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Overview

• Summary of Approach

• School-based Responses
  1 – Improved institutional capacity to plan and deliver WASH in schools
  2 – Teacher-led hygiene promotion in classes
  3 – Peer-to-peer advocacy amongst students
  4 – Engagement with enabling environment actors

• Limitations

• Conclusion
A new approach: 1. Building local capacity to drive bottom up demand

• Adapted from the Unicef bottleneck approach

• Using evidence to create bottom up demand and capacity for improved school WASH services
A new approach: 2. Building local capacity to drive evidence based programming

![Diagram showing steps:]

i. Baseline data → Understanding of current status

ii. Analysis of barriers → Where to prioritise actions

iii. Communicating & engaging action → Shared ownership of findings → New priorities
A new approach: Building local capacity to start with local priority issues

Localised Theory of Change

Diversity of starting points for different schools
Strengthened school environment

1. Design and development
   - Principles are supporting WASH policy, committees and budgets in schools

2. Building an Enabling Environment
   - School are accessing services and supplies

3. Strengthening demand for hygiene and sanitation
   - Teachers are delivering hygiene and sanitation activities in all classrooms

4. Building student leadership
   - Students are taking active roles in demanding and practicing improved HySan

5. Strengthening GSI & Safe Sanitation
   - School management are supporting better maintenance of toilets

6. Process review
   - School are actively participating in reviews of improvement and challenges for WINS

Targeted Outcomes

- Improved education and health of students
- Improved safe sanitation for all

Impacts

- Strengthened school environment
- Improve handwashing with soap
Summary of project reach:
4 countries - Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and Fiji
43 schools
18,800 Students
Partners - Ministry of Education, District Education, Vanuatu Institute of Teachers Education
School-based Responses
1 – Improved institutional capacity to plan and deliver WASH in schools

- School WASH policies in place, with operational WASH Committees and Action Plans
- WASH included in School Learning & Improvement Plans
- Funds for O&M set aside
- WASH focus days in school annual calendar, and WASH clubs integrated into school class timetable
2 – Teacher-led hygiene promotion in classes

• Integration of “Hands Up for Hygiene” and “Arts for Advocacy” activities into classes
• Teachers supervising group hand-washing with soap
• Teachers and students established “Hygiene Corners” in classrooms
3 – Peer-to-peer advocacy amongst students

- WASH Clubs functioning in all partner schools
- Students using “Arts for Advocacy” approach to stage creative advocacy events about safe sanitation, MHM, and hand-washing with soap
- Students leading on global focus days
- Senior students are mentoring younger students in good hygiene practice
4 – Engagement with enabling environment actors

• **Vanuatu** - Vanuatu School Improvement Officers in Shefa Province have been trained to integrate WASH into their school inspections and linked to the school WASH Action Plans so inspections look at key WASH indicators.

• **Vanuatu** – Hygiene Promotion unit taught to trainee teachers before graduation from Vanuatu Institute of Technical Education

• **Solomon Is** - Honiara City Council Education Authority commitment to conducting regular whole-of-school inspections including WASH

• **PNG** - New Ireland Provincial Education WaSH Policy drafted with the input of LLEE – Kavieng & is completed. To be presented before the Provincial Education Board (PEB) for approval.

• **PNG** - With the input of LLEE the TFF coordinator at the Education Division is liaising with Head Teachers of about 600 schools in New Ireland to allocate 10 - 15 % of their TFF component to purchase toilets for students & staff.
Evidence of improvement

Students washing hands with soap - Fiji school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Detectors</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline 2015</th>
<th>December 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Environment</td>
<td>School WASH policies</td>
<td>School has current WASH policy</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>It has been drafted and submitted to school council for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School WASH Committee</td>
<td>School has active WASH committee</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School has current action plan for improving WASH</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget/Expenditure</td>
<td>Budget audits and evidence of expenditure on WASH G&amp;M</td>
<td>No, It is being prepared for 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>Functional water supply</td>
<td>No major concerns reported with access, quality, quantity to water</td>
<td>Water supply is fine</td>
<td>Water supply is fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access toilets that comply with national standards</td>
<td>The schools has appropriate number of male &amp; female sanitation facilities</td>
<td>No, Toilet are segregated yes but the ratio is still excessive</td>
<td>No, We still do not meet the ideal ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of staff and parents who attended construction and G&amp;M training</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functional access to handwashing facilities (HF)</td>
<td># of HF that are functional (with water and soap), and can be used independently by school children</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Sanitation</td>
<td>No major concerns related to storage, septi, tanks, and or waste management</td>
<td>Some maintenance required</td>
<td>Maintained in better condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of Human resources for hygiene promotion</td>
<td># teachers received training in HP</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># teachers apply HP in structured lessons</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hygiene promotion activities</td>
<td># Students at health club established</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>WASH Club Functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># students advocating good hygiene and demanding better hygiene and sanitation through health clubs and Art for Advocacy program</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strengthened school environment

1. Design and development
   - Principles are supporting WASH policy, committees and budgets in schools
2. Building an Enabling Environment
   - School have clear understanding of WASH challenges and plans to respond
3. Strengthening demand for hygiene and sanitation
   - School are accessing services and supplies
   - Teachers are delivering hygiene and sanitation activities in all classrooms
4. Building student leadership
   - Students are taking active roles in demanding and practicing improved HySan
5. Strengthening GSI & Safe Sanitation
   - School management are supporting better maintenance of toilets
6. Process review
   - School are actively participating in reviews of improvement and challenges for WINS

Targeted Outcomes

- Strengthened school environment
- Improved handwashing with soap
- Improved safe sanitation for all

Impacts

- Improved education and health of students
Limitations

• Schools always keen to improve WASH services, but starting point for basic WASH infrastructure can be a significant barrier.

• Decided to select partner schools with access to water supply, as the bottom-up advocacy approach is severely constrained if water access is not available.

• Ability to leverage government advocacy, local politician or other connections for funding for improved WASH infrastructure varies from school to school depending on leadership and network of school managers and WASH Committee members.

• Government schools experience frequent changes in leadership as School Managers are moved around schools.
Conclusions
Conclusion – Lessons for moving from pilot to scale

• Spend time getting to know and sharing the importance/benefits of the program first with key actors

• The bottleneck can be overwhelming at first, but use evidence has proven effective in shifting attitudes on WASH

• Have strong coordination with MOE and Principals to get approval and support for taking teachers out of schools for joint training.

• Build on existing structures - Assess what committees already exist in schools and take guidance from the principal as to the need to establish new committees or alternatively integrate roles into existing committees.

• LLEE focused on the importance of the Annual Action Plans to help schools to use bottleneck to prioritise where to start and not trying to address all issues at once.

• Use clustering methods to reach multiple schools, coaching champions within each school

• Focus on the ‘rules of the game’ how make WASH a key responsibility of provincial offices and schools. How to influence the curriculum writers and training of teachers.
Conclusion – for further discussion

• High likelihood that knowledge has improved, attitudes and WASH planning process have improved and this is likely to have impacted the opportunities to practice WASH

• There has been reasonable success in adopting an evidence-based approach, but there are risks that the approach is not institutionalised

• Still questions on moving from pilot to scale –cost effectiveness, and speed

• Capacity building is possibly one of the strongest aspects of the program
Students painted hygiene messages on new toilet block, PNG