

## **Beyond the school and the community**

By Marielle Snel, Sophie Hickling and Chingati Banda

- 1. BEYOND ODF**
- 2. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **1. BEYOND ODF**

#### **Experiences/successes**

Rooting community sanitation in schools in Nepal is a conscious strategy to ensure sustainability. In this way the facilitators and main drivers of the process remain within the community for constant follow-up and support.

As in CLTS the importance of exchange and learning visits seems to be an important aspect of scale up. In India, school to school exchange visits have taken place and have been effective in catalysing further action.

In many cases the goal of the process is not simply attainment of ODF status but a continuation of social and behaviour change to include other aspects of sanitation and hygiene. For example in Indonesia under the Community Based Total Sanitation policy, 5 pillars of hygiene behaviour are addressed: ODF (access and use of latrine), handwashing with soap, household water treatment, wastewater treatment and solid waste management.

In Nepal, the goal of ODF followed by proper latrine use and handwashing with soap as a first step is then taken further in schools to address solid waste management with separation of degradable and non-degradable, urine re-use where appropriate and household water treatment. In India also, school activities have continued through the programme to encompass composting and school gardens.

In Ethiopia, Community conversation is being used as a tool for post-triggering follow up and to move beyond ODF.

#### **Lessons learned**

An interesting lesson from India is that the involvement of children in the CLTS triggering process can serve to focus efforts on the elimination of open defecation rather than getting sidetracked on latrine construction and design. In this way children can be useful in the ODF verification process as they focus on whether a latrine stops you eating shit or not.

#### **Challenges**

The main focus has been on ODF achievement, but the “beyond ODF” activities have yet to be institutionalised.

- Creating a platform that allows the further engagement with partners after ODF has been create. This also entails maintaining momentum.
- Supporting teaching trainings beyond ODF so that there is a continuous support to maintain a sanitary environment around the school/community environment.
- Supporting the role of the school health clubs beyond ODF continuous support to maintain a sanitary environment around the school/community environment.

### **Tips**

- Upgrading of temporary pits to permanent pit latrines as fast as possible
- Exchange visits amongst schools that have promoted ODF in their communities
- Documentation and dissemination of progress especially in the issue of scaling up CLTS/SLTS

### **Sources of further information**

Da Silva Wells, C. and Sijbesma, C. (2010). *Practical innovations for strengthening Community-Led Total Sanitation : selected experience from Asia*. Unpublished paper

IRC (2008). *CLTS-Plus : some suggestions for strengthening Community-Led Total Sanitation*. The Hague, The Netherlands, IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre. Available at: <http://www.irc.nl/page/44830>

Mehta, L. (2010). *Shit matters: the potential of community-led total sanitation*. Rugby, UK, Practical Action. Available at: <http://www.goodreads.com/book/show/8312205-shit-matters>

### **Beyond the school and the community**

## **2. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **Experiences**

Country experiences presented fell broadly into 3 categories:-

#### **Working Definitions**

##### **a) SCHOOL LED Total Sanitation =**

WASH in Schools expands out to the communities, communities are triggered by the school community (children, teachers, PTA etc) – the goal is ODF school catchment areas and schools followed by toilet use and handwashing with soap.

- Nepal (Pakistan – from documentation)

**b) COMMUNITY LED Total Sanitation including triggering in schools =**

Schools are seen as part of the community and triggering occurs simultaneously and separately in communities and in schools in order to reinforce the community ODF process and / or school sanitary environment.

- India, Indonesia, Malawi, Uganda

**c) Standard community led total sanitation** = includes children (as well as adults) in the triggering process in the community

- Kenya, Zambia, Ghana

**Successes and innovations**

Success in terms of role/responsibilities the following can be cited:

- SLTS has been adopted as the national strategy for community sanitation in Nepal. The enabling policy environment and joint ownership of SLTS at every level has generated resources and capacity to reach approximately 1/2million people in 15 districts by focusing on 300 schools and their catchment areas.
- In the context of India, CLTS triggering takes place at both the communities and schools in a parallel manner. This simultaneous triggering in communities and schools has been found to accelerate achievement of total sanitation.
- In the context of Malawi where teachers and children are triggered together, the triggering of the school community resulted in the PTA and the school management communities to mobilise sources. This came in the form of providing construction of the facilities.

**Lessons learned**

*Students*

In Nepal the school is the entry point for community sanitation. Children are catalytic change agents and the school institution (including students, child clubs, teachers, PTAs, SMC) is the driving force behind the approach.

Having resources and capacity (trained students and teachers) based within existing community institution as the lead in means that sustainability and follow up for community sanitation is built in to the process.

*Teachers*

Apart from school children, teachers are key stakeholders. In Nepal teachers are highly regarded within communities and their knowledge and understanding is key. In India teachers are seen as opinion leaders and their buy-in to the approach can be paramount.

Teachers support to school childrens plans and activities is essential to mobilise actions of communities and other stakeholders. However whether teachers are triggered along with children or are silent observers to the process depends on the context.

Training all the teachers at the same time, as is the case in Nepal, means that when teachers leave the school, human resource remain in the school to continue activities and contributes to scale up through skill transfer.

### *Local Government*

Prioritisation of SLTS/CLTS by local government provides a supportive framework for activities.

In Nepal the local government are prioritising sanitation as a human rights issue and is fully accountable for ensuring access for all. In Indonesia also the district governments are highly autonomous and with their support resources, capacity and time can be generated for SLTS/CLTS. In Bangladesh the district and upazilla education office has been a committed partner to the process and has now included hygiene into weekly lesson plans.

### *National*

As has been found in many countries a supportive policy environment is important in legitimising the buy-in of all stakeholders to the approach. Operating within a clear national strategy and defined institutional structure has been paramount to the success and possibility for scale in Nepal and Indonesia.

### *Coordination*

Action research in Kenya found that improving coordination between various actors who have been working disparately, starting from district level line ministries can secure cost-effectiveness of WASH in Schools activities.

In Indonesia all duty bearers are involved in the approach. Capacity building of responsible institutions such as the water and sanitation working groups at all levels is a strategic means to ensure that the approach is institutionalised and sustainable after project end.

## **Challenges**

### **Community level**

- Differences exist in efficiency and commitment amongst natural leaders, commitment among stakeholders and understanding and following CLTS approach and steps.

- There is a severe lack of skilled staff (e.g. teacher, health extension workers, and rural development agencies) that can facilitate the CLTS process effectively and efficiently.
- Committed teachers can drive the success of the approach, however where teachers are already overburdened sanitation and hygiene activities may be deprioritised.

### **Intermediate level**

- Insufficient personnel numbers has meant that continuous follow up and monitoring is hampered and this leads to loss of interest.

### **National level**

- In the countries presented, communities where subsidy has been provided in the past are less receptive to implementing CLTS and triggering is much more challenging. Future subsidies by other NGOs or the government may have negative effects on what the CLTS process achieves.
- How to sustain the massive community movement that has started was highlighted as a challenge in Nepal. Like CLTS in other countries success generates an ever increasing demand that need to be met.
- Inadequate funding allocations for WASH in Schools remains a challenge. It remains unclear how SLTS or CLTS with triggering in schools as a springboard for community sanitation works in a context where the school in question has no sanitation facilities (or inadequate facilities). Further strategic work on advocating for continued and increased investment in school WASH is required.

### **Tips**

- Use local schools as resource base for scale out
- Documentation and dissemination of progress
- Involve the duty bearers e.g. government departments from the beginning of the programme/project
- Teacher need to be also be involved from the beginning of the programme/project as well.
- Planners should consider the number of users (pupils) when designing the facilities.

### **Sources of further information**

Bongartz, P. and Chambers, R. (2009). *Beyond subsidies : triggering a revolution in rural sanitation*. (IDS policy briefing; no. 10). Brighton, UK, Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex.  
Available at:

<http://www.irc.nl/docsearch/title/170713> or <http://www.ids.ac.uk/index.cfm?objectid=7447E12B-B4CD-5162-7151E5E78AB94027> +

Chambers, R. (2009). *Going to scale with community-led total sanitation : reflections on experience, issues and ways forward*. (Practice paper / IDS; no. 1). Brighton, UK, Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex. Available at:

<http://www.irc.nl/docsearch/title/165952> or <http://www.ntd.co.uk/idsbookshop/details.asp?id=1090>

Khan, F. et al. (2008). 'School led sanitation promotion : helping achieve total sanitation outcomes in Azad Jammu and Kashmir'. In: *Beyond construction : use by all : a collection of case studies from sanitation and hygiene promotion practitioners in South Asia*. London, UK, WaterAid and Delft, The Netherlands, IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre. Available at: <http://www.irc.nl/page/40584>