Community-Led School Sanitation Construction: Improving sanitation infrastructure in hard-to-reach areas
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WASH in Schools: A Challenging Reality
National Standards: Sufficient # of toilets and facilities

Safe Drinking water hygiene is observed

How to get there

Reality in Schools:

No or limited access to water and toilets
Lack of hygiene behavior
No or limited WinS funds
Start with small steps!
One ★ School
Requirements: Daily routines to promote healthy habits

Two ★★ School
Requirements: Incremental improvements

Three ★★★ School
Requirements: Meeting national standards

Reality in Schools

School

National Standards
Simple

System Thinking

Scalable

Sustainable

FIT FOR SCHOOL
MAKING CHILDREN FIT FOR SCHOOL // TRANSFORMING SCHOOLS INTO HEALTHY PLACES

FIT FOR SCHOOL

STAKEHOLDERS
- School Head
- Teachers
- Students
- Parents
- Community
- Education Office

SCHOOL MANAGEMENT
- Monitoring
- Routine
- Planning & Budgeting
- Stakeholder Involvement

INTERVENTIONS
- Handwashing
- Toothbrushing
- Deworming
- Feeding
- Bringing Drinking Water to School
- Menstrual Hygiene Management (MHM)
- Cleaning & Maintenance

INFRASTRUCTURE & MATERIALS
- Water Facilities
- Group Washing Facilities
- Toilets
- Supplies
Fit for School ARMM Program

- Improved water and sanitation facilities
- Daily cleaning of washing facilities and toilets
- Daily supervised group hand washing with soap and tooth brushing with fluoride toothpaste
- Bi-annual de-worming of all children
- Support for School Based Feeding Program
BEAM ARMM Program

- Basic Education Assistance to Muslim Mindanao
- Component 2 on WinS
- Co-financed by DFAT and BMZ
Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao
Sanitation Component

- Targeted rehabilitate and construct toilets in 255 schools
- Initially implemented through construction teams travelling from school to school, but this created challenges:
  - Sensitivities around workers from different areas considered “outsiders” when entering new communities
  - Costly as team had to travel around the region and access sometimes limited
  - Changing security situation limited access to 32 remaining schools
Community Led Sanitation Construction

- Developed in response to the need to access hard-to-reach schools
- Harnesses the available skills and resources within a community to repair or construct toilets
- Strengthens capacity already existing within community for school toilets
- Anchored on School Based Management principles with School Community in the lead to ensure construction is completed
How did it work: Capacity Development

- School Heads identified skilled workers (CSW) from within their community
- DepEd ARMM and GIZ conducted theoretical and practicum on-the-job workshops for community skilled workers, who later on, took the lead in the construction of toilets in their respective schools
- Capacity development focused on both construction but also long-term cleaning, maintenance, broader hygiene and the impact functional sanitation facilities have on schoolchildren
- Skilled workers also trained on rainwater catchment system, group handwashing facilities
- School Heads were also oriented on the approach
How did it work: Construction Materials

- Construction materials were provided by GIZ to be turned over directly to School Heads
- DepEd ARMM provided the delivery of materials to the schools
- The basic tools needed were also provided to division office
How did it work: Resource Mobilization

- School Heads mobilized their communities to provide the needed in-kind resources.
- School Heads together with their respective trained skilled workers identified additional workers from the community who could provide the needed manpower to complete the construction.
- Labor was provided as a contribution of the school.
- Schools also mobilized resources from their communities, including the local government.
How did it work: Incentives

- The Regional Office provided a 10,000 PHP (200 USD) as an incentive for those schools who completed construction.
- Rewards were disbursed based on confirmation of completion from Physical Facilities Coordinators, report from the monitoring team, and final report and photos from School Head regarding the experience and lessons learned in the approach.
How did it work: Monitoring

- Division Physical Facilities Coordinators, supported by GIZ, provided technical guidance and conducted inspection
- Regional Office was capacitated to conduct monitoring and provided with a User-Friendly Monitoring Tool developed for non-engineers
How did it work: Quality Control

- Guidance for School Heads selecting CSW with appropriate previous experience
- 2 day theoretical, 8 day on the job training to ensure CSW have full understanding of how to implement according to DepEd ARMM-GIZ toilet design and standards
- Physical Facilities Coordinators – division personnel responsible for infrastructure, who were previously involved in sanitation component implemented by GIZ construction teams, provided technical on-site guidance and conducted inspection of the toilets in each school
- Regional Monitoring Team, trained by GIZ, conducted their own monitoring during two school visits (together with monitoring team of BEAM ARMM for final reporting)
Results

- Of the 35 schools targeted, 32 schools were able to complete functional toilets within 8 months.
- Of the 3 schools which did not complete, used the materials for other infrastructure projects.
Advantages of the approach

Short-term:
- Increases the number of schools with functional toilets
- Reaches schools which are otherwise normally not prioritized due to security concerns
- Establishes pool of trained workers within a remote province
- Maximizes available resources and can reduce costs
  - In ARMM, community-led approach basic costs were one quarter less expensive compared to construction team led in the same province
Advantages of the approach

Long-term:
• Potential to improve long-term functionality
  ✓ Community workers are already identified by the school, locally available, understand how facilities work and are able to repair them
  ✓ Potential to improve ownership since school community alone was responsible for the construction, using some of their own resources
• Potential for more community awareness and willingness to contribute to WASH needs
Challenges of the approach

• Some schools did not initiate construction immediately
  • DepEd ARMM monitoring team issued memo identifying specific schools and followed up on site
• Requires high levels of participation by school community
• Some schools found it difficult to mobilize the needed additional labour to complete construction
• Some schools diverted materials to other infrastructure needs
• Higher costs for monitoring and more time-intensive
Lessons Learned

- Emphasizing 10,000 PHP as an incentive, rather than payment for labour, reinforced the concept that construction work was part of a contribution to the school community rather than an opportunity for work.
- Provision of construction materials was a key catalyst to mobilize additional counterpart resources from community, particularly local government.
Lessons Learned

- Capacitating workers on the importance of sanitation facilities in the broader health of the children in their community helped them to understand the importance of the program and be generous with their time.
- Having the government partner responsible for all monitoring and providing financial incentives, improved their sense of responsibility for WinS.
- Creating linkages among trained workers created a locally available team which could be leveraged for sanitation also in communities.
Way Forward

- Department of Education is eager to expand approach to other provinces

- Approach needs to be replicated in other contexts to be able to understand the opportunity and limitations

- A longer-term evaluation is needed to understand the potential benefit to functionality over time
Toilet Repair Manual
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