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ABSTRACT

This study examines the changes that should be made within the Tanzanian government’s structure to develop intersectoral linkages and collaboration. The present approach is based on plans and development programming which tend to focus on individual sectors such as health, education and agriculture, an approach which does not explicitly take into account the compatibilities and inconsistencies among them. ECD programs and their improvement strategies are at the core of the intersectoral linkages approach advocated in this project. ECD is seen as being impacted upon by a wide range of services and sectors beyond any one sector; hence the need for other sectors and stakeholders within the civil society to be involved in the development and determination of ECD programs. ECD task forces and working groups organized around technical themes are an important mechanism to help ensure ECD programs’ responsiveness to children’s needs.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

No single government ministry can address all of the needs of children on its own, as attested by Nomfundo Mqadi at the 25th WEDC Conference on integrated development for water supply and sanitation in 1999. Mqadi’s Integrated School Sanitation Program in South Africa involved the Departments of Education and Public Works and took the lead in addressing the shortage of school toilets in Gautang province on a cross-sectoral partnership. In Tanzania, however, the provision of children’s services crosses various ministries and lacks intersectoral linkages, creating problems of coordination, communication and networking. Consequently, it is of paramount importance that ministries create an environment in which they can work together to achieve multisectoral ECD programs in Tanzania. This major project addresses some of the linkage, communication and coordination challenges.

Project Statement

Tanzania’s Development Vision 2025 (1999) highlights human resource and gender development as keys for opening the locks that hold individuals, families and the nation in an ongoing cycle of poverty. Today’s infants and young children will be the young adults of the year 2025. In Tanzania, issues related to early childhood development have been mandated to several line ministries within the government structure. This departmentalization of children’s issues has created a vacuum in which a lack of collaboration, coordination and networking, especially among government ministries, is becoming more apparent. The Ministry of Education, for example, in its policy on pre-primary education, addresses children aged five years and above. The Day Care Centre Act of 1981 under the Social Welfare Department addresses children aged two to six
years old. It is apparent that there is an overlap between the two policies. Due to the prevailing overlap, once officials from the ministry discover that a community-based ECD program under the licence of the Social Welfare Department has enrolled children whose age is above five years they demand that such ECD programs close down or register with the Ministry of Education. It is incidences such as this that lie behind the author’s assertion that there is a problematic lack of collaboration, coordination and networking among government ministries on one hand and other stakeholders on the other. In Tanzania, ministries that provide services to children include the Ministries of Health, Education, Community Development, Gender and Children, Labour, Youth Development and Sports, Agriculture, Regional Administration and Local Government; each has sectoral-specific policies and guidelines instead of making children a focal point of intent. This environment, in which service provision to children is discharged, challenges a holistic approach to child development.

Through deliberate revision of policies, the above-mentioned ministries are advised to create an environment in which they can cooperate and coordinate services in a cross-sectoral approach to improve the well-being of children in the country. Some of the advantages of multisectoral approaches suggested in the literature, and which are relevant to Tanzania, include the development of joint initiatives with anticipated higher levels of productivity, more effective use and exchange of resources, more holistic perspective and understanding of client and situation, more informed decisions through greater information and multiple perspectives, and better case assessment and planning through coordination and collaboration of inputs from different disciplines in order to achieve a holistic approach to child development.
This project highlights the extent to which integrated programming among government ministries improves ECD programs in the country and the degree to which achieving such integration is possible. The report highlights the views and opinions given by interviewees on how multisectoral collaboration and networking can best be achieved. The report also identifies issues of individual beliefs, feelings and attitudes towards multisectoral programming among heads of departments and ministries.

During his years of experience in government service, the author has observed and noted gaps in service provision to children due to sectoralization and under-integration. These phenomena work against the best interests of the child. Current ECD thinking views the child holistically and calls for serving the child through integrated approaches. The harmonization of sectoral policies and guidelines is important in that it will open a window of opportunity to implement cross-sectoral ECD programs with linkages that are necessary for holistic child development.

The first steps in this endeavour were to: (a) sensitize policy makers and managers on holistic developmental needs of children; (b) gather ideas and views from heads of departments, local and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) dealing with children’s issues and parents on how ministries can best cooperate and coordinate services and activities for the improved well-being of children in Tanzania.

Involving other stakeholders, including parents and other community members, in giving out ideas and views on important aspects of child development to be incorporated in an ECD program is of prime importance. Through this project it was possible to look at relevant international conventions and agreements on children’s issues that were “owned” by sectoral ministries for the purpose of identifying their linkages. The
identification of areas of linkage will greatly improve integrated ECD programs at the practice level.

*Rationale for the Project*

The project is important because present sectoral policies and guidelines are departmentalizing children’s issues – as if the child can be cut into segments according to the roles and mandates of line ministries. The problem with this approach is that providers of services to children tend to ignore aspects of coordination, collaboration and networking and end up with duplication of services and misuse of public resources. The point here is that the child is the prime benefactor of services discharged by different stakeholders. Line ministries and other stakeholders are supposed to work out best modalities of providing quality services to meet children’s needs through cooperation and coordination in order to utilise scarce resources effectively. The need for holistic child development arises from the fact that children have a wide range of often complex and inter-related needs. Individual service providers working in isolation cannot adequately address these needs. While the appropriate range of services may be provided, they may prove to be ineffective. For example, when service providers work in isolation, clients may have to deal with many different professionals who may or may not be in contact with each other; information about a case may be missed or may have to be repeated by client and provider, time may be wasted, and minor but vital links between services may be overlooked. To avoid these difficulties, multisectoral teams of professionals who collaborate to serve the best interests of the child is a practical alternative. To be truly child-centred, services must be delivered in an integrated manner that respects individual children’s needs. The integrated approach ensures that all providers involved in a case are
in contact with each other and that information is shared. This approach also ensures that links between services are maintained.

From the author’s experience of working in the government, he has been able to observe how a sectorized approach in service provision to the child is problematic, especially with reference to current literature and understanding regarding treating the child holistically and providing services on an integrated basis. However, if a number of ministries (e.g., Health, Education, Community Development, Gender and Children, Regional Administration and Local Government, Agriculture, Water and Livestock, and Labour) work together in a multisectoral approach, they can address a variety of children’s issues through an integrated approach to programming. The responsible ministries should be able to identify which ministry is in a better position to implement which activities, and with what resources. The ministries could put in place an ongoing coordinating mechanism to utilize resources to the maximum.

Specifically, the project intended to build a new working approach whereby government ministries should see themselves as units of the government structure that can work in a collaborative way to maximize the utilization of scarce resources and therefore improve the quality of ECD programs in the country.

Baseline observations from which the author set out to determine the degree to which advocacy and education have had the desired impact included the following:

1. Through the ECDVU training, I became aware of holistic child development.

   When I reflected on the way we discharged children’s services, I realized that they were formulated more to meet the needs of departments and ministries than they were to meet the needs of children who are the recipients of such services.
Among other services, the department which I head provides family and child welfare services. As such, I am directly involved in ensuring service provision to families and children. More specifically, the department is mandated by the Act of Parliament No. 17 of 1981 (i.e., the Day Care Act) to provide day care services, which fall under the umbrella of ECD programs. I recognized the importance of collaboration, networking and coordination. I understood that children needed other services that fell outside the department’s scheduled duties, and therefore wished to promote an understanding of the need for an integrated approach to programming.

2. As a professional social worker and an ECDVU participant, I knew that children need a variety of services. These services range from parents’ love at one end of the ladder to an environment conducive to proper child growth and development at the other. I was also aware that children needed health services, but as a social worker I could not be of much assistance in the area of health, nor of water and sanitation. I am not a teacher nor a community development officer. I lack expertise in food and nutrition. I therefore need other professionals to play their parts in services that fall under their competence to augment my efforts before the dream of an essentially holistic approach to child development will be realized.

3. Being one of the African team members who have received ECD capacity-building training through ECDVU, I am committed to addressing the limitations of existing systems. Ignoring linkages in service provision is detrimental to the welfare of children in Tanzania. As implementers we should not be protective of sectoral policies, but rather focus on building bridges by formulating intersectoral
policies that address children’s issues holistically. When there is a malfunction to
one part of an organism, or a failure to interact across systems, the organism will
not be perfect. When government ministries cling to traditional sectoral policies,
despite their broader implications, the whole government structure will perform
poorly.

Specific objectives to be achieved through this project include the following:

1. To sensitize key policy formulators and implementers to the holistic development
   needs of children.

2. To receive ideas and views from heads of government departments, heads of local
   and international agencies, and parents on how stakeholders can work in an
   integrated framework.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Relevant Projects and Related Work

The work by Nomfundo Mqadi (1999) on integrated school sanitation programming in South Africa is one example of the work that has been done in the area of integrated programming and which relates to and informs this topic. In 1996, the Departments of Education and Public Works took the lead in addressing the shortage of school toilets in Gautang Province. The main objective of the program, at that point, was to provide sanitation facilities.

The Public Works Department (the custodian of all government property) and the Department of Education (responsible for schools) were the two partners. The construction of toilet facilities was co-managed with the school government bodies, and the funds for purchasing materials and payment of labour were kept by the schools. Apart from external support for technical designers, the entire project management was within the school.

Before the completion of the toilets, the two departments were concerned about the sustainability, operation and maintenance of the initiative and wished to ensure that the new facilities would not deteriorate to substandard conditions. The Department of Health and the Mvula Trust, a national NGO in South Africa, were approached to assist in this program. Mqadi (1999) concludes:

It was clear that one government department could not solve all the problems. An integrated approach was needed. Partnerships can lead to sustainable programs. The School Sanitation Program provides one of the ideal and rare opportunities
for governments to collaborate. Different departments learn about each other’s systems, which may affect their work (p. 60).

From Mqadi’s integrated school sanitation program, it is evident that the partnership between government ministries and school committees composed of parents and teachers made a difference. Before the completion of the project, the Departments of Public Works and Education were concerned about the sustainability, operation and maintenance of the initiative and that the conditions of the new facilities should not deteriorate and be substandard. To counteract the foreseen problem, the two departments involved other stakeholders (i.e., the school committees) to co-manage the project by making sure that parents within the school committees participated fully in the purchase of construction materials and making payments to labourers who worked in the project. From this example it is clear that though combined efforts, resources and expertise to make sure that the program they had looked forward to accomplish had actually materialized. In the same example one learns that coordination and networking was one of the pillars to their success. Division of responsibilities, which called for decision-making at different levels, made the program more participatory in practise and therefore ensuring the sustainability of the program.

Three lessons, at least, can be drawn from the Mqadi integrated program as described above and which may be relevant to an integrated ECD program to be introduced in Tanzania. First, there are opportunities for government ministries to work collaboratively and, there are windows of opportunity in forming partnerships with groups among the civil society and other funding organizations to collectively and effectively address ECD issues in Tanzania. The second lesson is that with the
involvement of parents in designing and implementing ECD programs, problems associated with ownership and sustainability of ECD programs will be evaded. Third, mobilization and utilization of available resources will be maximized and hence the improvement of the quality of services in ECD programs.

Bishop Robert Lynch (2002), when outlining the severity of the problems facing people in Zimbabwe, Zambia and Malawi, points out that by:

working hand in hand with our local partners in these countries, Catholic Relief Services is positioned to distribute life saving food to the general population at risk. Empowerment for affected communities with integrated programming is crucial. Catholic Relief Services is helping dioceses and partner agencies expand home-based care programs. The real challenge is that the problem is so enormous, so CRS is working with their local partners to see that they are better able to provide the necessary and required services (par. 3).

Bishop Lynch emphasises working with local partners in three different countries to solve the problem of hunger. He underscores the importance of participatory approaches to achieve the objective of saving people by providing the needed food, but he understands that for Catholic Relief Services to succeed they need other partners on the ground. Bishop Lynch (2002) mentions the empowerment aspect in integrated programming as being important to affected communities, so that they understand where to look for whom and who provides what. This is an important step in locating where the convergence zone of stakeholders appears.

To improve ECD programs in Tanzania, government institutions, NGOs and communities could do the same in identifying the linkages that are available for the
improvement of services to children. Communities when empowered will be able to contact government ministries, funding agencies and technical partners who in one way or another will contribute to the improvement of ECD programs at the family and community levels by providing material resources and technical expertise.

In *The State of the World’s Children 2001*, UNICEF (2001) underscores the importance of Integrated Management of Childhood Illness (IMCI). The report makes it evident that partnerships with families, which go beyond parental involvement and include a role for parents in directing the program and influencing decision making at all levels, contribute to the quality of care and to the health and well-being of children and families (Doherty, 2000, in UNICEF, 2001). Involvement of parents in decision-making and management of programs facilitates change of behaviour from passive to active, as proved through participation. Behavioural aspects at the family and community levels have impacts on what people decide to do. When people are well informed about a problem they tend to take timely actions against the problem. Empowerment of families on key family practices is important in that it makes members aware of both negative and positive family practices.

The report emphasizes the following major areas as an opportunity for convergence:

1. Key household- and community-level behaviours that have the potential to impact on preventing (and if it has occurred, adequate and timely management of) morbidity and mortality.
2. Focus on prevention and timely action.
3. Focus on preventing causes of common childhood morbidity and mortality.
4. Empowerment of caregivers – key family practices.
5. Promote linkages between communities and services.
6. Multisectoral approaches and linkages are re-emphasized (UNICEF, 2001).

The multisectoral approach promotes linkages between communities and services. Through a multisectoral approach, community members will be able to identify different types of services provided by stakeholders that address issues of children holistically.

The theoretical framework on which the report by UNICEF rests fits well with this project in that it mentions behaviour of actors as being important to any meaningful actions to be taken. For improved ECD programs to thrive, the behaviour of professionals from different government sectors and other stakeholders should be considered critically. Education of family and community members on the importance of ECD programs is important and ECD programs will flourish only when there is multisectoral programming, which promotes linkages between communities, ECD programs and key partners.

Two West African countries, Mali and Myanmar, have paved the way for collaborative approaches in ECD. In an internet newsletter article, *Early Childhood Programming: Examples from the Field* (2003, October), which documents ECD programming in the two countries, the idea is put forth that ECD should be understood as a rights-based issue with a goal of fulfilling all of a child’s rights not only to survive but also to thrive. Services and activities must converge on the same family and child, with an emphasis on the disadvantaged. The article takes Mali as an example whereby the Ministry of Health leads the early childhood efforts, combining interventions in health, nutrition, water and sanitation, and moving now into child development. Mali is
combining interventions from the different sectors so that the combined knowledge and strategies to address children’s needs are well articulated for the benefit of young children.

Each sector provides an input on how best it can cooperate with others to improve services to children so that the overall output have an impact on the well-being of children in Mali. In Myanmar, multiple sectors collaborate at a sub-district level under the guidance of a coordinating committee to meet children’s rights. In Myanmar, the intersectoral collaboration is closer to communities because they work in an integrated way at the sub district level with a multidisciplinary team working as a coordinating committee. It is anticipated that through such an approach, children in Myanmar will be better served than when sectoral approaches continued to guide implementation.

The examples from Mali and Myanmar show the importance of collaboration among stakeholders. It is unfortunate, however, that they mention the family as recipients of services rather than active participants in an attempt to improve the well being of children. Government and non-government organizations may collaborate in efforts to improve the living standards of the people but if such community members are not empowered and cannot participate fully in the planning process and decision making then not much will be achieved in terms of improving the well being of such families and children.

The impact of ECD programs in Tanzania will be more effective when people with different professional backgrounds talk to each other, plan, organize and implement activities towards a common goal. If all stakeholders underscore the importance of collaboration among actors based specifically on the involvement of families and
communities to initiate actions that will yield positive effects on children. The author believes that parents are knowledgeable on best practices for child rearing and upbringing. In many cases professionals neglect the fact that those parents have some valuable knowledge, which if taped and utilized correctly can have a positive impact on ECD programs. A good example of such knowledge is the stories that are narrated every evening around a fireplace. These stories carry messages about a wide range of actual behaviours in the lived world.

Another relevant work is Narendra Sharma’s report on workshops held in Kenya and Senegal in 1996. Though the workshops dealt with water resource management in Sub Saharan Africa, Sharma’s report is rich in ideas on collaborative approach. Sharma (1996) captures the enthusiasm of the workshop participants to learn the lessons of the past but to base their future programs on strengths and achievements in the following statement:

A number of countries have shown that commitment to stakeholder-driven policy development, with all partners having a voice and contributing resources, leads to more effective and sustainable programs. A necessary condition for more efficient and lasting management of water resources is the participation of all stakeholders (public agencies, private sector, NGOs, local communities and special interests) in all aspects of decision-making, planning and implementation. Cooperation can be further increased through joint projects, training and applied research programs, particularly those related to the management of shared resources (p. 42).
The report mentions specifically the importance of participation of all stakeholders in all aspects of decision-making, planning and implementation. It continues to define “all stakeholders” as being public agencies, private sector, NGOs, local communities and special interest groups. When all stakeholders have a voice and contribute resources accordingly then this state will lead to more effective and sustainable programs.

Similarly, if ECD programs are to be effective and sustainable, stakeholders should have a voice on top of participating in making decisions, planning and implementing. If ECD programs are to be sustained in Tanzania, then parents and communities must be given the first opportunity to add their voices about what should be done in relation to ECD programs that “they” as community members are able to effectively contribute and safeguard. Other stakeholders come in as facilitators regarding what should be done in relation to gaps that have been identified in the whole process of implementing an ECD program apart from providing needed resources and information. Capacity building at the family and community level is one among the roles that professional stakeholders ought to undertake. To enrich the performance of an ECD program, stakeholders must network coordinate and exchange experiences and information that will be communicated to communities for practical application on the ground.

In its summary, the report by United States Agency for International Development (USAID, 2002) on Africa Regional Program points out that Africa is going through a period of political transformation. It goes further by saying that, over the past ten years, many African countries developed more representative political systems, stronger
democratic institutions and more active civil societies. Yet, serious challenges to the institutionalization of democracy in Africa remain. The African Regional Program, under the funding of the USAID, is aimed at developing and disseminating knowledge on participation and local governance, enhancing knowledge on how to integrate democracy and governance principles into the implementation of other sectoral activities and increasing the capacity to assess results attributed to program synergies. The program helps consolidate positive gains by emphasizing increased participation and improved local governance across all goal areas. It identifies and analyzes ways in which the application of good governance principles across the sector improves development performance. It also develops and implements interventions. The African Regional Program works to ensure that successes with integrated approaches inform agency programming and that principles of participation and local governance are more fully incorporated into all sectors. Development assistance resources will fund technical expertise to support cross-sectoral approaches.

The document by USAID (2002) emphasizes the importance of participation by all sectors and especially at the local level as a basis for democracy and good governance. The emphasis comes out as a result of findings from most African countries preaching democracy while the truth is that several gaps exist which calls for our attention. The document points out clearly that in African context not all sectors and especially at the local level do effectively participate in a democratic way.

Participation of local communities in the formulation and implementation of ECD programs is very minimal. This is the reason why the author finds the document by USAID to be applicable. As mentioned earlier, local communities and other stakeholders
must work collaboratively in order to improve the welfare of children in Tanzania. Funding agencies and donors should come in not only from outside the country but also from within whose role would be to fund technical expertise to support cross-sectoral approaches and capacity building to local communities.

Kleinau (2001), who conducted an integrated baseline survey in Madagascar, points out that the objective of the baseline study and follow-up surveys was to evaluate the effectiveness of the multisectoral integrated approach. Among key indicators identified were health outcomes, nutritional status and fertility control practices. These indicators were selected because they are directly linked to natural resource management, agricultural practices and livelihood issue. Effectiveness of the program was measured in qualitative terms through participatory action research.

One important lesson from Kleinau’s (2001) work is that when ECD programs are implemented by various stakeholders, it is important to do an evaluation so that the quality of services offered can be measured. It is after such an evaluation that one may identify gaps and strengths so that the way forward can be built on what exists today. It is also important that the evaluation be participatory in mature so as to allow local communities and parents to understand the benefits and challenges ahead in order to plan for collective future actions.

The World Bank (2000) assessed the implementation of Zimbabwe’s national HIV/AIDS policy and accessibility of the national AIDS Trust Fund by civil society. The study sought to ascertain levels of awareness about the 1999 Zimbabwe National Policy on HIV/AIDS document and National AIDS Council Funds by civil society, assess
progress in the implementation of these initiatives and make recommendations for their improvement.

Findings from the study showed that the National AIDS Council spearheaded the Government of Zimbabwe efforts to implement the national policy and the National AIDS Council Board managed the disbursement of funds. The council made great strides and progress to put in place structures at the national, provincial and district levels, for the creation of an operational environment conducive for the HIV/AIDS multisectoral approach.

Though study findings are suggestive that such efforts, though commendable, have lacked in their comprehensiveness to engage and include all civil society actors. Policy awareness and availability was generally limited, patchy and varied amongst NGOs. There existed weak policy advocacy, dissemination and distribution strategies. There existed poor capacities amongst civil society to engage in HIV/AIDS programming, thus only the traditional players (health related NGOs), were implementing the policy, albeit in a fragmented and uncoordinated manner.

One of the study’s recommendations was to overcome obstacles and facilitate productive collaboration between NGOs and government by taking the following actions:

1. Greater coordination of NGO activities so as to present a unified front when dealing with government agencies and departments.
2. Exchange programs between NGOs and government departments to permit each sector to better understand constraints and advantages of the others.
3. The involvement of NGOs in all aspects of HIV/AIDS mitigation activities, including policy development, material development, training design, implementation and evaluation.

4. Ministry recognition of the importance of collaboration with NGOs, and the creation of procedures to facilitate this partnership on both fiscal and practical levels.

5. As greater emphasis within the country is being placed on a multisector approach to the management of the HIV/AIDS epidemic, organizations within civil society are increasingly being called upon to join governmental AIDS partnership.

6. “Bottom up” (as opposed to top down planning), cross-sectoral, gender-sensitive strategic planning and management skills be instituted.

The recommendations by the Zimbabwean government and national agencies need to be commended for realizing the importance of multisectoral approach to HIV/AIDS programming. ECD programs in Tanzania also require greater coordination of activities, exchange program, recognition of the importance of collaboration among stakeholders and bottom-up, cross-sectoral gender-sensitive strategic planning and management skills if ECD programs in Tanzania are to flourish.

In order to move away from the present practices where sectoral policies and individual initiatives are not coordinated, where collaboration is absent, leave alone the lack of exchange of experiences; emphasis should be to put in place the relevant mechanisms.

The majority of people live at the grassroots level, and they know the problems that confront them better than the top few in government. If ECD programs are to be
improved then the bottom-up planning progress must be practiced because about 80% of all Tanzania’s children live in rural areas where parents are never involved in the planning processes.

The definition given by CARE International (n.d.) scores high especially when it defines partnership as mutually beneficial alliances of diverse types between organizations when roles and accountabilities are clear. Partnerships facilitate continuous two-way learning and are based on trust, shared vision and commitment to common objectives. One of CARE’s strengths is its ability to form partnerships from grassroots to international level –from CBOs, local and international NGOs, through to local and national governments, private sector, research organizations and donors. CARE South Africa-Lesotho has numerous programs that are implemented in partnership with organizations as diverse as NGO coalitions and national government ministries.

The emphasis by CARE on partnerships is crucial especially if ECD programs are to operate successively. Parents, government institutions and non-government organizations mutually undertake programs, which address children’s needs. There should be clear roles and accountabilities for each partner so that learning processes from one another becomes smooth due to a shared vision and commitment.

Community members, being parents, have their indigenous knowledge about child rearing practices which professionals coming from outside that particular community might not know. It is through partnerships that such professionals will be able to learn from local communities on what actually exists in relation to ECD programs that need professional expertise for improvement. Likewise local community members will be
able to acquire new knowledge and skills in management, planning and issues of sustainability to ECD programs.

Van Vuuren (2001) reports that the organizers (including Freedom From Hunger, CARE, Trickle Up, Women’s World Bank, World Relief, Project Hope, Grameen Foundation, Save the Children and Catholic Relief Services) of the workshop regarding micro-enterprise development into health and HIV/AIDS programs committed to doing the following:

1. Creating a forum to address common concerns and to develop appropriate collaborative responses.
2. Piloting and testing collaborative or linked approaches that maximize impact.
3. Documenting and sharing lessons learned about integrated and/or complementary services.
4. Advocating for proven broad reaching initiatives that promote healthy and economically productive households.

Commitments by the above workshop are actually a guiding tool for professionals who are committed to work with local communities in countries like Tanzania.

Creating a forum to address common concerns and develop appropriate collaborative responses before the introduction of an ECD program is important because parents and local leaders will be given an opportunity to voice their ideas on issues of early childhood development in their locality and what they wish to be done, by whom and with what resources. It is from such a process that interested partners will be able to understand the immediate problem or problems as voiced out by parents themselves. The
role of professionals would be that of guidance at the initial stages. This is a process and local communities need time to see things in the same way as professionals do.

Community members want to see things done with elements of their own culture being reflected in the program. It is from the cultural point of view that through piloting an ECD program is for scientific reasons, but for ECD programs to flourish community members want to see some of their cultural identity being reflected in such program.

When government and non-government organizations work with communities on the basis of collaboration, then it is important to document roles and responsibilities for each partner and points or stages of convergence in complementary services such as ECD programs. Ashby (2002, April-June), in the newsletter of the Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA) points out that one of the main principles underlying the policy is that the family has “the primary responsibility for the support of a child’s healthy growth and development” (p. 13). The policy recognizes the need for a cross-sectoral approach involving parents, communities, NGOs, and various government agencies, with the lead coming from ministries responsible for community development, education, and health.

The policy clearly spells out the roles and responsibilities of the various actors. The Directorate of Community Development in the lead ministry of Women Development and Child Welfare (MWACW) is responsible for the registration of facilities, guidelines, standards, regulations, community mobilization, and parent committee training. The Ministry of Basic Education, Sports and Culture is responsible for training ECD caregivers, developing curriculum guidelines for a variety of ECD programs, certifying NGO training institutions involved in ECD training, and developing
training materials. The Ministry of Finance will play a lead role in creating a structure for the allocation of funds to ECD programs.

From the above literature review, it is evident that there are opportunities for government ministries and non-government organizations to work collaboratively and windows of opportunity for forming partnerships amongst themselves and other civil societies are available. The government should take initiatives to introduce a stakeholder driven policy that will allow the participation of the civil society to have a voice and contributing resources leading to more effective and sustainable programs. A new approach, which involves cooperation and coordination in planning, implementation and supervision is therefore essential at this point in time so that funds and human resources are utilized in a coordinated manner so as to avoid duplication of services and misuse of public funds.
CHAPTER 3: PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The government has prioritized poverty alleviation, especially as it affects the most vulnerable, women and children included, as its fundamental challenge. However, we have yet to realize the importance of collaborative investment in ECD during the critical years of human development. Sectoral plans coupled with conflicting policies and guidelines on children’s matters compound the problem of poor coordination and networking among stakeholders resulting into inefficiency and ineffective programs that waste government money. Using relevant and available literature, specific activities that were to be undertaken within the project included the following:

1. Sensitization of policy makers and managers on holistic developmental needs of children. So that they understand the importance of investing in early childhood development programs and prepare policies that favour the process of such investment.

2. Gathering ideas and views through interviews with: (a) heads of government departments; (b) local and international NGOs dealing with children issues; and (c) parents and other lay individuals to register the level of understanding on whether the involvement of many actors in the area of early childhood development is crucial or not. Also it was intended to find out from participants how important it is to work in partnerships.

3. Observing the process in which government heads of departments discuss issues of collaboration and integration taking into consideration that participants have been practising their professions basing on sectoral policies for longer periods as government employees. Observation of the process will
help the author in understanding the kind of social interaction that prevail in such a meeting and the reactions from participants regarding collaboration and integration in ECD programs. Kirk and Miller (as cited in Goodwin & Goodwin, 1996) point out that “qualitative research is a particular tradition in social science that fundamentally depend on watching people in their own territory and interacting with them in their own language, on their own terms” (p. 19).

4. Conducting a survey through questionnaire concerning the degree to which heads of government departments understand the importance of multisectoral collaboration to programming.

The first activity to undertake was the sensitization session that was part of the National Early Childhood Development Forum held in Dar es Salaam from June 24-25, 2003. The forum was attended by 82 participants comprising senior government representatives from ECD related sectors from both Tanzania Mainland and Zanzibar, ECD/EFA working group members and active ECD network members representing a cross-section of stakeholders (parents included) regional representatives, as well as representatives from UN agencies, international NGOs, development partners and visiting agency representatives from the Aga Khan Foundation, Bernard Van Leer Foundation and the World Bank.

The agenda for the forum was:

1. To present the ECD Network’s draft document to a forum of ECD stakeholders for open discussion and debate, and to agree on ways forward for developing a comprehensive ECD Action Plan for Tanzania.
2. To address important issues concerning the functioning of the ECD Network including, namely:

(a) The organization structure of the ECD Network

(b) ECD Network Activities: Updates and Forward Planning

(c) The Commonwealth Education Fund and ECD proposals.

There were panel and plenary discussions under the guidance of the moderator, visiting Agency Representatives, senior government representatives and NGO representatives.

Deliberations on the importance of cooperation and coordination were made possible through a participatory and interactive exchange of ideas. The author used the theme “None of us is as strong as all of us.” By this statement the author meant that no single institution can provide services to meet children’s needs on its own as the Nomfundo Mqadi example from the South African school sanitation program described earlier and which was echoed at the forum. But if institutions work together collaboratively then it is possible to meet most of such needs. At the forum the following issues were highlighted:

(a) Investment in human potential should start in the formative years of early childhood development (0-6 years), yet very little had been happening before age 7, which is the school age in Tanzania.

(b) ECD programs have not been adequately addressing the issues of investing in human development at early years. Perhaps the shortfall emanates from limitations in sectoral planning and implementation of ECD programs and lack of coordination on the same.
(c) The prevailing low status of women and gender imbalances that impact negatively on child survival and development also need to be considered when planning ECD initiatives.

(d) The government does not support community efforts in initiating ECD programs leaving them to handle the responsibility on their own.

(e) Institutional capacity is limited due to the absence of a holistic approach to ECD, which could best be dealt with through collaboration and partnership in implementation.

It was during the discussion of the last element (e) that an opportunity had come to the author to bring in his sensitization statement that “None of us is as strong as all of us.” The author told the participants that the main challenge among others is the need for ECD programs to focus more on a holistic, multisectoral approach while ensuring that children’s needs are adequately addressed through scenario working together to ensure that young children in the country, especially the most vulnerable not only survive but thrive to become the backbones of national development.

The project used more than two data collection methods for purposes of reliability and validity. In order to obtain both qualitative and quantitative data on different aspects of multisectoral cooperation and coordination three methods of data collection techniques, namely, interview, observation and survey, were used so as to corroborate the data collected with a single strategy with data from at least one other strategy, thereby enhancing the authenticity of the information. The second activity was that of gathering ideas and views from heads of government departments, local and international organizations and parents through interviews. The author started the activity by creating a
list of identified key stakeholders, government institutions, NGOs and individuals who have an interest in ECD programs and who are members to the Tanzania ECD Network. The identified government institutions included the Ministry of Planning in the President’s Office, Ministry of Labour, Youth Development and Sports (Department of Social Welfare), Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Regional Administration and Local Government, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Livestock and Water and Tanzania Institute of Education. National and international NGOs that were identified are Plan International, UNICEF, UNESCO, Aga Khan Foundation, World Vision, University of Dar Es Salaam, Save the Children, Amani ECCD and Zanzibar Madrasa Resource Centre.

There were nine people from government ministries and nine others were from non-government institutions. Lastly the author identified six parents who are literate and who are active members of the Tanzania ECD network residing in the same city as the author.

Having identified institutions that are concerned with issues of children, the author went further to identifying nine individuals who are responsible for the day to day implementation of duties and responsibilities in government departments and nine other people from NGOs whose programs related to ECD within their organizations. The process of selecting participating individuals was a purposive selection. The number of people asked to participate in the study was 24 individuals: eight participants from government departments, nine from national and international agencies and six parents agreed to participate. One participant from a government ministry, who had agreed to participate, failed to do so because she was on leave and could not be traced at that time.
Most important was the involvement of six identified parents who were selected to participate because of their experience as parents and who were knowledgeable on issues regarding ECD programs. Three out of six parents were retired people who had worked in the government and ministries mandated with children’s matters and the other three were ordinary elderly mothers whose input the author thought would be of value especially regarding traditional childcare practices. These parents were given an opportunity to air out their ideas and views on how best can ECD programs be improved in the country.

Before conducting interviews the author explained to individual representatives and parents the intention of conducting such interview and that the interview was centred on seeking ideas and views on issues of ECD programs under multisectoral cooperation and coordination. The author asked each respondent if he/she did not mind taking notes in between the interviewing process. All 23 participants did not object to the requested permission request. The interview protocol is attached as Appendix I.

While conducting individual interviews with heads of government institutions, the author and individual respondents both realized that they had something to learn from each other. They also identified similarities in work plans; differences in implementing those plans and they jointly identified gaps that exist. They brainstormed on how best they can jointly address those gaps. They looked at existing policies and guidelines and found out that in many cases there were contradictory aspects of policy statements and guidelines. The best example of such contradictory policy statements which are in use to date is cited from the Education policy on Primary Education Development Plan (PEDP) which emphasize on early education as starting from age 5 to 6 years, while the Day Care
Centre Act 1981 mentions ECD programs as being in the age range of 2 to 6 years. During discussions participants therefore came to agreement that such a situation was a result of lack of cooperation and coordination at the preparatory phases of those policies. To conclude the exercise, they identified existing strengths and weaknesses and brainstormed on how best they can jointly address them.

The author developed questions whose responses would be indicative of the understanding of the term multisectoral collaboration. The questions were designed so that at the end of the interview the author could easily identify individuals who understood the concept and those who did not. The intention was that for those who understood the concept it would be easy for the researcher to collaborate with them in an attempt to sensitize those who did not understand the concept in order to widen the coalition for the campaign on multisectoral approach to programming.

Interviews with eight heads of local and international organizations were conducted in a transparent way. Interview questions were developed so as to solicit views on mutual understanding between government departments and NGOs and the working trust that each one has towards another Heads of these agencies were to identify existing gaps that are prevalent in government institutions regarding ECD matters. The aspect of not involving non-governmental organization by the government was discussed in order for participating individuals to voice out the shortfalls that exist in the government’s structure. The issue of partnership with the government was discussed to identify gaps for purposes of taking meaningful actions that will promote collaboration and cooperation. The aspect of misuse of resources was extensively deliberated to seek views and suggestions as to the ways forward (see Appendix I).
Interviews with parents had the same questions as those asked to heads of government departments and heads of NGOs. It was really a learning opportunity for the author. Parents discussed the position of the government regarding children below age seven in national development plans. The issue of ECD programs being expensive was also discussed for purposes of proposing ways forward. They were asked to give their views on the government’s position as to why does it leaves early childhood programs to be managed by private individuals whose interests are for generating huge amounts of money as incomes at the expense of children.

The third activity was to observe the process in which several heads of government departments discussed the issue of multisectoral collaboration and integration. The author wanted to observe the reactions arising from participant’s feelings and the meaning they attach to collaboration in the implementation of ECD programs. Information gathered through observing reactions and feelings have a bearing on the readiness or rejection of collaboration and cooperation among government departments.

This activity was undertaken under the auspices of the Tanzania ECD network task force meeting held on August 7, 2003. The Tanzania ECD network Task force is charged with spearheading the activities of the network by making sure that there is linkage between the government and other stakeholders. The task force is also charged with the responsibility of making major decisions regarding Tanzania ECD network’s programs. The meeting attracted participants from the Ministries of Community Development, Gender and Children, Education and Culture, Labour, Youth Development and Sports, Health, Regional Administration and Local Government, Prime Minister
Office, Agriculture, Livestock and Water, Planning in the President’s Office, Tanzania Institute of Education and Tanzania Food and Nutrition Centre.

At this meeting a total of 12 members attended and the venue for the meeting was at the Ministry of Community Development, Gender and Children. Participants to the meeting were heads of government departments and only four were assistant heads of departments.

The choice for participant observation was a result of the author being a network member and therefore had the opportunity of observing other participants and took field notes as a source of data. The intention was to observe the process in which several heads of government departments discussed issues of multisectoral cooperation and coordination in initiating and implementing ECD programs. The author wanted to observe individual reactions regarding the acceptance or rejection of collaboration in favour of sectoral plans.

Goodwin and Goodwin (1996) contend “multiple realities exist and must be recognized by giving attention to group and individual constructions and perceptions of reality” (p. 19). By taking part in the discussions with individuals being studied, the author was better placed to learn from participant’s perceptions of reality as expressed by their actions and in their thoughts, beliefs and feelings that they were ready to work on a collaborative basis or not. Shamir et al. (in Yukl, 2002) make the following assumption about human behaviour: “Behaviour is expressive of a person’s feelings, values, and self-concept as well as being pragmatic and goal oriented” (p. 243).

The author gathered data that was descriptive in nature. Being one of the network members it was not difficult for the author to request permission from the rest of network
members to take short notes to the proceedings of the meeting, a request that they accepted.

In the discussions the author wanted to know what heads of departments understood by the term multisectoral cooperation and coordination to ECD programming. The discussions aimed at soliciting answers that indicated whether particular individuals favoured sectoral plans against integrated plans. The second area that was to be observed was whether heads of departments saw the potential advantages of multisectoral collaboration against the traditional sectoral advantages. Due to the fact that most heads of departments exercise loyalty to sectoral objectives against integrated ones, the author wanted to demonstrate that individuals express such values, opinions and views. It is from the understanding of those expressions that meaningful strategies can be designed to do away with such practices.

Another area that was to be discussed was that of seeking opinions on the preparedness of heads of department to work collaboratively in the planning and implementation of ECD programs. Given that heads of departments favour sectoral plans rather than multisectoral ones (as pointed out in the literature review), it was seen as important to know individuals who at least had the wider and focused perspective of getting started in working as partners in ECD programs.

The last aspect that was discussed was the identification of ministries/departments that provide services related to children’s welfare which were to be taken on board. Heads of departments were asked to identify ministries/departments other than their own which provide services similar to those provided by their departments. This identification stage aimed at establishing linkages/synergies that can be developed.
The last activity was to conduct a survey in which the author wanted to get responses from a wider range of respondents most of whom were heads of government departments and Senior Civil Servants. The reason for choosing these respondents was that they are involved in one way or another with the provision of services to children. The rationale for choosing the survey method was first, because it was relatively inexpensive to administer and one can send the exact same instrument to a wider number of people. Second, the author had a complete listing of the departments/ministries to be sampled among a total of 21 ministries. Line ministries that deal with children’s matters are nine and all nine ministries were included in the sampling frame. The population the author dealt with was literate, there were no language barriers, the sample population cooperated well and there was no geographical restriction because all respondents resided in the same city where the author was stationed.

The questionnaire was prepared around the following question: “To what extent do heads of departments in government ministries understand the importance of multisectoral cooperation and coordination in support of ECD programs?” The questions were developed in such a way that responses from participants gave a bearing on whether a particular participant was opting for integrated approach or was against it. (See questions as Appendix II).

From the questionnaire, the author wanted to get opinions on whether a single ministry can handle all children’s issues on its own and whether respondents agree or disagree that ministries spend a lot of time implementing sectoral plans which lack linkages to what is happening in other ministries. Questions in the questionnaire were developed so that respondents could give answers that correspond to what a particular
respondent believes works well. Respondents who believe in the traditional way of doing things were given equal opportunities to react positively or negatively as the question required.

The rating of the responses were YES or NO while some responses had AGREE or DISAGREE and others had STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, NEUTRAL, DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE. One question asked respondents to say TRUE or FALSE. The author wanted respondents to identify ministries that had responsibilities for some facet of children’s issues or programs. One question was developed so that responses to it would indicate whether respondents knew other ministries that provide services to children. Respondents were also asked if they understood what was meant by the term “multisectoral cooperation and coordination” and what were the advantages of multisector cooperation and coordination. The idea of relinquishing individual authority, power and funds was asked so that the author could understand how strong such feelings are to individual heads of departments. Yukl (2002) points out that:

> power stemming from formal authority over work activities is sometimes called legitimate power…but the potential influence derived from authority depends as much on the consent of the governed as on the ownership and control of property….Compliance with legitimate rules and requests is more likely for members who identify with the organization and are loyal to it (p. 143).

Key words from the above citation are authority, power, ownership and control of property. To most heads of government departments, the reluctance to work on a multisectoral approach emanates from the above key words. That is the reason behind the author’s question to respondents in the questionnaire instrument.
Having sensitized policy makers and managers on the importance of holistic childhood development and having gathered ideas and views from heads of government departments, heads of local and international organizations and parents, the researcher presents some of the findings in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

In this chapter the author presents findings from the different activities that he undertook while gathering data. He presents them in a tabular form for easy comparison purposes. Due to the small number of respondents in the sample, the findings might produce different results than would be the case if the number of respondents in the sample were bigger.

Sensitization Results

The first activity was to sensitize policy makers on the importance of cooperation and coordination in ECD program development and implementation. An opportunity to discuss this issue arose as one of several issues that came out strongly during the national early childhood development forum held in Dar es Salaam in June 2003 (discussed in Chapter 3). The discussion was centered on the sensitization statement, created by the author, that “none of us is as strong as all of us.” Most participants discussed the need for ECD programs to focus on a holistic multisectoral approach while ensuring that children’s needs and rights are addressed in the early stages of life. Few participants questioned the role of parents, particularly mothers, as primary care-givers as to what extent are they involved in ECD programs. Others were worried for the uncoordinated manner in which ECD programs are being implemented and, the fact that most of them do not address issues of children’s holistic development; and the Limited resources that are being allocated for child development at the national level.

Participants also discussed at length the need for clarification on where ECD issues “sit” in Tanzania’s Development Planning. They concluded by questioning the position of ECD in the priority list and whether it was seen as an issue in a broad range of
development agenda. They voiced out the gaps that exist at the implementation level and that no one actor can succeed alone and that what was important was to keep in sight of the common goal: collaboration and involvement of all stakeholders as a key to the realization of effective and meaningful ECD programs in the country.

One participant, who was the Director of Gender Development in the Ministry of Community Development, Gender and Children, commended participants for developing concrete proposals on the way forward, focusing particularly on early childhood care and development in a holistic approach. She said she was particularly impressed by the consideration of multisectoral approaches in addressing ECD matters and the need to bring on board all actors in a coordinated fashion. The Director informed the forum that the broad-based child development policy of 1996 was being revised and that it will emphasize the importance of early years in human development and the roles played by parents, guardians, families, the government and the civil society in ensuring young children’s care and development.

The Acting Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Labour, Youth Development and Sport pointed out that it was high time children’s issues were addressed in a holistic manner so as to develop a comprehensive approach. He noted with concern that currently, early childhood care and development programs in Tanzania address children’s needs as though children can be separate entities that each sector should serve singly, adding that most services tend to be sector specific and lack inter-sectoral coordination and integration. He pointed out that there are no coherent and integrated national policies and guidelines that define the different roles and responsibilities among stakeholders;
neither is there coordination and networking among ministries responsible for early childhood development issues.

The Director for Amani ECCD, informed the Forum that a number of ECD related sectors have recognized that, no goal for children can be achieved by a single sector working on its own’ and that a common stumbling block is that there is fragmentation among ECD actors at policy levels which in turn causes confusion for ECD services at all levels. She further pointed out that there is a tendency among non government ECD stakeholders, as well as development partners, to point a blaming finger at the government, whilst not recognizing that their own approaches to ECD support may also be quite limited by their narrow sectoral approaches. She urged partners to look inside their organizations to see how they could model cross-sectoral collaboration so as to contribute to working together in realizing what integrated multisectoral approaches to holistic ECD support means in Tanzania. The UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan (2000) once pointed out, “When you see something that is wrong, no matter how big the problem is, think: who else would like to change this? How can we work together?” (p. 1) These words are encouraging in that they underscore the importance of cooperation and coordination.

In the second activity there were eight respondents from government departments, nine respondents from local and international NGOs and six parents who were interviewed. Interview findings will be presented in a descriptive format because the nature of responses given by interview respondents would not be easily quantified. In the first item on the level of understanding of multisectoral collaboration, four people (50%) from government heads of departments, five people (55.5%) from local and international
NGOs and two people (33.4%) who are parents gave responses that clearly indicated that those respondents were knowledgeable on multisectoral collaboration. The following response statements were among some of the responses they gave to show their understanding of the first item:

- Multisectoral collaboration improves service delivery.
- Multisectoral collaboration allows the utilization of resources more effectively.
- Multisectoral collaboration makes it possible for networking of services.
- Multisectoral collaboration facilitates exchange of information.
- Multisectoral collaboration opens opportunities for partnerships.

Responses to the second item regarding reasons for emphasizing on multisectoral collaboration, three people (37.5%) from government heads of departments, three people (33.3%) from local and international NGOs and one parent (16.7%) gave responses that contained reasons for emphasizing on multisectoral collaboration. They mentioned the following as being some of the reasons:

- Multisectoral collaboration ensures that all providers involved in a case are in contact with each other and information is shared.
- Multisectoral collaboration will ensure that service providers, working in partnerships, adequately address children and families who have a wide range of often complex and interrelated needs.
- While the correct range of services may be provided, they can prove ineffective, that is, when service providers work in isolation, clients may have to deal with many different professionals who may or may not be in contact
with each other. Information about a case may be missed, time may be wasted, and minor but vital links between services may be overlooked.

On the issue of readiness to collaborate with others, three people (37.5%) from government heads of departments, three people (33.3%) from local and international NGOs and one parent (16.7%) said they were ready to collaborate with others because of the following reasons:

• Unity is strength; when people do things together they succeed.
• Resources are better utilized when there is collective planning.
• Sustainability of programs are evident due to collective decision making.
• Learning from one another through exchange of experiences and information while implementing a program is much more possible.
• There is a big opportunity for formulating relevant strategies for the program due to the availability of several professional backgrounds.

On the item concerning potential advantages of integrated approaches in ECD programs, three individuals (37.5%) from government heads of departments, four people (44.4%) from local and international NGOs and one parent (16.7%) were knowledgeable on potential advantages of integrated approaches to ECD programming. They mentioned some of the following as being potential advantages to integrated approaches to ECD programming:

• Better case assessment and planning through coordination and collaboration of inputs from different disciplines.
• It is expected that there will be a higher level of productivity.
• There will be enhanced competence of team members.
• There will be more holistic perspective and understanding of client and situation.

• There will be an ability to solve problems beyond the scope of any one discipline.

• There will be chances of dealing more effectively with complex and broad issues.

• There will be more informed decisions through greater information.

• There will be greater possibilities for the development of joint initiatives.

• There will be increased professional stimulation.

On the item of identifying partners who provide services to children, most of the interview respondents knew partners who provide services to children and families in general. Five people (62.5%) from government heads of departments, six individuals (66.6%) from local and international NGOs and two parents knew institutions and organizations that provide services to children. They mentioned the following institutions and organizations as partners in providing services to children:


• Local and international NGOs mentioned are: UNICEF, UNESCO, Plan International, Save the Children UK, CARE Tanzania, Aga Khan Foundation, Amani ECCD, faith-based organizations and CBOs.
The item on the importance of sharing information on early childhood got more positive responses than the rest of the items. Seven (87.5%) government heads of departments, eight individuals (88.8%) from local and international NGOs and three (50.0%) parents agreed that there were advantages in sharing information on early childhood. Their reasons for agreement with the statement include the following:

- The primary responsibility of parents is to care for and nurture their children and therefore information on early childhood is important to parents.
- Traditionally care for children was the responsibility of mothers but due to changes in living patterns, fathers begin to assume roles of caring for their children. That is why it is important to share information of early childhood so that both parents, especially fathers, understand better what is involved in the care of children in the early stages.
- Exchange of information on early childhood will facilitate the documentation of childrearing experiences from different eco-cultural settings.
- Exchange of information on early childhood will enable partners to know who is doing what in relation to children and therefore makes networking and coordination possible.

The item that seeks to get the level of understanding by respondents on the term ECD partnership and networking was not positively responded to. Only three (37.5%) government heads of departments, three (33.3%) individuals from local and international NGOs and one (16.7%) parent had an understanding on ECD partnership and networking. They mentioned some of the following statements that indicated the level of understanding they had on this item:
• In order to succeed, any provider of service should involve parents, local leaders and professionals from other institutions whose inputs will be vital to the success of an ECD program.

• Providers working in partnership will pool resources together for proper utilization of the same.

• Providers who work in partnership will exchange information and make referrals to cases, which the other partner has, an added advantage of solving such a problem.

• Providers working in partnership will have a multidisciplinary team in place.

The item that dealt with the issue of whether or not integration and collaboration threaten the existence of institutional authority was equally responded to by four (50.0%) government heads of departments, four (44.4%) people from local and international NGOs and four (66.8%) parents agreeing that integration and collaboration do threaten the existence of institutional authority. Reasons behind this belief include the following:

• Decisions made by involving partners may not be in line with policies and regulations strictly adhered to by one institution.

• Interests of particular institutions will be jeopardized by integrated interests.

• It is difficult and not practical to prepare integrated policies and regulations.

• Involvement of many partners in a program may bring about confusion.

• Problems of budgeting will arise because no institution can handle all aspects even those that fall outside their mandate.

The item concerning views on individual versus collective efforts in implementing ECD programs had similar responses to those that concerned the
threatening of institutional authority. Five (50.0%) government heads of departments, four (44.4%) individuals from local and international NGOs and five (83.5%) parents disagreed in collective efforts in implementing ECD programs. Those views are reflected from the following statements as pointed out by respondents:

- Many cooks spoil the broth.
- It is difficult to work collectively because some actors are lazy.
- Resources will be quickly depleted if actors work collectively.
- There is a problem of formulating a multisectoral policy.

On the item of readiness to share professional experiences with others, respondents were open to give out their views. Four (50.0%) government heads of departments, five (55.5%) representatives from local and international NGOs and three (50.0%) parents agreed that they were ready to share whatever they knew regarding ECD activities. They pointed out the following as being the basis for their agreement with the item statement.

- Everybody learns from others each passing day.
- Sharing of experiences increases professional stimulation.
- Sharing of experiences gives emotional support for team members.

The third activity, as pointed out in Chapter 3, was observing reactions in a meeting. By observing social interaction while the meeting was in progress, the researcher was able to note the reactions individuals had towards multisectoral cooperation and coordination. Behavioural reactions are a result of feelings of an individual toward stimuli, which in this case is towards the subject being discussed. During ECDVU courses observation of social interaction was one of the methods in
qualitative research. As Shamir et al. (in Yukl, 2002) point out, “behaviour is expressive of a person’s feelings, values and self-concept…” (p. 243). This is the main reason why the researcher chose observation as a method for data collection in an attempt to fulfil one of the objectives of the project.

On August 7, 2003, a senior level ECD Task Force with representatives from key stakeholders met to discuss among other things the coordination of ECD activities as a multisectoral issue and the organizational structure of the Tanzania ECD Network.

In previous meetings of Tanzania ECD network members, the issue of multisectoral cooperation and coordination has been discussed extensively. But observations from the meeting on August 7 portrayed a different picture. While in previous meetings, almost all participants emphasized collaboration and partnership, in practice very few individuals and institutions practice such cooperation. The Ministry of Education and culture is very vocal on collaboration at meetings but at the practice level, the Ministry is an obstacle to the expansion of ECD programs. A live example is the closure of Day Care Centres on the pretext that some of the children attending in those centres are aged 5 to 6 years and therefore they should be enrolled in pre-primary school programs. The Ministry of Health is pro-multisectoral but its representation is among the poorest at ECD network meetings/nor does it show in any way that it is really committed to inter-sectoral cooperation and coordination at the practice level.

Quality interactions at meetings were vividly observed. Network members interacted freely and showed understanding of what others tried to say. But the quality of interactions varied from one member to another. Some individual members were serious of what they said and they are committed to achieving the objectives of the network
especially the objective of putting in place a multisectoral approach to ECD programming. The quality of their interaction was reflected in the statements they made, and the roles they played on voluntary basis to the fulfillment of those goals. The qualities of interactions from individuals were also reflected by such people through their commitment to the network in spite of being employees of other organizations.

Another aspect that is important in the quality versus quantity interactions is the number of meetings held to resolve obstacles but took several months and meetings to come to a conclusion. This situation indicated that there was less commitment and therefore only the quantity of interactions occurred which did not yield fruits. Quality interactions would bear results within short periods of time. A good example of quantity interactions is drawn from the Tanzania ECD network experience. Since the year 2000, discussions on multisectoral collaborations started but till to date only few government, non government and individuals show some quality interactions while the majority of institutions and individuals are not practicing what they preach and therefore they are members of the network who only count on quantity interactions.

Survey Results

Questionnaires administered to heads of government departments regarding their understanding of multisectoral cooperation and coordination yielded results that confirmed that most heads of government departments prefer working on sectoral basis as against integrated approaches. Table 1 below shows how those heads of departments responded to the questionnaire instrument.
Table 1: Understanding of multisectoral cooperation and coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses by heads of government departments</th>
<th>Percentages of those who say YES.</th>
<th>Percentages of those who say NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can one ministry handle all children’s issues</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the concept of multisectoral approach to programming</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you identify departments and you may work with in a multisectoral approach.</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you prepared your department to join the multisectoral approach boat?</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of similar services in other ministries.</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heads of government ministries understand that no single ministry can meet all children’s needs on its own. About 74.7% of respondents supported the statement and only 25.3% opposed it.

The concept of multisectoral approach to programming was understood by only half of the respondents. Respondents who said they understood the concept were 49.8% and the rest said they did not understand it. The issue of identifying departments and ministries that respondents could work with ended with seven respondents (58.1%) saying yes and five people (41.9%) rejected the idea of working collaboratively.

Responding to Question 8 in the Appendix II, five respondents (41.5%) agreed with the
statement compared to those who have not taken any positive steps of looking into possibilities of working in partnerships who scored 58.5%. Most heads of departments identified services in other ministries that were similar to those being discharged by their own departments and scored 58.1% compared to those who did not.

*Table 2: Knowledge on multisectoral approach*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At present government ministries work on sectoral plans lacking linkages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a belief that working with other ministries through multisectoral approaches is important.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multisectoral approaches relinquishes individual authority, power and funds.</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When ministries function within multisectoral approaches, service provision improves.</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multisectoral approaches allows for coordination, networking and linkages.</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that among 12 respondents, five (41.5%) strongly agreed that at present government ministries put emphasis on sectoral plans, which lack linkages, another group of four people (33.2%) said they only agree and two (16.6%) respondents
were undecided. To the aspect of believing in working with other ministries in a multisectoral approach, four respondents (33.2%) did not know and therefore were neutral, three (24.9%) said they agreed and five respondents (41.5%) said they strongly agreed to the statement.

On the question of whether a multisectoral approach relinquishes individuals’ authority, power and funds, three respondents (24.9%) said they strongly disagree with the statement, two people (16.6%) said they disagree, three respondents (24.9%) agreed with the statement and four people (33.2%) were strongly in agreement with the statement.

On the issue of whether ministries functioning within multisectoral approaches improve service provision, seven respondents (58.1%) said they strongly agreed, one respondent (8.3%) said he agreed, one other person representing 8.3% was undecided and three respondents (24.9%) said they disagree with the statement. On multisectoral approaches facilitating coordination, networking and allowing linkages, five participants (41.5%) agreed with the statement, three respondents (24.9%) agreed with the statement, two people representing 16.6% were neutral, and two others (16.6%) disagreed.

The following is a summary of findings in each activity:

1. Sensitization of policy makers and managers was carried out and participants were informed of the holistic child development approach.

2. There were eight heads of government departments, nine representatives from local and international agencies and six parents. From the interviews it was found out that four government heads of departments, five heads of local and
international NGOs and two parents understood the concept of multisectoral collaboration.

3. Reasons for emphasizing on multisectoral collaboration in ECD and readiness to collaborate with other ECD stakeholders had the same ratio of three government heads of departments, three from local and international NGOs and one parent each, agreeing with those items.

4. Identification of partners who provide ECD services had agreements from five government heads of departments, six heads from local and international NGOs and two parents.

5. The item on information sharing scored highest with seven heads of departments, eight individuals from NGOs and three parents agreeing.

6. The survey results conducted to heads of government departments was balanced in nature, while nine participants agreed that one ministry can not provide all services on its own, three participants said ministries can, six people understood the concept of multisectoral approach while six others did not. Seven participants identified other departments that they could work with while five others were not able to do so. Seven participants were able to identify similar services in their ministries while five people did not.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

In this project, one of the expected outcomes was for government ministries to have policy makers and managers who are knowledgeable about holistic developmental needs of children. It is the author’s opinion that when policies and guidelines that concern children are harmonized then it will become easy to put in place multisectoral ECD programs. That is why the author chose to sensitize policy makers and managers so that they become aware of the importance of the early years of life to the child. When such policy makers understand the importance of ECD programs to the future life of the child, then they will be able to review existing policies or create new policies that are family and child friendly. Wharf and McKenzie (1998) have the following to say regarding policies:

In policy making the beginning point might emanate from a social movement pushing for change, from staff in a ministry who have become convinced of the inadequate of existing policy, or from a government that in its role as official opposition or because of its political constituency has become committed to making changes (p. 39).

Creating cross-sectoral policies is a long term plan which cannot be achieved in the near future, as such the author intended to do a piece from the long term plan which he hoped will serve as a basis for undertaking future studies in an attempt to fulfill a long term goal that of creating cross-sectoral collaboration and linkages. Senge (1990) points out that:

the only vision that motivates you is your vision. It is not that people care about their personal self interest in fact people’s personal visions usually include
dimensions that concern family, organization, community and even the world. The Japanese believe building a great organization is like growing a tree, it takes twenty-five to fifty years. Parents of young children try to lay a foundation of values and attitudes that will serve an adult twenty years hence. In all these cases, people hold a vision that can be realized only over a long term (pp. 210-211).

There are several limitations to this expected output first the sensitization time was limited because it happened just as one of the issues to be discussed at the ECD network forum. As it happened, when some participants wanted to make contributions, the moderator was there to tell them that time was over. The situation in which the sensitization process was undertaken was not conducive to participants for understanding the whole process of cross-sectoral policy formulation. The second aspect that the author considers as a limitation is the fact that the sensitization seminar was undertaken only once and the fact that the sensitization aimed at changing attitudes then it was necessary to conduct such sensitization seminars more often. Beer et al. (in Yukl, 2002) point out that:

many attempts to introduce change in an organization emphasize changing either attitudes or roles but not both... however, the two approaches are not incompatible, and the best strategy is to use them together in a mutually supportive way. Efforts to change attitudes and skills to support new roles reduces the chance that the role change will be subverted by opponents before it has a chance to succeed (p. 277).

The second anticipated project outcome was for heads of government departments/heads of local and international NGOs who deal with children’s issues and
parents to understand the importance of cooperation and coordination. The author values the role played by inter-sectoral teams and anticipated that from the understanding by heads of departments and other stakeholders, the next stage would be that of working together in multisectoral teams. Parents should have a role in ECD programs so that all of us can do better things in ECD programs than any one of us. Senge (1990) says:

Individuals may work extraordinarily hard, but their efforts do not efficiently translate to team effort. By contrast, when a team becomes more aligned, a commonality of direction emerges, and individual’s energies resonance or synergy develops, like the coherent light of laser rather than the incoherent and scattered light of a light bulb. There is commonality of purpose, a shared vision and understanding of how to complement one another’s efforts (p. 234).

One more aspect of this anticipated outcome was that apart from cooperating in implementing ECD programs, all stakeholders would appreciate the issues of coordination of programs being implemented by various stakeholders. Ford and Randolph (1992, cited in Yukl, 2002) point out that:

cross-functional teams are being used increasingly in organizations to improve coordination of interdependent activities among specialized subunits. The team usually includes representatives from each of the functional subunits involved in an activity or project, and it may include representatives from outside organizations such as suppliers, clients and joint-venture partners (p. 310).

Involvement of other stakeholders, community members and parents in originating ideas and views on important aspects of holistic child development, which
should be incorporated in an ECD program, is of prime importance as Senge (1990) underscores:

Over and above self-interest, people truly want to be part of something larger than themselves, they want to contribute towards building something important. And they value doing it with others. You may recall that a cornerstone of the discipline of personal mastery is that people have an innate sense of purpose and that, when people reflect on what they truly want, most discover that aspects of their vision concern their families, their communities, their organizations and for some their world (p. 275).

The author’s reflection on this anticipated project outcome is that most heads of government and non-government institutions see the importance of collaboration in the implementation of ECD programs but the problem is at the practice level. Sectoral policies hinder attempts that try to address issues on a multisectoral basis. Two parents with whom the author discussed this issue had the following to say: “In our tradition, the child belonged to the whole village or community. No single parent or family was able to nurture the child on his own.” By this statement the parents were saying it was important for partners to collaborate in issues of children because no single actor can accomplish this big task on his or her own.

The limitations in achieving the project outcome are a result of a short time frame. No one can expect the anticipated outcome to bear fruits within a short period. There are policies and regulations to be reviewed, and there are parents or communities to be consulted before the preparation of new policies and guidelines. Funds/donor conditions for funding projects also contribute to the stagnation of changes that could have been
reviewed. Another limitation arises from the number of respondents to the whole exercise. In the activity that concerned interviewing the author was able to contact eight heads of government departments, nine representatives of NGOs and six parents; this is really a small number to effect any meaningful change. The author would require a bigger number of respondents who would be change agents within their organizations.

Berk (2002) has the following to say on wider participation of professionals:

Our large storehouse of information about child development is interdisciplinary. It has grown through the combined efforts of people from many fields. Because of the need for solutions to everyday problems concerning children, academic scientists from psychology, Sociology, anthropology and biology joined forces in research with professionals from a variety of applied fields, including education, family studies, medicine, public health and social service, to name just a few (p. 5).

Generally the project intended to build-up a new working approach whereby government ministries were to see themselves as units of the government that works in an interdisciplinary manner to maximize the utilization of scare resources and thereby improve ECD program in the country in partnership with other stakeholders. The work by Nomfundo Mqadi (1999) on integrated school sanitation programming in South Africa is one example of the works that has been done in the area of integrated programming and which relate to the author’s topic and informs his ideas. In 1996, the Departments of Education and Public Works took the lead in addressing the shortage of school toilets in Gautang province. The main objective of the program at that point was to provide sanitation facilities to public schools.
The Public Works Department as the custodian of all government property, and the Department of Education, responsible for the schools, were the two partners. The construction of toilet facilities was co-managed with the school government bodies and the funds for purchasing materials and payment of labour were kept by the schools. Apart from external support for technical designers the entire project was within the school. The aspect of involving local community members was taken seriously because school committees were involved.

Before the completion of the toilets, the two departments were concerned about the sustainability, operation and maintenance of the initiative and that the conditions of new facilities should not deteriorate and be substandard. The department of Health and Mvula Trust, a national NGO in South Africa, were approached to assist in this program. Mqadi (1999) concludes, “It was clear that one government department could not solve all problems. An integrated approach was needed. Partnerships can lead to sustainable programs. The school sanitation program provides one of the ideal and rare opportunities for governments to collaborate” (p. 58).

It is clear from the above example that while two government’s departments were the two initiators of the program, they went on inviting other partners to join them as stages of implementation progressed. School committees were invited to supervise the day-to-day activities with added responsibilities of purchasing materials and paying labourers. Mvula Trust was called in to make sure that the facilities were maintained to an acceptable level, which meant undertaking repairs work and supervising activities that aimed at making the facilities usable by school children.
One of the expected outputs from the project was to document constructive and quality discussions by heads of government departments that might facilitate the establishment of a new working approach that will take into consideration aspects of synergies and linkages in ECD programs. The traditional approach by government departments do not suffice in attempts to address present ECD programs. Colletta and Reinhold (1997) point out that:

there is now great deal of information demonstrating that the fundamental problem of investing in ECD has not been confronted. Holistic ECD does not fit comfortably into the compartmentalized organizations of governments, which either divide responsibilities for young children and their families and communities between the education, health, welfare and women’s affairs ministries or leave the responsibility to NGOs and the private sector. The result is that each sectoral ministry may claim to have an ECD policy, which may range from a sentence or two to a complete section of comprehensive policy documents, but which rarely carry budgetary commitment. If a real commitment to ECD is to be secured, cross-sectoral policies and services, including joint budgetary provision, seem the only answer (p. 8).

On the same issue of holistic child development programs, Torkington (2001), in a Working Group on ECD policy project report, states:

It is clear that ECD stakeholders in many countries are striving to develop an ECD policy but are finding it difficult to hold on to the principle of holistic ECD in governments organized on sectoral lines. Several countries reported that they had developed specific ECD policies under the ministry of Education, while
others had used different lead ministries, such as the ministries of women’s affairs and social security. Effective and powerful coordinating committees do not seem to exist, and provision of any ECD services seemed to remain strictly sectoral (p. 9).

From the summary of Colletta and Reinhold together with the WGEDC by Torkington it is obvious that what they have pointed out were the issues being discussed by government heads of departments and which again and gain will be discussed in the near future until a truly holistic child/development policy is in place which will pave the way for cross-sectoral approach to ECD. The delay in realizing the holistic approach to ECD programs is a limitation in the achievement of the projected outcome of the project even when discussions were constructive at that particular discussion. Every constructive discussion should be results-oriented. In this project the author noticed some minimal positive elements of cooperation but there is a long way to go before multisectoral cooperation and coordination is realized.

One of the limitations to this project is that politicians and Permanent Secretaries who are decision makers at the highest level were not involved in any activity of the project. This is a major limitation because politicians make decision at the cabinet level before any government plan is approved. Permanent Secretaries also sit as an interministerial Technical Committee to discuss the document before it is given a go-ahead to the cabinet. It is in this vein that the author thinks it was necessary for those two groups to be sensitized on the importance of multisectoral cooperation and coordination together with the issue of holistic child development approach to programming. Nelson Mandela, former president of South Africa, and Grace Machel, a UN specialist on child
victims of armed conflict, recently issued the following appeal to policy makers: “The future of our children depends on our capacity for initiative and on policy decisions of our leaders” (cited in ADEA Newsletter, 2002, April-June, p. 2). Regarding the same political leaders and government chief executives, Torkington (2001) says:

The principle that underpinned the setting up of the project was that national government commitment is essential for the development and expansion of ECD policies and provision. Distinctive and cross-sectoral ECD policies based on a commitment to holistic ECD are likely to be the most effective (p. 9).

The activity that involved observing heads of government discuss multisectoral approaches to programming did not involve parents as well as other stakeholders. This situation was a limitation in that it neglected the ideas of key partners in ECD programs. Parents, NGOs and donor agencies are important partners who have the potential to exert influence on government ministries. Torkington (2001), a consultant for the ADEA Working Group on Early Childhood Development, states that:

without the support of international donors, the fragile structures of ECD in Africa would collapse. Implementing policies in a context of scarce resources and competing priorities will require imaginative strategies that elicit strong involvement on the part of both parents and communities and that strengthen the capacities of all stakeholders at the local, regional and national levels (p. 2).

The expected project outcome from the questionnaire was to get ideas and views from a variety of stakeholders on the importance of multisectoral cooperation and coordination in the implementation of ECD programs.
The actual problem is that implementation aspect that is not forthcoming. Top government officials and politicians have emphasized integrated approaches to programming for some years now but nothing is happening on the ground. This shows how difficult it is to change attitudes in order to accommodate new ideas. Goodwin and Goodwin (1996) point out that “attitudes are generally considered to be less stable than personality characteristics. Most attitude measures are paper and pencil, self-report rating scales. While easy to administer the score, they are also easily susceptible to faking and social desirability” (p. 87). The author agrees with Goodwin and Goodwin that people may result in faking because in meeting held under the auspices of the Tanzania ECD Network most participants agree on working in a multisectoral approach but when implementation of programs are undertaken they resort to sectoral plans; this is faking that you agree to a proposal but one works against it. The fact that about 50% of the respondents in the survey did not understand the importance of multisectoral cooperation and coordination, efforts should be made to sensitize as many individuals and institutions as possible. To start with government ministries should be the first to be sensitized because the 37.5% of respondents who were neutral regarding the importance of multisectoral cooperation and coordination were from government departments and ministries. Also the fact that there were neutral respondents ranging from 12.5% of 37.5% in responding to questions then the meaning that can be drawn from such be informed on what multisectoral approaches in ECD programming can achieve that no single ministry can do on its own.

One point that should be noted is that about 25% of respondents strongly agreed that multisectoral approach to ECD programming relinquishes the head of department’s
authority, power and funds. This might be the cornerstone for reluctance to most heads of departments to cooperate and collaborate in intersectoral programs. The point here is that being a head of department is just a matter of leadership and as such you are not bound to work on you own. For heads that understand the importance of cooperation and coordination, the issue of fear of losing authority, power and funds is absent. Working in partnership entails contributing equal shares of resources to implement a program. For heads of departments who understand the advantages of intersectoral collaboration fear to work on their own. This issue may also be looked into from the personality perspective with regard to individual behaviour.

There were several limitations while undertaking this project activity that might have blurred the project outcome. The first limitation is that respondents who got questionnaires were very few due to timeframe in which to undertake the project. Not all stakeholders were given a chance so that the aggregated results could be representative of the sample of the target population. Trochim (2001) points out that:

simple random sampling is easy to accomplish and explain to others. Because simple random sampling is a fair way to select a sample, it is reasonable to generalize the results from the sample back to the population. Simple random sampling is not the most statistically efficient method of sampling and you may-just because of the luck of the draw-not get a good representation of subgroups in a population (p. 51).

Another limitation was that older people like grandmothers/fathers and illiterate parents did not participate as respondents just because they could not read and write. But these people, especially the grandparents, have a rich experience in childrearing practices
that would help to enrich our understanding on how to improve ECD programs in communities in accordance to specific needs in particular cultures. ADEA Newsletter (2002, April-June) reports that:

some of the basic precepts underlying ECD have evolved over time, through experience in intervention projects for children. The greatest source of knowledge seems to reside at the local and community level. In many areas community-based responses are more cost-effective, but there are the least visible and are strained severely. The extended family is still the main absorber of orphans…while strengthening the capacity of families and communities is of critical importance, it must go hand in hand with increasing resources and improving service provision. The ability to devise creative programs that identify and assist need families and to increase economic and emotional support to them by mobilizing existing services has become a critical component of ECD programming (pp. 5-6).

Emphasis on the involvement of families and communities is important if sustainability of ECD programs is to be achieved. It is the community members who should be given an opportunity to give out ideas and views on how best we should plan and implement ECD programs instead of officials from government and non government institutions. The Jomtien Declaration (1990, cited in World Education Forum, n. d.) calls for “early childhood care and initial education. These can be provided through arrangements involving families, communities or institutional programs as appropriate” (Article 5).

Some of the major points discussed in this chapter include the following:
1. The need to make government policy makers and managers knowledgeable on the importance of holistic child development in order to design policies that would enhance multisectoral collaboration and coordination.

2. The need to make heads of government departments and heads of local and international organizations who deal with issues related to children and parents understand the importance of cooperation and coordination in the implementation of ECD programs.

3. The need for a change of approach in dealing with children’s issues so that a new integrated approach is put in place.

4. The need to involve other stakeholders in the implementation of ECD programs to improve service provision.

5. The fact that the existence of sectoral-specific policies and guidelines are a hindrance to the establishment of multisectoral coordinating mechanisms.

6. The need to document constructive and quality discussions regarding a new working approach that involves many stakeholders.

7. The need to gather ideas and views from various stakeholders on the status of multisectoral cooperation and coordination.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS

The aim of undertaking this project was to find opportunities in which government ministries, non governmental institutions, CBOs and parents improve ECD programs so that the take on board the issue of holistic child development. The author took up this project after realizing that currently children’s issues were departmentalized on sectoral basis, a situation that is not healthy for proper child development.

Specific activities to be undertaken were to sensitize policy makers and managers on holistic developmental needs of children, gathering ideas and views through interviews with heads of government departments and local and international NGOs dealing with children and parents. Another activity involved making observations to government heads of departments when they discussed issues of collaboration and integration. The last activity was conducting a survey through questionnaire concerning the degree to which heads of government departments understood the importance of multisectoral collaboration to programming.

The sensitization process went on well and there was a lively discussion by senior government official who are also policy makers, NGOs and international agencies participated in the discussions. At this juncture the author was convinced that all those participants saw the importance of emphasizing on early childhood development and that sector policies are inflicting harm on children rather than providing a relief. The expected outcome was for those senior government officials to understand those facts. Whether they understood or not and whether they will put in action what they said they understood remains to be seen because the time factor may have an effect on this aspiration in that policies take longer times to be approved.
Ideas and views obtained from interviews are half positive and the other half is either neutral or negative. This is vindicated by the fact that on the ground very little is being done on multisectoral basis. At least what has come up clearly is that there are consultations going on between line ministries concerned with children’s issues. It is a good start and the author requests all line ministries and departments to come nearer to each other so that slowly they can learn what the other is doing regarding the welfare of children.

While observing the manner in which heads of departments discussed issues of cooperation and coordination, they agreed in principle to the following realities:

- There is a high demand for ECD services in the country.
- There is expertise in ECD matters from government, NGOs and the private sector.
- About 85% of Tanzania’s children below 6 years of age are ready to join ECD programs.
- There is will from members attending that ECD programs are multisectoral and holistic in nature.

From the agreement above it is evident that these department heads see the issue of children in the same way. What might be the hindrance of practicing? Multisectoral approach arises from existing policies and guidelines that are sector-specific. More time is needed to review current policies and guidelines so that the reviewed ones will open windows for cooperation and coordination apart from including other stakeholders to participate in the planning and implementation of ECD programs.
Of the survey activity responses, half were positive and the other half were either neutral or negative. The fact that people responded without any psychological pressure such as in a meeting or a workshop, respondents showed their individual true “self” because they knew that nobody will identify them as being against intersectoral collaboration. The author is confident that while we continue to sensitize as many people as possible, the multisectoral collaboration train will be boarded soon than later.
CHAPTER 7: RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the activities that were undertaken in this project, the following recommendations are put forth:

- The Ministry of Community Development, Gender and Children should assume the role of coordination of ECD issues since it is mandated to take a lead role in children’s issues. However, the coordinating procedures should have a blessing from all stakeholders.

- The broadest possible range of stakeholders should be involved and consulted at all stages and levels of the processes undertaken regarding children’s issues.

- The government should lead the processes involved in developing ECD support in the country and other stakeholders should be responsible to make the program operation.

- In the country, the government, NGOs and individuals primarily provide ECD programs. A cost-effective alternative that gets families and communities involved can make a substantial contribution to ECD and should be encouraged.

- Development of an integrated ECD policy is of paramount importance and should aim for holistic child development.

- Cooperation and collaboration in cross-sectoral planning is of vital importance if such holistic development is to be achieved.

- The government should start to budget for ECD programs if the country wants to succeed.
• Politicians and high-ranking executives should be sensitized on the importance of investing in early childhood development.

• Senior government employees should be retrained on multisectoral approaches to programming.

• There should be an official forum where line ministries dealing with children’s issues report on what they have done as ministries to the welfare of children.

• Through the Tanzania Website, all stakeholders should provide activities they do for purposes of networking.
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APPENDIX I: GUIDE FOR INTERVIEWS WITH HEADS OF GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

The guiding questions for the interview will be as follows:

1. What do you understand by the term multisectoral collaboration?
2. In the case ECD, should we emphasize multisectoral collaboration?
3. Are you prepared to collaborate with other ECD stakeholders in program formulation?
4. What are the potential advantages of integrated approaches in ECD programs?
5. Can you identify actors who provide services to children?
6. Do you see any importance of sharing information on Early Childhood?
7. What do you understand by the term ECD partnership and networking?
8. Does integration and collaboration threaten the existence of institutional authority?
9. What views do you have on individual vs. collective efforts in implementing ECD programs?
10. Are you ready to share your professional experiences with others?
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS/MINISTRIES

1. In your opinion, can a single government ministry handle all children’s issues on its own?

   YES ___________   NO __________

2. Which ministries do you see as having responsibility for some facet of children’s issues on programs?

3. At present government ministries spend a lot of time on implementing sectoral plans which lack linkage to what happens in other Ministries.

   5  4  3  2  1
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

4. There are times when heads of government departments find out that other departments in some ministries provide similar services to their own.

   TRUE ___________   FALSE __________

5. Do you understand the concept of multisectoral approaches to programming?

   YES ___________   NO __________
6. There is a belief that working with other ministries through multisectoral approaches to programming is important; what are your views on this?

5 4 3 2 1
Strongly disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

7. Can you identify departments and ministries that you may work with in a multisectoral approach?

YES ________   NO __________

8. Have you prepared your department to join the multisectoral approaches boat?

YES ________   NO __________

9. Multisectoral approaches to programming have some of the following advantages:

• Coordination and networking becomes possible
• Inter-ministerial linkages are possible. What are your views?

AGREE ________   DISAGREE ________

10. It is argued that multisectoral approaches to programming relinquish individual authority, power and funds. What is your position on this?

5 4 3 2 1
Strongly disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree
11. When government Ministries function within multisectoral approaches, public service provision improves. What is your opinion on this statement?

5                            4       3     2     1

Strongly disagree   Disagree   Neutral   Agree   Strongly Agree