEF Children and Women in Tanzania (Situation) report)</th>
<th>Child protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 9 in 10</td>
<td>Children under five years who do not have a birth certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 in 100</td>
<td>Children under 18 years who have lost one or both parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 in 5</td>
<td>Children engaged in child labour (rural 25%; urban 8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Status of Children with Disabilities
In 2011, only 0.35 per cent of all children enrolled in primary school were children with disabilities. In secondary schools, 0.3 per cent of boys and 0.25 per cent of girls have disabilities. These percentages are extremely low when compared with the estimated 7.8 per cent of the population with disabilities in Tanzania and indicates that most children with impairment are not enrolled. There is no functioning national system for the identification and assessment of children with physical or mental impairments, and no coherent data to track or respond to their needs. For those children with disabilities who do enrol, regular attendance is often extremely difficult. Girls with disabilities are more vulnerable to abuse including sexual abuse than boys.

2.3 The Children’s Agenda: Introduction and Overview
The Children’s Agenda (CA) is a coalition committed to advocating and improving child rights in Tanzania. The membership consists of local, national and international non-governmental (NGO) and civil society (CSO) organisations, UNICEF, and the Ministry of Community Development Gender and Children (MCDGC). A list of all the current members can be found in annex 15. The CA is currently chaired by the Children’s Development Department of the MCDGC with the deputy chair occupied by an elected member from civil society (currently Compassion International), and UNICEF acting as the secretariat.

Having the Ministry as chair of the coalition has a number of implications with regards to coalition’s capacity and independence in defining advocacy priorities, methods and strategies. The CA advocacy priorities are focused on the ‘The Top Ten Investments’ which define the core messages of the Children’s Agenda. These Top Ten Investments were developed from consultations with
children conducted across many regions in 2009, analyses of the situation of children, and discussions among key government and CSO partners. The Top Ten investments include:

1. Invest to Save the Lives of Children and Women
2. Invest in Good Nutrition
3. Invest in Better Hygiene and Sanitation in Schools and Health Facilities
4. Invest in Early Childhood Development
5. Invest in Quality Education for all Children
6. Invest to Make Schools Safe
7. Invest to Protect Infants and Adolescent Girls from HIV
8. Invest to Reduce Teenage Pregnancy
9. Invest to Protect Children from Violence, Abuse, and Exploitation
10. Invest in Children with Disabilities

The investments are phrased broadly and are consistent with national priorities articulated in national and sectoral strategies and documents. The approach adopted appears to be one of alignment and collaboration with Government rather than confrontation.

There are six taskforces within the CA, each reflecting the coalition’s primary activities. These are: Working with Parliamentarians; Working with Local Government; Working with the Media; Child Participation and Advocacy Campaigns. Members are divided between taskforces and meet monthly, as convened by the task force lead. Each taskforce is expected to report on progress against annual plans at the CA quarterly meetings.

The CA is currently divided into five taskforce areas and a leadership structure as described in the table 2 below. The outputs and activities of each taskforce are listed in annex 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taskforce</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Chair (MCDGC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice Chair (Compassion International)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretariat (UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Parliamentarians</td>
<td>Ministry of Community Development Gender &amp; Children (MCDGC) (Lead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kiwohede, Save the Children, SOS, MYCN (Members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with local government</td>
<td>Kiwohede (Lead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Vision, CHESO, PACT, MCDGC, HUHESO, MYCN, Shalom Center, Children in Crossfire, Watoto Salama, PASADA (Members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with the media</td>
<td>Art in Tanzania (AiT) (Lead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan, MYCN, TWCCW (Members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child participation</td>
<td>Children’s Dignity Forum (CDF) (Lead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WVT, MK, AiT, GNRC, KIWOHEDE, CHESO, Watoto Salama, ANPPCAN, Compassion International, HUHESO, TUSEIS, MYCN, Right to play, Femina, Plan (Members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy campaigns</td>
<td>SOS Village (Lead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AiT, WVT, EGPAF, Watoto Salama, VSO, TECDEN, Dogodogo Center, TENMET, CYDAD, Mkombozi, C-Sema (Members)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This leadership and taskforce structure reflects changes implemented in 2013. The Chair leads and oversees the activities of the Children’s Agenda network. S/he works to ensure that the Children’s Agenda functions properly, meets its responsibilities and fulfils its mandate as set forth in the CA Strategic Plan 2012-2015 and as otherwise determined by the CA members.

The main leadership duties include the following:

- Convene and chair all CA meetings;
- Set the agenda for all CA meetings in consultation with the co-chair and secretariat;
- Strive to ensure harmonization and articulation of joint positions among the CA members. Represents the CA in different forums, if required.

In addition to its chairpersonship role, it is expected that the MDGC mainstreams the Children’s Agenda in the Children’s Department and legitimizes the Agenda at national and local levels. As per the approved CA Strategic Plan, MDGC facilitates parliamentary engagement; supports the development and dissemination of the CA materials across the country; trains and orients stakeholders on the goals and strategies of the Children’s Agenda. There is currently no process for the regular review of the performance of the chair or any term limits or instructions for (re)elections of the chair. Because of this, the MCDGC has in essence become the permanent chair of the CA.

The Deputy Chair is elected by among the CA members by a majority. The Deputy Chairs serves for one year, but may be re-elected for no more than two consecutive terms. The main duties of the Deputy Chair including the following:

- Preside at CA meetings in the absence of the Chair.
- Represent the CA in different fora, if required.

The Secretariat’s (UNICEF) main duties include:

- Draft and distribute an approved agenda for the meetings to the CA members.
- Ensures finalisation and circulation of action-oriented minutes within one week of each meeting.
- Prepare and file documentation related to the functioning of the CA, as well as background documentation, necessary for the decision making process of the CA members.
- Maintain communication and smooth coordination of information and exchange among the CA members.
- Maintain an updated contact list for the CA members.
- Develop visibility materials, communication and advocacy tools to support the CA activities.

The taskforces, which reflect the primary activities of the CA, meet monthly as convened by the Task Force leads and report on progress at the CA quarterly meetings. The taskforce outputs and activities can be found in annex 14.
Non-member Stakeholders
Institutional members of the CA work with a variety of non-member individuals and institutions to carry out their efforts to raise awareness of child rights issues throughout Tanzania. These include:

- Children’s/Junior Councils
- Regional, District, Municipal, Ward, and Village/Street-level government staff including Village Chairs, Executive Officers and Directors, and Education, Health, and Community Development Officers.
- Elected and appointed officials including Members of parliament (MPs); Village, Ward, Division, and District counsellors and commissioners; Mayors, Deputy Mayors, and Municipal Counsellors.
- Prime Minister’s Office-Regional Administration and Local Government (PMORALG)
- Political Parties (whose policy manifestos the CA has sought to amend with children’s rights goals)

2.4 Budget and Expenditures
The following is a summary of budget information on the CA by UNICEF has been limited to funds disbursed to CA members for use on CA-related activities from 2011 to 2013. In the absence of budget for the Children’s Agenda and the difficulty in distinguishing between individual member institution and coalition activities, member contributions beyond UNICEF have not been systematically documented and are therefore a complete cost analysis could not be conducted.

According to the table below, the following estimated amounts were disbursed in each year from 2011 to 2013 to 10 members of the CA:

Table 2: Funds Disbursed by UNICEF to the Children’s Agenda (2011–2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount in TSH</th>
<th>Amount in USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>303,233,174.12</td>
<td>$185,520.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>159,444,672.22</td>
<td>$99,652.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>486,113,482.22</td>
<td>$303,820.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The monies described above and in a detailed description of these allocations in section 5.3, appear to have been allocated on a project-by-project basis to about 10 CA members between 2011 and 2013 in order to support some CA activities.

2.5 Implementation Status
The CA has undergone a number of significant shifts in structure and focus that have impacted on its activities during the period being evaluated.

---

5 The amounts are estimated because the 4 entries that were disbursed over two or three years were divided equally by the number of years over which the amounts were disbursed.
6 Constant, $1=TSH 1,600.00.
The developments in its focus and orientation can be characterised by two distinct phases:

1. **Launch and Conceptualisation (2009-2011):** The first phase between 2009 and 2011 covered the period of conceptualization and launch with early efforts focusing outward on political advocacy over the 2010 electoral period. Lobbying focused on securing pledges from political parties and politicians, however, no strategic or operational plan was developed. A turnover in staffing within the Secretariat also saw a noticeable drop in momentum although staff were recommitted toward the end of the year when the 2012-2015 strategic plan was developed. During this time a new CA leadership structure was put in place with the MCDGC as chair, UNICEF as secretariat, and taskforces for each of the Top Ten Investments, plus additional taskforces were focused on parliamentarians, the media, and monitoring and evaluation.

2. **Consolidation and Transition (2012-2013):** The second phase from 2012-2013 was a time of consolidation and transition with efforts focusing inward, resulting in a new strategic plan covering the period 2012-2015 defining a broader vision for the coalition beyond electoral advocacy and recognizing the importance of building coalition capacity for advocacy. Activities during this phase also focused on engaging children through participatory structures and processes. The CA revised the 2012-2015 strategy in 2013, re-organising into six taskforce areas each with a lead organization, including a better defined leadership structure and clearly articulated outputs, outcomes, and monitoring activities.

A summary of progress on the components outlined in the current iteration of the 2012-2015 strategic plan is detailed below:

**Table 3: Components of the CA 2012-2015 Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Rationale for completion status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Children's Agenda established and operational</td>
<td>The CA is fully established, although undergoing change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Children’s Agenda partners advocate effectively for child rights</td>
<td>Some sub-components have yet to be started or completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Advocacy strategy for increasing Parliamentary understanding of child rights and investing in children developed and implemented</td>
<td>Some sub-components have yet to be started or completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Advocacy strategy for increasing LGA understanding of child rights and investing in children developed and implemented</td>
<td>Some sub-components have yet to be started or completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Mass media reports regularly, ethically and accurately on advancing child rights</td>
<td>Some sub-components have yet to be started or completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Child participation advanced in homes, communities, schools and through local Government</td>
<td>Some sub-components have yet to be started or completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a result of the shifting focus and structure of the CA, the CfBT evaluation team has defined the project in terms of the interim outcomes expressed in the results framework presented in section 2.1. As explained, these interim outcomes or key goals are taken from the election focus of the 2010 period and the 2012-2015 strategic plan:

1. Increased/strengthened partnerships with mass media for child rights advocacy
2. Strengthened and expanded opportunities for sustainable, quality child participation
3. Increased visibility of children’s issues amongst elected officials and electoral candidates
4. Established child rights partnerships with Parliamentarians, Councillors and other key influencers
5. Strengthened capacity for policy influence and budget advocacy
3. Evaluation Purpose, Objective(s) and Scope

3.1 Purpose
The purpose of this evaluation is to document the successes and challenges of the Children’s Agenda as an advocacy strategy in the period between 2010-2013 by examining the capacity of the individual Children’s Agenda members and the capacity of the Children’s Agenda as a coalition to raise awareness, visibility, and political momentum of children’s issues in Tanzania, and assess the degree to which interim outcomes have been achieved.

This evaluation comes at a critical juncture in the life of the CA for a number of reasons. Firstly, and perhaps foremost, this will be the first independent evaluation of the CA since its inception. As a consequence there has previously been a dearth of information or analysis about the successes and challenges of the CA as an advocacy strategy. Furthermore, there has been an absence of internal, routine performance monitoring that would allow for an on-going review of progress and the satisfaction and experience of the members.

Secondly, momentum within the CA is declining, characterised by a decrease in member participation and a sense that the overall direction and vision of the CA is beginning to wane. The formative evaluation therefore provides an opportunity to better understand the reasons for this change and how it can become more “fit-for-purpose”.

The findings from this formative evaluation therefore represent a unique opportunity in the history of the CA since they should help it make any necessary adjustments, re-focus and revive.

3.2 Evaluation Objectives & Evaluation Questions
To design the evaluation, the CfBT evaluation team consulted with the coalition and its members, the MCDGC as chair, the leadership and UNICEF as secretariat through meetings and interviews. Their input into the design of the evaluation was obtained during the inception phase in mid-December 2013. The individuals and organisations consulted during the inception phase of this evaluation are listed in annex 16 and 17.

Based on the initial terms of reference for the formative evaluation, the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria and input obtained during the inception phase, the specific objectives of the formative evaluation are as follows:

- To evaluate the relevance of the CA; specifically the relevance of engaging through a structure such as the Children’s Agenda in the Tanzania context and assess the role and presence of a logic model for addressing the needs of all children in Tanzania;
- To evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the programme with respect to the membership capacity of the Children’s Agenda;
- To evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the programme with respect to the capacity of the Children’s Agenda as an entity in and of itself;
- To document what progress has been made on the interim outcomes or goals;
- To evaluate the sustainability of the Children’s Agenda and its contributing factors;
• To evaluate the extent to which gender and equity dimensions have been taken into account in the design of interventions supported by the Children’s Agenda and throughout the implementation process;
• To systematically document weaknesses, strengths, constraints, opportunities and lessons learnt in the project implementation, any unintended consequence(s), the capacity and reliability of existing monitoring systems, and make recommendations for strengthening the M&E framework as a result of this analysis.

The main questions of this evaluation are as follows, and will form the structure for reporting the findings and conclusions of this evaluation:

1. To what extent have agreed activities taken place and interim outcomes achieved during the period 2010 to 2013, noting the absence of written plans in the 2010-2011 period?
2. How efficient and effective is the Children’s Agenda, including its activities and structure, with respect to the membership capacity of the coalition?
3. How efficient and effective is the Children’s Agenda, including its activities and structure, with respect to the capacity of the coalition as an entity in and of itself?
4. How relevant have the activities and structure of the Children’s Agenda been to the needs and goals of its members and to its ability to advocate for children’s rights?
5. Is the Children’s Agenda as it is currently structured sustainable over the longer-term?
6. In what ways has the Children’s Agenda supported advocacy efforts on behalf of marginalized populations and gender equity?
7. What are the weaknesses, strengths, constraints, opportunities, and lessons learnt since the implementation of the Children’s Agenda?
8. What is the capacity and reliability of existing monitoring and evaluation systems, and how can these systems be improved?

3.3 Evaluation Scope
The formative evaluation covers the period 2010 to 2013, which is an extension of the original period (2010-2012) outline in the evaluation Terms of Reference. This was agreed upon by the CfBT evaluation team and UNICEF Tanzania staff because the year 2013 had been completed by the time the evaluation formally began in early 2014. The evaluation examined the degree to which the desired outputs and interim outcomes had been achieved, or expected to be achieved (effectiveness); how well the coalition network engaged with each other and toward its advocacy agenda (efficiency); how the work of the CA aligned with children’s priorities, legislative and policy agendas and how it compared to advocacy models of ‘best practice’ (relevance); and the contribution of the CA and its members toward advancing a child rights agenda in Tanzania, including the presence of a government chair (capacity). The evaluation also sought to establish if the current structure is sustainable over the longer term (sustainability).

The CA revised the 2012-2015 strategy in 2013, re-organising into six taskforce areas each with a lead organization, including a better defined leadership structure and clearly articulated outputs,

7 Sustainability is understood as the ability of the CA to remain functional and effective with a decreased administrative and financial role of UNICEF.
outcomes, and monitoring activities. While this evaluation only focused on the first two years (2012-2013) of this latter strategy, the current structure and leadership of the CA as defined by these taskforce areas were taken into account when drafting conclusions and recommendations that are relevant to current structure and strategy of the CA.

The evaluation team sampled four regions — Dar es Salaam, Mbeya, Dodoma and Mwanza — purposively selected for their geographic diversity and coverage of CA activity. Dar es Salaam is the largest city in Tanzania and were a big focus of national level advocacy activities take place. It also represents an increasing urban centre with poverty rates higher than surrounding district rural areas, belying the notion that urban areas are always epicentres of affluence. Mbeya region is located in the Southern Highlands bordering Zambia and Malawi and is characterised by high agricultural productivity but with high HIV prevalence of 9.0 per cent amongst men and women aged 15-49 years and where 13.3 per cent of children under 18 have one or both parents deceased. Dodoma is the official capital of Tanzania located in the centre of the country, where the National Assembly and a number of government offices are located. Despite its proximity to political influence, it has the highest percentage of children under 5 years who are stunted at 56 per cent, well above the national average of 42 per cent. Mwanza is located in the north of the country, bordering Lake Victoria and is the second largest city in the country after Dar es Salaam. Its geographic location makes it an important transit point for business, people and travellers from Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi however growth brings along an increased level of crime and the problem of street children. A regional chapter of the CA was established in Mwanza in October 2013 to bring together partners in the area and give focus to regional priorities.

The evaluation focused on activities that took place between 2010 and 2013 as defined by the five goals above, and collected data from a sample of CA members and non-member stakeholders in each of the current taskforce areas at the national and sub-national levels.

3.4 Limitations
A number of issues limit the scope this evaluation. First, achieving change through advocacy is subject to multiple variables and it can take many years before impacts are realised. Secondly, advocacy strategies constantly shift and evolve over time. The achievement of impact will not be a focus of this evaluation. Rather, the focus will be to review interim outcomes, the development of advocacy capacity in CA coalition members, the contributions CA coalition members have made individually and collectively to the advocacy effort, and how relevant, effective, efficient, and sustainable these contributions were.

An evaluability assessment was undertaken during the inception phase where the limitations regarding limited documentation or performance indicators were discussed. In response, the evaluators defined the project goals using the five key interim goals outlined above, and by using the concepts of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, capacity, and sustainability as performance indicators.

The evaluation relied on a mix of quantitative and qualitative data with greater proportion of qualitative information including the perceptions of key informants, which are limited by their
subjectivity.

The primary mechanism for collecting quantitative data was achieved through the media analysis and the CA member survey conducted during the 2014 Annual Review meeting in January 2014. Half of those attending the meeting were new to the CA, as there appeared to be a high turnover of focal persons for many of the CA members. This meant there were a large number of responses left blank which limited the validity and use of the data. For the purposes of the evaluation it was agreed that only the perceptions of members and non-member stakeholders would be analysed and triangulated against existing documentation to establish potential correlations (but not causation) between the activities and interim outcomes of the CA.

Furthermore, the evaluation did not attempt to quantitatively measure changes in government budgets, services, or policies in the Top Ten Investments at the national, regional or local level; thus placing more reliance on the qualitative data captured. As already mentioned in section 2.4 a formal budget analysis was not possible because there was no CA budget to analyse.

The evaluation team conducted a limited analysis of print, digital and social media in Tanzania over the evaluation period, but it was not within the scope of this evaluation to examine TV and radio. The evaluation therefore relies on a sub-set of media for its findings. Furthermore, the analysis for the print media tracking was done ‘just before, during and after’ specific activity dates that coincided with major CA-related events. Thus, the evaluation is not able to examine all trends in child rights reporting for print media from 2010 to 2013, it is only able to comment and draw conclusions based on the more specific dates that were tracked over those four years.

Unfortunately, it was found to be extremely difficult to solicit interviews with MPs. Social norms dictated it was best practice for the chair of the CA (as a government minister) to contact the MPs and request for their time. The chair had limited capacity to undertake this task and thus only two interviews were undertaken with MPs. Furthermore, the evaluation team was also unable to maintain the credibility of MPs Bellwether interviews since the chair of the CA shared in full the purpose of the interview with the MPs. This nullified the ability of the team to undertake a formal Bellwether interview whereby the participant does not know the true purpose of their interview and, as in this instance, does not have any prior information that it is about the CA. It had been the original intention of the evaluation to utilise Bellwether interviews with MPs in order to evaluate the degree of relationship and awareness of the MPs had for the CA, but since it had not proved possible Bellwether data was not used as part of the evaluation. However, the MP semi-structured interviews are referenced and used to triangulate some of the evaluation.

It was also beyond the scope of this evaluation to visit all CA coalition members and all geographic areas where CA coalition members conduct activities. A non-random, purposive sample was established instead that was representative of the geographic and demographic diversity of the parts of Tanzania in which CA members work.

There was also an issue of high member turnover during 2010 to 2013 which has limited the institutional memory of the CA and meant that key focal persons interviewed were often new members themselves with limited views. In response, a number of CA members who were active
during the 2010 to 2013 period were interviewed to provide background.

Finally, there is limited documentation of articulated strategies, work plans, and activities carried out by the CA in 2010 and 2011. In response, interviews have been carried out with current and former UNICEF Tanzania staff to reconstruct much of this time period. Furthermore, there had been no organised effort, or paper trail, to follow up on elected officials who made written commitments to the CA/child rights. It was therefore extremely difficult to assess the value of the political endorsements and commitments to policy change and increased resources for children.

Despite these limitations the evaluation was able to gather meaningful data that was analysed to provide fruitful findings and recommendations.
4. Evaluation Methodology

4.1 Methodology

As described previously, the approach this evaluation took was a non-experimental, mixed method, formative evaluation. The approach described herein is non-experimental because it focuses on describing the outputs and interim outcomes to-date of the project, assessing its capacity, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability, and recommending a way forward; the evaluation did not utilise a control group or comparison project and did not measure project impact. The approach is mixed methods because it utilised archival, quantitative, and qualitative research methods to answer the evaluation questions, which allowed for the data to be contextualised. It is formative because it focused on using data about the project to date to inform future improvements; it was not a performance evaluation of the coalition. The eight evaluation questions were:

1. To what extent have agreed activities taken place and interim outcomes achieved during the period 2010 to 2013, noting the absence of written plans in the 2010-2011 period?
2. How efficient and effective is the Children’s Agenda, including its activities and structure, with respect to the membership capacity of the coalition?
3. How efficient and effective is the Children’s Agenda, including its activities and structure, with respect to the capacity of the coalition as an entity in and of itself?
4. How relevant have the activities and structure of the Children’s Agenda been to the needs and goals of its members and to its ability to advocate for children’s rights?
5. Is the Children’s Agenda as it is currently structured sustainable over the longer-term?
6. In what ways has the Children’s Agenda supported advocacy efforts on behalf of marginalized populations and gender equity?
7. What are the weaknesses, strengths, constraints, opportunities, and lessons learnt since the Children’s Agenda implementation?
8. What is the capacity and reliability of existing monitoring and evaluation systems, and how can these systems be improved?

Evaluation question 1 refers to the objective of analysing what has taken place so far and the interim outcomes achieved. Details were derived from project document reviews, surveys and semi-structured interviews of CA members and beneficiaries, and focus groups with Children’s/Junior Councils and school children.

Evaluation question 2 refers to the advocacy capacity of each of the CA coalition members. Capacity was measured using an Advocacy Capacity Index, which was embedded in the surveys and semi-structured interviews of coalition leadership and members. The question also refers to the efficiency and effectiveness of any capacities by establishing whether they improved the member’s ability to meet own service objectives and/or subsequently influence any of the Top Ten Investments for Children areas. The structure of the CA was taken into account in terms of its ability to effectively and efficiently support members to advocate for child rights in Tanzania. The data for

---

8 Sustainability is understood as the ability of the CA to remain functional and effective with a decreased administrative and financial role of UNICEF.
this aspect of the evaluation question was obtained through focus groups with member beneficiaries, Children’s/Junior Councils, semi-structured interviews with MPs and political party staff, and media tracking.

Evaluation question 3 refers to the advocacy capacity of the CA coalition itself. As in evaluation question 2, capacity was measured by an Advocacy Capacity Index, which was embedded in the surveys and semi-structured interviews of coalition leadership and members. The question also refers to the efficiency and effectiveness of any capacities by evaluating the strength and productivity of the CA network, and the CA’s influence on the Top Ten Investments for Children areas as established by focus groups with Children’s/Junior Councils, semi-structured interviews with MPs and political party staff, and media tracking. The structure of the CA will also be taken into account in terms of its ability to effectively and efficiently advocate for child rights in Tanzania.

Evaluation question 4 refers to the relevance of the CA in terms of the needs and goals of its members and the constituencies they serve, as well as the relevance of the structure through which it attempts to advocate for children’s rights. Data for this question was collected through surveys and semi-structured interviews with CA members, focus groups with Children’s/Junior Councils and CA coalition member beneficiaries, semi-structured interviews with PMs and regional and local government officials, and media tracking.

Evaluation question 5 refers to the sustainability of the project defined as an established ability by government, NGO, and CSO coalition members other than UNICEF to assume increased administrative and financial responsibilities for maintaining the network and activities of the CA. This was established through surveys, semi-structured interviews, and the advocacy capacity index with government, NGO, and CSO members.

Evaluation question 6 refers to the cross cutting issues of gender equity and marginalised populations, including children living in rural and hard to reach areas. Information about how they have been integrated into the activities of the CA was collected through surveys and semi-structured interviews with coalition members and beneficiaries, and focus group discussions with Children’s/Junior Councils, as well as examinations of CA-related documents, publications and activities.

Evaluation question 7 refers to what can be learned so far in terms of weaknesses, strengths, constraints, opportunities, and lessons learnt and how this can be applied to the future of the CA. Data for this question was drawn from all research tools and informant groups.

Evaluation question 8 refers to the current state and effectiveness of the CA’s monitoring system, and how it can be improved. Data for this question was collected through surveys and semi-structured interviews with CA members and document reviews.

4.2 Data Collection Methods and Analysis
The following data collection methods were employed to answer the evaluation questions:
Semi-structured interviews assessed the strengths of Children’s Agenda members and as a coalition, with particular attention paid to the themes of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. Variations of this tool were developed for:

- CA member CSO/NGO lead staff
- MGDGC national/regional staff
- Local Government Agency staff
- UNICEF Tanzania staff
- Parliamentarians and political party leaders

CSO/NGO Survey focused on advocacy capacity and coalition strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities. The survey consisted of the same questions as the semi-structured interviews but quantified. Both contain elements from the Advocacy Capacity Index\(^9\) and the TCC Advocacy self-appraisal. The surveys were administered to attendees of the 2014 CA Annual Review Meeting held on January 27\(^{th}\) and 28\(^{th}\) in Dar es Salaam.

Focus Groups documented the views and perspectives of children and youth and were conducted with the Children’s/Junior Councils and groups of upper primary students from local schools.

Advocacy Capacity Index the Advocacy Capacity Index\(^10\) is an 11-component index or tool that measures NGO/CSO capacity for and performance in advocacy for specific changes in policies, laws, and practices of State (national and/or local) institutions. The published Advocacy Capacity Index was substantially modified by the CfBT evaluation team and based on an earlier version made by PACT in Zimbabwe. It is not a tool that had previously been used by the CA. This index was integrated into surveys and semi-structured interviews of CA members.

Document/archival review included project documents and budgets, publications, training materials, films and media, and meeting minutes where relevant to assess outcomes, outputs and activities of the CA.

Media tracking of print media, mostly newspapers, and some digital and social media. In order to evaluate the success of Children’s Agenda’s (CA) advocacy work, a limited media tracking and analysis was commissioned covering print, digital and social media from the period of 2010-2013. Over a two-week period in February 2014, the team visited four newspaper warehouses as well as the Tanzania National Library Services in order to go through the selected copies for each period in 2010 to 2013. The newspapers included, The East African, Mwananchi, Nipashe, and Mtanzania and the periods reviewed were March 7-21, June 8-22, October 4-18 and December 12-26 only. These specific dates were purposively selected as activities of the CA fell within these dates and should therefore reveal a peak of reporting if the CA was having traction within the media at these times. Purposive selection of dates was chosen over tracking print media right across 2010 to 2013 due to the size of such a project being cost prohibitive. See the key CA-related dates and events below:

---

\(^9\) For a more detailed description, see section 5.1.

\(^10\) Ibid.
Two day visits to each of the four warehouses were undertaken by the team who reviewed copies of the newspapers and identified the key stories with a ‘child welfare’ theme. The team took photographs of the relevant stories and/or pictorials and provided this pictorial evidence of their existence as part of this report. Whether each article was ‘positive, neutral or negative’ was then analysed.

**Positive Stories:** These were stories that identified challenges facing children, and proceeded to advocate on behalf of children in various ways in order to improve a particular issue for the child. Positive stories also shone a spotlight on inspiring or positive good news stories relating to child welfare.

**Negative Stories:** These were stories that portrayed children in a non-flattering or bad light and did not advocate for any measures to be taken in order to better their situation. For example, these stories may have contained information about child labour and either proceeded to illustrate it to be a useful activity or simply failed to advocate for such abuses to be improved.

**Neutral Stories:** These were stories of children in different situations that did not report in a positive or negative manner. The story merely reported the information or a situation but provided no comment on whether it was good or bad and how to improve such a situation.

In addition to print media, online desk research of social media and other digital sites was conducted over two days to identify any increased coverage of child welfare issues over the period of 2010-2013. These focused on social media sites, such as Facebook and Twitter, and major search engines. The following key words and phrases were used in these searches:

- Children’s Agenda
- childrens agenda
- Ajenda ya watoto
- UNICEF
- UNICEF Tanzania
- Child welfare
- Child issues
- Day of the girl child
- Day of the African Child
- Teenage pregnancy
- Better hygiene and sanitation in schools and health facilities
- Ethical reporting on children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Key CA event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 14, 2013</td>
<td>Media advisory sent to print and digital media on Teenage Pregnancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 10, 2012, 2013</td>
<td>International Day of the Girl Child, press release Media advisory on Hygiene and sanitation in schools/health facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 19, 2013</td>
<td>Media workshop on ‘ethical reporting on children’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first five search terms (Children’s Agenda, childrens agenda [SIC], Ajenda ya watoto, UNICEF, UNICEF Tanzania) were chosen as direct but broad search terms to assess the extent to which they had presence and visibility in several forms of social media. The other terms were a combination of international days that the CA had engaged in (for instance by hosting relevant events), press releases or workshops the CA had undertaken. Some of the terms happen to be similar or link to the Top Ten Investments. However, it was not feasible to search for all of the Top Ten Investment areas, as their lengthy names meant results were indirect and not relevant.

4.3 Data Sources & Sampling Frame

The individuals, groups, and organisations included as data sources were selected by consensus of the CA technical group, first by choosing the four geographic areas that were visited by the evaluators: Dar es Salaam, Mwanza, Mbeya and Dodoma. These regions were selected mainly based on:

- Recommendations from the secretariat (UNICEF) and the CA Technical Committee.
- Recommendations from individual CA member leaders during inception interviews
- Information that particular Top Ten Investment areas or Task forces were present in that region
- Information that there were at least two NGOs implementing Children’s Agenda activities in the region, such as support for children’s councils, YRNs, and media training
- Information that the region had at least one regional children’s council, one district children’s council and one young reporters network
- Agreement that the selected regions under study should represent different geographic areas of Tanzania, although it was acknowledged all regions could not be included. Indeed, their differing characteristics allowed for the evaluation to be richer in detail and understanding. Dar and Dodoma are urban regions with Mwanza and Mbeya being rural with some small urban conurbations (but not to the degree of Dar and Dodoma). Furthermore, these regions each reflect different geographical areas being at opposite ends of the country.

In each of the four regions, a mix of the different stakeholder categories was sought out for interviews and focus groups discussions. The data from these different stakeholder categories were triangulated within the different evaluation questions to ensure accuracy and a diversity of perspectives.

Annex 2 outlines the individuals, groups, and organisations that served as informants for this evaluation, and the dates and locations of the consultations.

The data sources outlined in annex 2 includes representatives the following stakeholder categories:

- CA chair and secretariat (two)
- CA member organisations (14)
- Children’s/Junior Councils (eight)
- Regional, District, Municipal, Ward, and Village/Street-level government staff including
Village Chairs, Executive Officers and Directors, and Education, Health, and Community Development Officers (16)

- Elected and appointed officials including Members of parliament (MPs); Village, Ward, Division, Municipal, and District counsellors and commissioners (two)
- Prime Minister’s Office-Regional Administration and Local Government (PMORALG)
- Political Parties (two)

The primary limitation of the data sources, as stated earlier, was the lack of access to elected officials and political party leaders. The MCDGC was due to organise meetings with elected officials for the evaluation team to attend, as this was the correct protocol. However, these did not take place and thus, the access to this informant group was very limited and consequently the conclusions of this evaluation only represent the input of two elected officials.

4.4 Conceptual Framework and Analysis

Advocacy can be defined as deliberate and systematic efforts to persuade decision-makers to bring a change to a specified issue of public concern, in this case to adopt certain policies or actions in order to protect women and children’s rights. Adopting a systematic approach to advocacy implies having clearly defining goals and undertaking specific actions in the planning and execution of an advocacy strategy.

In a context such as Tanzania, electoral, policy and/or budgetary change require building and maintaining relationships with different partners, including government, development partners, civil society and communities, and packaging information in a way that will be palatable and convincing to these different audiences. Tanzania is perceived to be a context in which various actors have the capacity to contribute to and collaborate with government in policy and national decision making processes. Indeed, community engagement and participation is enshrined within planning, budgeting, monitoring and reporting processes at district level district and although improving have had variable results with processes tending toward strong government ownership 11.

This evaluation approaches advocacy through the agency of a coalition based structure, whose individual contributions, constituencies, networks and points of leverage are all components of the collective capacity of the entity of the CA. The evaluation examines the cohesiveness of this vision, the concreteness of its strategies for engagement and its extent to which the structure of coalition is a viable and effective means for representing its interests and achieving its desired results.

This evaluation framework focuses on the five themes, which were recommended the terms of reference for the project s and are based on the OECD-DAC criteria of: capacity (of the coalition and its members), relevance (of the coalition structure and context), effectiveness (with regard to interim outcomes), efficiency (in terms of the coalition network and administrative function), and sustainability (in terms of the CAs longer-term financial and administrative capacity). All the field

11 AMCA Inter Consult Ltd & The CSR Group Africa Limited 2013, Assessment of Government Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring and Reporting (PBMR) in UNICEF Supported Local Government Authorities (LGAs)
tools were designed against an analysis framework in order to align the data capture and analysis. Each of the five themes or evaluation criteria is detailed below.

**Approach to Capacity**

The approach to capacity analysis is critical if this evaluation is to understand the skills, knowledge and influence of both individual members and member organisations. The challenge was to assess both coalition and member capacity without conducting in-depth institutional reviews, as this approach would have been cost and time prohibitive.

The evaluators settled on a self-assessment approach, based on an 11 characteristic index of advocacy capacity as described on pages 260 – 262 of the August 1998 “*Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators*”, Technical Publication Series, Centre for Democracy and Governance, USAID Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support, and Research. The published Advocacy Capacity Index is recommended for use on page 22 of the *UNICEF Advocacy Toolkit Companion: Monitoring and Evaluating Advocacy* and has been modified for the Tanzania context by the CfBT evaluation team. The modifications were made so that the advocacy capacity index used here includes stated capacity goals of the CA as well as those described in the January 2009 TCC Group *Framework for Determining Advocacy Capacity*, namely leadership, management, technical, and adaptive capacities, to which the evaluators were directed by the ToR for this project. The leadership and management capacities of the coalition are already investigated directly through questions in all member interviews and surveys. The 11 capacities for the member self-assessment thus focus on the technical and adaptive capacities. These are:

1. Policy analysis and research
2. Public consultation/constituency input
3. Alternative policy formulation/service approaches
4. Gender/marginalized populations analysis
5. Monitoring and evaluation
6. Funding for advocacy activities
7. Time for advocacy activities
8. Public education/awareness raising
9. Coalition building and networking
10. Media relations
11. Political lobbying and legislative relations

Each of the eleven dimensions of advocacy is operationalized through the NGO/CSO member interview protocols where the CA member makes a self-assessment, using an ascending order of capacity or accomplishment, where 0 = inapplicability or no capacity and 5 = very strong capacity/accomplishment with virtually no room for improvement. The interviewers then followed up with questions about the particular activities in which they’ve engaged for each dimension, if the CA assisted them in gaining the capacity to engage in these activities, and where they see room for improvement. The index was integrated into member interview protocols and the member survey.

The capacity of the current structure of the CA to carry out its objectives was examined, including
the leadership and taskforces. In particular, the advantages and disadvantages of the MCDGC as chair, the balance of power and commitment within the membership of both large international organisations and smaller local ones, and the degree of networking, communication, and sharing of resource capacity was examined.

**Approach to Analysis of Relevance**
Relevance is conceived of here as the degree to which the activities of the CA match the advocacy needs of children in Tanzania, and the degree to which the structure of the CA is appropriate to its stated goals and objectives. Relevance data was collected through the surveys, semi-structured interviews and focus groups. It was analysed by triangulating the advocacy foci of CA coalition members with the investment priorities identified by children and youth surveyed or interviewed, and the policy, legislative, and party platform priorities around children’s welfare identified by LGA staff, MPs, and political party leaders. It was also measured by establishing the expectations and priorities of the members against what has actually transpired, as well as determining if the structure of the CA is fit for its stated purpose. This data will also be measured against how it compares to advocacy models of best practice.

**Approach to Analysis of Effectiveness**
Effectiveness is conceived of here as the ability of the CA coalition and members to carry out activities set forth in strategic plans and achieve stated interim outcomes. Effectiveness data was collected through the document reviews, surveys, semi-structured interviews, focus groups and media tracking. It was analysed by 1) the degree to which activities outlined in work plans have been implemented, 2) by assessing the degree to which interim outcomes in the results framework presented in section 2.1 were attained, 3) the ability of CA members, taskforce leaders, and leadership to carry out their stated roles and responsibilities. These will also be measured against other models of advocacy for children rights in other parts of the world.

**Approach to Analysis of Efficiency**
Efficiency is conceived of here as the ability of the CA and its members to carry out its work plan in such a way that productively utilizes the myriad capacities and resources of its membership and partners. Efficiency data was collected through the document reviews, surveys, and semi-structured interviews. It was analysed by measuring the extent of the project implementation, if its outputs are aligned with its work plans, if its interim outcomes are aligned with the project objectives, and if the CA member network is productive and adaptive.

**Approach to Analysis of Sustainability**
Sustainability is conceived of here as the ability of the CA to function with reduced financial and administrative dependence on UNICEF. Sustainability data was collected by document reviews, surveys, semi-structured interviews, focus groups and media tracking. It was analysed by establishing the existing advocacy capacity of the CA coalition members individually and as a collective, including the capacity of the chair and vice chair—or other members—to assume increased financial and administrative responsibilities. Sustainability was be measured by assessing the influence of the CA on the media.
Approach to Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues

Cross cutting issues are conceived of here as those pertaining to equity and access. Cross-cutting issues in this context include gender and marginalised populations living in rural and hard-to-reach areas. This data was collected through our document reviews, surveys, semi-structured interviews and focus groups. It was analysed by establishing how these issues are interpreted, operationalized, and implemented through the CA.

4.5 Data Quality & Ethical Safeguards

All data collection instruments were field tested and revised accordingly in preparation for the main period of field work. Data quality was overseen by Kate Moriaty of CfBT Education Trust. CfBT does not have a formal ethical review or internal review board.

Letters to introduce and seek formal authorisation and documentation for the data collection were sent to PMORALG, and national, regional, and district-level MCDGC staff. Emails were sent to coalition members to seek authorization and support for the data collection from their staff and youth beneficiaries. Advice was sought from MCDGC on how to contact and communicate with the Members of parliament (MPs) including the 27 ‘champions’ group of MPs, and three political parties namely Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM, the ruling party), CHADEMA (conservative party) and Chama Cha Wananchi (CUF liberal party), although this approach turned out to yield only two interviews with MPs. The secretariat (UNICEF) followed-up and acted on introduction and authorisation letters to all government staff and elected/appointed officials.

The evaluation team was respectful at all times to the feelings and thoughts of the participants. All participants were read an informed consent script and gave Voluntary Informed Consent prior to participating and participants were informed that they had the Right to Withdraw (or 'opt out') at any time. Data was stored in password protected computer, and access was restricted to the evaluation team and relevant others.

The evaluation team followed CfBT’s child protection policy when working with child participants and ensured they were supervised by appropriate staff when speaking with children.

The main risks associated with this evaluation concern the participation of children and youth, and the participation of MP’s and political party representatives. To mitigate these issues children were accessed through the CA member organisations who work with them, who in turn obtained parental permission prior to their participation. Children’s/Junior Councils and their facilitators were notified ahead of time; but it was agreed that parental permission to visit with them over the course of their normal meeting schedules was not required.

Meeting with MPs and party representatives created the risk of influencing them in ways counter-productive to the goals of the CA, by for example, not following meeting protocols or creating the impression that they may be under scrutiny for their performance on children’s issues. This was mitigated by ensuring that all proper channels were followed in the process of setting up the meetings, the questions of the evaluators were submitted ahead of time if requested, and the questions were framed so that their knowledge of the legislative and policy environments of children’s issues in their districts and nationally were the focus of the interview.
5. Findings and Conclusions
The findings and conclusions in this section are summarised for each evaluation question.

5.1 Evaluation Question 1
To what extent have agreed activities taken place and interim outcomes achieved during the period 2010 to 2013, noting the absence of written plans in the 2010-2011 period?

Findings
In order to answer this question, a detailed history of the CA and its activities was necessary to understand the evolution of the project and its changing focus since 2010. In keeping with how the coalition has evolved, and for the purposes of this report, the period 2010 to 2013 is divided into two phases:

- Phase I (2010 to 2011) was characterised primarily by an effort to influence political party platforms and candidate policy commitments leading up to the 2010 elections in Tanzania. While there was no formal strategic plan or work plan for this phase, a few existing documents such as power point presentations and policy briefs were used in conjunction with interviews with former and current UNICEF Tanzania staff as the source data for outlining the activities of Phase I.
- Phase II (2012 to 2013) was defined by a new Strategic Plan (2012-2015) and focused on building advocacy capacity among CA members and establishing closer partnerships; between the members themselves, with regional and national elected officials, relevant government ministries and staff, and with the media. It also focused on supporting children’s participation in local, regional, and national decision making. The CA revised its 2012-2015 Strategic Plan in 2013.

Phase 1
The seeds of the CA took root in November 2009, during events marking the twentieth anniversary of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, when UNICEF Tanzania with civil society organisations supported consultations with children in seven regions. The consultations generated the Top Ten Questions that children wanted to ask the nation’s leaders. Elected representatives of the children interviewed civic, religious, business and media leaders as well as leading politicians.

The same group then organised a multi-media campaign putting the children’s questions before the public, including TV and radio spots, full page advertisements in five leading newspapers, and billboards, with the aim of increasing public awareness and raising political consciousness of these issues. Questions and statements such as: “Most abused children do not know where to go for help! What will you do to protect children from violence, abuse and exploitation?” and “More than one in four girls under 18 is already a mother! What will you do to reduce teenage pregnancy?”
“Most children with disabilities are hidden away; What will you do to protect the rights of all children?”

“Most schools don’t have enough working toilets or taps for hand-washing; What will you do to improve hygiene and sanitation?”

“Most abused children do not know where to go for help; What will you do to protect children from violence?”

Engagement with children has been adult-led with UNICEF facilitating a process of consultation with members of the child-led Children’s Council on the development and prioritisation of the Top Ten Investments in January 2010. These groups also agreed to join UNICEF and its partners with the aim of ensuring children were heard during the 2010 elections. The children helped to define the Kiswahili slogan for the campaign, “Tuwape nafasi viongozi wanaojali watoto kwa kutetea haki zao”, which translates as “Let’s support leaders who care about children by defending their rights.” These initial processes of engagement and consultation mark the beginning of the CA.

From April 2010, members of local CSOs began approaching the policy and manifesto committees of the main political parties to advocate for the prioritisation of child rights in the election. In the Children’s Agenda discussions with representatives of the parties, they outlined a list of Top Ten Investments for children, which came to define the core messages of the Children’s Agenda. They were based on the late 2009 consultations with children as well as analyses of the situation of children in Tanzania and discussions among key government and CSO partners.

Consultations between children and civic and religious leaders, and candidates were held in 20 districts by mid-2010. Many of these discussions also featured on phone-in programmes on local radio. The campaign was backed by an extensive media campaign that put the top ten investments and key actions before the public. T-shirts, stickers, banners, policy briefs for each investment, and project literature were printed and distributed to CA member organisations. Interestingly, from the media analysis undertaken as part of this evaluation we see that in 2010 the print media covered slightly more stories regarding child welfare than in any other subsequent year of the CA since. Whilst we don’t have the specific evidence to see numbers published on a daily basis throughout
2010, we can see that from the tracking of media on four key days in 2010 that overall there seems to be slightly more presence of child issues in print media during this year. Whilst we cannot attribute this directly to the CA, we can assume that there was some influence due to these campaign activities.

**Graph 1: Print media reporting child welfare stories from 2010-2013**

According to the 2012 CA Annual Report, several political parties had, as a result of the 2010 election efforts of the CA, amended their manifestos to reflect elements of the Top Ten investments for children. Local CSOs were able to secure signed commitments to the Children’s Agenda from more than 300 candidates for parliament or council seats, although this number could not be independently confirmed by the evaluators. On 14 June 2010, the current President of Tanzania, Jakaya Kikwete, was interviewed by the Children’s Council on national television – a first in Tanzania. The President also featured child survival and education messages on his campaign billboards, apparently for the first time, according to the CA 2012 Annual Report. The MCDGC (although not the chair or even an official member at this time) pledged government support for the Children’s Agenda and urged partners to mobilise CSOs and local government across the country to increase investment in children.

Put very simplistically, the assumption in the advocacy results framework is that awareness will lead to action. But interviews with current and former CA leaders and members reported that the while awareness of the issues increased, they have yet to see elected officials make any meaningful changes to government policies, services, or budgets. Still, there was a feeling of accomplishment and momentum, and a sense that a coalition and local capacity-building approach of bringing the advocacy capacity at UNICEF to Tanzanian civil society was being paved.

*Members of the National Children’s Council meet with President Kikwete in 2010.*
CA members then set about crafting a post-election strategy which was outlined in a September 2010 presentation, proposing:

- a taskforce for each of the Top Ten Investments;
- a decentralised regional leadership structure;
- an online children’s constituency monitoring tool;
- and a retreat to craft a new strategic plan in February 2011.

A CA newsletter was published monthly from October of 2010 to January 2011 by the Association of Journalists Against AIDS in Tanzania, who also began preparations for a website. However, just prior to the 2010 elections, there was a change of the country representative at UNICEF Tanzania. According to multiple communications staff at the time, the new leadership did not initially see value in the CA, preferring the more traditional communications approach of focusing on events and publications, and paused all activities and financial support for the CA for most of 2011. In fact there were no CA documents from 2011 provided to evaluators.

Phase II

According to current and former UNICEF staff, as well as the Chair of CA at the time, after discussions with CA members, the UNICEF leadership became re-convinced of the value of the CA, and activities resumed by late 2011. However, the departure of the UNICEF Chief of Communications in early 2012 and the absence of a replacement for a further 18 months placed considerable pressure on a depleted UNICEF communications staff to act as secretariat. Staff turnover is a frequent occurrence in organisations and the resultant capacity or institutional knowledge gaps can cause difficulties. On the one hand, it indicates the strong reliance that the CA placed on UNICEF to sustain and drive the coalition. On the other, the fact that the CA survived this period demonstrates a high degree of interest and dedication to the CA among members.

This phase is defined by the 2012-2015 strategic plan developed in November of 2011, and revised in 2013, which organized the CA into a set of 9 taskforce areas around four main areas of operation:

1. Building capacity and strengthening the coalition for child rights advocacy among civil society partners
2. Establishing child rights partnerships with Parliamentarians, Councilors and other key influencers.
3. Building capacity and establishing partnerships for child rights with the mass media.
4. Strengthening and expanding opportunities for sustainable, quality participation of children as advocates for their rights.

The taskforce areas were eventually revised down in 2013 to the six areas which currently form the structure of the CA and can be seen in annex 14.

According to interviews with current and former UNICEF staff and CA members present at the time, the MCDGC approached UNICEF in late 2011 and committed to supporting the CA as Chair. Initially some CA members had reservations about a government ministry as chair of an advocacy
organisation, as there were doubts a government entity would have the time to lead such a large change programme. However, the idea was also seen by other members as beneficial to the long-term sustainability of the CA, as it meant government ownership of child rights efforts. The maintenance of a good working relationship between CA members and the MCDGC, with whom many CA members already worked closely was also seen as a strong reason to have MCDGC as chair.

The four areas of operation outlined in the 2012-2015 strategic plan shifted the focus of the CA away from elections and visibility, and toward capacity building of CA members, the media, and children. Planning and funding for research on urban childhood in Tanzania, the Advocacy Toolkit, and the Budgeting for Children Guide, was initiated in late 2011. At the same time, the CA and UNICEF began supporting for the Young Reporters Network (YRN) which aimed to create and expand media space for some of the most vulnerable children to voice their opinions and concerns about child rights issues in Tanzania. Working with CSOs (ZAPHA+, World Vision, Save the Children and Mkomobzi, MYCN, Huheso and Plan International) and community radio, over 165 young reporters – including some affected/infected by HIV, living on the streets and in extreme poverty – were trained under this initiative and are now due to be operating in ten locations across the country. They are engaged in producing children’s radio programmes, video reporting, photography and use of social media. In 2012, MYCN negotiated the YRNs first TV show with one free hour air-time per week to be produced by the Mwanza young reporters.

Despite delays to the CAs implementation in 2011, the strategic plan that followed set forth a map to build coalition capacity leading up to the 2015 elections. It is an ambitious plan, with a new leadership structure and an expanded mandate from the original conception in 2010 to include capacity building not only of members but of multiple youth organisations, the media, and elected officials. All the activities that took place in 2012 and 2013 were part of this plan, and so can be classified as ‘agreed upon’ however many activities remain in progress or have yet to begin. It is a rather crude form of analysis but of the activities around 32% are complete (these tend to be those involved with establishment of work), 30% are incomplete, 20% are partially complete and 18% are ongoing (see annex 11). Of course it should be considered that the majority of advocacy work is usually likely to be ‘ongoing.’

**Conclusions for Agreed Activities**

The Children’s Agenda in Tanzania has accomplished a reasonable amount in four years. It has completed or initiated around 52% of the activities listed in annex 11 (these were activities agreed in meetings, strategic plans, and work plans made between 2010 and 2013). While the other 48% have yet to be completed or initiated advocacy work is by its nature ongoing.

These reasonable accomplishments have been achieved despite some setbacks, such as changing leadership, capacities and foci. It has revised its strategic plan three times in order to adapt and despite challenges in direction and member commitment, it has nonetheless accomplished a reasonable amount (save a dormant period in the first half of 2011 when the secretariat, UNICEF,  

12 Source of data: see annex 11 ‘status of activities’
reduced its support).

Although there are few documents with which to reliably conclude whether ‘agreed’ activities took place in 2010, interviews reveal that this was considered a productive phase in the history of the CA.

**Conclusion 1:** There was a sense that the CA was very productive in 2010. However, analysis of agreed activities revealed only moderate progress on agreed activities.

**Conclusions on Interim Outcomes**

1. Increased visibility of children’s issues amongst elected officials and electoral candidates

The CA in 2010 made important gains in achieving the interim outcome of influencing elections, most notably in the area of visibility and awareness among parliamentary candidates as evidenced by a concerted visibility campaign involving billboards, t-shirts, stickers, and banners, radio broadcasts, and the meeting with the Prime Minister. However, evaluators were unable to establish if party platforms were in fact revised as a result of CA efforts in 2010. Though the few existing documents from this period and anecdotal evidence from interviews suggest that one party did change its platform, but the party is not named. There was no indication that the CA or its members have engaged with political parties since then.

There is little evidence to conclude that candidates who signed CA commitments to children’s rights were elected or subsequently engaged with children’s rights issues as elected officials (complete information on who signed commitments was not available). Interviews with CA members and non-member stakeholders indicated however that candidate commitments have not yet translated into an increase in elected officials who support children’s rights, or into changes in government policies, services, or budgets in the Top Ten Investments as a direct result of this strategy. There has been no organised effort to follow up on those who made written commitments, however, anecdotal evidence through interviews indicate that some MPs have been resistant to follow-up efforts. Interviews with two MPs suggest that there is as yet not enough support for child rights initiatives in the legislature. At present a concerted effort is currently underway to influence the constitutional review process.

**Conclusion 2:** The CA was quite successful in raising awareness of child rights issues with political candidates and the public at-large in 2010, but it has not yet been successful in influencing party platforms and candidate policy commitments in such a way that lead to increased power and influence of children’s rights advocates in parliament or that lead to positive changes in government policies, services, and budgets that effect children.

2. Strengthened capacity for policy influence and budget advocacy

The CA has engaged in multiple activities designed to increase capacity among members and partners, including workshops and publications, and these activities remain ongoing (outlined in
Annex 9 and 10). It needs to be considered that without members having capacity they cannot in turn build the capacity of civil-society members. Thus, the evaluation focused on coalition capacity and member capacity. Detailed findings from this aspect of the evaluation are contained in section 5.2 and section 5.3 respectively. To summarise the findings; two thirds of survey respondents and member interviews reported that they or staff in their organisations possessed more than 75% of the 11 advocacy capacities contained in the Advocacy Capacity Index, however, the vast majority (80%) of these reported that all the capacities they possessed (except for working with members of parliament) were not obtained or improved by the CA. In interviews, the capacities members claimed to possess were there because of the background of their staff; not as a result of any focused capacity building by the CA. The capacities that appear to be in most need of strengthening are policy research and data-driven policy advocacy. These are currently not part of the CA strategic plan or annual work plans presented at the 2014 Annual Review Meeting. The capacities that were cited most often to be gained from CA-related activities were working with parliamentarians and conducting public education and awareness campaigns, although the latter was claimed to have been obtained by CA-related activities by only 10% of informants. However, it should be noted that because half of the individual survey takers were new focal persons (who had just joined the CA), the surveys are not as useful as hoped. Instead, more weight was given to the semi-structured interviews. Training on working with parliamentarians remains a focus for the CA in its strategic and annual plans, and while public education and awareness campaigns are not included as training for members, events are planned around the international days that model these capacities.

The latter two capacities in fact were not provided by the CA as trainings, but as supported activities for members, and so could be said to be ‘role modelled’ capacities. In other words, UNICEF and other members engaged in these activities, such as policy research, but not in a way that was deliberately intended to build the capacity of other members to engage in such activities on their own. It should be noted that while members cited working with parliamentarians as an advocacy capacity obtained by their membership in the CA, the same informants also complained that this represented an area where the CA could use substantial improvement. This indicates that an attempt was made to build capacity in this area, but with marginal success.

The way members talked about advocacy in interviews revealed that there was also widespread confusion about what advocacy entails, as well as what the primary objectives of the CA were. Many confused service delivery with building the capacity of partners, while others limited advocacy to a single activity like lobbying politicians or strengthening the voices of children.

The strength of the coalition has suffered as waning commitment to the CA on the part of members has manifested itself in poor attendance at taskforce, quarterly, and annual review meetings. This was corroborated in interviews by all informants and was also a prominent issue at the annual review meeting in January 2014. Half of members present at the annual review meeting in 2014 reported in surveys that their activity with the CA had decreased since first becoming a member. The most prominent reasons cited for decreasing activity was lack of focus of the CA, lack of internal resources to fully participate, and a lack of direction within the CA. The position of the CA within member organisations varied; the CA remained prominent in some, but more than half of the organisations interviewed for this evaluation expressed concern about a lack of knowledge or commitment to the CA on the part of their own leadership. This was most pronounced in the case
of field staff who consistently complained that the national leadership of their own organisations lacked sufficient knowledge about their activities of the CA. Furthermore, most interviewees described competing priorities between the CA and member organisations’ primary donors.

It was also found that taskforce members did not effectively seize opportunities for collaboration including the sharing of resources or expertise beyond a few planned trainings and meetings. For example, development of music and films have been planned since 2012, but members in charge reported facing challenges in recruiting artists and finding venues in which to record and do post-production work, even though the CA member, Art in Tanzania, has its own video and music studios and works regularly with musicians and film makers. It is not entirely clear whether this is because they are concerned about sharing their resources, haven’t been approached yet or simply haven’t considered it their role to volunteer. Another example is that members complained that newspapers were not printing stories about CA activities even when CA-trained journalists were present. A possible reason for this seems to be that these CA trained journalists were those less well trained who required payment for articles by newspapers and/or perhaps didn’t have relationships with the right editors. It was commented by a group of journalists working with AJAAT that “They [the CA] are working with the wrong journalists”. Indeed, the CA member AJAAT has a list of trained and vetted journalists who cover HIV/AIDS and other rights issues, but this list has yet to be utilised by the CA or its members according AJAAT staff. Though AJAAT has reduced involvement in the CA since 2010 and this could explain why the CA have not been able to take advantage of their journalists. Either way, this means that the CA are expending effort in training journalists who in the end do not prove effective.

As stated earlier, most CA members who were interviewed complained that the focus and excitement from 2010 had been lost and this discouraged many from now participating fully in the CA. The most consistent reason stated for this was that the MCDGC staff assigned to act as chair of the CA did not appear to have the time, or capacity to fully carry out their duties as chair. It was perceived by most that UNICEF as secretariat had to perform the majority of leadership duties. Members of the MCDGC who were interviewed considered that the MCDGC had performed well in many of the chair duties, such as setting agendas for meetings, leading meetings, and arranging for member interactions with parliamentarians and other relevant government ministries. Though they noted that they were indeed limited by time and resources, and had not been able to meet many of the expectations of the chair. Nearly all CA members interviewed and surveyed reported that staff in charge of leading meetings were consistently late, that UNICEF was consistently setting meeting agendas, and that interactions with elected officials had decreased since 2010.

**Conclusion 3:** The self-perception of CA members is that advocacy capacity among themselves is moderate to high, but the CA as a collective was not credited with building this capacity. It was claimed that leadership, coordination, and resources were the capacities in need by the members. Members also said that there had been no concerted effort to engage with the leadership of their own organisations so that they could prioritise the CA and activities within their organisations. Indeed, it appears that the strength of the CA coalition has suffered since 2011 due to lack of focus and direction. While members say their commitment to child rights advocacy remains very high, the extent to which members communicate, share resources and capacities, and coordinate with each other, is low. As a result there is little concerted effort to build external or partner capacity.
2. Establishing child rights partnerships with Parliamentarians, Councillors and other key influencers.

Members surveyed and interviewed report gaining some interaction with parliamentarians through CA-sponsored activities, but very little support for partnerships with LGA and PMORALG officials. There was only one meeting between CA members and MPs between 2012 and 2013; more meetings and activities with MPs are planned for 2014. Concern was also expressed by many informants that there is a lack of focus on building partnerships with cultural and religious leaders. There were no documented activities with either group despite explicit mention of working with religious leaders in the 2012-2015 strategic plan.

Parliamentarians and LGA officials who were interviewed in Mbeya and Mwanza reported some interaction with individual CA members and were generally familiar with the CA, primarily their work with children’s councils and the 2010 election activities. Those who reported receiving CA materials such as the child participation toolkit and budgeting for children reported that while the materials were helpful, further orientation was required. Most however reported that a lack of resources and policy directives made it difficult to carry out the work of supporting children’s participation. In fact, much of the work of supporting children’s councils, and advocating for children’s rights and budgets, was assumed by LGA staff to be the responsibility of NGOs. The MPs interviewed lamented that while the formation of a group of 27 parliamentary ‘champions,’ (those who have publically committed to promoting children’s rights laws and legislation), was a good start, they still lacked the ability to influence legislation and budgeting at the national level because of their small numbers and loose coordination. This view was corroborated by both CA members and LGA officials who report that while awareness of child rights issues has increased, changes in government policy, services, and budgets have yet to be realised. Whilst we would not expect a direct causal relationship, awareness of such issues can only support and precede improvements in government policy.

Furthermore, there was no evidence that CA has been able to establish additional partnerships with other key ministries such as health and education in order to build broader government support for the Top Ten Investments. The area of political and governmental partnerships was one of the responsibilities of the MCDGC that CA members identified as yet unfulfilled. According to interviews and presentations at the 2014 Annual Review meeting, the activities of the Local Government Taskforce were limited almost exclusively to a single member. They coordinated the bulk of activities around children’s consultations for the constitutional review, distributed CA publications, and ran a training for parliamentarians. As was the case for most taskforces, participation and meeting attendance at the events they hosted was very poor.

**Conclusion 4:** The CA made considerable progress in terms of awareness of children’s rights among some parliamentarians and the public in 2010, but this momentum has faded. The CA has since struggled to make influential and effective partnerships at the national, regional, and local government levels, and with other government ministries, political parties, or cultural and religious leaders.
3. Increased/strengthened partnerships with mass media for child rights advocacy

In summary there has been a concerted effort by the CA to educate newspaper journalists on child rights issues embodied by six different workshops for media professionals since 2012. Evaluators did not find any evidence of formal interactions with TV or digital media professionals. The single professional media organisation member, AJAAT, has reduced their participation in the CA after having been very active in 2010, when they published a CA newsletter and began planning for a CA website (which has yet to be completed). At present the CA has web presence on the UNICEF Tanzania website. Most CA members reported in interviews and surveys that while attendance by the media at CA- and member sponsored media and media training events was good, limited articles have subsequently been published specifically about the CA or member sponsored activities.

There is a wide-spread perception among CA members that the primary way to get articles published is to pay journalists. Interviews with journalists, however, yielded a more complex picture. Indeed, they reported, that many journalists ask for money to write articles. These tend to be the poorly paid journalists—who thus attempt to increase their incomes through ‘pay-to-play’ tactics—but who also lack the skills not only in reporting on children’s rights issues, but in basic journalism and writing skills, and have trouble submitting articles that get approved for publication by editors. “They [the CA] are working with the wrong journalists,” concluded the group of journalists from AJAAT who were interviewed. As stated earlier, AJAAT has a list of journalists that regularly publish articles on HIV/AIDS and other rights issues, but this list has yet to be utilised by the CA or its members, according AJAAT staff. Evaluators were not able to establish whether other professional media organisations such the Tanzania Association of Women Journalists or major newspaper editors were included in CA media efforts.

The evaluation team visited four newspaper’s warehouses as well as the Tanzania National Library Services in order to go through the selected copies for each period in 2010 to 2013, sampling the reports on eight days in every year. The total number of stories relating to children found during those sample dates was 889 and of those, only three made specific reference to the CA. Nipashe - the privately owned newspaper, IPP Media Group, had the highest number of tracked stories on children at 347. Mtanzania followed with 249 stories in total and Mwananchi with 226 stories over the period of review. The East African totaled 47 stories. Overall, it appears that reporting on child welfare issues did not increase over the period reviewed (see the graph 2 below) and that specific mention of the CA was extremely limited. Furthermore, as mentioned earlier there seemed to be a slight peak in print reporting on child issues in 2010 and a very slight decline each year since then, with the lowest amount of print on child welfare found in 2013. In more specific detail, according to the data there were no print references to any of the events that the CA initiated by name (such as press releases or workshops). For example, in March of 2013 when the media seminar on teenage pregnancy was held, no stories were found in the four papers reviewed within the dates sampled. Similarly, press releases sent out on June 15 2013 with reference to Day of the African Child do not appear to have been picked-up by any of the sampled papers. When searching for stories that could be a result of the press releases and/or media training/advisories but not referencing CA, only one paper was found to have reported on one of CA activities. In October 2013, Nipashe had two articles on the Year of the Girl Child celebrations. However, it is not clear if that was due to CA’s press release or another’s press release.
It is worth noting that from 2010 to 2013 of the 889 stories relating to the Top Ten Investment areas, ‘save lives of children and women’ (SLCW), ‘early childhood development’ (ECD), ‘quality education for all children’ (QEC), and ‘protect children from violence, abuse and exploitation’ (PCVAE) were the most referenced themes in the print media.

**Graph 2: Total number of stories by Top Ten Investment area from 2010-2013**

The analysis also concluded that a lack of presence in digital and social media persists with popular websites such as Facebook not being effectively capitalised upon although nearly 90% of internet users in Tanzania are members of or use Facebook (*ihub Research 2012 [www.tanganyikan.co.tz/?p=618](http://www.tanganyikan.co.tz/?p=618)*). The CA has a Twitter Account set up in January 2014 with 274 followers already, though from the table below it would appear that Twitter is a much less used platform than Facebook in Tanzania.

**Table 4: Social Media Usage in Tanzania**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Media Platform</th>
<th>% of internet users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>90.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StumbleUpon</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LinkedIn</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the findings of the analysis, the CA is not presently taking advantage of social media to its full potential. To do so, commitment, resources and a champion is required to develop a full strategy and work plan that is properly supported and resourced by the CA.
Conclusion 5: The CA has made a concerted effort at establishing partnerships with the media, though it appears that these activities have not yet led to CA specific media coverage of the coalition or events. Newspaper articles addressing child welfare seem to have declined since 2010, and there is no evidence to suggest that newspapers had reported on any of the media events or press releases provided by the CA. Closer relationships with journalists’ organisations and editors, rather than individual journalists, are needed.

4. Strengthened and expanded opportunities for sustainable, quality child participation

The Government of Tanzania (GoT) ratified the UN convention of the Rights of the Child (CRC) in 1991, and the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child (ACRWC) in 2003. In 1996 Tanzania formulated a Child Development Policy, which was revised in 2008. The policy advocates for children’s rights to survival and development, protection and participation. The Law of the Child Act, passed by Tanzania’s parliament in November 2009, provides a national legal framework through which the rights of children can be protected and realized. Among the rights addressed in the law are children’s right to have an opinion and to participate in decision-making.

In 2002, the government of Tanzania created the Junior Council structure which aims to represent children’s views at national and regional levels. The MCDCG has further included consultations with children as a key feature in national review processes and child rights monitoring.

While there are now a number of policies and laws favouring child participation, children’s issues are still quite marginalised in Tanzania. In general, teaching and the traditions of bringing up children in Tanzania tend to be authoritative, supporting patriarchal and hierarchical structures in family and the community. The survey ‘Views of the Children 2007’ on Tanzanian children’s perceptions of education and their role in society confirms this, showing that learning in school is top-down and non-participatory, and corporal punishment widespread. While many children say they feel informally listened to in families, there is very little institutionalized participation and listening to children’s views.

A number of stakeholders, including government officials and civil society actors (such as Save the Children, REPSSI, GNRC, World Vision, PLAN, Children’s Dignity Forum and others) are working to introduce quality child participation in different settings in Tanzania. They are working through peace clubs, children’s committees, children’s councils and school councils using nationally or internationally developed guidelines and a wide range of participatory tools. But apart from these initiatives most child participation activities are often one off events with symbolic participation.

CA members have actively supported the participation of children in government decision-making and in their homes and communities in a number of ways (these are detailed in annex 11) and remain extremely committed to the idea. As one CA member put it "There needs to be more focus on grassroots advocacy, and getting our members and Children’s Councils to understand and get involved in the local political processes." In summary, support for Children’s Councils, school-based children’s rights clubs, and the Young Reporters Network (YRN) are ongoing projects of the CA as a coalition and of individual CA members at local, regional and national levels. However, evaluators
found that Children’s Councils, which were sometimes called Junior Councils, lacked common operating structures and processes, and links between the different levels appeared weak. Generally, the Children’s Councils are coordinated in conjunction with the MCDGC, who has overseen the establishment and maintenance of Children’s Councils since 2009, as well as with LGAs who in partnership with local CSOs and NGOs are mandated with supporting and interacting with children’s councils at the ward and district levels. This support and interaction varied greatly from place to place, and most LGA staff interviewed identified a lack of general funding (not specifically from the CA but generally)—and thus their reliance on NGOs as barriers to more proactive interaction. As one ward executive director put it "There’s been some recent policy changes like all the primary schools need to offer pre-school, or all the police stations have to have gender desks. But there’s rarely ever money that comes along with it. Where are the preschool teachers and extra classrooms going to come from? Who will staff the gender desk?" Some also identified other barriers such as a lack of general capacity, as one LGA member put it "We know about the child participation handbook, but we just haven’t had the time or training to really use it."

In addition to the commitment and support the CA has for the Children’s Councils, children have been consulted by or through the CA on numerous issues including input on the Top Ten Investments, the 2012-2015 strategic plan, and the review of the Tanzania Constitution. Members of the YRN have established regular call-in radio programming where they have an opportunity to interact with the public and promote children’s rights. Members of the ward- and district-level Children’s Councils and Children’s Rights Clubs have also begun to interact directly with law enforcement and child protection government staff at the Village, Ward, and Municipal levels to report violations of children’s rights, including physical abuse, child labor, sex trafficking, and denial of the right to go to school.

The fact that children are being proactive in asserting their rights through Children’s Councils is very positive. Indeed, one children’s council member stated "We know who the parents are who don’t respect our rights, and the teachers who use sticks, and the people who use children for work or prostitution. We’re not afraid of them. We know our rights now." However, challenges remain in building the capacity of CSO, NGO, and LGA staff in supporting and interacting with children’s councils, and standardizing the way they are named, structured and organized, as multiple iterations of children’s participation structures were found in the field, in part due to multiple sponsoring institutions, but also due to variance in the degree of support they are getting from LGAs.

Another challenge can be found in widespread disappointment on the part of Children’s Council, YRN, and Children’s Rights club members regarding the response of government officials to their input on child rights issues, services, policies, and budgets. This was in response to questions about their interactions with LGA staff, elected officials, and candidates for elected office. Focus group discussions feature comments that MPs who signed pledges in the run-up to the 2010 elections have not made good on their promises to promote children’s rights and the Top Ten Investments, and that their consultations with other officials and adults have not yielded the changes they had hoped for. Considerable frustration was palpable in all the children’s focus groups regarding their influence on politicians and the lack of any discernable progress on things like education quality,
child protection, and health in their view. This is summarized by one child from Mbeya who said “Are you here to ask us questions and then disappear to do nothing like all the other adults who come here to talk to us?”

MPs and LGA staff acknowledged in interviews that little progress has been made on the Top Ten Investments in terms of budgets, policies, or services. Most cited a general lack of government funds to address these issues, and that most politicians, especially at the local level, cater to what they perceive to be voter interests, which tend to favour roads and infrastructure projects. Hence, the context is not necessarily conducive to child participation as their ideas cannot necessarily be met and as a result leads to feelings of discouragement and disengagement. How to manage the expectations and competing priorities of the Children’s Councils and LGAs should be considered by the CA as they move forward in this area of work. Finally, none of the children’s groups interviewed participated in any local or regional budgeting processes.

**Conclusion 6:** The CA has made progress in supporting children’s councils, who appear to be focusing proactively on issues concerning child abuse, child labor, sex trafficking, and denial of the right to go to school. Children’s Councils are however in need of national and regional standards of operation, mechanisms for persistence in holding MPs and other elected officials to account for commitments to children’s rights, and support for participation in local and regional policy setting and budgeting processes. There is an enthusiasm from some CA members to get more involved in grass roots level advocacy with children, but this would take time and resources. The CA needs to consider where it focuses its efforts.

5.2 Evaluation Question 2

**How efficient and effective is the Children’s Agenda, including its activities and structure, with respect to the capacity of the coalition as an entity in and of itself?**

**Findings**

As described in the previous section, the CA has remained relatively productive in terms of carrying out activities as a coalition, and has made progress toward its interim outcomes. The CA is at a critical juncture, however, in the commitment of its membership as evidenced by decreasing participation in meetings and more than half of members interviewed or surveyed describing decreasing activities with the CA since joining. This means that while the CA continues to be relatively productive, fewer members are taking on the work of the CA. Commitment has suffered for multiple reasons and among those most cited in interviews were: ‘the CA lacks leadership or focus’ and that ‘members have limited internal resources to continue participation’.

The chair of the CA (which consists of designated staff from the Children’s Department of the MCDGC) has proven to be committed to the CA and its aims, and thus the MCDGC remains an important partner for the CA. It has coordinated a number of initiatives including a meeting with MPs, the distribution of CA materials around child participation, budgeting support to LGA staff and leading the CA annual and quarterly meetings. Most CA members interviewed expressed a great degree of respect for the MCDGC and the many challenges they face with funding and influence. According to multiple sources in the government and UNICEF, the ministry is
comparatively not well funded in large part because its work is highly supported by international assistance, including that from UNICEF. For this same reason, there are clear benefits for both CA members and the MCDGC to closely collaborate on children’s rights issues.

However, in interviews and surveys, CA members also consistently expressed concern for the ability of the MCDGC to carry out all the functions of the chair. In fact this was the second most cited reason as to why members had decreased their activity with the CA. The first was loss of focus, with which the MCDGC was also associated by informants. The interim outcome around relationships with parliament and LGAs, is a prime responsibility of the MCDGC and has not been carried out very well according to CA members who were interviewed. They cited low CA member interactions with MPs and LGA staff, and said they did not participate in local budgeting processes. According to interviews, this was a result of a lack of understanding of the budgeting process on the part of local CA member, a lack of clear or consistent direction by LGA staff supervisors to engage with the CA and children’s councils, and a lack of clear communication between CA member headquarters in Dar and their local or regional offices.

In Dodoma, Mbeya, and Mwanza, for example, the evaluators found that the local staff of CA members with national headquarters in Dar expressed concern about knowledge of what was happening at the national level. A regional chapter of the CA was established by locally based members in Mwanza in October of 2013 to more directly advocate for the particular needs of children and the organisations that serve them in the Mwanza. This followed the regional leadership structure that was envisioned by CA members at the end of 2010. The group is attempting to make strategic linkages with representatives such as parents, local MPs, community religious and cultural leaders and mayors and their municipal councils. According to interviews and a report from the 2014 Annual review meeting, the larger international NGOs who have projects in Mwanza have yet to engage in this effort.

In Dodoma, there used to be a group of CA members led by Right to Play but when they closed the programme, CA coalition activity in the region waned. The larger institutional members of the coalition at the national levels like Compassion and World Vision did not play an active role in the district/regional areas that the evaluators visited. Nor did they participate in the formation of the coalition at the decentralised levels, or promote the children’s agenda among LGA staff and government officials. PACT had an office in Mbeya, but it was not working formally with the CA there. These organisations had multiple projects in many hard-to-reach and underserved areas throughout Tanzania.

Nearly all informants reported high marks for UNICEF’s role as secretariat, and many credited them with picking up some of the duties of chair, including running meetings and setting meeting agendas. Interviews with UNICEF staff revealed, however, that there have been ongoing challenges with staffing at the Communications section in terms of leadership and support having been without a Chief for 18 months, and currently has one technical staff person and one administrative support person. The staff should be commended for the progress and support they have enabled despite these challenges, as UNICEF was highly praised for their productivity and professionalism.
by CA members and non-member stakeholders alike.¹³

Both UNICEF staff and CA members expressed concern, however, for the lack of integration of the CA into the other programme sections within UNICEF, such as health, child protection, and education. UNICEF was characterized by multiple UNICEF staff informants as an organisation of ‘silos’ and the work of the CA was done by the Communications section staff in functional isolation from other sectors, despite the potential for intersections. Among the 14 CA member organisations and staff that were interviewed, similar ‘silo’ sentiments were repeated regarding UNICEF. However, whilst members reported this lack of link as frustrating it is important to recognise the activities are different and there may not necessarily be a clear connection between CA activities and other programmatic work.

Conversations with some CA members revealed that many appeared to confuse the services they provide for children and their families with the work of advocacy. ‘Everything we do fits into the goals of the Children Agenda’, was a common statement when asked about the specific activities they do on behalf of the CA, and some version of this sentiment was made in virtually every interview. In following up on these comments, it was revealed that sometimes there was a lack of understanding of what advocacy truly entailed, a lack of clarity and distinction between the advocacy efforts of individual institutions and those for which they were contributing toward within the context of the CA, as well as a perceived lack of focus on the part of the CA and a perceived devaluation of membership in the CA since 2011.

In understanding the capacities of individual institutions, there does not appear to have been any process or mechanism to verify the capacity of individual members to effectively contribute toward the CA. Some members cited a lack of resources to carry out many of the CA-related activities. One member in Mbeya who facilitates a children’s council had no computer to, among other things, print out the views of their Council to deliver to the Municipal Council and LGA staff. Another member in Mwanza complained that they have no capacity to transport children to Ward Council budget meetings. Another member in Dar complained that their staff must carry out the objectives of their donors, and cannot afford to have them spend time on CA-related activities.

Conflicting pressure from donors, especially among CA members who do not receive funding from UNICEF, was consistently reported as a challenge to CA participation and interaction with other members. Interviews with the larger international NGO members who receive funding from other UNICEF programme sections such as Child Protection more often spoke about their participation in child rights advocacy as in partnership with UNICEF, and less so as members of the CA. This revealed perceptions that the CA had weakened as a focal point for advocacy: for smaller, local CSOs and NGOs who must prioritize the requirements of their donors, and for more prominent members who, typically receiving funding from UNICEF, attend to the requirements of their financial relationship with UNICEF, and less so as members the CA. Furthermore, the broad—or perhaps less focused—scope of child advocacy activities undertaken by the CA since 2010 may have served to complicate these tensions.

¹³There was likely some reluctance to criticise UNICEF given many organisations’ dependence on them for funding and other support. However, it was made clear to all informants that interviews and surveys would be anonymised and as such the data collected on UNICEF remains relevant and valid.
Almost all of the 14 CA member organisations and staff who were interviewed identified the moment in late 2011 when the CA ‘confused themselves’, or ‘lost direction’, or ‘forgot what we’re really about’. This was the moment when UNICEF sought to resume support for the CA after nine months of reduced support. Based on interviews with CA members, 2010 was considered an exciting and successful year, and most remembered it for the visibility it generated for the coalition and its individual members. Most claimed that the CA was more broadly known and recognised by non-member stakeholders, children, and the public than at present, and this sentiment was repeated by former UNICEF staff, LGA staff, and the two MPs who were interviewed. Most interviewees mourned the lost momentum, and expressed hope the coalition would return to the focus it had in 2010. Some members appeared to be active participants in carrying out change in the CA while others have reduced their activities and are on a wait-and-see basis, especially on the question of leadership.

The challenge at the end of 2011 was to redefine the CA strategy post-elections, with an eye towards the 2015 elections, but also with some interest in a number of other goals, including advocacy capacity building, establishing ‘relationships’ with MPs and the media, and empowering children and children’s councils. Aside from tentative plans by the CA in late 2010 to establish a regional leadership structure rather than a national taskforce-based structure, the evaluators found no other reason to believe that the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan that emerged would have been any different had it been crafted earlier in 2011. Some of the work of this plan has been accomplished, but perceptions are that it has been done in a piecemeal way —which is to say that there was little clarity among members and non-member stakeholders about how the many activities of the CA fit into a larger, cohesive vision.

There is also emerging evidence to suggest that some of the assumptions behind the CA results framework may not bear out. For instance, the many media trainings, journalist database, and the presence of journalists at CA- and member-sponsored events have yet to lead to any published articles referencing the CA. Work on children’s councils is another example, which has resulted in there being many more of them, but they are structured and run in many different ways even within the same region, and their ability to meaningfully communicate the views of children to candidates, elected officials, and LGA staff is there, but not enacted. Even so, there is so far considerable evidence to suggest that candidates who engaged with these children and/or committed to the values of the CA in 2010 have yet to make good on their commitments. In Mbeya, for example, an MP who visited a children’s council and signed a CA pledge of commitment as a candidate and who was subsequently elected, has since refused to see these very same children who would like to know why nothing has changed since they supported his election. This has the effect of increasing scepticism among children about how much influence they can ever hope to have. These sentiments were expressed by children themselves in the eight Children’s Councils (also known as junior councils), and children’s rights clubs that evaluators talked to. Among the first things the evaluators typically heard from children could be summarized by one child from Mbeya: “Are you here to ask us questions and then disappear to do nothing like all the other adults who come here to talk to us?” Another child in Dar remarked, “We sure made the president look good. What has he done for us?” It is assumed that child participation can only strengthen understanding and commitment to child rights issues, yet this assumption appears to be challenged
The children that were interviewed in focus groups became the most excited and proud when talking about their role in directly advocating for abused, neglected, and trafficked children. They excitedly recounted moments when they reported parents who were known to be violating children’s rights to the police, or recruiting street children to attend school. They realised the most immediate results from these interventions, especially because LGAs had recently been mandated to set up local structures for dealing with child protection issues, including ward- and municipal-level children’s committees and gender and children’s desks at local police stations. So the children themselves enjoyed and were committed to their role, yet the issue remains, that their impact seemed to have been negligible.

The 17 Local Government Agency and PMORALG staff that were interviewed generally had very little idea about CA activities beyond what they remember from the 2010 elections, and some had a few contacts with children’s councils while others had little to none. Children have not been represented at Ward-Executive Committee meetings where local budgets and policies are developed and there was mixed understanding on the part of CA members working with children’s councils regarding local government policy making and budgeting processes. It does not appear that the Budgeting for Children publication has as yet been fully utilised, meaning that issues other than knowledge of the budget process, such as time, resources, and will, are important barriers. Most LGA staff such as Executive Officers and Directors, and Education, Health, and Community Development Officers were aware of the CA literature, most commonly those on children’s participation and budgeting, as these materials were actively distributed to CDOs by the MCDGC. None interviewed had any direct training on these materials however, nor were there any additional funds to enable these staff to support children’s councils. Most commented that unfunded mandates were typical of government action around children’s welfare. According to LGA officials, budgets for children (as defined by the Top Ten Investments) have generally remained unchanged throughout Tanzania since 2010.

**Conclusion 7:** The advocacy capacity of the CA as a collective coalition appears relatively high, but it has not taken full advantage of this capacity. This is possibly due to a lack of direction, a weak cohesive strategy, a lack of clarity and relevance of the value of active CA membership, and a lack of a well-functioning members ‘network’ who know about and utilise the variety of capacities and resources each member has to offer.

**Conclusion 8:** The effectiveness and efficiency of the CA as a coalition is mixed as it has proven to be productive in some areas of advocacy but with varying results. Again, in part this is because of ineffective or partially ineffective strategies as in the case of the media or children’s councils, and in part because of a weakening coalition network where there is a lack of good communication and collaboration.

**5.3 Evaluation Question 3**

How efficient and effective is the Children’s Agenda, including its activities and structure, with respect to the capacity of the coalition as an entity in and of itself?
**Findings**

The capacity of each CA member (and therefore the coalition as a whole) was determined by an advocacy capacity self-assessment using an 11 point index summarised in the methodology section 4.1 and as can be seen in annex 3 (data collection instruments). The self-assessment was administered to staff from 16 different member organisations in semi-structured interviews and surveys. For each element in the index, members were also asked the degree to which they gained capacity in that area as a result of activities by the CA. The index categories were as follows:

1. Policy analysis and research
2. Public consultation/constituency input
3. Alternative policy formulation/service approaches
4. Gender/marginalized populations analysis
5. Monitoring and evaluation
6. Funding for advocacy activities
7. Time for advocacy activities
8. Public education/awareness raising
9. Coalition building and networking
10. Media relations
11. Political lobbying and government relations

More than 80% of the 40 respondents marked their organisations between 3 and 5 (out of 5, 5 being the highest mark) in all of the categories except two: funding for advocacy activities and political lobbying and government relations. The categories that were consistently rated the highest were: time for advocacy activities; public education/awareness raising; and coalition building and networking. According to interviews with members these capacities were not obtained or improved by CA-related training, materials, or activities.

It should be noted that since this was a self-assessment, the results are based on self-perception and not confirmed independently, though an ongoing attempt to triangulate opinions of each member organisation was made. In this regard, some further findings are relevant here. First, in the area of monitoring and evaluation, while members claimed to have capacity for this, no M&E system exists although an M&E framework was developed in 2011 but has yet to be implemented.

Secondly, and unsurprisingly, the survey showed that the capacity of the larger international organisations tended to be greater than the smaller national and local ones. This shows up most readily in the areas of policy analysis and research, gender and marginalised population analysis, funding, and public education and awareness raising. The smaller members reported in interviews that one of their biggest capacity needs was funding and fund raising. Only ten CA members have received funds from UNICEF for CA-related activities since 2011. This issue of funding is covered under 5.7, but it is worth noting here that if capacity is scoped to include ‘financial’ capacity results would be considerably different. In interviews most members cited the need for funds as crucial to their ability to continue engaging with the CA. As one CA member put it "We know UNICEF can't just give us money. Although that would be nice, it's not what we really need in the longer term. We
need to be able to apply for more funding from all the donors, and it seems we could do that if we team up with other members, and UNICEF helps us with the application process."

**Conclusion 9:** The CA as a coalition considers that it has not been provided with necessary capacity by the CA. Rather it had these capacities as individual members from the outset. The CA is yet to comprehensively, effectively or efficiently provide capacity, specifically those centred around funding and government relations.

5.4 Evaluation Question 4

How relevant have the activities and structure of the Children’s Agenda been to the needs and goals of its members and to its ability to advocate for children’s rights?

**Findings**

It has been difficult to assess if the coalition structure of the CA—as opposed to one based on individual organisations—has been best suited to the Tanzania context since there is comparable structure with the breadth of coverage and membership against which it can be compared. However, given that there have been many positive developments and successes of the CA, in particular those achieved in 2010 as well as the expressed benefits of local organisations partnering with larger international ones (both realised and potential) one has to conclude that the coalition structure has supported these achievements and indeed, helped it to overcome many of the challenges it has faced.

It has also been difficult to assess whether the structure of the CA is relevant to the needs of its individual members and their ability to advocate for children because of enduring problems in direction and waning member commitment to the CA. CA members did not share any concerns about the coalition format or taskforce structure. Instead, the issue for members was one of ‘focus’, where the coalition is seen to attempt to do too much without having a cohesive purpose or having had much noticeable success over the last two years. Although it should be said that achieving the level of change sought by the CA will mean results always feel relatively limited.

The surveys and interviews illustrated that the Top Ten Investments for children still embody the priorities on which the CA is focused and remain highly relevant to the children, government officials, and CA members. There is broad agreement that these reflect the main issues facing children in Tanzania and are critical to the work of the CA. However, whilst the surveys and most interviews may have shown they still have relevance, several interviewees suggested that the Top Ten Investments should be narrowed to five or even three; though this was more for pragmatic reasons than a desire to reduce the focus of their efforts in these areas.

The activities of the CA were found to be less relevant in terms of the member’s needs and opinions. In particular many interviewees felt that the CA has recently focused more effort on media and awareness raising through international days, rather than on funding, fund raising capacity, and government relations - which were activities identified by the members as being ones they would like to have training or support on. Although the CA planned robust efforts to build CA
member relations with government officials and bodies, these efforts have so far been limited.

Based on interviews with CA members, the activities that are most relevant to the needs and goals of its members are 1) visibility/awareness of the CA, its members, and its message, 2) influencing local, regional, and national elections, 3) influencing laws, policies, and budgets that concern children’s rights and welfare, and 4) providing coordinating support, funding and fund raising support, and networking for members.

This evaluation of the CA is based on the stated objectives of the CA itself, yet it is also worth considering here how relevant the CA activities and structure compares to other advocacy initiatives. Each advocacy initiative is unique in as much as it is addressing a specific problem at a specific time, in a particular context and these will inform the way the advocacy is undertaken. The majority of advocacy initiatives, however, share common traits and a substantial body literature exists on advocacy models, planning, actions and evaluation including guidelines on what advocacy is how to do it (The Good Campaigns Guide: Campaigning for Impact, Coe and Kingham 2005, NCVO), as well as a growing body of work on the evaluation of literature on advocacy (A User’s Guide to Advocacy Evaluation Planning, Julia Coffman, 2009; Looking Through the Right End of the Telescope, Jim Coe and Rhonda Schlangen 2011). From large international NGOs such as Amnesty International, Greenpeace and Oxfam, to national NGOs and local CSOs examples can be found of shared advocacy principles. The design of the Children’s Agenda generally compares favourably to accepted good models of practice in advocacy, including advocacy on child rights, although some weakness is evident in the conception, planning and implementation as highlighted in this evaluation.

The CA has ensured children’s voices inform the demands of the advocacy and that children themselves are trained and supported to undertake advocacy, this models best practice guidelines from Save the Children, the largest Child Rights Development and Humanitarian organisation with programmes around the world, who stress the need for children’s voices in advocacy (Advocacy Matters: Helping children change their world, An International Save the Children Alliance guide to advocacy, 2011). A recent publication by Save the Children documents eight case study on advocacy on children rights using human rights frameworks (Child Rights Governance Universal Periodic Review: Successful examples of child rights advocacy (Save the Children, 2014), an approach which could be more prominent in the actual advocacy of the CA. Examples of projects in the region, such as The Adolescent Girls Advocacy and Leadership Initiative (AGALI) in Liberia and Malawi have engaged children as advocates with positive results (http://agaliprogram.org/eng/wp-content/uploads/2009/05/AGALI-2012-Annual-Report.pdf.), in similar ways to the CA.

The coalition model of the CA is inclusive and maximises the potential for change by bringing different skill sets and stakeholder groups together and examples from education coalitions at global and national level highlight the importance of this approach (Country Spanning Citizenship Spaces Through Transnational Coalitions: The Case of the Global Campaign for Education, John Gaventa and Marjorie Mayo, June 2009).

The 2012-2015 strategic plan of the CA is comprehensive in its formulation, identifying the
problems that need addressing, priority areas and range of tools and actions in line with standardized practice in the design of advocacy programmes. As this evaluation of the CA has shown, the initiative has had some achievements and also a number of challenges.

Two areas, however, stand out as being less strong in relation to accepted models of advocacy; these include an articulated vision of change and a strong power analysis to identify key targets. First, all advocacy initiatives have a theory of change, although not necessarily always explicitly spelt out. A theory of change sets out the building blocks necessary to affect the desired changes and how each aspect interrelates with the next to create change. The CA does this to a certain extent, however, the links between different key areas such as building capacity and how this will lead to achieving change are could be considered further. According to an Oxfam blog last year (Lessons learned from a year of advocacy impact evaluation, Posted by Claire Hutchings Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning, Campaigns, Kimberly Bowman Global Adviser, Gender and MEL, 28th Feb 2013) “Theories of change are critical - but often hidden and they take time to unpack”, going forward it may be worthwhile for the CA to look at its own theory of change and articulate this in order to achieve greater impact. Secondly, advocacy is about achieving specific change outcomes, most often in relation to institutional policy and practice, the inclusive nature of the CA, which is actually chaired by a Government Ministry, means that there is not a simple divide between those seeking change (for themselves or on the behalf of others) and those with the power to make those changes. The CA is not alone in this situation and it need not necessarily limit its effectiveness (the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies has members from the UN and civil society and successfully conducts advocacy) but this is clearly an area that needs more attention. Going forward it would be beneficial for the CA to expand its power analysis and in order to most effective channel human and financial resources with maximum impact.

Lastly, advocacy is a process, not a one off event or project, and takes place on multiple levels. Advocacy can build awareness of an issue, change opinions and influence behaviour. Pro-poor advocacy should lead to increased power and influence for the poor and marginalised groups. The CA has largely followed an accepted model, no doubt drawing on UNICEF’s own advocacy toolkit. Further attention to examples of best practice will result in making the CA even more relevant and effective in bringing about the change for children’s rights in Tanzania.

**Conclusion 10:** The CA’s general coalition model and taskforce structure is both perceived as a relative strength by members and when considering other models of best practice. The Top Ten Investments remain relevant to the CA though there is some concern from members that the CA should consider the long term practical challenges of such broad investment areas.

**5.5 Evaluation Question 5**
Is the Children’s Agenda as it is currently structured sustainable\(^\text{14}\) over the longer-term?

\(^\text{14}\) Sustainability is understood as the ability of the CA to remain functional and effective with a decreased administrative and financial role of UNICEF.
Interviews and surveys reveal that the CA is deeply dependent on the administrative and financial support of UNICEF. Stakeholders felt that the children’s agenda activities particularly at the national levels are mostly not sustainable because it needs funding and administrative support from UNICEF or others. Meetings, events, training, research and publications of the coalition as well as children’s council activities incur costs which can be substantial and require extensive efforts in coordination, particular types of expertise, and access to funds. Should any of these be decreased, the CA runs the risk of fragmentation.

There were however, levels whereby it was noted that the activities of the CA are sustainable without substantial external financing or administrative support. These included: the CA activities undertaken by the Right to Play (trained school teachers in Dodoma who continue to work in schools); the rights monitoring activities of the children’s councils at the village levels and many CA-aligned services and advocacy activities undertaken by individual CA members.

The sustainability of the CA is also dependent on the leadership, secretariat capacity and member engagement identified by informants. The leadership has been perceived to lack initiative, direction, or focus. This again highlights the significant role of UNICEF, not just as the secretariat but as a key driving force. Concerns about staffing at the UNICEF Communications section were also consistently raised. Both CA members and current and former UNICEF staff cited the lack of a Chief of Communications for 18 months and a shortage of technical and support staff, as evidence that direction had been problematic for the years under review.

Most members believe that there is existing capacity within the CA membership for taking on more administrative support and filling the leadership vacuum. However, the current structure does not allow for regular evaluations of the leadership or cycles of elections and term limits where members have a chance to change the leadership if deemed necessary; the chair and secretariat are currently permanent. Additional capacities for fund raising and additional funding members are needed to relieve UNICEF of financial dependence.

In terms of the CAs ability to deal with resistance to CA initiatives, the evaluation team found that whilst the CA members saw themselves as able to address the immovability of government or the inaction of elected officials, this was not necessarily the case in practice. For instance, elected officials frequently did not following through on election pledges and yet there was no plan on how to tackle this.

**Conclusion 11:** The CA as currently structured is not sustainable over the long term due to its financial and administrative dependence on UNICEF. Furthermore, its own leadership and member engagement is also weakening and lack of direction and focus were frequently cited in interviews with members and non-member stakeholders. Based on the limited evidence the CA also seems relatively unable to handle resistance from MPs or political figures.

**5.6 Evaluation Question 6**
In what ways has the Children’s Agenda supported advocacy efforts on behalf of marginalized populations and gender equity?
The CA Top Ten Investments reflect a high priority placed on girls and vulnerable populations covering issues within areas such as child protection, child marriage, and maternal and infant health. Issues concerning marginalised and/or excluded populations were further detailed in the CA advocacy briefs, providing a much needed focus within the broad investment areas. Nearly all CA members have service delivery activities around gender equity, and women and girls are among the priority populations of a majority of members. A focus on vulnerability due to geographic exclusion is an area where the CA could improve upon. In Dodoma, Mbeya and Mwanza, evaluators found that the vast majority of CA- and CA member-sponsored activities were located in urban and town centre areas. Children in more rural areas remain not only isolated from CA activities, but they also feature less in terms of representation on children’s councils.

**Conclusion 12:** The CA members and their organisations support efforts on gender equity. Many of them also engage in service delivery activities aimed at improving gender equity. The CA itself is supportive of gender issues, however it has had limited effect in reaching children in rural and hard-to-reach areas. This is of critical importance to be considered going forward.

### 5.7 Evaluation Question 7

**What are the weaknesses, strengths, constraints, opportunities, and lessons learnt since the implementation of the Children’s Agenda?**

**Findings**

**Weaknesses**

The weaknesses of the CA were reported by members and non-member stakeholders as located: in the passive leadership style of its chair; lack of coordination and collaboration between members; lack of focus and cohesion of its mission; inability (so far) to make headway in the areas of government relations and media relations; almost complete lack of monitoring and reporting and finally, a perceived lack of value in membership.

**Strengths**

Its strengths were identified by informants as located: in the performance of the secretariat and in UNICEF as an institution that lends members legitimacy in the eyes of current and potential donors and the communities they serve (although this reliance on UNICEF could be said to affect the long term sustainability of the CA and thus be a weakness it is important to acknowledge the stature of UNICEF with the Tanzanian government as an undeniable asset and strength to the CA). The participation of the MCDGC can also be considered a strength because, as a government partner, it provides access and further legitimacy of the CA among its many staff members throughout the country. The expansion of the children’s councils and Young Reporters Network, as well as the proven ability to conduct successful visibility and awareness campaigns in the context of elections were also cited as strengths by informants.

**Constraints**

The wide variety of needs and capacities of members, as well as their different financial and
coordinating relationships with UNICEF, also presents complex challenges as the CA must find the right mix of capacity building and support activities that enable all members to share resources and expertise more easily.

Time and resources were also constraints. The constitutional review and 2015 elections are only months away, and the ability of the CA to influence these important milestones will have a huge impact on the future viability and sustainability of the CA (as it did in 2010). It is thus important for the CA to consider the recommendations of this report in a timely manner in order to effectively prepare itself to engage in electoral advocacy.

**Opportunities**
The CA finds itself at a critical juncture. It has for the first time the benefit of an independent evaluation and recommendations based on collaborative feedback at the workshop from which to make adjustments to its current strategy. The 2015 elections in particular will present an opportunity for the CA to refocus its mission and regain the visibility and stature it was perceived to have gained over the previous elections in 2010. It has an opportunity to meaningfully re-evaluate its leadership and make the necessary adjustments to address an issue that was consistently identified by nearly all stakeholders as among its most pressing challenges.

Another opportunity can be found in the many new CA focal point personnel who appear to very committed and eager to be involved. The regional CA group in Mwanza is also an opportunity for the CA to pilot a sub-national structure, particularly as this may address the challenge of representing the voices of and advocating for children in rural communities.

**5.8 Evaluation Question 8**
**What is the capacity and reliability of existing monitoring and evaluation systems, and how can these systems be improved?**

**Findings**
There is no formalized or established monitoring and evaluation system. A reporting form was developed in 2013, but according to CA members and secretariat staff it has not been used because there is no mechanism for compliance or perceived value in completing. In 2013 more rigorous indicators were developed in conjunction with the review of the 2010-2015 Strategic Plan, and these should go a long way toward developing an effective M&E system for the CA. However, once again, there is as yet not a clear implementation and enforcement mechanism for this system.

According to surveys and interviews, there is capacity within the secretariat and CA membership to guide the development of such a system. In all the sites visited, it was found that the stakeholders document and report their activities and data in differing ways. While we do point out that there is some confusion about the difference between individual member and CA-contributed activities, all the members report monitoring their activities, even those of the CA, but these get reported to their donors, not the CA. There was no consistent system to routinely monitor, collect and document information and data on advocacy activities, nor is any strategy to monitor indicators related to the Top Ten Investments.
The Young Reporters Networks did not have a way to track listenership and had yet to transcribe and analyse the content of their broadcasts and interactions with callers.

As mentioned earlier, in terms of measuring the CA’s impact on government, there also no system for collecting and following-up on the pledges made by councillors and elected officials.

**Conclusion 13:** While an M&E framework exists as part of the revised 2012-2015 work plan, there is no clear indication of who is charged with coordinating it. Overall, there is a lack of monitoring for the activities of children’s councils, the YRN, or pledges made by elected officials. However, some members are undertaking monitoring for their own purposes and also for their CA activities, so there appears to be appetite for a system. Furthermore, there is capacity within the CA membership and secretariat to guide the implementation of a system.
6. Recommendations

As part of the UNICEF-adapted UNEG evaluation report standards this evaluation has made recommendations that are sustainable for the CA’s resources and relevant to the findings, were agreed as acceptable to members and fit within the capacities of the CA to effectively take forward. The process followed in making these recommendations was initially based on the evaluation team’s findings. Following this, a workshop involving the CA and its’ members (including the chair and secretariat) was held to discuss in detail the recommendations and findings, and ensure that the recommendations made were agreeable and actionable. The following recommendations are therefore based on both evidence from the evaluation and detailed discussions with members of the CA. Here they are given in priority order, according to the findings of the report.

Recommendation area: Structure and Planning

1. Review the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan
The evaluators recognise that the CA made revisions to the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan in 2013, and that these revisions were not directed at inputs and outcomes as much as they were intended to improve monitoring and evaluability. For this reason, the evaluators recommend that the CA once more revisit the Strategic Plan, with the goal of re-focusing its advocacy priorities to a fewer number of time bound areas and reviewing its structure as per item 2 below. The goal of the review would also be to produce two new plans; a short term plan that addresses the CA’s role in the upcoming constitutional convention and 2015 elections, and a longer term 2016-2020 plan. This activity would involve the leadership of the CA reviewing the Strategic Plan in close consultation with the CA members.

2. Consider a new leadership structure
The evaluators recommend a new leadership structure (see diagram 3 below) to strengthen and benefit all members. From the evaluation report, many members felt more capacity was needed at the leadership level and it was difficult for the MCDGC to chair in practice due to their extended commitments. It was suggested the CA consider establishing a new executive leadership that has the capacity to drive the CA forward.

In addition the new executive leadership would be supported by an ‘Advisory Board’ of experts comprising of senior government officials, academics, cultural and religious leaders and relevant private sector parties. The evaluators had identified relatively little involvement with cultural, religious leaders and private sector organisations. The members agreed that these partnerships was lacking during the workshop, but they were less vocal about the idea of an ‘Advisory Board’. Perhaps this was again due to the sensitivity of the issue or the need for it to be considered with more time.

It was also recommended that the CA establish term periods and election processes for the executive leadership positions, advisory board positions and even the new taskforce groups (referenced below). This recommendation would continue to support the CA’s collaborative and unified force and seemed to be mutually agreed by the members at the workshop.
3. Re-configure the taskforces and subtasks
The evaluators also found that the **taskforces and subtasks could be re-configured** in order to create a more focused and accountable team within each taskforce. A reconfiguration would support an increased focus and direction of the taskforces; something that was considered to be lacking overall across the CA. A potential structure of the CA taskforces that reflects such a focus might look like the following:

**Taskforce 1: Leadership**
- Chair
- Vice Chair
- Secretariat
- Taskforce Chairs
- Advisory board made of other Gvt bodies, private sector, academia, etc.

**Taskforce 2: Visibility and Public Education**
- Identity & Branding
- Research and Information Dissemination
- Event planning and support
- Media and Publicity

**Taskforce 3: Elections & Government Relations**
- National (MPs, Prime Minister, Ministries)
- Regional (District/Municipal)
- Local (Village and Ward)
- Political Parties
- Religious/Cultural Leaders

**Taskforce 4: Child Participation**
- National
• Regional
• Local

**Taskforce 5: Member Capacity**

- Networking and sharing of expertise through an ‘Expert bureau’
- Member recruitment, induction, and support

The taskforce reconfiguration focuses the CA on: Leadership; Visibility; Elections; Government Relations; Child Participation; and inwardly on Member Capacity. This reconfiguration of the taskforces from six (including leadership) to five seemed popular in the workshop. Each taskforce would need to create a new work plan that linked to the 2012-2015 strategic plan or any new plans developed as a result of these recommendations.

Linked to the re-configuring of the taskforces, the CA should collaboratively identify members (with most relevant capacity in that field) to take responsibility for being a taskforce chair, and similarly identify a member to take charge of each subtask. Their respective needs for capacity development should be reviewed regularly (see recommendation 5 below).

**4. Consider reducing or re-focusing the Top Ten Investments**

Finally, there was a consensus of members that the CA should reconsider the role of the Top Ten Investments whilst ensuring that we don’t lose their essence and full breadth. Two options emerged. Firstly, one option is to reduce the Top Ten Investments by establishing which are the most pressing, and focusing the activities and goals of the CA on those. The second option is to retain all of the current Top Ten Investments as a framework, but to select two or three on which to focus over each five year strategic plan/election cycle.

**Recommendation area: Capacity and Engagement of the CA members**

**5. Develop networking or sharing of expertise to build capacity**

Opportunities and mechanisms for the sharing of member expertise requires development not least as the basis for building individual and collective capacity but more importantly as the basis for effectively working and pursuing goals as a coalition. The effect of sharing this expertise and building capacity more comprehensively may increase the value of membership and improve member engagement. The “Member Capacity’ Taskforce could play the role of coordinating this process.

**6. Establish an M&E system**

The evaluators found that despite an M&E framework existing as part of the revised 2012-2015 Strategic Plan, there was no consistent plan of who was responsible for its’ coordination and enforcement, and thus was never fully implemented. It is recommended that M&E be overseen by the leadership (perhaps the vice chair) but that all members and taskforces should ultimately have a responsibility for minimum reporting requirements. Clarifying this would support increased accountability and may encourage more members into action (potentially reducing the inertia found in some members as demonstrated by their lack of attendance at meetings).
Recommendation area: Political Allegiances, Media and Profile Raising

7. Track and celebrate political commitments
The evaluators found that there was limited to no information tracking political figures who had pledged support to child rights before the 2010 election. To create more political momentum, these commitments should be followed up. It is recommended that the CA develop a pre and post-election tracking mechanism to identify those MPs and Political Parties who do and don’t follow up on their commitments. This tracking would be undertaken by the Elections and Government Relations Taskforce. Further encouragement could be given to other political figures and parties by the CA actively raising and celebrating the profiles of their supporters, especially the so-called CA ‘champions’, some of whom have requested more support from the CA, as well as opportunities to increase their numbers so that they can wield more influence in the legislature.

8. Improve visibility of the CA and child welfare issues in the media
The evaluators also found that media connections were not being adequately used or explored. The CA should establish direct relationships with newspaper editors, television and radio producers, and professional journalist and media organisations (not just individual journalists), to coordinate media coverage of children’s rights issues and CA-related activities and events. It would also make sense to leverage or make most use of the Young Reporter Network, TV programmes and newspaper pullouts (such as Mwananchi’s dedicated pages to children on Sundays ‘Watoto wetu—“our children”’ and Mtanzania’s pullout on Saturdays both dedicated to children). This would be done by the Visibility and Public Education Taskforce. If possible, the CA should also consider media tracking. This could be done somewhat easily with radio broadcasts and television spots, as recordings and transcripts can be generated, as well as with digital media using various easy online ‘alert’ facilities. Tracking paper media is more resource and time heavy. Tracking of media could potentially be done through the secretariat (UNICEF) who may have access to such expertise already.

Related to this, the CA should also increase its presence on digital and social media by rolling out a dedicated CA web site or instead maintaining its UNICEF webpages and focusing increased attention of its presence on Twitter and Facebook where it already has accounts. The cost and time needed to generate more social media presence is relatively light touch for the comparative impact it can have. The Facebook account would be of primary importance, since it is estimated that 90% of internet users in Tanzania are on Facebook15.

9. Seek high profile persons of influence to champion CA issues
The evaluators recommend that the CA could consider recruiting persons of influence (or high profile) from religious, cultural or celebrity backgrounds to volunteer as public spokespersons and promote the CA to the general public. They could feature as the face of the CA in visibility campaigns and sponsor children’s events or contests in art, music, dance, and writing that are juried by elected and well known officials. This recommendation could be achieved through the membership of the recommended Advisory Board.

---
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10. Consider and agree the role of children’s councils for the CA
The evaluators recommended that the Child Participation workforce take responsibility for working with the MCDGC, PMORALG, and other NGOs who work with Children’s Councils, junior councils, and peace clubs to standardise the application of child participation mechanisms across Tanzania, and better facilitate their active participation in local and regional budgeting and policy making processes.

There was some discussion at the workshop as to whether the CA should be supporting the work of Children’s Councils across all geographical regions. Some members felt it was important that the CA champion the work of all Children’s Councils across Tanzania, whilst others felt it would be extremely time consuming and not necessarily impact effective. Indeed, Mwanza was discussed as a model of best practice for a regional structure of the CA and child participation, which may present opportunities to represent the voices of children in more isolated and rural areas. A case study of Mwanza could be created and used as part of the dissemination work.
7. Lessons learned and next steps

In summary the coalition structure and taskforce groups have proven to be a relatively effective approach to advocacy in Tanzania when evaluating interim outcomes. Overall the CA has completed and initiated some of their agreed activities and is making reasonable progress. UNICEF as a secretariat clearly lends legitimacy and confidence to the members. However, the capacity of the coalition as a unit is also limited due to weak leadership and coordination. Attendance at meetings and commitment from the members appears to be waning at present. While most CA members are deeply committed to child rights advocacy, this alone is not enough to maintain a strong and active membership. There must be a more clear value to their membership, including accessing the expertise and resources of other members and increased visibility or profile of the CA. The CA benefits greatly from having government partners like the MCDGC and should seek to include additional ministries on the advisory board. However, since 2010 there has been relatively little political traction and children or child issues cannot be considered powerful or influential at the political level or in the media. Whilst the CA has made a concerted effort to influence the media, evidence from the media tracking and the members themselves shows us there is very little traction taking place. Lastly, the children’s councils appear to have been relatively well supported and make good sense as a priority group since they are direct advocates. However, they are need of national and regional standards of operation and ongoing mechanisms in holding MPs and others to account for their commitments.

Given the mixed feedback from this formative evaluation that is summarised above, the recommendations made in this report are of critical significance to consider swiftly and carefully.

In particular, the CfBT evaluation team are concerned that the CA consider carefully their leadership structure and governance. It is imperative that the CA membership have a process for evaluating and electing all leadership positions on a regular basis and that there is an agreed time period for leadership positions. It may also be of value to create an advisory board to assist the executive leadership. In addition it is particularly important that the structure of the CA’s leadership and taskforce is considered and members are carefully identified as having relevant capacity to the taskforce they are nominated. It is also a priority to build closer links to politicians in order to track whether they follow through commitments and celebrate them when they do. These celebrations of success should encourage other political figures to follow suit. Lastly, the evaluation team is concerned to ensure that increased networking and skills sharing is undertaken effectively between members. This will add perceived value to their membership and should help to enhance motivation and engagement.