

Tanzania Early Childhood Development Network – TECDEN

**BENCHMARK ON ADVOCACY INDICES FOR TECDEN
ADVOCACY STRATEGY**

Prepared by:

**Ruta G. Mutakyahwa,
Lead Consultant**

**Anthony Rwegasira,
Associate Consultant**



ROMME Centre

P.O. Box 23144

Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

Tel: +255-754-770775

Email: romme@uccmail.co.tz

Website: www.rommecentre.com

September, 2013

1. Introduction

This report presents findings on organisational review of TECDEN in an attempt to benchmark advocacy capacity on selected indices. The Review adopted the Advocacy Indices from Pact Zimbabwe as presented in the “Strengthening and Measuring Advocacy Capacity of Civil Society Organisations” (Pact Inc. 2005). Pact presents twelve indices on advocacy competency areas. These indices were used to facilitate TECDEN National Secretariat and TECDEN Chapters in Mwanza, Morogoro and Kilimanjaro to make self-assessment on their advocacy capacities.

The aim of this Review was to determine the gaps in TECDEN’s capacity to undertake advocacy activities. The review of the capacity gap has facilitated an understanding of the areas for improvement. The findings will facilitate TECDEN to design and implement an advocacy capacity building programme in order to effectively carry out its advocacy activities. TECDEN partners, on the other hand, will be clear on competence areas to support. Furthermore, the benchmark established on indices will facilitate an assessment on progress made in capacity building initiatives.

2. Background to the advocacy strategy

Tanzania Early Childhood Development Network (TECDEN) is in the process of developing an Advocacy Strategy, an initiative aimed at having a clear framework for advocacy activities. TECDEN is a national umbrella of Early Childhood Development Organizations (ECD). It was established in year 2000 as an informal national network of ECD stakeholders. In 2004, it was officially registered as a national network of civil society organizations and institutions working in the field of ECD in Tanzania. TECDEN is in the repositioning process to become an advocate for improved outcomes for young children in Tanzania. Thus it is stimulating dialogue and debate at all levels and improving services through its members who are implementing agents for ECD interventions in the country.

The Vision of TECDEN is to see all infants and children in Tanzania have their rights and needs met and to enable their development to full potential. To achieve this, TECDEN is determined to work in collaboration with like-minded stakeholders to advocate for and promote multi-sectorial approaches to the holistic development of infants and children in Tanzania.

Among the issues that TECDEN needs to address in the advocacy agenda is improving outcomes for children’s rights through provision of quality ECD and others services which include: nutrition, health, stimulation, care, education, parenting, as well as protection from abuse, neglect, violence and exploitation.

In order to play its role effectively TECDEN desires to have an Advocacy Strategy that will enable the network to conduct advocacy campaigns. For this reason, ROMME

Centre was commissioned to facilitate the process. One item in the ToR required ROMME Centre to review TECDEN’s advocacy capacity and establish a benchmark for capacity building. This report is in fulfillment of that particular item in the ToR.

3. Methodology

The review of TECDEN’s advocacy capacity has adopted the Advocacy index for measuring NGOs/CSOs capacity for advocacy. The Index was an innovation of USAID and was published in the “*Handbook of Democracy and Governance Indicators*” in 1998. The Advocacy Index was used by Pact in building advocacy capacity of CSOs in Zimbabwe. Pact proposed twelve indices as elements for capacity building. In order to measure these indices, Pact presented an Advocacy Index Scoring Scale ranging from 0-6 where 6 is the highest performance. However, the scale for purposes of this study has been modified by extending the highest score up to 10. This increment in scale score was intended to facilitate an identification of differences in perceptions among the respondents, i.e. TECDEN members.

A scoring-form with scale of scores ranging from 0-10 was prepared. The definition of the scale is as follows:

- 0: Lack of capacity
- 1-3: Very little capacity
- 4-6: Reasonable or average capacity
- 7-9: Strong or effective capacity
- 10: Absolute capacity

The Review was done at National and Chapter levels. At national level, 3 members of TECDEN National Secretariat were facilitated to make self-assessment, with the focus on capacity of TECDEN as an institution. At Chapter level, representatives of TECDEN Chapters in Mwanza, Morogoro and Kilimanjaro were also facilitated to make self-assessment. These focused assessment on their respective chapters. The participation of TECDEN Secretariat and Chapters’ members is illustrated in **Table 1**.

Table 1: Number of Participants in the self-assessment

Category of Respondents	Number of Respondents
TECDEN- National Secretariat	3
TECDEN- Mwanza Chapter	5
TECDEN- Morogoro Chapter	6
TECDEN- Kilimanjaro Chapter	7
Total	21

During this exercise of self-assessment the facilitator presented the score-form, explained every index and illustrated the modalities of scoring. The exercise for each of the category group lasted for 3 up to 4 hours. The time spent on the exercise was too short owing to resource constraints which had an impact on the exercise. An

understanding of the purpose of the exercise and the content of the exercise (indices) were not sufficiently developed and this is indicated in the wide range in scores on similar index by people within the same setting.

The analysis of the score involved summing up score of each participant on a similar index in order to get an average score for each category of the respondents. Every average score was approximated to the nearest decimal point in order to be consistent with the definition of the scale.

Whereas the exercise required a panel of experts to agree on the score on every index, this process was not done. The discussions made between the consultants and TECDEN members (preferably from the national secretariat) was expected to discuss on the emerging issues from the score and moderate the scores as this was baseline information to be used in later performance assessments.

4. The Findings

The findings are presented as the overall TECDEN's performance and then are segregated to indicate the scoring by the National Secretariat and by the three TECDEN Chapters.

a) General Performance

Institutional capacity includes an aggregate of scores by TECDEN Secretariat at national level and scores by TECDEN Chapters in Mwanza, Kilimanjaro and Morogoro regions. The general observation from the findings is that TECDEN as an institution has average capacity for undertaking advocacy activities. The average score of TECDEN as a whole was 6, indicating that there is reasonable capacity or average capacity for advocacy work. Focusing on individual indices, the findings indicate that TECDEN has strong capacity to internalize advocacy by committing resources on the targeted policy issues. The institution also indicated to have strong capacity in building coalitions and networks for enlisting partners in joint action to secure the policy change. In both indices, the average score was 7 which imply effective or strong capacity. However, the areas which scored the least were concerned with data collection, research and policy formulation. In these areas there is much more need for capacity building. **Table 2** provides the details.

Table 2: National Average Score on Advocacy Indices

Indices on Advocacy Competency Areas	National Secretariat	Mwanza Chapter	Kilimanjaro Chapter	Morogoro Chapter	Average Score
Index 1: The identification of an issue or issues is/are timely (determined both in terms of citizen's perception of importance as well as reasonable prospect that policy change is possible)	8	6	4	6	6
Index 2: TECDEN is able to collect sound and persuasive data on the effects of policy sought to be changed	4	7	4	6	5
Index 3: TECDEN is able to systematically secure inputs from its constituencies on the need for the policy change.	6	6	5	6	6
Index 4: TECDEN with its constituency and public participation is able to formulate a viable alternative policy position	5	7	3	6	5
Index 5: TECDEN is able to analyze and document gender-specific implications of the current policy and the proposed policy alternative	7	6	5	5	6
Index 6: TECDEN internalizes advocacy by devoting resources (time and money) for advocacy on the targeted policy issues	8	6	9	6	7
Index 7: TECDEN is able to provide public education and to build support (including through the media) for the proposed policy change.	5	6	5	7	6
Index 8: TECDEN is able to build coalitions and networks to enlist partners in joint action to secure policy change	8	7	7	7	7
Index 9: TECDEN engages in direct action with legislative and/or executive decision-makers (empowered to effect policy change).	6	6	6	7	6
Index 10: After a policy change is effected, TECDEN, TECDEN takes follow-up action to foster implementation of policy change	6	6	5	7	6
Index 11: TECDEN demonstrates that it has institutionalized its commitment and capacity to follow-through on policy change and implementation	8	7	5	6	7
Index 12: TECDEN demonstrates sound financial management and internal governance	8	7	4	7	7
Average Score	7	6	5	6	6

b) Performance by Views of the National Secretariat

At the level of National Secretariat, three members of the secretariat (TECDEN National Coordinator, Programme Officer and Administrator) filled Advocacy Capacity Indices Score Forms. The findings from the score form indicate that the National

Secretariat considers TECDEN to have effective and strong capacity required in undertaking advocacy for identified issues. The overall average score is 7 which is defined as scale for strong capacity. The areas in which TECDEN has strong capacity are in index 1, index 5, index 6, index 8, index 11 and index 12. This implies that TECDEN National Secretariat needs less capacity building in these competence areas as there is little room for capacity needed. The scores by TECDEN National Secretariat are illustrated in **Table 3**.

Table 3: Indices Scores by TECDEN National Secretariat

Indices on Advocacy Competency Areas	Scores	Range of Scores
Index 1: The identification of an issue or issues is/are timely (determined both in terms of citizen's perception of importance as well as reasonable prospect that policy change is possible)	8	6-9
Index 2: TECDEN is able to collect sound and persuasive data on the effects of policy sought to be changed	4	3-6
Index 3: TECDEN is able to systematically secure inputs from its constituencies on the need for the policy change.	6	5-7
Index 4: TECDEN with its constituency and public participation is able to formulate a viable alternative policy position	5	4-8
Index 5: TECDEN is able to analyze and document gender-specific implications of the current policy and the proposed policy alternative	7	6-9
Index 6: TECDEN internalizes advocacy by devoting resources (time and money) for advocacy on the targeted policy issues	8	4-8
Index 7: TECDEN is able to provide public education and to build support (including through the media) for the proposed policy change.	5	3-8
Index 8: TECDEN is able to build coalitions and networks to enlist partners in joint action to secure policy change	8	6-9
Index 9: TECDEN engages in direct action with legislative and/or executive decision-makers (empowered to effect policy change).	6	5-8
Index 10: After a policy change is effected, TECDEN follow-up action to foster implementation of policy change	6	6-8
Index 11: TECDEN demonstrates that it has institutionalized its commitment and capacity to follow-through on policy change and implementation	8	7-8
Index 12: TECDEN demonstrates sound financial management and internal governance	8	8-9
Average Score	7	

TECDEN National Secretariat indicated to have reasonable capacity in index 3, index 4, index 7, index 9 and index 10. These scored between 5 and 6 which is a scale for reasonable or average capacity. Index 2 which is about data collection or research has the least score (4). The implication of these findings is that indices with reasonable or average score there is much room or need for capacity building.

Analyzing the scores basing on range of scores, it is indicated that there is much agreement on the capacity of TECDEN to provide public education as index 7 has the highest score range of 5. There is however, higher disagreement on indices 4 and 6

which are about TECDEN’s capacity to formulate alternative policy options and on internalizing advocacy, respectively. The two indices have the score range of 4. This may be attributed to different perceptions on the indices.

c) Scores of Mwanza Chapter

Indices Score Forms in Mwanza were filled in by 5 representatives of organisations who are members of the Mwanza Chapter drawn from Ilemela district. During the exercise, there were 9 representatives but 4 of them indicated to have been new in the network and declined to fill in the forms as they could not assess TECDEN Mwanza Chapter confidently. Among the representatives who filled in the score forms, 3 were members of Mwanza Chapter Steering Committee.

The general average score for Mwanza Chapter was 6, a scale for reasonable or average score. Among the 12 indices on advocacy competency areas, seven indices (58%) are within the reasonable capacity. There is, therefore, much room or need for capacity building for the seven indices. The remaining five indices (42%) indicate strong capacity, implying less need for capacity building. The scores for the 12 indices are expressed in **Table 4**.

Table 4: Indices Scores for Mwanza Chapter.

Indices on Advocacy Competency Areas	Score	Range of Scores
Index 1: The identification of an issue or issues is/are timely (determined both in terms of citizen’s perception of importance as well as reasonable prospect that policy change is possible)	6	5-6
Index 2: TECDEN is able to collect sound and persuasive data on the effects of policy sought to be changed	7	6-9
Index 3: TECDEN is able to systematically secure inputs from its constituencies on the need for the policy change.	6	5-8
Index 4: TECDEN with its constituency and public participation is able to formulate a viable alternative policy position	7	5-8
Index 5: TECDEN is able to analyze and document gender-specific implications of the current policy and the proposed policy alternative	6	4-9
Index 6: TECDEN internalizes advocacy by devoting resources (time and money) for advocacy on the targeted policy issues	6	3-8
Index 7: TECDEN is able to provide public education and to build support (including through the media) for the proposed policy change.	6	3-8
Index 8: TECDEN is able to build coalitions and networks to enlist partners in joint action to secure policy change	7	3-9
Index 9: TECDEN engages in direct action with legislative and/or executive decision-makers (empowered to effect policy change).	6	4-7
Index 10: After a policy change is effected, TECDEN takes follow-up action to foster implementation of policy change	6	3-8
Index 11: Demonstrates that it has institutionalized its commitment and capacity to follow- through on policy change and implementation	7	4-8
Index 12: TECDEN demonstrates sound financial management and internal governance	7	6-8
Average Score	6	

d) Kilimanjaro Chapter

In Kilimanjaro, there were 11 representatives of institutions who are members of TECDEN Kilimanjaro Chapter drawn from Moshi-Rural. Four of them indicated that they were new to TECDEN and did not fill in the indices score form. The remaining 7 members, who were able to assess their Chapter confidently, filled in the score cards.

Kilimanjaro Chapter generally indicated to have reasonable or average capacity in advocacy of identified issues. The overall average score for Kilimanjaro Chapter is 5 as indicated in **Table 5**.

Table 5: Indices Scores for Kilimanjaro Chapter

Indices on Advocacy Competency Areas	Score	Range of Scores
Index 1: The identification of an issue or issues is/are timely (determined both in terms of citizen's perception of importance as well as reasonable prospect that policy change is possible)	4	3-7
Index 2: TECDEN is able to collect sound and persuasive data on the effects of policy sought to be changed	4	2-7
Index 3: TECDEN is able to systematically secure inputs from its constituency on the need for the policy change.	5	3-8
Index 4: TECDEN with its constituencies and public participation is able to formulate a viable alternative policy position	3	2-8
Index 5: TECDEN is able to analyze and document gender-specific implications of the current policy and the proposed policy alternative	5	2-8
Index 6: TECDEN internalizes advocacy by devoting resources (time and money) for advocacy on the targeted policy issues	9	2-9
Index 7: TECDEN is able to provide public education and to build support (including through the media) for the proposed policy change.	5	3-8
Index 8: TECDEN is able to build coalitions and networks to enlist partners in joint action to secure policy change	7	4-9
Index 9: TECDEN engages in direct action with legislative and/or executive decision-makers (empowered to effect policy change).	6	4-9
Index 10: After a policy change is effected, TECDEN takes follow-up action to foster implementation of policy change	5	3-8
Index 11: Demonstrates that it has institutionalized its commitment and capacity to follow-through on policy change and implementation	5	3-7
Index 12: Demonstrates sound financial management and internal governance	4	2-9
Average Score	5	

The findings indicate that Kilimanjaro chapter has reasonable or average scores on ten indices (83 %). It had a strong score on two indices which are index 1 on internalizing advocacy (9) and index 8 on networking and coalition building (7). Kilimanjaro Chapter is the only chapter with an index scale of little capacity, that is, below 4. This is on formulation of alternative policy option (3).

Basing on scores range, Kilimanjaro Chapter expressed higher disagreement with the scores of most of the indices. The highest score range is 7 and two indices have score range of 6. There is much agreement on the index about timely identification of advocacy issues.

e) Morogoro Chapter

Indices Score Forms in Morogoro were filled in by 6 representatives of TECDEN member organisations drawn from Mvomero district. Half of the respondents were members of Morogoro Chapter Steering Committee.

The average score for TECDEN Morogoro Chapter was 6 which stand within the scale for reasonable or average scores. Details of the scores are illustrated in **Table 6**.

Table 6: Scores for Morogoro Chapter

	Score	Range of Scores
Index 1: The identification of an issue or issues is/are timely (determined both in terms of citizen’s perception of importance as well as reasonable prospect that policy change is possible)	6	5-7
Index 2: TECDEN is able to collect sound and persuasive data on the effects of policy sought to be changed	6	4-8
Index 3: TECDEN is able to systematically secure inputs from its constituency on the need for the policy change.	6	3-7
Index 4: TECDEN with its constituencies and public participation is able to formulate a viable alternative policy position	6	3-7
Index 5: TECDEN is able to analyze and document gender-specific implications of the current policy and the proposed policy alternative	5	2-8
Index 6: TECDEN internalizes advocacy by devoting resources (time and money) for advocacy on the targeted policy issues	6	1-9
Index 7: TECDEN is able to provide public education and to build support (including through the media) for the proposed policy change.	7	4-8
Index 8: TECDEN is able to build coalitions and networks to enlist partners in joint action to secure policy change	7	1-9
Index 9: TECDEN engages in direct action with legislative and/or executive decision-makers (empowered to effect policy change).	7	4-9
Index 10: After a policy change is effected, TECDEN takes follow-up action to foster implementation of policy change	7	4-9
Index 11: TECDEN demonstrates that it has institutionalized its commitment and capacity to follow- through on policy change and implementation	6	2-9
Index 12: TECDEN demonstrates sound financial management and internal governance	7	1-10
Average Score	6	

The score for individual indices indicate that five indices (42%) fall within the scale of strong capacity and the remaining seven indices fall within the scale of reasonable or average scores.

Self-assessment sessions in:



a. Mwanza



b. Kilimanjaro



c. Mvomero

The analysis of the findings based on range of scores indicated that there is some agreement on the scores, index 5 which is about gender analysis having the highest range of 5. However, Mwanza Chapter indicated a more general agreement among members compared with the other two Chapters. While the highest score range for Mwanza Chapter was 5, Morogoro and Kilimanjaro Chapters had the highest score range of 9 and 7, respectively.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

TECDEN made self-assessment at both Secretarial and Chapter levels. The Findings indicated that there was wide gap of opinion about the scores on indices as expressed by score range. For example, the lowest score for financial management for Morogoro Chapter was 1 while the highest score is 10. Here score range was 9, implying high discrepancy on understanding about the issue. Morogoro and Kilimanjaro were characterized by such high disparities compared with Mwanza. The disparity may be because TECDEN members have different understanding on performance of their Chapters or because of unfamiliarity with the indices. Another important point noted from the findings was that Kilimanjaro Chapter was the least performer compared with the other two Chapters.

All the findings taken together, it can be concluded that TECDEN has reasonable or average capacity of undertaking advocacy for the identified issues. The available capacity is more or less the same with the required capacity, suggesting that TECDEN has capacity to start advocacy programme and improve through capacity building activities and from learning by doing. Data indicated that the average capacity of TECDEN is 60% and this implies that without capacity building to maximize the capacity, the maximum performance of any advocacy programme would

be 60% if the rest of the requirements are 100%. Engagement of TECDEN in advocacy, therefore, needs to go hand in hand with capacity building in advocacy if they want to be effective in advocacy.

The degree of needs for capacity building for advocacy activities in a descending order is expressed in the **Table 7**.

Table 7: Capacity building needs for TECDEN

Indices on Advocacy Competency Areas	Capacity for Advocacy	
	Available	Needed
Index 2: Collect sound and persuasive data on the effects of policy sought to be changed	50%	50%
Index 4: Formulation of viable alternative policy position	50%	50%
Index 1: The identification of an issue or issues is/are timely (determined both in terms of citizen's perception of importance as well as reasonable prospect that policy change is possible)	60%	40%
Index 3: Systematically secure of inputs from constituencies on the need for policy change.	60%	40%
Index 7: Provision of public education and to build support (including through the media) for the proposed policy change.	60%	40%
Index 5: Analysis and documentation gender-specific implications of the current policy and the proposed policy alternative	60%	40%
Index 9: Engaging in direct action with legislative and/or executive decision-makers (empowered to effect policy change).	60%	40%
Index 6: TECDEN internalizes advocacy by devoting resources (time and money) for advocacy on the targeted policy issues	60%	40%
Index 10: Follow-up action to foster implementation of policy change	60%	40%
Index 8: TECDEN is able to build coalitions and networks to enlist partners in joint action to secure policy change	70%	30%
Index 11: TECDEN demonstrates that it has institutionalized its commitment and capacity to follow-through on policy change and implementation	70%	30%
Index 12: TECDEN demonstrates sound financial management and internal governance	70%	30%

Table 7 clearly shows the critical areas for which skills have to be enhanced in order to carry out advocacy activities. These skills include research and data analysis, policy analysis, resources management (including human resource at various levels), communication and lobbying.

It is important that TECDEN Advocacy activities need competency of TECDEN Chapters. The Kilimanjaro Chapter needs more attention for capacity building. The indices may not indicate the factors behind the low performance of Moshi members but from the field experience, most of members in Kilimanjaro Chapter are small CBOs with little technical capability in advocacy work. The issue of increasing

members with technical expertise and experience in development initiatives should be stressed not only for Moshi but also for all TECDEN Chapters.

References:

1. Agenda ya Watoto et al. 2009; *The Children's Agenda Advocacy Toolkit: Guideline on how to effectively advocate for children's rights in Tanzania*, Dar es Salaam.
2. Centre for Democracy and Governance, 1998; *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Indicators; Technical Publication Series*; Washington DC
3. Hansen, Rene et al, 2005; *Best Practices: Strengthening and Measuring Advocacy Capacity of Civil Society Organisations*; Pact Zimbabwe; Harare.
4. Coulby, Hilary, 2008; *Advocacy and Campaigning Tool Kit*; International NGO Training and Research Centre, Cyprus