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ABSTRACT

This project is about capacity building for Community Resource Teams (CRTs) in Zanzibar under the Madrasa Preschool Program (MPP). The MPP had gone through two phases with the aim of supporting poor communities to establish, manage and own quality preschools. During this time, there had been capacity building for different sectors of communities. However, there was no support system.

This project describes the process of empowering CRTs who will be responsible for ensuring that the existing technical expertise in communities is sustained. The paper describes training and support given to CRTs in order to affect these objectives. This includes centre and site based training for CRTs, monitoring and evaluation, as well as developing support materials for use by communities and CRTs.

The paper concludes by reflecting on the original objectives and makes recommendations for further training within communities for ownership and sustainability.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The Zanzibar Madrasa Preschool Program (MPP) has come to the end of its first phase for community-owned preschools. Much has happened during the time of this program phase. For example, there has been training of teachers, School Management Committee members, and some members of the community. The program has evolved over time, changing strategies and including aspects that could make the program more effective.

There is a good amount of technical expertise in communities, both in terms of management and conducting classroom teaching for young children. However, there is no system or structure in place to monitor or support this expertise and see that it is sustainable.

The Post Graduation Support for Sustainability is one of the sub-programs developed to address this need: the need to have support systems and structures in communities that would ensure that the already established and active Madrasa preschools do not vanish. As de los Angeles-Bautista (2003) puts it “We can no longer afford the luxury of seeing ECCD as primarily ‘delivery of services,’ because experience has shown us that services that are delivered without supports and learning built into the environment around the child and/or family will quickly diminish in effect when the services are withdrawn” (p. 13). The Zanzibar Madrasa Resource Centre (ZMRC) would like to see sustainable preschools that do not disappear after ZMRC ceases to deliver services.

One way of responding to this issue had been trying to build the technical capability of members from within communities. There have been several attempts to
address this including training of lead and head teachers. However, these trainings were
delivered without follow-up or support to trainees and therefore they did not bring about
the expected outcome.

The Community Resource Teams (CRT) capacity building program was
developed to address some of the shortfalls that were identified in the training of lead and
head teachers. It is aimed at ensuring that in addition to theory given, a close follow-up of
trainees will be conducted so that they are able to give each other support, to support
others and to monitor and evaluate preschool activities.

Statement of the Project

This project is about the process involved in “Building ECD Community
Leadership for Sustainability.” It is a project of the Zanzibar Madrasa Resource Centre a
local NGO whose aim is to support marginalized Muslim communities to establish, own
and manage sustainable (technical, organizational and financial) quality Madrasa
Preschools. It is one of the most successful ECD programs in the world. The Madrasa
Preschool Program (MPP) is a Regional East African program, with three countries in
East Africa taking part. It started in Mombasa (Kenya) in 1986 when His Highness The
Aga Khan visited Mombasa and encouraged Muslims to integrate secular education in the
already existing traditional Qur’an madrasa. In most traditional madrasa, children usually
recite the Qur’a’n and child development principles are not practiced. The Madrasa
Preschool program aimed at responding to this problem by introducing Active Learning
and integrating religious with secular education in these madrasa.

The program started in Zanzibar as a pilot in June 1989, and Kampala (Uganda)
in 1993 (Nzomo, Bartlett, & Ndayyide, 2003). By 2001, the MPP in Zanzibar had
undergone three phases, during which time the ZMRC developed technical capacities of communities so that they could manage preschools and perform classroom teaching effectively. The program started as a pilot in the years 1989-1990 when two preschools from the urban area were taken as pilot schools. Four teachers from these preschools were sent to Mombasa (Kenya) for a four months training course.

The first phase of the program was in the years 1990-1995. During the pilot and this period the emphasis was on preschool teacher training, development of the Islamic integrated curriculum and building linkages with the Government. Preschool teachers from the madrasa preschools were trained for three months and were regularly supervised in their classroom practice. In addition, teachers from the ruling Political Party Branches were trained for a period of one month at the Zanzibar Madrasa Resource Centre. The second phase of the program was in the years 1995-2001. During this period emphasis was on teacher training, strengthening management of preschools, community ownership and continuing to build relationships with the Government and other ECE institutions. A Madrasa Preschool curriculum that had started to be put together in the first phase of the program was worked upon further and the finished curriculum was available by the end of the phase. In addition, staff from the three MRCs developed other support materials including the Teacher Trainers’ Manual, the SMC Trainers’ Manual and other teacher support materials. The third phase of the program started in 2002 and is continuing until 2006. During this phase, there is a shift from ECE to ECD, and preschools that graduated during the second phase of the program will be strengthened to include aspects of ECD that were not addressed during the former two phases. Amongst the things that will be addressed during the current phase are:
• Strengthening involvement of parents and working with them as direct beneficiaries of the program.
• Building partnership between parents and teachers so that they work together towards ensuring effective development of children.
• Integrating in the curriculum health and nutrition (including HIV/AIDS) and special education needs of children.
• Working with parents to support children under 3 years of age who are not attending madrasa preschools.

As explained above, the program is based on community ownership, and communities are empowered at different levels to be able to establish and run their own preschools. At the beginning of the second phase of the program, there was extensive community mobilization for creating awareness on the importance of education for young children. Intensive capacity building mainly focused on Teachers and School Management Committee (SMC) members who were trained to take specific roles and perform specific activities. Towards the end of the second phase, Lead Teachers (LTs) and Head Teachers (HTs) were trained to support other teachers in maintaining the quality of classroom learning and the school environment. However, training these individuals could not achieve program objectives. These members being teachers, have a group of children to attend to in the classroom and are therefore mostly concerned with classroom activities and child focused issues; it was not possible for them to have extra time in identifying and monitoring other preschool issues, for example, management and financial issues. In addition, the SMC is the management body of the preschool and is considered to be employer for teachers. It was therefore difficult for the HT and LT to
face the SMC and tell them of their “failures” in carrying out their responsibilities. From lessons learnt during the first community capacity building activities, a decision was made to have a second level of community capacity building that will focus on training teams in addition to training individuals. The composition of these teams considered having members associated with classroom teaching, school management and community development to ensure that the community is well represented and there will be a shared responsibility for the different preschool activities. Thus Community Resource Teams (CRTs) will be trained to ensure quality is sustained in community preschools by providing technical support to teachers and SMC members while ZMRC moves on to work with other programs in new communities. Communities are supported by ZMRC to identify one member from the Village Development Committee (MVDC), who, together with a HT, a LT, and a Community Mobilizer (CM) forms the CRT for each community. It is anticipated that CRTs will work in a team and sustain the quality of preschools since each team member has his/her own specialized training (strength) that they will use for supporting each other in maintaining the desired quality.

Rationale for the Project

For many communities the Madrasa Preschool Program (MPP) was implemented for three years, while for some the program went on for up to four years. This was a short time for communities to build a school structure, receive training, and have enough capacity for sustaining the quality of preschools. During that time there was no community follow-up structure that was developed. Communities had trained teachers and SMC members who had no support structures. For example, any attrition of trained
personnel could not be handled adequately in communities as the question of replacement of trained personnel was not addressed.

There was an attempt by ZMRC to train individuals to become resource people in communities. For example there was training of LTs and the expectation was that they would be able to monitor classroom practice, supervise teachers and conduct training/refresher courses when necessary. However, training was provided mainly as theory at the centre with no clear focus and no support for LTs to use the new skills acquired. Training CRTs involves giving theory inputs at the centre followed by specific site-based training in each community where CRTs will be handheld to monitor preschool activities, identify areas for intervention, plan and implement the planned activities. The process of monitoring to identify areas of intervention, planning for and implementing the intervention will hopefully take root in the madrasa preschools to ensure continuous maintenance of quality.

Since its inception, the Madrasa Preschool Program has been carrying out Monitoring and Evaluation and both staff and community have a good experience in this process. The ZMRC had developed and used the Madrasa Evaluation Instrument (MEI), which was used by both staff and communities in monitoring communities for graduation. In this project, CRTs will be supported to develop their own Monitoring and Evaluation (M/E) tools to monitor the quality of teaching practice and learning environment, school management and the involvement of the community in school activities to ensure sustainability of the preschools.

The MPP will come to an end, but communities will still need their school, and the aim of the program is to make communities have their preschools sustained. During
the first phases individuals were trained for implementation rather than their skills being
developed and their knowledge widened to train and give ongoing support to others. The
proposed project aims at training leaders in a team (CRTs) in basic knowledge of: (a)
classroom practice, (b) Financial management including keeping financial records, (c)
General management and Administration of the preschool, (d) Monitoring and Evaluation
skills and (e) the development of Monitoring/Evaluation tools. In addition, CRTs will
develop drafts of reference notes, training outlines and handouts which they can later use
when training teachers/SMC members in communities. Through equipping CRTs with
the basic knowledge, skills and reference materials, it is anticipated that a support
structure will be developed in each community and CRTs would be able to work together
towards supporting teachers/SMC members in maintaining Active Learning environment
and classroom teaching in their preschools, as well as strengthening community
ownership of the preschools.

The beneficiaries of the project include people at different levels. During the first
phases of the MPP period, it was common for trained teachers and SMC members to
utilize acquired skills in other development projects in their villages. By building
capacities of CRTs, it is expected that there will be more beneficiaries because of the
composition of CRTs (including a member from the VDC). CRTs will benefit in terms of
acquiring knowledge and skills in training, mobilizing communities and developing
support materials and this is expected to cascade to other community projects. Skills
gained will be used to develop teachers, SMC members, and in turn children with their
parents and the development of the larger community through the Village Development
Committees. At the institutional level MRC staff from three countries (Mombasa-Kenya,
Kampala-Uganda and Zanzibar - Tanzania) will benefit by: (a) gaining skills and confidence in developing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating a CRT Training Program; and (b) using the lessons learnt in developing and ECD Training Program for Teachers, SMCs and parents in the current phase.

The MPP is an evolving program, learning and changing strategies or coming up with new ideas from lessons learnt is a common practice. The training of CRTs is a new idea and will hopefully provide staff with new insights on community empowerment and development. At the donors’ level, project funders will get reports on the project’s progress and this might be used to share some lessons learnt from the project with other ECD stakeholders and possibly adapt a similar project in other areas.

**Objectives of the Project**

1. At the ZMRC level the Project Director and staff members will:
   - Gain confidence and be able to develop other programs for communities with lessons learnt from implementing this one.
   - Communicate with other MRCs at the Regional level to share experiences on community capacity building for sustainability. There will also be a chance to learn about other MRCs strengths and challenges and utilize these to improve upon program implementation.
   - Strengthen their leadership skills.
   - Develop a Training Manual for CRTs. This will be at its initial stages and will be used and improved upon as CRTs are being monitored and evaluated.

2. At the community level the CRTs will:
• Be trained in selected classroom practice and school management topics, including monitoring of classroom practice and management.

• Develop draft reference notes in selected topics, which they can use when training teachers/SMC members.

• Develop at least five drafts of training outlines, which they can use when training teachers/SMC members.

The assumption in developing materials is that CRTs will develop “very rough drafts” to be reviewed and revised during implementation in communities. There will also be a skeleton of the training manual for CRTs, which will be developed by staff. The draft will be expanded and made into a full training manual, which will be used by staff during later training of CRTs. The Training Manual will build up during training sessions for CRTs, gathering and compiling notes, handouts and ideas received from CRTs. The skeleton of the manual produced at the end of this project will be reviewed and material added to complete it for use by MRC later during the program of training CRTs.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This project focused on capacity building and leadership for CRTs and communities. Before describing what happened in the process of capacity building for CRTs, and understanding the literature behind this project, it is useful to understand how the Madrasa Preschool Program operated.

Madrasa Preschool Program

The Zanzibar Madrasa Resource Centre worked with each community for a period of not less than three years. There was one year of intensive mobilization when communities tried to understand the program and two years of training after the community had joined the program. The training involved both theory and practice in classroom and general school management and administration as well as other preschool activities, for example, fundraising and arranging for school excursions.

During the mobilization year communities are supported to understand the importance of early childhood education, put up a building, (with an outdoor play area with at least five play equipment) and a toilet for the preschool; identify teachers (two for every 30 children) and members of School Management Committee (with at least two female members); identify local available resources for use as learning materials, and open a bank account. If the community is able to sufficiently meet the above criteria, it signs a Contract with ZMRC and is given a US$ 1000 as an incentive grant to help them improve the school environment. The contract stipulates roles of both the community and ZMRC during the time the community receives support from ZMRC. More often than not, a community enters its second year without having signed the contract. When this happens and the community has shown signs that it will meet the criteria, ZMRC starts to
support the community for the two years of intensive practical training of teachers and SMC members.

**Teacher Training**

Teachers are trained in setting up the learning environment and in general preschool classroom practice. The training starts with four weeks of orientation training where Principles of Child Development, How Young Children Learn, Active Learning, and Effective Communication Skills are given for a period of three weeks. In addition, teachers are supported to collect and develop teaching and learning materials from their local environment which are mostly low/no cost. During the fourth week, trainers go to communities to work with teachers in their preschools in setting up learning environment, develop lesson plans, continue to develop materials, and develop Daily Routine.

The Orientation Training is followed by once a week Centre Based Training (CBT) during the first year of support, where teachers continue to receive theory inputs on the curriculum, different subjects in the curriculum, developing lesson plans and teaching methodology for young children. CBT is complemented by School Based Support (SBT) where trainers follow up teachers in their preschools and spend about five hours mentoring in classroom practice. While at the school, a trainer supervises, and is prepared to take a part of the daily routine or even a group of children and model for the teacher when need arises. At the end of the day, a trainer sits down with teachers to give each other feedback. The feedback process starts with self-feedback from the teachers where they each identify their strengths and later point out an area they think they would like to change. This is followed by feedback from the trainer who acknowledges strengths mentioned by the teachers, add more and identify one area for change. The teachers and
trainer then agree for a focus that could be followed up for each teacher during the next visit.

During SBT a trainer also supports teachers to develop materials, review and add materials in the learning environment and develop lesson plans. This training process continues for two years except the frequency of CBT and SBT is reduced to once a fortnight during the second year, although it might return to once a week for SBT specially when the preschool is nearing graduation. During the two years of teacher training, teachers are being monitored and continuously assessed in Attendance, Team Teaching, Material Development, Teacher-Child and Teacher-Teacher interaction, Assignments, Teaching Practice and Annual Written Examinations. Teacher assessment for certification puts a great weight on classroom practice as compared to written annual examination. This is because the academic level of teachers selected for training is very low and what is needed is their classroom performance, and their interaction with children rather than what they can put on a piece of paper. Depending upon performance, teachers are then given certificates at the end of two years training.

**The SMC Training**

Training for SMC is also CBT and SBT, but the Orientation Training is shorter as it takes two to three days. During the Orientation training, SMCs are given theory inputs on the History of the Madrasa Preschool Program, Understanding their Roles, Active Learning and Effective Communication Skills. CBT is then provided on a needs basis. Training is mostly SBT where Office bearers (Chairman, Treasurer and Secretary) are supported to be able to handle their responsibilities. SMC members are also continuously assessed in attendance at the training and in meetings, as well as accomplishment of their
responsibilities. Successful SMC members are also given certificates. Both CBT and SBT can either be minimized or maximized in frequency during the second year depending on the level of members’ understanding and implementing preschool activities.

*Monitoring and Evaluation under the Madrasa Preschool Program*

During the three years of mobilization, support and training in communities, continuous monitoring is done for teachers, SMC members and other preschool activities during preschool visits. Trainers record their observations for teachers and the learning environment, noting changes which occur during the period. Community Development Officers also record what happened during their visits, who they met and what was discussed, and notable changes during each of their visits. In addition, a Madrasa Evaluation Instrument (MEI) is used to evaluate preschool activities (including classroom practice and community work) after every six months. This evaluation helps teachers, SMC members and ZMRC staff to identify the level of implementation and gaps to be addressed. At the end of each evaluation, objectives are set for the next six months. Teachers and SMC members work on implementing activities to achieve these objectives, and the trainer/CDO follows up to supports them to realise the objectives. At the end of the six months, another evaluation is conducted and each objective is looked at to determine its level of achievement. This process helped schools to see their progress over time, and encouraged them to set realistic goals they could achieve within the given six months period.
Graduation of Preschools

At the end of two years of intensive support, a preschool graduates from the Madrasa Preschool Program if 75% of teachers and 50% of SMC members are certified; they have an MEI score of 80%; at least 80% of school fees has been paid and at least 80% of salaries have been received by teachers. When a preschool graduates from the program, they are given a certificate, and receive a graduation grant of US $2500. The graduation grant is part of the endowment program set up to support madrasa preschools in financial sustainability. In addition to the graduation grant, madrasa preschool members are also encouraged to save money during the two years of support. This money is matched on a one-to-one for up to US $2500 when the preschool graduates. The graduation grant, school savings and the matching funds from all madrasa preschools are invested in a common pool and dividends are expected to be used for supplementing teachers’ salaries and school maintenance.

At the conception of the Madrasa Preschool Program, the idea was that when a preschool graduates, it would have enough technical and financial capacities to be able to sustain itself. However, after the five years of program phase, preschools are still showing signs of needing support from MRC. This led to the idea of building resource teams within communities that will support the already trained teachers and SMC members to continue to maintain the quality of the learning environment and classroom practice. The Community Resource Teams were trained to: (a) develop/strengthen their knowledge in classroom practice and school management practices, (b) build their skills in training, (c) develop support training materials and monitoring and evaluation tools, and (d) assess the performance of the school.
Linking to the above background, the paragraphs below describe how the
different programs/projects, a few researches, and some related literature have been used
to inform the project. Mentions of some projects within and outside Tanzania that are
currently operating have been cited, for example the Non Governmental Organizations
Resource Center (NGORC), AMANI ECCD, and the Guiding Spirit programs.

Related Program Theories

The following paragraphs explain some theories that are related to the project.

Evans, Myers and Ilfeld (2000) point out that capacity building

is to strengthen or fortify the operation of systems and the skills of individuals.
For an individual, capacity building usually involves training or supervision to
help him/her increase knowledge and develop competencies and confidence. For
an organization, capacity building refers to providing support to help an
organization to create more effective systems and procedures for carrying out the
work. In some instances capacity building for an organization simply involves
staff training. In other instances it includes growing or expanding an organization
to handle more work and demands (p. 392).

Capacity building for CRTs involved empowering the CRTs through providing
both theoretical training and on-site supervision of individuals/teams to help them
increase their knowledge in early childhood matters as well as develop competencies in
handling preschool activities for the purpose of making it sustainable. According to Yukl
(2002):

empowerment … means asking people to determine for themselves the best way
to implement strategies or attain objectives, rather than telling them in detail what
to do. It means encouraging subordinates to suggest solutions to problems if they come to you for help, and it means supporting subordinates who assume responsibility for resolving problems of their own even though they do not do it the way you would (p. 266).

A definition put forward by the Cornell Empowerment Group states that: “empowerment is an intentional, ongoing process centred in the local community involving mutual respect, critical reflection, caring, and group participation, through which people lacking an equal share of valued resources gain greater access to and control over resources.” The process of empowerment must be carried out in a way that helps participants believe in themselves, their knowledge, and in their ability to know what it is they want and the actions needed to bring that about. (Lopez, et al, 1993). Through the process of capacity building, CRTs are also expected to be empowered to develop confidence in ownership of the preschool, supported to believe in themselves and in their ability so that they are able to suggest solutions to their problems according to their own context and available resources, and thus making effective decisions in preschool activities without necessarily doing it the way that ZMRC staff would normally do.

Although CRTs are not an organization per se, they are a “team” of people whose capacity has been built for a specific and common purpose. Therefore, capacity building in this case will also involve “providing support to help CRTs create more effective systems and procedures for carrying out the work.” This was especially so for three members of CRT team (the Head teacher, the Lead Teacher and the Community Mobilizer) who had undergone two years’ training at ZMRC and need support in
developing their skills so that they are able to support others in the community to sustain their preschool.

Chambers (1994) argues that “Empowerment means that people, especially poorer people, are enabled to take more control of their lives, and secure a better livelihood with ownership and control of productive assets as one key element” (p. 11). This project was about Building ECD Community Leadership through empowering CRTs for ownership and sustainability of their preschools; enabling CRTs to take more control of their decisions and activities in their respective villages by making use of existing assets and available time. It involved training of CRTs, so that they are able to identify their needs through conducting Needs Assessment in their respective communities, plan, organize, implement, monitor and evaluate as well as coordinate identified preschool activities. It has been the practice of MRCs to create awareness of use of available resources and this is consolidated when building the capacity of CRTs.

Kirpal (2002) distinguishes between active and passive participation, pointing out the need for active participation for community ownership. She contends, “Active participation includes shared responsibility by the groups for decision that are made. Although passive participation is useful and may be necessary (for example, the presence of parents or community leaders at meetings), a program is more likely to be sustainable if this participation is complemented by a community’s active participation in making decisions about the program and sharing responsibilities for implementing it. Active participation requires, and results in, community decision-making and community management. When a program is controlled by the community, the community is much more likely to take ownership of it” (p. 301). During the last phase of the MRC program,
community involvement was mainly mobilized by the ZMRC staff where parents and other community members participated in meetings, collected/developed Teaching-Learning materials, and paid preschool fees. This project aimed at empowering leaders in communities to mobilize others, so that they would be able to take action, make decisions, identify resources and implement their own plans. It aimed at strengthening ownership in communities through active involvement of community leaders.

Most ECCD programs are run as service delivery programs, providing services for children without allowing for community members to learn about the rationale of the program, how to run it and giving them enough support in the process to allow the service to continue when provider of the service cease to provide it. As de los Angeles-Bautista (2003) puts it: “Central to our work is the need to active genuine community participation and engagement in ECCD. We can no longer afford the luxury of seeing ECCD as primarily ‘delivery of services’, because experience has shown us that services that are delivered without supports and learning built into the environment around the child and/or family will quickly diminish in effect when the services are withdrawn” (pp. 1-25). Torkington (1996) advocates for active, participatory and experiential learning approaches. She describes experiential training as training that involves activities, which require trainers to interact, carry out tasks, and participate in problem solving.

During the first phase of the MPP, capacity was built for the community in terms of training teachers and SMC members. Later, an attempt to train resource people from communities was done through training of lead and head teachers. However, training was not experiential, as there was no inbuilt support structure and learning within the immediate environment. Lead teachers and head teachers were given special training
(with the same topics being given to all irrespective of individual’s community’s needs).

The training covered content in classroom practice, training and facilitation skills, and giving effective feedback. This training was theoretical, and topics that were selected for training depended more on what the trainers felt were the needs rather than finding out the real needs from the LTs and HTs. It was expected that with this training they would be able to follow up their fellow teachers/SMC members and see that the quality in preschool activities is sustained. However, this was not possible since these had a workload of classroom practice and no proper system was developed for ensuring that they can perform extra duties assigned to them for follow-up support.

During training of CRTs a system will be slowly developed during the training and follow-up support to ensure that the workload is divided amongst the team members and that they plan to meet on a regular basis so as to share/clarify to each other on inputs given in addition to discuss on their preschool activities. A system will be inbuilt from the roles of the CRT members such that they work together to identify their own responsibilities and come up with a plan of Action they can easily follow and implement. Working from communities’ needs will help to ease the situation. This project was looking at these factors. As ZMRC plans to withdraw its support to communities, CRTs being around families were trained to be able to deliver services to preschools so as to make them sustainable.

Nolan (2002) explains that the most important thing about making changes is to get started. It will not always be easy and sometimes you will get it wrong. But trying to cover every eventuality in a theoretical way will not ensure perfection in practice (p. 81) Early research work on the antecedents of community capacity building is found within
the disciplines of adult education (Freire, 1972). The early research indicated that strategic partnerships were essential for real development to occur. Community development required education that was based on the direct needs of the community as identified by them, and action taken once problems were identified. Capacity building for CRTs will involve empowering communities to set up leadership and training, and establish a network of CRTs for exchange of ideas. Training will be based on the direct needs of communities as identified by each of the CRTs. The process will be practical oriented where CRTs will be expected to implement while they learn, receive feedback and continue to implement. It will be “getting them started” with the little they know. They will be given theory inputs and supported to implement before receiving another input. This will minimise overwhelming them with theories, of which little is made use of.

In the MPP, a lot of emphasis is placed on community ownership through involvement of community members, and capacity building for CRTs was expected to follow these principles, with a wider community involvement and participation. Another related concept on community capacity building and creating ownership and sustainability of ECD programs is that described by Kirpal (2002, p. 298), where she discussed five case studies of community based early childhood development programs. The cases are examples of good practices, which give priority to extensive involvement of the local community to create ownership and establish successful, cost-effective and sustainable programs. The CRT program intends to address community participation as one of the issues. This has been highlighted by Kirpal (2002) as one of the examples that support good practices for Early Childhood Development projects. Kirpal (2002) points
out that “among the features of successful ECD programs are ‘Community Ownership and Training and Capacity building’” (p. 298).

Sako (2003) discusses capacity building across African Civil Societies organizations. He describes how the process (of capacity building) is as important as the output and that the process should “… emphasize country ownership and indigenous capacity, while encouraging useful and mutually beneficial cross fertilization in the relationship between human resources and the rest of the world” (p. 2)

Sako (2003) points out that: “inadequate human and institutional capacity remains the most constraining factor in Africa’s development” (p. 2). Capacity building is still a big constraint to development in ECD programs. This project addressed the issue by empowering people from within communities to take leadership, ownership and manage the technical aspect of preschools’ activities.

*Related Programs*

Following are some examples of ECD programs that are consistent with CRTs capacity building program. AMANI is a local NGO in Tanzania mainland that deals with advocacy of ECD and builds capacity in communities that is based on community needs. A lesson learnt from AMANI is that it is difficult to meet with all members of the community as planned and give them an input or perform a follow-up session. However, even one community member can make a difference provided the field officer and the member can agree on what can be done with the two of them.

The work of the two people could be used for the community or can be easily shared with the rest of the community members when the field officer has left. One of the challenges facing the Madrasa Preschool Program was poor attendance, especially of
LTs, HTs during theory input sessions at the centre, and there was no mechanism of following up the absentees to see that they receive training from those who attended. One of the roles of CRTs is to share training they received from the resource centre with others who did not attend the training when they go back to communities. This will ensure that absent team members also receive all the training covered at the centre. This is planned to be part of the on-site support that CRT will receive from ZMRC staff.

Another program is the Community-Run Preschool Centres in Chile’s low-income areas (Communication Initiative, n.d.). The Centre for the Study and Care of Children and Women (CEANIM) has developed a model to enable poor communities to run their own preschool centres in Chile. The main characteristic of the model is the participation of mothers as community agents who run the centres. Each Centre is developed in three stages: (i) setting up the centre, (ii) community running the centre with material resources provided by CEANIM; and (iii) centres functioning autonomously with occasional help from CEANIM to solve problems.

Guiding Spirit is an experiential program from Canada that stresses learning by doing and is intended to build skills and knowledge participants can use immediately. The program focuses on, among other things, personal and leadership development (Guiding Spirit, 2002). Focusing on sustainability and ownership, the CRTs’ program was planned so that participants could use knowledge gained immediately in their communities. CRTs were followed up and given practical support in the field, as well as feedback on how to improve madrasa preschool activities. The training includes personal and leadership development, in addition to empowering the teams with other management, monitoring and evaluation skills.
Gujarat (1992) described a program in rural India, which focuses on future training group, which resembles training of the CRTs in communities. The India program has identified urgent training required at two levels: (1) training women’s groups in skills to run ECD centres and (2) training another group necessary for future childcare workers and educators.

One of the goals of the program described by Nabi (1999) is to adopt sustainable strategies based on mobilization of community’s own resources for the ownership of the education program in their areas. This is in line with the ZMRC program where, CRTs members, in the communities are being mobilized to promote community ownership.

NGO Resource Centre (NGORC) is a national NGO in Zanzibar which supports communities to establish and run effective NGO and Community Based Organizations (CBOs). This is done through building capacity of resource people from communities who are in turn hand-held by NGORC staff to support others through building their capacity. The CRT program will work along these lines: CRTs will be trained as well as being further supported to train other community members to identify and address their own needs.

Reinhold (1993) describes working with rural communities in Nepal. He explains, among other things, the importance of local program management for effectively reaching isolated areas. One of the aims of the MRC program is to have sustainable quality preschools in poor isolated communities. Although very remote areas have been reached, it will be difficult to support and follow them up for life. Capacity building for CRTs involved building the local capacity of people from within the community as
leaders, who would be able to manage the preschools locally since they know their communities better.

Swadener, Kabiru, and Njenga (2000) describe some ECD projects in Kenya, including preschools that aim at building capacity at different levels of people in communities for sustainable quality in ECD. Projects start with needs analysis and capacity given is according to identified needs. Training of CRTs also depended on identified needs.

The following few paragraphs discuss some papers written on programs related to the training of CRTs. In approaches to the development of young children paper, the strategy of promoting community development through stressing the community initiative and participation to create a basis for social changes necessary to correct conditions affecting children has been emphasised. In training CRTs, community participation was enhanced and CRTs were encouraged to take initiatives depending upon needs in their communities. This is one way where communities (CRTs) were being empowered. It has been found out that one of the most productive ECD programs is the empowering effect on adults. Adults’ empowerment has, and still is, a feature of the MPP. The MRC had been empowering adults: teachers and SMC members for the past ten years. Empowerment is still part of this project, with a change in strategies, now training teams as well as training individuals.

The National ECD policy in Namibia (2003) reflects building local capacity and creating ownership and accountability at the community level. This project intends to strengthen ownership and accountability for this group so that they are responsible for the community’s development and can ensure that the preschools are sustained.
CHAPTER 3: PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This project was intended to cover a period of one year, starting in January and ending in December 2003. However, implementation of the project started in April 2003. Therefore, by the end of October 2003, the project was halfway through completion and ZMRC carried out a mid-term evaluation of the project. While the Project Director is involved in the general planning and monitoring of project activities as well as participating fully in material development (e.g., development of M/E tools and manuals), it is the other staff members who implement the project in the field.

Project Description

Following is a brief description of the context and the process that was followed in achieving informed consent.

The project is about building the technical capacity of Community Resource Teams (CRTs) who will be able to work with communities in sustaining the quality of madrasa preschools in terms of technical support after the program term ends. This is part of the Post Graduation Support Program which is optional for members of graduated schools. The process entailed training (centre- and site-based) and supporting the CRTs to develop reference and monitoring/evaluation materials. Zanzibar Madrasa Resource Centre staff conducted the training, as well as supported the CRTs in material development. Some staff members already knew about my intention of documenting the process of building the capacity of CRTs as my major project in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts. However, since all have been involved in implementing the CRT program, I shared during one of our regular monthly meetings the rationale of the project and who will benefit. In addition, I asked staff for their consent to
read their monthly reports and use the information, not only as part of my job requirements, but also to write my project. Sometimes I also used comments made during reflection and sharing sessions with staff on the program. I had talked with some staff members already, on an individual as well as in a group, and told them about my project. They had agreed to share with me all the information they are documenting, all the materials they are developing and all ideas they come up with while implementing the CRT program so as to help me in the project that I am writing.

*Obtaining Informed Consent*

In communities, I asked for permission from CRTs to use some of their developed materials as examples in my project. This was be done during material development session at the centre. The process involved explaining the project to CRTs and then asking for their consent to share the materials developed.

The methods that were used to collect data included observation of training conducted at the center. I observed the training as a process (including what inputs were given and feedback/responses/comments from trainees. Members of the CRT are the ones who have opted to join the program. However, for the purpose of the project, I had made a point of telling participants to opt out of being observed. Fortunately all participants agreed to being observed, and I also selected and read site-based notes for those who have agreed to be involved in the project. During training, it is common for staff to participate in groups during small groups discussion, and all staff get involved. Participants are aware of this and my going into the training room and participated in the training did not disrupt the training in any way. In addition, participants know that at ZMRC even the director can train, and sometimes we observe each other for feedback on
how the training went. Therefore my presence in the training room did not affect the training session.

The second method I used to get information was to read monthly reports written for every community by members of staff during site-based training. Reports are written as part of the program documentation process. Every staff member is responsible for a certain number of schools, and therefore a specific number of CRTs. Some CRT members who don’t want to be involved in the training can make a choice and miss out without affecting their careers (their roles as CRTs). Not all CRT members attended training sessions due to their different commitments. However, the training was designed in such a way that those (CRTs) who attend the training (either centre or site based), can share what they gain with the other team members during their own time in communities. Staff members who did not wish their reports to be read to inform the project were not forced to give their reports to me.

There was also a discussion with staff on achievements; challenges and lessons learnt at the end of every month. In addition, I read the mid-term evaluation forms filled by CRTs.

The text below is an explanation of how I worked with the community participants during centre-based training.

The community participants I worked with in this project are all familiar with me since most of them have been in the project since the last phase (1996-2001). However, I introduced myself to newly appointed Village Development Committee members who are part of CRT members. On Saturday 4th October, during centre-based training, I
provided each participant a Kiswahili copy of my request to work with them (Please see Appendix I).

The CRTs were conscious of the course I was doing and chose to answer my questions freely. It is common for the Director to visit training rooms during sessions and contribute to training. Participants who had been with the program freely contributed their thoughts since team teaching had been part of training methodology used at ZMRC. Although I interacted with CRT members from time to time, they mostly interacted with their trainers.

The method used for training at ZMRC is participatory, and participants are expected to share their knowledge from communities during centre and site-based training. The CRTs will therefore contribute information when developing materials (training guides, reference notes, and monitoring/evaluation tools for their use in communities at the end of the CRT program).

The CRTs’ contribution is useful because ZMRC would like to see them own and manage their own schools including undertaking simple training for community members (e.g., teachers, School Management Committee and other community members). In the last phase ZMRC developed materials for use (e.g., stories for children, guides for training SMCs and monitoring and evaluation tools) in communities and to consolidate ownership, communities were supported so that they are more comfortable to participate fully during training and in developing their own materials, which will be culturally relevant and user-friendly.
The contribution and information was be used for discussion with staff on improving training or responding to training needs. It was also used as part of the information during writing of the project report.

A large proportion of the participants cannot read or write English. I intend to share the report of the project with staff members whom I will request to share important points with communities when they go for field visits. I will also write some important recommendations in Kiswahili and share a copy with the CRTs in their communities. As for the staff, my project copy will be available at the office library for them to read.

Staff and CRTs were aware that this is part of the work assignments. In addition, I also notified all parties involved (ZMRC staff and CRTs from communities) that this is part of the ECDVU requirements. This was done through staff monthly meetings and during centre based training for CRTs, both verbally and by providing the CRTs with a consent request letter where the ECDVU connection was stated clearly.

Finally I made this declaration: I, Asha Mohammed Ahmed, am aware of the information contained on my ECDVU Achieving Informed Consent Waiver form, and I agree to abide by the policies, procedures, regulations and laws governing the ethical conduct of research involving humans.
CHAPTER 4: THE PROCESS OF CAPACITY BUILDING FOR CRTS

Capacity building for CRTs involved both centre- and site-based training (CBT and SBT). It also included material development at two levels: the level of trainers, where a CRT training manual will be developed for their use and the level of community, where CRTs will be supported to develop a training guide for their use in communities. In addition, handouts and reference notes were, and continue to be, developed for use by the CRTs after training in their communities. Capacity building for CRTs is still in progress, and is expected to be completed by June 2004. The following paragraphs describe the process and what has happened during the capacity building for CRT members on Unguja Island.

Conducting Baseline Survey

Before starting the CRT training, a baseline was conducted for all the graduated preschools. This exercise helped ZMRC staff to identify the quality level of preschools, both in classroom practice and management, before they started the intervention so that they could monitor and identify changes after the intervention. A tool was developed for conducting this baseline, and the tool was adapted from a tool used during the graduation of Madrasa Preschools exercise in 2000. It contained items of preschool activities as shown in Table 1. For each item/activity there were ratings (i.e., 1-7, where 1 reflected the least achievement and 7 reflected high achievement) that showed the situation of that item at the time baseline was conducted. The baseline was conducted towards the end of 2002 and completed at the beginning of 2003. Results from the baseline survey for 40 madrasa preschools in Unguja were summarised and areas in need of interventions were then summarised as shown in Table 1.
### Table 1: A Summary of Number of Schools Requiring Intervention in Different Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of intervention</th>
<th>Batch 1 schools</th>
<th>Batch 2 schools</th>
<th>Batch 3 schools</th>
<th>Batch 4 schools</th>
<th>Total number of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Practice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets/Structure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting Materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Learning Materials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Areas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Ground</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Play Equipment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Play Equipments</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Area</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Area</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets/usage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water for Washing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water for Drinking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 shows the number of preschools in each batch requiring intervention in a certain item, and it can be seen that areas requiring intervention differed not only for each of the madrasa preschools, but also for the four different batches of schools (Batch 1 preschools joined the MPP in January 1997, Batch 2 in June 1997, Batch 3 in June 1998 and Batch 4 in January 1999. These preschools graduated from the program in December 1998, June 1999, June 2000 and December 2000 respectively after receiving program support for two years). It can be seen from Table 1 that some areas have deteriorated more than others in all the preschools on average. For example, 39 out of 40 preschools have deteriorated in financial management and community involvement, 34 in mobile play equipment and 29 in fixed play equipment. On the other hand, 2 preschools have deteriorated in classroom practice, 6 in availability of water for washing and water for drinking. This showed that activities that are directly related to teachers/children (e.g., classroom practice and water hygiene) are somehow more sustainable than those that are directly related to community/teachers/children (e.g., community involvement). Across the different batches of preschools, it can be seen that 11 batch 3 preschools have deteriorated in outdoor areas (including the fixed and mobile play equipment, sand and water areas) as compared to batches 1, 2, and 4.

Table 2 shows the relative percentage of preschools that have deteriorated in different areas at the time of conducting baseline before intervention of post graduation support. It shows that outdoor areas (including the playground, outdoor play equipments, Sand and Water areas) have deteriorated very much in many preschools (over 55% of the total number of preschools have indicated deterioration in the items seen). In some preschools outdoor space area for playing was in a poor state in terms of cleanliness,
safety, and usage. Where the outdoor play space existed, both fixed and mobile play materials were negligible. Another area of concern for sustainability is the community involvement and financial management. The outdoor, school management and community involvement in school activities were the responsibility of SMC and the community. The SMC members were not considered for specialized training during the last phase as it was done for HTs and LTs. However, in the CRTs training program, an SMC member has been included in the hope that all preschool activity areas will be followed up and sustained.

Table 2: A Summary of Areas Needing Immediate Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas in need of intervention</th>
<th>Number of preschools</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Equipment</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Play Equipments</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Area</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Area</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conducting Training Needs Analysis

After conducting baseline and doing an initial analysis, each madrasa preschool was supported to select a team of CRTs who were then brought to the Centre for a session to understand their roles and to collect their training needs (TN). CRTs, supported by ZMRC were able to identify their roles as follows:
1. To mobilize communities, parents and members of SMC to understand early childhood development and plan for supporting preschools after graduation.

2. Mobilizing community members to be involved in preschool activities.

3. To plan with teachers and SMC members on their training needs.

4. To plan and conduct parents’ workshops according to needs.

5. To improve on the learning environment, classroom practice and school management.

6. To develop and use monitoring and evaluation tools.

7. To prepare and write reports for preschool activities and share them with ZMRC.

8. To prepare and file preschool statistics.

CRTs then reflected on these roles and prioritized their needs. They used Pairwise Matrix which is a method of prioritizing needs/issues/topics which starts with brainstorming of all needs, followed by saying which one is more pressing/important and a comparison is made to finally find out which one dominates. Please see Appendix VI for an example. The prioritized needs are shown below:

1. English language

2. Preparation of scheme of work

3. Preparation of lesson plan

4. Science

5. Community and SMC mobilization

6. Development of M/E tools

7. Preparation for training sessions

8. Conducting meetings and minutes writing
9. Income generation and fundraising
10. Project proposal writing
11. Data collection
12. Financial management
13. Linkages with different institutions
14. Leadership skills and problem solving
15. Teaching methodology
16. Interpersonal skills
17. Report writing
18. Preparation of a training program
19. Promoting teaching and learning environment
20. Record keeping
21. Child development
22. Monitoring and evaluation

Staff then discussed and summarised these needs, and planned for which ones could be done as theory input followed by hands on support, and which ones could be effectively done at the school. The training was done once a fortnight, at the Resource Centre and in communities. Some of the topics that were discussed at the centre included “Child Development” and “How Young Children Learn” so that when they followed up teachers, they could provide effective support with the background they have on how young children develop and learn. And topics that were discussed at school were “Record Keeping” with CRTs being supported to keep, for example, financial records and community involvement records.
Planning for Centre- and Site-Based Training

The Training Needs Analysis (TNA) was the basis for CBT for CRTs. Staff held planning meetings to prepare training outlines and training materials for CBT. The CBT was a four-hour session conducted on each alternate Saturday, where CRTs were taught theoretical aspects reflecting on what was identified during the TNA. However, staff reviewed the training inputs after feedback sessions with CRTs, and the topic was either changed or additional content added. In addition, each staff member was assigned a preschool where s/he went and worked with individual CRT team. During these fortnightly visits for SBT, CRTs were supported to identify their area(s) of need and then supported to address them accordingly. SBT was more of hands-on and was based on specific training needs for each team of CRTs in their preschool, as described by a few examples below. Both CBT and SBT started in May for the CRTs, which was late since the program was expected to start early in January. This was because staff members were still preparing the training program, conducting baseline, analyzing data from the baseline and supporting communities to select CRTs.

Centre-based training.

The expected number of CRTs (from Unguja) to attend the training was 128 (i.e., 32 preschools with 4 members from each school). This was a large number to take in one training session and staff decided to divide the CRTs into two groups for more effective training. Therefore, each group came to the Resource Centre once a fortnight for training. At the resource centre, the 62 CRTs were further divided into two training groups, and each group was attended by two trainers. The following topics were given to CRTs from August 2003:
• Principles of adult learning
• How to conduct TNA and preparation of a training session
• Guidelines on preparation of a Training Outline (TO)
• Practicum on (a) Preparation of TO and (b) Practicing training
• Monitoring and Evaluation (concept, what/when to monitor, need for tools)
• Developing M/E tools

The above training topics focused more on the “how,” for example, how to support communities in terms of training and follow-up. It was mainly assumed that CRTs have some content of what is to be done. In addition, this is what they had originally identified as seen from their own initial TNA list. Other topics, such as Conducting Meetings and Community Mobilization, were more hands-on and they were treated in individual communities as part of the SBT. Other topics, for example Science, were tailored to specific groups of CRTs (in this case teachers) and they were addressed during Refresher Courses for teachers.

Before August, the CRTs were introduced to the idea of post graduation support and what is involved (including a need to having a Community Resource Team which will be responsible for taking care of preschool activities and ensure sustainability of preschools even after the ZMRC support cease after program life period). The average attendance at the centre was 55.8% and majority of attendees were Head and Lead teachers. A few members of SMC attended the training and there were fewer members still from the Village Development Committees (VDCs) who attended.

Site based training.
Site-based training was conducted more on specific community needs basis than the centre-based training. During the first visit with CRTs, staff facilitated a brainstorming session to support them to reflect on their preschool activities and levels of performance at the time of graduation. They were then supported to reflect on the current situation of the school and identify gaps they would like to work on. This was followed by another session where the CRTs were supported to prioritise and analyse the gaps, looking at the why, who will be involved and resources required to address the gap(s).

Due to the nature of attendees, SBT was mainly monopolized by HTs and LTs and as far as these were concerned, their pressing issues were those needs related to what they had been trained to do in the preschools. These included classroom practice, teachers’ related problems, and children related problems. The management aspect (which included financial issues such as fee payment and salaries, as well as community participation and contribution, were left out since this was what the SMCs were originally trained to do for the preschools. Hardly did the members from SMC and VDC attended, and this created a problem since the SMC and VDC members each had a specific role to play according to the original composition of CRTs. This was partly due to these members having to work to earn a living during the time that ZMRC staff made training visits, but it was also due to the fact that the idea of preschool being also theirs was not well understood and therefore accepted. Most gaps identified were child development related, and almost all preschools identified a gap in the outdoor play areas and equipments (including the sand and water areas).

The examples provided below have been selected to show different levels/standards of performance for two different communities.
The LT and the HT from the school in Example 1 were able to identify the gap in playground and went to the core of the problem. Although only these members of CRT attended the SBT, during planning on how and who should be involved in the intervention, they had identified the treasurer, chairman of SMC and the local village leader who would help them identify a donor for putting up the wall for the fence.

Example 1

Madrasa Siraja Munira in Jambiani village is a preschool which joined the MPP in June 1997 and graduated in June 1999. Jambiani is a tourist area, and tourists who offer some support in terms of money or learning materials visit the madrasa from time to time. It is a three-classroom school with five teachers including the HT and LT. During five visits made to the preschool, only the HT and LT were present although members from SMC and VDC sometimes attended CBT. The CRTs had identified a number of issues as gaps in their preschool but they decided to start working on the outdoor area, specifically putting up a permanent fence. This was because, they argued, if there is no fence, older children come to the preschool during the afternoon hours and play with play equipment which was intended for younger children. In the process they destroy the equipments and it is not easy to maintain them so frequently. In addition, animals from the village (for example dogs and cats) could easily enter the playground and defecate in the sand and water areas. CRTs (LT and HT in this case) planned and set time lines for securing resources and identified who will do the activity and who will follow up. The fence has now been put up, and they are waiting to increase the height of the fence wall.
The two members followed up their plan regularly and were able to secure funds for putting up the wall as shown in the above box.

The preschool in Example 2 shows a case where the SMC had ceased to function. They decided that the preschool could not function without the SMC since this is the managing body of the preschools. Teachers had decided that they could not make any improvement without involvement of SMC. Functioning of SMC members have been slow in most communities, may be due to the fact that these members work purely on voluntary basis, and they have other work to do so as to earn their living.

Example 2

Madrasa Tahdhiib Islamiya is in Michungwa Miwili village. It is situated in a complex with a mosque, a traditional Qura’n madrasa and the preschool. This school joined the program in June 1998 and graduated in June 2000. The school had four very committed teachers. The chairman was also committed and the school was one of the best performing in the 1998-200 batch schools. Members of the community decided to start a primary school to cater for the first graduates of the preschool. Two of the teachers got married and moved from the village, and the preschool standard began to deteriorate. The SMC members were no longer as committed as they used to be. This led to a number of activities either stopping or slowing down. Enrolment of children also dropped. When the preschool joined the PGSS, teachers identified a problem being that SMC members have ceased to be involved in preschool activities. They decided to call a meeting with the SMC and invited the Sheha (local community leader). During this meeting it was decided to reshuffle the SMC and they had a new chairman. Since then attendance of CRTs have been very good both at the CBT and SBT, including a member of SMC being 100%
attendance both for the centre and the school. After reshuffling the SMC, CRTs decided to work on recording financial transactions and they have been up to date ever since.

Teachers of the above schools were also trained in financial management during the two years of school support since teaching was a day-to-day activity while management could be done as a part time job. In many madrasa preschools teachers managed finances even in places where the treasurer was not a teacher because most of the time the treasurers will not be available for taking fees, writing receipts and recording in the income/expenditure book.

*Monitoring training and evaluating the CRTs.*

Monitoring of the CRT training was done during preschool visits when ZMRC staff also observed what was happening to the activities in the preschools. The staff recorded their observation in their note books or in visit forms (see Appendix III). Through these records, staff could identify the growth (or lack thereof) of the preschool after intervention of training CRTs. It was through these types of records that the examples of what happened in the two schools above were taken. In addition, during December, midway through training CRTs, an evaluation of the training and its impact (as reflected by CRTs) was done at the Resource Centre. Forty CRTs (10 LTs, 12 HTs, 10 SMCs and 8 MVDCs) responded to the evaluation. A summary of the Evaluation shows that CRTs have been able to provide an impact in their schools, for example, 14 have followed up and improved the outdoor areas, 9 have improved the indoors’ learning environment and four have followed upon financial records.
Material development.

The development of training material is a long and slow process and ZMRC staff had experienced this during the last phase of the program. While building the capacity for CRTs, support materials were to be developed for the purpose of supporting both staff and CRTs. It was expected that a Training Manual for CRTs would be developed by and for staff. An outline of this training Manual has been developed (See Appendix II) and staff hope to work towards completing the first draft and share it with the other MRCs by the end of 2004. Other materials to be developed included an evaluation tool for the CRT training (see Appendix V) and this was used to evaluate the training mid way during the month of December. The results of the evaluation are summarised in the section above.

Since CRTs were being empowered to be able to support communities so that preschools are sustainable, a plan to develop a training guide and monitoring and evaluation tools for use by CRTs was thought necessary. Therefore during the course of training CRTs, notes, training outlines used by CRTs in communities, handouts developed during training sessions in communities, and monitoring procedures are being compiled in the hope that towards the end of CRTs training, a draft training guide for the CRTs will be in place. A selected number of CRTs will work with ZMRC staff in reviewing, editing and finalizing the draft training material for use by CRTs.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Outcomes and Projected Outcomes of the Project

From the introduction, the aim of the project was to build capacity of CRTs so that they are able to work in sustaining madrasa preschools in technical and organizational aspects. The expected outcomes of the project were at two different levels: those related directly to CRTs, and those related to ZMRC as a resource and training centre.

At the ZMRC level the Project Director and staff members will:

1. Gain confidence and be able to develop other programs for communities with lessons learnt from implementing this one.

2. Communicate with other MRCs at the Regional level to share experiences on community capacity building for sustainability. There will also be a chance to learn about other MRCs strengths and challenges and utilize these to improve upon program implementation.

3. Strengthen their leadership skills.

Develop a Training Manual for CRTs. This will be at its initial stages and will be used and improved upon, as CRTs are being monitored and evaluated.

At the community level, the project aimed at training CRTs:

1. In selected classroom practice and school management topics, including monitoring of both classroom practice and school management.

2. To develop draft reference notes in selected topics, which they can use when training teachers/SMC members.
3. To develop at least five drafts of training outlines, which they can use when training teachers/SMC members.

In addition, as a projected outcome of the project, CRTs were expected to be able to identify areas that need intervention, the kind of intervention that would be needed, how the intervention should be tackled, and the resources that are to be mobilized.

Building the capacity for CRTs to be able to accomplish the above included a number of activities as discussed in Chapter 4. When ZMRC staff planned and got involved with the CRTs’ activities, the mentioned outcomes at their level were accomplished. In this chapter, the outcomes of the project at both levels are examined in relation to literature/existing programs, and limitations of the project will be discussed.

The discussion will focus on how the training went and how ZMRC staff used existing potentials in communities to support CRTs, and other community members through the Village Development Committee (VDC) realize their roles and responsibilities for the preschool. Although it was not possible to realize the aims of the project due to a number of reasons, as will be discussed later under “limitations” in this chapter, it was possible to start the process, and it is the hope of the ZMRC hope that with the lessons learnt and experience gained, it will be possible to have these teams working as expected in communities. This will be a very slow process, especially considering the uniqueness of each community, challenges of working with communities, academic level of CRTs, and time limitation since CRTs have to sacrifice time out of their day to day working for a living and attending to family commitments. The following paragraphs are a discussion of the outcomes.
Choice of CRTs: Building from the Communities’ Strengths

Torkington (1996, p. 1) talks about the principles guiding the work with children, families and communities. These principles include the empowerment of people and communities and building on the strengths of individuals and communities. In this project, it was intended to build capacity (i.e., empower) of CRTs (a team of people in the community) by providing them with knowledge and skills to carry out certain tasks as outlined above. Several strategies were used including building from the strengths of the individuals and teams in the communities. Amongst them is the choice of CRT membership, which included those who were trained for the program (teachers and SMC member), as well as a member from the VDC who not only has strength as an individual but possess strength in being able to coordinate preschool activities with the Village Development activities. It is believed that this team represents a wide section of the community and that the combined efforts of this team of people might help in sustaining the preschools.

The VDC is a body, which looks after overall development of the village, and it is through this body that villagers are mobilized to understand and take part in their developmental activities. This includes their contribution (e.g., in cash or in kind) whenever such a need arises so that the activities do not stagger.

From earlier discussions, staff members were able to work with LTs and HTs, trying to build their capacity for overseeing preschool activities for sustainability. This was a minor representation of the community both from the preschool perspective and also from the communities’ perspective. HTs and LTs were trained mainly in classroom practice, and they could work well with teachers, although the question of monitoring and
supporting other teachers was difficult since each of HTs and LTs had a group of children to look after in a classroom. There was also a neglect of training a member from the SMC, who are in charge of preschool management and administration (including financial management). School management is an area where teachers could not handle well although it is among the factors affecting their performance. Therefore, the expected strengths from the other team members was not considered and this posed questions as to whether ZMRC is repeating the first phase program (by only working with a group of teachers) and not taking firm steps towards involving the wider community in the process of building and strengthening community ownership.

In addition, during the second phase of the program, there was no follow-up of the training given to HTs and LTs in communities. These were being empowered in theory but practice was non-existent. The program did not consider the existing potentials in the communities, nor was there any consideration of individual’s community’s context. This shortfall has been seen by Ball (2000) who points out, “Capacity building initiatives must be anchored deeply in the community’s context, existing strengths, potential for cultural reconstruction, and ability to push forward their own agenda towards self-identified goals” (p. 3). The idea of ZMRC working with CRTs in their own communities was to enable them work in their own context, make use of existing strengths, and push forward their own agenda towards their identified goals. Through SBT, ZMRC staff facilitated sessions with CRT members to identify their own goals, and suggest ways they could move forward. Although teachers were the members present during these sessions, they were able to identify their goals and suggested ways of achieving the goals.

*Building Teams Sharing the Same Interests: Creating Community Resource Teams*
As discussed in the previous chapters, this project aimed at building the capacity of community resource people both as “team” and as individuals. This is because a team can bring together individuals of different abilities, skills, strengths and roles to fulfill a certain goal or objective. Communities that have been supported by ZMRC are still approaching the staff and asking for different kinds of support, including training and general school management. Preschools are also finding it difficult to mobilize communities for fee collection, which is the main source of teachers’ salaries. Although the Village Development Committee (VDC) is supposed to be an overseer of all village developmental programs and activities, it does not consider the madrasa preschool as being in their developmental plans.

In this project, teams were selected (to include a member from the VDC) by the communities and supported by ZMRC to increase their involvement in the activities of their preschools, and thus strengthen ownership and accountability and therefore increase the opportunity for sustaining the preschool activities. However, building the team was difficult in the first six months of training. As seen from chapter 4 above, the average attendance during Centre Based Training was 55.8%, which is a little over half of the expected attendance. During teacher training in the first and second phase of the madrasa program, the average attendance ranged between 78%-90% during CBT and it was over 90% for SBT.

The team members who attended CRTs’ training were mostly HTs and LTs. These were the people who were trained during the last phase, and it proved to be ineffective towards sustaining all aspects of the preschool activities (see Table 1). During Site Based Training, ZMRC staff almost always met with teachers in communities. The
SMC and VDC members were hardly present, and staff ended up doing activities with teachers only.

Although communities were involved in making a decision as to who should form the CRT, the problem of non/poor attendance of some members greatly affected the aims and objectives set for the team. For example, as Yukl (2002) puts it:

Getting agreement among group members on objectives, strategies for attaining them and need for cooperative effort greatly increases the likelihood of strong identification with the group. Emphasize mutual interests rather than differences.
Identify shared objectives and explain why cooperation is necessary to attain them. Encourage group members to share information and ideas and help each other (p. 323).

During the planning of training CRTs, it was expected that some community members would not be able to attend all the training sessions. The SMC and VDC members are also full time workers, some are fisherman or farmers, and their working hours are not so programmed as teachers’ working hours. Therefore, it was planned that the team would be made aware of that and that they were supposed to support each other through sharing inputs gained from training once they are in their communities.

Objectives of the Post Graduation Support for Sustainability were shared during CBT. However, each community had a different set of goals and objectives, and for the team to agree on objectives and strategies for attaining them, it required the team to meet as a complete team. Because it was not possible to have the team together in most cases, it was difficult to support them to realise the importance of working together cooperatively.
It was also difficult for teachers to get hold of VDC and SMC members to share training and the plan they have made for the preschool.

The mid term evaluation done for the CRTs indicated that there had been some changes in preschools. However, most of the changes were to do with the learning environment rather than other preschool activities, including general preschool management and fee payment. Although fee payment was one of the big problems facing over 90% of all madrasa preschools, it was not among the problems that were addressed by CRTs. SMC and VDC members, who are directly involved with following up parents, could not follow up fee payment since they were not part of the team during identifying problems and planning for what could be done.

**Involving the Community to Participate**

As discussed in Chapter 4, the program for CRTs had followed “program development principles” as described by Evans et al. (2000). A needs analysis was conducted at the communities to find out common needs that could be addressed together as part of the CBT. ZMRC staff went to communities to identify specific needs, set specific goals and later worked on the needs. An evaluation done for the CRTs indicated some changes had taken place. However, there was also a need to conduct evaluation in each community to identify whether there had been changes according to set goals. This is important for the CRTs, since after setting the goals and working at individuals’ community’s level, they needed to know how far and what have they been able to accomplish towards achieving the set goals. As Yukl (2002) puts it: “People tend to feel alienated and unappreciated when they receive little information about the plans, activities, and achievements of their teams or departments. It is important to keep
members informed about these things and to explain how their work contributes to the success of the mission” (p. 324). It is clear that CRTs were involved during both planning and carrying out of activities in their communities. Continuous monitoring was done during fortnightly visits. However, looking back at the goals and actually seeing what has been accomplished by CRTs halfway through the project implementation was not done.

People need to be involved in all aspects of program development including mobilization and evaluation stages. Myers (1993) notes:

A more complete definition of community participation in a program would include mobilization and indirect involvement of the community in all phases of program activity – in design, implementation and evaluation. It implies the existence and growth organizational mechanism through which participation can be expressed. It means involving the community at large, not just a selected few individuals in the process of discussion and action on a continuing basis (p. 77).

CRTs were not involved during the early mobilization stage of the program. Through reflection and examining the gaps for realizing the goals during the first phase of the program, it was found out that VDCs, who are responsible for all development activities of the village, still consider MPS as being ZMRC responsibility, and not part of their development. The other CRT members were somehow involved during implementation in that they had to implement some of the activities. The involvement of these members during evaluation was minimal. The exercise focusing their involvement during discussion of evaluation results after ZMRC staff had conducted the evaluation was also minimal.
During planning of the project for capacity building of CRTs, one of the expected challenges was irregular attendance of some members both during CBT and SBT, especially members from the community who were not teachers. Reasons for this have already been explained. Therefore, staff planned to deal with this issue by openly discussing it with CRT members, and asking them to support each other by providing information, or sharing the knowledge when one of them misses training or team meeting. As pointed out by Cohen (1994), “when such peer to peer interactions are part of a well planned program that includes training, supervision and relevant materials, they can achieve benefits for all concerned that are not possible through bureaucratically organized welfare services” (p. 24). ZMRC planned for centre-based training, supervision in communities through SBT, and it was assumed that there would be the peer-to-peer interaction when team members share knowledge and meet to discuss on preschool activities for action when and if required. However, it was not easy for the teams to share training inputs as planned, since it appeared difficult for them to arrange for meetings, which were not facilitated by a member from ZMRC. Therefore when one of the team members missed out (as it happened most of the time in communities as already discussed), s/he has missed out for good.

**Material Development**

This aspect of the project was not realised fully as planned. An outline of the training manual for CRTs was developed, and it is hoped that this will be developed further to have the first draft by the end of 2004. On the part of the CRTs, some reference
notes and training outlines are available, but these have not been compiled to at least get a skeleton of their training manuals. Some CRTs have just begun to conduct workshops in their communities, and are having their skills in facilitation improved. During this process, it is expected that they will also be supported to develop monitoring and evaluation tools. This will be done during the feedback sessions with CRTs where they will be able to identify areas for further intervention and therefore areas they could follow up later. In addition, during planning meetings, CRTs can also identify areas to include in the monitoring/evaluation tools. As CRTs are being handheld to provide support in their communities, developing support materials for their use will be done simultaneously. However, it will be a very slow process, and it may take another two years before working drafts are produced. In the meantime, whatever notes and outlines being developed during training and follow-up in communities are being used and filed in preparation for the set of materials which will be used by CRTs in their roles of supporting their communities.

At the ZMRC level, mentioned outcomes 1 and 4 (please see page 43) are still to be realised, although an outline of the CRTs training manual exists. But, like for material development for CRTs, this is a slow process, and it will continue for another one or two years although it will be in use once the draft is complete by the end of the year 2004. Lessons learnt will be used for developing other programs in future. Already ZMRC is thinking of selecting CRTs six months before the end of the two years of support with new communities that join the Madrasa Preschool Program. This is to allow the CRTs to be involved, right from the beginning, into the activities of the preschool and learn while the program unfolds to allow them understand their roles and responsibilities as owners.
of the preschool together with other community members. Staff members were able to communicate and share experiences with the other two MRCs, and gain confidence in the course of their supporting CRTs in communities.

Project Limitations

Time.

Among the limitations of this project was the time frame, because of the nature of activities, which took place before and on commencement of the project. This being a new program, it required a lot of time to think through and prepare. ZMRC staff was struggling with different ideas on how to continue with implementation. Being so used to train teachers and SMC members, who came on board quite green, it was easy for staff to plan the CBT, and follow up the same training in the field. It appeared difficult for some staff members to accept addressing individual CRTs according to their specific needs in communities. After conducting CBT, some staff members felt it would be easier to follow up the training in respective communities. It took a number of meetings, trials and errors by those who were ready to venture, sharing experiences from the field, to finally allow staff members to accept the idea of “doing it according to community’s needs” and trying it out. This had repercussions on the time since it was already planned that the project would take one year (January –November 2003). Time had to be extended to enable staff work with CRTs more and improve on their capacities as indicated in the introduction.
**CRTs’ attendance.**

As discussed, the attendance of CRTs was another limitation. The original idea of building a team was not realised, since it was only two members who could actually take part in the planned activities. Working as individuals was already a part of the last program, and a new idea of working with community teams was what ZMRC wanted to try out. Different strategies are still being thought of which could bring this to a fact.

**Low academic level of CRT members.**

Dealing with people from poor villages means that one was dealing with people who were also “poor” in education. Villagers who are able to attain higher academic qualifications would hardly stay in villages, and they would prefer urban areas where they would get better paid employment. ZMRC had experienced this situation before when training teachers and SMC members. It required a lot of patience, follow-up and taking people at their own pace. Since CRTs are being developed to work in their own communities, for their own children, it is believed that they would be able to perform their roles, at their own level. Assuming that they will be able to rise to the level of ZMRC staff and actually replace them is an over assumption. However, learning to deal with the CRTs so that they are allowed to perform at their level is not easy, considering that staff is learning as it is implementing. One has to be very cautious as to the expectations from these teams. A more practical focused approach might bring quicker changes than a series of workshops.
In conclusion, I will here summarize the key outcomes and the conclusions that can be drawn from these outcomes. Reflecting back on the stated aims and objectives of the project, there were two sets of objectives: those focusing at the ZMRC level with staff, and those focusing on CRTs on behalf of the communities.

At the ZMRC level, much has been accomplished including gaining experience and confidence for the program. The program for building the capacity of CRTs was very new and posed some challenges. One of the challenges was whether the CRTs who were being developed would be able to perform the expected roles. Although ZMRC had worked with women who had very low academic qualifications and turned them into very good preschool teachers, ZMRC staff was still uncomfortable because building the capacity of CRTs was another “level” of training, and another much higher expectation from community members.

During teacher training it was easy for staff to accept that “they” will be able to do produce “good” teachers since the emphasis was on teaching young children. Teaching was the only out-of-home activity for most of the teachers. With CRTs it was different as these teams are dealing with adults in their communities and this has a two pronged challenge: (i) building enough confidence for the CRTs to be able to face their counterparts who know them very well and also know their abilities, and (ii) getting CRTs committed during training and support due to 50% of the team (community mobilizer and a member of the village development committee) being involved in some other income generating activities.
During the course of working with CRTs, it was discovered that some of them actually found the training and support valuable and interesting enough to help them bring about changes in their communities. In some communities the CRTs are very powerful and they have been able to change or influence SMC members to take actions towards improving preschool activities. An example of this is Madrasa Imaan (Kibweni-periurban Unguja). The experience had given staff confidence that CRTs training can bring about positive changes in schools and ZMRC is now looking for ways of improving on the program.

In addition, ZMRC staff has strengthened their training and leadership skills when they were building capacity of community leaders. The process is similar to that of Training of Trainers, as the CRTs are believed to be more knowledgeable than other trained personnel in the communities. Sharing experiences with different CRTs in specific areas where staff have been able to support them allow staff members to gain more knowledge and skills on how to approach different situations. Some communities have started with a good base and have responded well to interventions while others have been slow in implementing agreed upon tasks. Through sharing these types of experiences, staff are motivated and become patient if communities they are responsible for are not performing as expected. Developing patience is another area where leadership has been strengthened.

The Draft Training Manual for CRTs has been developed, although staff found it difficult to develop an evaluation tool. Visit forms were used to monitor activities on site.

Part of the CRTs’ training was conducted as planned in selected topics as identified during CNA and TNA. Although the CRTs were unable to develop any
reference materials, they were able to identify issues in their communities and acted upon them accordingly. Attendance of CRT members was a problem both at the Centre and in communities. This greatly affected the outcomes in communities. It was not possible to “build Community Teams,” with a larger representation from the communities. The absence/poor attendance of MVDC left ZMRC staff to assume that the VDC will still not be involved in the preschool activities. There have been a few cases where these members have attended and took part in preschool activities. In these situations a link has been created between the preschool and VDC. This may ensure that the preschool activities become part of the village developmental plans.

The project of building capacity for CRTs has gone half way. It is anticipated that most of the set objectives and outcomes will be realised at the end of the project.
CHAPTER 7: RECOMMENDATIONS

The training of teachers and School Management Committee members during the last phase of the MPP was an effort to create technical capacities for running and managing sustainable quality preschools. However, there was no support system that was developed to oversee/supervise the maintenance of quality after schools have graduated. This led to lowered standards of performance in the preschools hardly one year after graduation when ZMRC stopped its regular school visits. This project of building capacity for CRTs was yet another effort by ZMRC to develop communities to establish the missing support structures. The effort promises success, but not without some reviewing and refining of the implementation strategies. The following are recommendations made as a result of taking part in this project:

1. Any community based ECD program should consider not only providing service to the community but have a succession plan where support systems are created from within the communities. If this is done simultaneously when the service is being provided, it will prepare communities for stronger ownership, later follow-up and taking responsibilities for the ECD activities provided during support from external donors. If CRTs were identified and selected from the early stages of the MPP, their capacity building would have started early, and the challenges faced currently would have been minimised.

2. It is important to create awareness of all community members towards making them understand that an ECD service provided in their community involves and is the responsibility of all community members. Although the VDC are responsible for all developmental activities of their village, it is still difficult to involve them
in the madrasa preschools. It is much easier to involve SMC members although they bear the same conditions as members of VDC in terms of having family and work commitments.

3. CRTs should be involved in all aspects of program development. Field Officers should work with them so that they air their expectations, understand the process, set goals and develop monitoring and evaluation systems they can use. This would support a sense of ownership in the program, at the same time build skills for CRTs to do the same with communities.

4. Reflection sessions should be part of a program. When dealing with CRTs, it is advisable to hold regular reflection sessions with both individual teams in communities, and also as a group of teams when they meet together. This would help them feel that they are informed of their accomplishments, and they would have the heart to work together for the way forward. In addition, this will build their capacities to impart the same to communities.

5. CRTs were intended to work as teams. If communities were aware right from the start of their responsibilities for children, working together in groups would be slowly built in communities. When it is time for CRTs to have their capacities developed, it would be easier to identify teams, which can easily work together for the preschool.

6. Training of CRTs should be more practical oriented, supporting communities rather than planning for a series of workshops before any implementation is done in communities. Training should be such that it follows the following steps:
   - Providing theory inputs for the CRTs
• Planning with CRTs to interact with communities

• Supporting CRTs to interact with communities

• Reflection session of what happened and what can be changed plus setting a way forward.


APPENDIX I: REQUESTING FOR CONSENT FROM CRTS

4th October 2003

My name is Asha Mohammed and I am the Project Director for the Zanzibar Madrasa Preschool program. I am also a student with the Early Childhood Education Virtual University doing a course in dealing with young children. As part of my course requirements I am doing a project describing the process of building capacity of CRTs for preschool sustainability.

Sometimes the project will require that I interact with you to elicit information about the program and asking about the impact. I know you all come to the centre with expectations of receiving training, but the process of interacting with you will not disrupt your training time in any way, and it will be mostly as part of the training you are given. I may not necessarily interact directly with you but the information and comments you give during your training may be part of the information I will use during my project.

Sometimes when I visit you in your communities, I may also ask for some comments or information. Some of the materials you develop as part of the training will also form part of this project. The Kiswahili translation (which was the one given to participants) is provided below:


Ninaomba ushirikiano wenu katika mambo niliyoorodhesha hapo juu. Jisikieni huru ikiwa hamtakubali kujibu masuali yangu kwa nia ya masomo ninayochukua.

Ahsanteni sana kwa msaada wenu na wakati wenu.
APPENDIX II: A DRAFT OUTLINE OF A TRAINING MANUAL FOR CRTS

THE ZANZIBAR MADRASA RESOURCE CENTRE

(Supporting Early Childhood Education)

THE COMMUNITY RESOURCE TEAM TRAINING MANUAL

December 2003
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INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE OF THE MANUAL

The Zanzibar Madrasa Preschool program has come to an end of its first phase for community owned preschools. Much has happened during the time of the program phase. For example, there has been training of teachers, School Management Committee members, and some members of the community. The program had been evolving, changing in strategies and including aspects which could make the program more effective.

There is a lot of technical expertise in communities, both in terms of management and conducting classroom teaching for young children. However, there is no system or structure in place to monitor or support this expertise and see that it is sustainable.

The Post Graduation Support for Sustainability is one of the sub programs developed to address this need: the need to have support systems and structures in communities which would ensure that the already established and active madrasa preschools do not vanish. As de los Angeles-Bautista (2003) puts it “We can no longer afford the luxury of seeing ECCD as primarily ‘delivery of services’, because experience has shown us that services that are delivered without supports and learning built into the environment around the child and/or family will quickly diminish in effect when the services are withdrawn.” ZMRC would like to see sustainable preschools which do not disappear after ZMRC cease to deliver services.

One way of responding to this issue had been trying to build the technical capability of members from within communities. There have been several attempts to address this including training of lead and head teachers. However, these trainings were delivered without follow-up or support to trainees.
The CRT capacity building program is aimed at ensuring that in addition to theory given, a close follow-up of trainees will be conducted so that they are able to support others and follow up preschool activities.

This manual outlines the training of CRTs. The training is divided into two parts namely Centre Based Training and Site Based training. Centre Based Training will be conducted at the Centre. It will be mainly theory given after common identified needs. Site based Training will be more specific and will address specific issues of communities. It will involve both theory and practical sessions depending upon needs.
HOW TO USE THE MANUAL

This manual is intended for use by MRC staff in training Community Resource Teams (CRTs). It has section on Centre and Site Based Training as well as supporting CRTs to conduct workshops for teachers, SMC members and interact with parents. Anyone using the manual is advised to work with CRTs in identifying their needs and then selecting an appropriate topics to be used.

A number of handouts and training outlines used during some of the CRTs’ training have been included in this guide. These should serve as guides only and trainers are advised to use their own creativity by developing outlines and handouts to suit their own community’s needs and context.

At the end of this manual there are empty pages which have been provided for the trainer to give their feedback when using this manual so that these can be included when reviewing/revising the manual.
Proposed topics and content

1. The Concept of Sustainability
   - What is sustainability?
   - Why sustainability?
   - Sustainability of Madrasa Preschools
   - Technical sustainability
   - Organizational sustainability
   - Financial sustainability
   - Roles of CRTs in relation to sustainability of Madrasa Preschools

2. The Community Resource Team
   - What is CRT?
   - Composition of CRTs
   - The need for CRT
   - Roles of CRTs and their relationship with ZMRC, Graduate Association and communities

3. Community Mobilization towards consolidating sustainability
   - The concept of mobilization
   - How to mobilize
   - Mobilization for a purpose

4. Community Involvement
   - What is a community?
   - What is community involvement?
   - How do we involve communities?
• Who should be involved?
• When should communities be involved?

5. Conducting Training Needs Assessment
• What is training needs assessment?
• Methods for conducting training needs assessment
• Compiling and analyzing data from TNA
• Identifying needs from TNA
• Prioritizing needs

6. Developing a training program
• What is a training program?
• Features of a training program
• Developing the training program according to identified needs

7. Preparation for training sessions
• Identifying a training topic
• Setting objectives for the training session
• Identifying the target audience
• Preparing a training outline
• Identifying and preparing training materials
• Preparing a training space/room

8. Report writing
• What is a report?
• Importance of writing reports
• How to write good reports
9. Classroom practice and learning environment

- The preschool learning environment
- Active learning
- Adult/adult and Adult/child interaction
- Parental involvement in classroom practice
- Classroom teaching
- Following up and monitoring teachers

10. Interacting with parents

- Need to involve parents in total development of their children
- When, how and what to involve parents in
- Home visits
- Monitoring child growth and development

11. School management and administration

- Description of school management and administration
- Who is involved
- Monitoring for effective management and administration

12. Child development

- What is child development?
- Stages of child development
- Needs of children at different stages

13. Networking

- Need for networking
- How to network
14. Monitoring and evaluation

- Definitions
- Developing tools for monitoring and evaluation
- Conducting monitoring and evaluation

ASSESSING CRTS
APPENDIX III: VISIT FORM USED TO RECORD CRT ACTIVITIES IN COMMUNITIES

ZANZIBAR MADRASA RESOURCE CENTRE
(Supporting early childhood development)

TRAINER/CDO VISIT FORM

Madrasa........................................................................................................
Name of Trainer/CDO ....................................................................................
Date of visit.................................................................................................
Time arrived........... Time left..................Time spent....................... 
People seen....................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................
Activities undertaken...................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................
Achievement.................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................
Challenges....................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................
Date of next visit...........................................................................................
APPENDIX IV: ABBREVIATIONS USED

MPP: Madrasa Preschool Program

CRTS: Community Resource Teams

ZMRC: Zanzibar Madrasa Resource Centre

MRCs: Madrasa Resource Centres

MoECS: Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports

VDC: Village Development Committee

SMC: School Management Committee

LTs: Lead Teachers

HTs: Head Teachers

CDO: Community development Officer

LTrainer: Lead Trainer

LCDO: Lead Community Development Officer

PD: Project Director

M/E: Monitoring and Evaluation
ZANZIBAR MADRASA RESOURCE CENTRE

Community Resource Team Mid-Term Training Evaluation

The purpose of this questionnaire is to improve on future CRT training. Please answer all the questions fully and truthfully. Do not write your name on this paper. Thank you very much for your time.

1. Please put [ ] in front of your response to the questions below.

   a. I am a [ ] Head Teacher [ ] Lead Teacher [ ] Member of School Management Committee [ ] Member of Village Development Committee [ ]

   b. My attendance for Centre Based Training is: Very Good [ ] Good [ ] Average [ ] Poor [ ]

   c. My attendance for School Based Training is: Very Good [ ] Good [ ] Average [ ] Poor [ ]

   d. The Madrasa Preschool for which I am a CRT member is in the:

      [ ] 1st [ ] 2nd [ ] 3rd [ ] 4th [ ] batch

   e. The CRT training has:

      Helped me very much [ ] Helped me [ ] Did not help me [ ]

2. Please answer the following questions:

   a. Have you noticed any changes in the preschool for which you are a member of CRT since the training started? YES [ ] NO [ ]

      If there are changes, please explain them briefly (You can use space at the end of this paper if the space below is not enough):
b. Have you trained as a member of CRT?
   YES ☐ NO ☐

   If the answer is YES, please explain the training done and for whom.

c. Have you been involved in preparing a Training Outline or any other reference materials for use in community at the end of CRT training?
   YES ☐ NO ☐

   If the answer is YES, please explain the material or mention topic of the Training Outline.

d. What areas of preschool activities have you followed up?

   i. .................................................................................................................................
   ii. .................................................................................................................................
   iii. .................................................................................................................................

e. On average, how many times in a month have you been able to attend CRTs’ Site Based Training in your preschool?

f. Have you met with other CRT members from your community to discuss on preschool issues? YES ☐ NO ☐

   If the Answer is YES, please explain what was discussed and what was done after the discussions.
g. What aspects of the training supported you best and you would like them to be continued?

h. What aspects were not valuable to you and you would like them to be discontinued?

i. What part of the training did you like?

j. What part of the training did you not like?

k. What changes would you like to see in future?

l. What other training needs do you have so that you can perform your roles better as a member of CRT?

m. Any other comments/ suggestions.

Thank you very much for your time.
APPENDIX VI: AN EXAMPLE OF USING PAIRWISE MATRIX FOR PRIORITYING NEEDS/ISSUES/TOPICS

**Step 1**: Allow people to brainstorm on all possible topics they would need to be addressed, for example:

(1) English, (2) Leadership, (3) Monitoring, (4) Training, and (5) Fund Raising

**Step 2**: Put the topics in a matrix as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>F/Raising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/Raising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 3**: Involve participants to compare pairs of topics and prioritize one, for example, “English” and “Leadership.” Put “English” if they say English or “Leadership” if they say Leadership where the pair cross as shown in the table. In this case participants chose “English” as being more important than “Leadership.” When comparing “Training” with “Monitoring,” “Monitoring” appears where the two cross showing that participants preferred “Monitoring” in relation to “Training.” Do the same for all the other topics.
**Step 4:** Count the number of times each topic appears. The most frequent will indicate the high priority and vice versa. For example, from the table above, “Monitoring” will be the first priority followed by “Training.”

**Step 5:** List the topics according to priority. For example:

1. Monitoring
2. Training
3. English
4. Leadership
5. Fundraising